

# **2004 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET**

## **Staff Report and SEPA Addendum for UGA Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (Including Adoption of a General Sewer Plan)**

### ***JEFFERSON COUNTY, WASHINGTON***

Staff Recommendation and Environmental Analysis  
with Regard to the  
Adoption of Suggested Amendments  
to the 1998 Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan

**May 19, 2004**

*INTEGRATED GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT/STATE  
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT DOCUMENT*  
Environmental Review of a Non-Project Action:  
Addendum to Existing Environmental Documents

# 1 Environmental Summary and Fact Sheet

## 1.1 FACT SHEET

### **Title and Description of Proposed Action**

Pursuant to the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) is considering adoption of an amendment to the 1998 Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan (CP) which will provide capital facilities (sewer, transportation, and stormwater) for the Irondale & Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA) and related Amendments to the Unified Development Code (UDC). Other amendments to the CP are under consideration and are part of the “Final Docket” for this year’s annual amendment cycle, but will be addressed in a separate staff report / SEPA document in the future.

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

As part of the 2002 Amendments to the CP, specifically Amendment MLA02-242 proposed that “Jefferson County; adopt an Urban Growth Area boundary in the Port Hadlock area and portray it on the land use map consistent with analysis conducted through the Special Study and the requirements of the GMA.”(Final Docket 2002 CP Amendments)

The County approved this Amendment as Ordinance 19-1220-02 (December 2002).

This decision was appealed the to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (Hearings Board) in 2003. The Hearings Board supported the UGA decision, but found that the County had failed to properly complete the designation process for the UGA since analysis of capital facilities and amendments to the UDC were not developed. The Hearings Board stated:

“We find that the County has not complied with the goals and requirements of the Act by prematurely adopting a final GMA Tri-Area UGA before adopting urban level of service standards, finishing required capital facilities planning and fiscal analysis of affordability of those facilities and adopting development regulations for application within the UGA.” Hearings Board - Final Order and Decision No. 03-2-0010 – August 22, 2003

The County has chosen a compliance pathway that involves UGA analysis, policy development, and capital facilities planning in the following areas:

- Update to Population Allocations and Projections
- Septic System Capacity Analysis
- Development of a General Sewer Plan
- Update to the Transportation Analysis
- Irondale and Port Hadlock UGA Build-out Analysis, Mark Personius, March 4, 2004.
- Stormwater Needs Analysis and Development of A Stormwater Management Plan
- Development of a UGA Chapter for the CP including land use, utilities, and capital facilities elements.
- Review of the entire CP for consistency with the UGA and proposed UGA Chapter (proposed line-in and line-out revisions).

As part of this process, the County proposed the following 2004 Amendment to the CP:

**MLA04-29** proposed by Jefferson County suggesting the following: Placeholder amendment for proposing the addition of narrative and policy language under a new Irondale & Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA) element in the Comprehensive Plan. This effort is related to compliance with a Growth Management Hearings Board order concerning the 2002 designation of the Irondale & Port Hadlock UGA. Among the topics under consideration by a Board-appointed UGA Citizen Task Force—and later by the public, the Planning Commission, and the Board—are urban growth levels of service, capital

facilities, and the UGA boundary and internal land use districts.

This amendment will include the following three major elements:

UGA Chapter: The focus of this Amendment is the addition to the Comprehensive Plan of a new chapter (Chapter 2 – Previous Chapter 2 is proposed as Appendix H) which provides detail on the Irondale & Port Hadlock UGA. This chapter addresses the GMA requirements for the urban growth area, including accommodating the projected population growth, proposed land uses, utilities and public facilities urban level of service standards, and capital facility plans to implement needed urban infrastructure.

General Sewer Plan: As part of the development of UGA urban services, sewer service is planned to all areas of the UGA except the areas designated as single family residential. The General Sewer Plan is proposed for adoption as a component of the Comprehensive Plan (Appendix H). This general sewer plan proposes a centralized constructed wetland system for treatment with discharge to a centrally located wetland for disposal (infiltration / evapo-transpiration).

Line-in / Line-out: The UGA Amendments also include specific line-in and line-out changes to various chapters of the Comprehensive Plan to adjust for inclusion of the new UGA, and to remove language no longer applicable.

UDC Amendments: Also required by the Hearings Board are revisions to the UDC to provide development regulations consistent with the UGA Amendment. These regulations include creation of new urban zoning districts, permitted land use tables, bulk and dimensional requirements and urban development standards.

<b>Proponent</b>	Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC)
<b>Lead Agency</b>	Jefferson County Department of Community Development (DCD) Long-Range Planning 621 Sheridan Street Port Townsend WA 98368
<b>Responsible Official</b>	Al Scalf, Director DCD (360) 379-4493
<b>Contact Person</b>	Kyle Alm, Associate Planner

<b>Authors and Principal Contributors</b>	DCD Long-Range Planning (360) 379-4482 Jefferson County Department of Community Development Long-Range Planning Marc Horton – Economic and Engineering Services, Inc.
<b>Date of Staff Report and SEPA Addendum Issuance</b>	May 19, 2004
<b>Past Related Actions and Future Anticipated Actions</b>	<p>This action is a continuation of a series of actions which began in the early 1990's with the start of GMA Planning. The Irondale and Port Hadlock area has always been a candidate for a UGA since the area was characterized by urban growth. The 1998 CP reflected the UGA considerations and density discussions. This was followed by several years of evaluation and environmental analysis culminating with completion of the "Special Study," the Final Supplemental EIS, and the CP UGA Amendment of 2002.</p> <p>In 2002, Amendment MLA02-242 proposed that "Jefferson County; adopt an Urban Growth Area boundary in the Port Hadlock area and portray it on the land use map consistent with analysis conducted through the Special Study and the requirements of the GMA."(Final Docket 2002 CP Amendments). This Amendment was adopted as Ordinance 19-220-02.</p> <p>The currently proposed Amendments provide for implementation of the UGA with land use designations, capital facilities planning, and development codes.</p>
<b>Tentative Adoption Date</b>	<p>A legislative decision from the BOCC on the UGA Comprehensive Plan Amendment and UDC Amendment proposals is expected July 26, 2004.</p> <p>The meeting schedules and agendas for the Planning Commission and BOCC with regard to this proposed Amendment will be advertised in the Port Townsend Leader and are available on a Jefferson County website dedicated to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan annual amendment cycle process. This website can be accessed from the "Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan" section of the Long-Range Planning website:</p> <p><a href="http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Comp_plan.htm">http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Comp_plan.htm</a></p>
<b>Appeal Information</b>	Issues relating to the adequacy of a SEPA Addendum and other procedural issues may not be appealed under the administrative

appeal provisions of Unified Development Code (UDC) 8.10.12. Appeals of GMA actions (i.e., a legislative decision by the BOCC) are heard first by a Growth Management Hearings Board. Appeals of the adoption of the UDC amendments as well as the UGA Amendments are both considered GMA actions.

**Location of Background  
Material and Documents  
Incorporated by Reference**

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

**Relation to Other  
Documents**

A series of documents have been prepared by or on behalf of Jefferson County to evaluate the impacts of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan inclusive of amendments. These documents, listed in part 3 of this document, "Supporting Record, Analyses, and Materials," provide substantial background information and offer previous environmental description and analysis. As described in Part 3, a portion of these documents have been adopted and others are hereby incorporated by reference. The reader is encouraged to utilize existing documents in conjunction with this document for more comprehensive perspective and understanding.

In this document, description of and references to the content of the proposals have been provided to the greatest extent possible, but are not inclusive of all relevant historical information for the UGA Comprehensive Plan Amendments. For optimum understanding of the discussion presented here, the previously issued environmental documents, staff reports, and all documents incorporated by reference should be accessed.

**Cost to the Public**

Copies of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket, DCD Integrated Staff Reports and SEPA documents, or select pages, are available at cost from the Jefferson County Department of Community Development (DCD). The text and selected appendices are also available for download on the DCD website dedicated to the 2004 annual amendment cycle, which can be accessed from the "Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan" section of the Long-Range Planning website:

[http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Comp\\_plan.htm](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Comp_plan.htm)

Copies of this document are available for inspection at DCD and

the Jefferson County Public Library at Port Hadlock.

## **1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY**

### **1.2.1 Introduction and Process**

Jefferson County adopted a comprehensive plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA) on August 28, 1998. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan is a policy document that guides growth and future land use decisions in Jefferson County. In each successive year, the County has conducted a Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle as provided by the GMA. The process for amending the Comprehensive Plan is outlined in Section 9 of the Unified Development Code (UDC). The 2004 Final Docket included five (5) proposed amendments. All proposed amendments except this UGA Amendment will be considered at a later date. Along with the UGA Amendment, this proposal includes UGA related Amendments to the UDC providing development regulations for the UGA.

This document is an integrated Staff Report and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Addendum. The objective is to analyze the proposed amendments individually and cumulatively with regard to Comprehensive Plan amendment criteria outlined in UDC Section 9 and potential environmental impacts as proscribed in SEPA. The proposed Amendments are being considered for Adoption separately from the other proposals on the 2004 Docket because these Amendments represent compliance actions in response to the 2003 Order of the Hearings Board. (related to 2002 UGA Amendments).

Adoption of Comprehensive Plan Amendments is a non-project action under SEPA and the analysis presented in this document is not intended to satisfy individual project SEPA action requirements (i.e., the review needed for a future land use or building permit application). This is an integrated GMA/SEPA document that combines environmental analysis with a Staff Report offering recommended action on the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. Guidance for a GMA document integrated with a SEPA Addendum is found at Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-235. The analysis in this document supplements adopted environmental documents and should be considered with those documents incorporated by reference.

#### **1.2.1.1 Adoption of Environmental Documents**

The following existing environmental documents have been adopted through legal notice published on May 19, 2004 (Attachment Item 2): are being adopted as part of this process:

- Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS/FEIS) and addenda prepared in anticipation of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 1998. The DEIS and FEIS are dated

February 24, 1997 and May 27, 1998, respectively, and examined the potential cumulative environmental impacts of adopting alternative versions of the Comprehensive Plan.

- Draft and Final Supplemental EIS (DSEIS/FSEIS) and addenda for the Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments, also known as Tasks III and IV of the Tn-Area / Glen Cove Special Study. The DSEIS and FSEIS are dated June 30, 1999 and August 18, 1999, respectively, and examined the potential environmental impacts of adopting one of the identified planning alternatives for the Tn-Area of Chimacum-Port Hadlock-Irondale and the Glen Cove mixed use area.
- DCD Integrated Staff Report and DSEIS/FSEIS for the 2002 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket. The DEIS and FSEIS are dated August 21, 2002 and November 25, 2002 respectively. Amidst other information, the adopted documents provide background and analysis on the designation of a UGA in the Irondale & Port Hadlock area.

### **1.2.1.2 Incorporation of Documents by Reference**

The proposed actions have been preceded by analysis and related actions by the County. Specific documents which might assist in better understanding of these proposed actions are listed in part 3 of this document. These and all other materials or documents referenced in the text within are hereby incorporated by reference, pursuant to SEPA rules at WAC 197-11-600 and 635.

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

Moreover, throughout this document description of and references to the content of these Amendments have been provided to the greatest extent possible, but are not inclusive of all relevant information from the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. For optimum understanding of the discussion presented here, the proposed Comprehensive Plan and UDC Amendments, including any associated SEPA Environmental Checklists, should be consulted as companion information to this document.

### **1.2.1.3 Level of Environmental Analysis**

This document provides analysis of environmental impacts as appropriate to the general nature of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan UGA Amendment and related UDC Amendments. The adoption of Comprehensive Plan and UDC Amendments is classified under SEPA as a non-project (i.e., programmatic) action. A non-project action, such as decisions on policies, plans or programs, is defined as an action that is broader than a single site-specific project. Environmental analysis for a non-project proposal does not require site-specific analyses; instead, a document such as an

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a SEPA Addendum discusses impacts and alternatives appropriate to the scope of the non-project proposal and to the level of planning for the proposal (WAC 197-11-442). The analysis in this document is not intended to satisfy individual project action SEPA requirements (i.e., the review needed for a future land use or building permit application).

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

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

#### **1.2.1.4 Process and Public Involvement**

Following is a description of the anticipated review and public involvement process for the 2004 Comprehensive Plan UGA Amendment, UDC Amendments, and associated Staff Report and SEPA Addendum. This 2004 Comprehensive Plan UGA Amendment, DCD Staff Report and SEPA Addendum are available to agencies and interested parties pursuant to GMA and SEPA rules. Comments on the merits of the proposals shall be accepted as outlined below under ‘Public Comment Period.’

##### **1.2.1.4.1 Planning Commission Public Hearings**

The Jefferson County Planning Commission is scheduled to hold a public hearing to take testimony on the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment, on Wednesday, June 2, 2004; 6:30 PM at the WSU Community Learning Center. A second public hearing is scheduled for Wednesday, June 16, 2004 to review the development regulations for the UGA. This combined Staff Report and SEPA Addendum is available at DCD and on the DCD web pages for public and agency use prior to the Planning Commission public hearing on these suggested amendments.

#### **1.2.1.4.2 Public Comment Period**

The Planning Commission will accept oral comments on these two suggested amendments at the public hearings cited above. DCD and the Planning Commission will accept written comments on the Comprehensive Plan amendments, including the General Sewer Plan and SEPA/Staff Report until the close of the June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. DCD and the Planning Commission will accept written comments on the Unified Development Code Amendments until the close of the June 16<sup>th</sup> public hearing. Any comments submitted after specified dates will be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) for consideration in their legislative decision. The BOCC may hold a public hearing before taking action on the Amendments (formal notice would appear in the newspaper of record). Written comments on the proposals may be submitted to DCD at 621 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend WA 98368 or via email to [planning@co.jefferson.wa.us](mailto:planning@co.jefferson.wa.us).

#### **1.2.1.4.3 Availability of Documents**

For more information or to inspect or request copies of the proposed amendments, the adopted existing environmental documents or other related information, contact DCD Long-Range Planning at the mail or email addresses above, by phone at (360) 379-4450, or visit the 2004 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle website, where as many relevant documents and maps as possible are available in Portable Document Format (PDF). The Universal Resource Locator (URL) for the website follows:

[http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Comp\\_plan.htm](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Comp_plan.htm)

#### **1.2.1.4.4 Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners Deliberation**

Following each of the public hearings, the Planning Commission deliberates on the proposals, potentially over a series of meetings, and formulates a recommendation on each proposal to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC). It is anticipated that the Planning Commission will deliberate on this suggested amendment during regularly scheduled meetings June 2<sup>nd</sup> June 16<sup>th</sup>, or until such time that they formulate a recommendation for transmittal to the BOCC. The Planning Commission generally meets the first and third Wednesdays of any given month at the WSU Community Learning Center, Shold Business Park, 201 W Patison, Port Hadlock.

Following the Planning Commission public hearing on this suggested amendment and subsequent recommendation, DCD will formerly transmit the Planning Commission recommendation to the BOCC, in conjunction with the DCD final staff recommendation, based on continuing review, comments submitted during the public comment period, and the Planning Commission deliberation and recommendation.

In making a final legislative decision on these Amendments, the BOCC considers the Planning Commission recommendation, the full case record of the Amendments (all comments provided to

the Planning Commission, the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings, and other background information), the DCD staff recommendation that accompanies the Planning Commission recommendation, legal advice from the Prosecuting Attorney’s office, and any written or oral comments provided to the BOCC before or during a BOCC public hearing on the Amendments. If the BOCC elects to schedule one or more public hearings on the Amendments following receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, there would be another opportunity for agencies and the public to provide formal comments on the Amendments. A legal notice would appear in the *Port Townsend & Jefferson County Leader*, the publication of record, announcing any BOCC public hearings.

The meeting schedules and agendas for the Planning Commission and BOCC with regard to the 2004 Docket are available on a Jefferson County website dedicated to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan annual amendment cycle process. This website can be accessed from the “Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan” section of the Long-Range Planning website:

[http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Comp\\_plan.htm](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Comp_plan.htm)

## 1.2.2 Major conclusion

### 1.2.2.1 Summary Matrix of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

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

<b>AMENDMENT ELEMENT</b>	<b>NEW IDENTIFIED IMPACTS</b>	<b>MITIGATION</b>	<b>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT / ADVERSE?</b>
UGA Chapter – Land Use	Increased Commercial / Multifamily lands.	Adequate planning for utilities and capital facilities such as transportation.	No
UGA Chapter – Capital Facilities (sewer, transportation, and stormwater)	None	Design of facilities to meet the LOS standards	No
General Sewer Plan	None	Advanced waste treatment / enhanced	No

		wetland function / groundwater recharge	
CP Language Changes (Line-in / out)	None	None	No

### 1.2.2.2 Changes in this Proposal from Previous Proposals and Analysis

The proposed Amendments are consistent with the initial 2002 CP adoption of the UGA, except for the implementation phase capital facility planning for sanitary sewer, stormwater and transportation facilities analyzed in this document and some minor adjustments to the internal allocation of commercial and multi-family land use designations shown on the 2002 UGA Comprehensive Plan Map. There are no external boundary changes proposed for the UGA from that adopted in 2002. The internal UGA land use adjustments have slightly increased the amount of commercial and multi-family designated lands (relative to single-family designated lands in 2002). These internal land use adjustments and comparative changes to the initial 2002 adopted UGA were completed to both reflect the higher 20-year population allocation adopted by the County in 2003 (based on the ten year updated OFM estimates) and to enhance feasibility of the proposed sanitary sewer system in the core area of the UGA. The internal UGA land use adjustments are discussed in detail in the *Irondale & Port Hadlock UGA Build-out Analysis, March 2004* adopted by reference as a part of this SEPA documentation.

### 1.2.2.3 Probable Significant Adverse Impacts

The analysis of the proposed Amendments indicate that the impacts are similar in nature to those assessed as part of the deliberation on the 2002 UGA boundary and adoption. The boundary has not changed, and the purpose of these Amendments are primarily to provide mitigation to growth through orderly development and development standards and capital facilities development to meet the areas' needs.

### 1.2.3 Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty

The most significant areas of uncertainty are those of growth rate, and the capability of the wetland waste treatment system to meet hydraulic (capacity) and regulatory requirements.

These issues are the subject of efforts currently underway to better understand the hydrogeology of the area, the characterization and delineation of the existing wetland area, and final design criteria for the facility.

As the area grows and as sewer planning progresses, new information will be developed which will require new levels of planning (e.g. a Sewer System Engineering Report) and may require changes to plans. When plans are adopted or revised, environmental review will be conducted. At that time, new SEPA Threshold Decisions will be made and environmental documents prepared accordingly to comply with SEPA.

#### **1.2.4 Issues To Be Resolved**

The two biggest issues to be resolved are related to wastewater facilities. These include technical adequacy of the chosen site, and financing for the system.

##### **1.2.4.1 Environmental Choices to be Made**

The most significant environmental choices to be made relative to this Amendment are those related to the location and type of sewage treatment. The preferred alternative is a constructed wetland treatment system with natural wetland disposal. This option has the benefits of recharge of wastewater, possible enhancement of wetland functions in the area, and a central location for development of possible future reuse facilities to serve school playgrounds, parks, and ball fields. Additionally, parcels of available land are approximately twice the size of that needed for the facility providing for buffers and expansion capacity. Reuse of wastewater will require additional treatment to provide high quality water for this purpose. Potential negative aspects to this alternative is the “cutting edge” nature of wetland treatment systems and lack of system performance information in the Pacific Northwest.

Alternatives to this approach all include mechanical (conventional) treatment, land treatment and land disposal with the exception of marine disposal options (Port Townsend Bay). The advantages of these systems are the performance history of mechanical systems and the recharge of much of the wastewater. The marine disposal option has exceptional ability to accommodate increasing flows into the future.

However, these alternatives have the negative aspects of utilizing land within or adjacent to the UGA or land treatment or disposal – therefore raising questions of sustainability. In the case of marine disposal, the concerns over endangered salmon species, and impacts (immediate and cumulative) on the marine environment will make permitting a long-term proposition if it can be done.

##### **1.2.4.2 Effectiveness of Mitigation Measures**

Adequate capital facilities are part of the mitigation for development of a UGA. Transportation, stormwater, and sewer planning will help assure that the environment is protected as growth occurs.

##### **1.2.4.3 Main Options to be Preserved or Foreclosed by the Action**

Capital facilities plans can have flexibility to adjust to varying growth rates, and changing conditions. The transportation and sewer systems, once constructed, tend to be more inflexible to change and therefore tend to foreclose options or make future options more difficult to implement.

In the case of transportation, the existing road network is not proposed to change. No options will be foreclosed by implementing this capital facilities plan.

The sewer system which has been recommended will include a system in the central part of the UGA. This will not foreclose future options of moving the system, and it will provide opportunity for centralized distribution of wastewater for reuse in the future. Other options are not foreclosed by this choice, however, once constructed, it will be expensive to move to another alternative. This can be said for selection of any of the alternatives, however.

## **2 Concise Analysis of the Proposals**

### **2.1 OVERVIEW**

Detailed planning for the designation of a Tri-Area (Chimacum, Irondale, and Port Hadlock) UGA in compliance with the requirements of the GMA has been on-going since the Jefferson County CP was originally adopted in 1998. Specific policy language in the CP indicated the joint city/county intent to pursue future UGA planning for the Tri-Area. As part of the on-going joint City/County urban growth area planning, the Tri-Area Provisional UGA (PUGA) was designated by Jefferson County on October 5, 1999 as an interim step in the UGA planning process. In-depth analysis and environmental impact review of the land use, population, capital facilities and public services, natural systems and critical area constraints, open space, housing and non-residential land use needs for a Tri-Area UGA were incorporated in the *Tri Area/Glen Cove Special Study* conducted from 1998-2002. The *Special Study* includes:

- Land Use Inventory Report (Task I) dated January 26, 1999
- Regional Economic Analysis and Forecast (Task II) dated January 26, 1999
- Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Task III) dated June 1999
- Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Task IV) dated August 1999
- Glen Cove/Tri Area Special Study Final Decision Document dated June 11, 2001
- Tri-Area UGA Capital Facilities Special Study (Task V) dated November 2001
- Tri Area & Glen Cove Special Study Implementation Plan (Task VI) dated November 28, 2001

As part of the 2002 Amendments to the CP, specifically Amendment MLA02-242 proposed that “Jefferson County; adopt an Urban Growth Area boundary in the Port Hadlock area and portray it on the land use map consistent with analysis conducted through the Special Study and the requirements of the GMA”(Final Docket 2002 CP Amendments).

The County approved this Amendment as Ordinance 19-1220-02 (December 2002).

This decision was appealed the to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (Hearings Board) in 2003. The Hearings Board supported the UGA decision, but found that the County had failed to properly designate the UGA since analysis of capital facilities and amendments to the UDC were not developed. The Hearings Board stated:

“We find that the County has not complied with the goals and requirements of the Act by prematurely adopting a final GMA Tri-Area UGA before adopting urban level of service standards, finishing required capital facilities planning and fiscal analysis of affordability of those facilities and adopting development regulations for application within the UGA.” Hearings Board - Final Order and Decision No. 03-2-0010 – August 22, 2003

The County has chosen a compliance pathway that involves UGA analysis, policy development, and capital facilities planning in the following areas:

- Update to Population Allocations and Projections
- Septic System Capacity Analysis
- Development of a General Sewer Plan
- Update to the Transportation Analysis
- Stormwater Needs Analysis and Development of A Stormwater Management Plan
- Development of a UGA Chapter for the CP including land use, utilities, and capital facilities elements.
- Review of the entire CP for consistency with the UGA and proposed UGA Chapter (proposed line-in and line-out revisions).

## **2.1.1 Staff Reports, Cumulative Analysis, and Staff Recommendations**

Described below is the process for evaluation of the CP Amendment proposals and the related UDC Amendments. This process provides for both policy and environmental analysis to assure that the proposals are consistent with County Policy, the CP, and that environmental are considered with an appropriate level of analysis.

### **2.1.2 Criteria for Evaluation**

#### **2.1.2.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

Section 9.2 of the UDC requires consideration of cumulative effects of proposals for amendments. For this amendment, the cumulative impact analysis of the UGA was completed in 2002. The actions proposed here are compliance actions as directed by the Hearings board and are directed to implementation of the previously adopted UGA. Other amendments on the 2004 Docket are being considered together along with their cumulative impacts.

### **2.1.2.2 Growth Management Indicators**

Pursuant to UDC section 9.8.1(b), the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners shall develop findings and conclusions which consider specific criteria. The Growth Management indicators are part of those criteria and are listed at UDC section 9.5.4(b)(1).

These growth management indicators address:

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

These indicators are not necessarily Amendment-specific but rather are meant to provide a snapshot of Jefferson County's status during this 2004 amendment cycle. This section will serve to promote consideration and inquiry into these seven growth management indicators and is intended to be a starting point for broader community consideration before the Planning Commission and the BOCC. While this review of the growth management indicators provides some basic analysis related to County demographics, it is not intended to measure progress in achieving the goals of the Comprehensive Plan; that task is reserved for the overall Comprehensive Plan update scheduled for completion in the second week in December 2004.

### **2.1.2.3 Planning Commission Criteria**

In addition to the Growth Management Indicators discussed above, UDC section 9.8.1(b) also requires additional findings for all amendments which consider three (3) additional criteria related to the assumptions of the CP and values held by residents of the County.

### **2.1.2.4 SEPA Non-Project Questions**

For Non-Project Actions such as this, the SEPA Checklist contains specific questions which should be considered in evaluation of a proposed action.

## **2.2 SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The staff have reviewed the proposed amendments and provide the following summary recommendations for consideration:

AMENDMENT ELEMENT	RECOMMENDATION
UGA Chapter – Land Use	Approve
UGA Chapter – Capital Facilities - Transportation	Approve
UGA Chapter – Capital Facilities - Stormwater	Approve
General Sewer Plan	Approve
CP Language Changes (Line-in / out)	Approve
UDC Amendments (Appendix D)	Approve

## 2.3 STAFF REPORTS AND ANALYSIS: SUGGESTED UGA AND UDC AMENDMENTS

### 2.3.1 Description of Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the establishment of goals and policies for a UGA established in 2002. Further, for capital facilities needs, urban level of service standards are proposed and capital facilities plans developed for sewer, transportation, and stormwater. Further, as part of this action, a General Sewer Plan will be adopted. Specific language changes to the CP have been proposed consistent with implementation of the UGA.

Further, development regulations for the UGA have been developed as an Amendment to the UDC. These regulations control the “bulk and dimension” of development in the UGA. These have been developed consistent with the proposed UGA Amendment.

#### 2.3.1.1 UGA Chapter (Attachment 3)

This Amended Chapter (Chapter 2) of the CP replaces the Plan Implementation and Monitoring Chapter which is proposed to be moved to the Appendix area (Appendix H). The purpose of the

chapter is to provide details of UGA planning. This chapter “mirrors” the content of the CP in that it contains information on population dynamics, land use designations, utilities information, a capital facilities element, etc.

The Chapter reflects the most recent agreement on allocation of population (County Resolution 55-03) which calls for an increase of 2,453 people by 2024 in the UGA area. This number is within the range of population projections evaluated in the 2002 UGA adoption process.

Internal UGA land use designations experienced a minor change from those of 2002 based on public input from the UGA Task Force. Commercial and multi-family land use designations increased slightly relative to single-family residential. A complete analysis of the internal land use changes between 2002 and 2004 UGA land use maps is contained in the *Irondale & Port Hadlock UGA Buildout Analysis, March 2004*.

Critical utilities not provided by the County include power and water. The providers are Puget Sound Energy and Public Utility District No. 1 of Jefferson County respectively. Other than routine adjustments due to the progression of time and adjustments for actual growth, there are no significant changes for these utilities as the UGA is implemented. Both utilities are regulated and obligated to maintain plans for meeting expected population growth within their service area. This area has been characterized by urban densities for many years, and both utilities have been planning accordingly.

The UGA Capital Facilities Element includes level of service standards (LOS) for urban services and utilities. This portion of the Chapter also includes identification of capital needs for County provided services and utilities. Most important of these are sewer, stormwater, and transportation which are described more fully below.

Importantly, the UGA Chapter provides goals and policy information for the UGA which will guide development of the area and the development standards. These standards will be adopted as Amendments to the UDC and will be proposed for adoption concurrently with adoption of this proposed Amendment.

### **2.3.1.2 UGA Capital Facilities (sewer, transportation, stormwater, water) Details**

The UGA Capital Facilities Element includes level of service standards (LOS) for urban services and utilities. This portion of the Chapter also includes identification of capital needs for County provided services and utilities. Most important of these are sewer, stormwater, and transportation. Sewer planning has been provided as a General Sewer Plan (GSP) and is being adopted as part of the CP (described below).

#### 2.3.1.2.1 Adoption of General Sewer Plan (Attachment 4)

The General Sewer Plan (GSP) is required under state law prior to development of a County sponsored sewer system. It is intended to be general in nature, but specific enough that an engineering report (more detailed and site specific engineering) can be completed without substantial change in concept.

The Final Draft GSP provides an analysis of possible alternatives for development of collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater from “core” areas of the UGA. These areas are expected to provide land for commercial, light industrial, and multi-family uses.

Prior to designation of the proposed service area within the UGA, a review of the on-site septic system capacity of soils within the UGA was completed. This study was conducted by Jefferson County Health Department (Environmental Health Department). This report (Jefferson County Irondale and Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area On-Site Sewer Capacity Report, October 2003) indicated that soil capacity is sufficient to support the anticipated residential population growth within the 20-year horizon, the majority of which was assumed to be associated with single-family residences.

The analysis was based on the soils and area requirements of the Department of Health for on-site disposal. These requirements are designed to protect both public health and the environment (groundwater). Both State and local regulations provide for density limitations based on soils and critical areas (such as critical aquifer recharge areas). These limitations will remain in place for those areas without sewer (as identified in the GSP).

For the areas targeted for higher density (e.g. commercial and high density residential), soils will not accommodate the planned build-out density and a sewer system will be required to accomplish implementation of the plan. It is for this area that a GSP was created.

Wastewater disposal options included various land treatment and disposal both within and outside the UGA boundaries, and included the option of a marine discharge(s). The environmental impacts from these types of treatment and location were evaluated in 2002 as part of the UGA adoption and at the time considered a “build-out” population of over 10,000 people. The GSP proposes a treatment system of a much smaller scale.

Of the treatment and disposal options, the GSP proposes the use of a constructed wetland, with discharge to a natural wetland area within the UGA (Exhibit 4-5 of the GSP). Under this option, the wastewater will need to receive a high level of treatment prior to final discharge. Also, the constructed wetland will require lining to prevent contamination of nearby groundwater.

Odor from the treatment and disposal options is not expected to be significant since all water bodies are shallow providing for aerobic conditions.

Criteria for alternative selection included cost, difficulty of permitting, scalability, and land requirements.

As required by law, the GSP was developed with the assistance of a Review Committee, and included information on the estimated costs and possible financing of the system.

Capital needs associated with implementation of the GSP have been included as part of the UGA Capital Facilities Element and the amended CP Capital Facilities Element.

At this stage of sewer planning, environmental review has not shown any impacts not previously anticipated or analyzed. This document provides a narrowing of alternatives and impacts from previous analysis. Continuing work will include detailed site analysis, including preparation of an engineering report. As future information is obtained, further environmental review (phased project review) will be required.

#### 2.3.1.2.2 Transportation Plan

Specific analysis of transportation needs for the proposed UGA have been completed. Levels of service (LOS) for the UGA were reviewed, proposed land uses assessed, and population growth considered in this latest analysis. Specific revisions to the capital facilities needs for the county (due to the UGA) as provided in the analysis have been included in this proposed Amendment. The most recent analysis concluded that the impacts to the transportation system and potential transportation needs, in the UGA and adjacent area, are manageable and that the UGA may impact transportation by increasing the capacity demand earlier, than would occur without the UGA.

#### 2.3.1.2.3 Stormwater Plan

A Stormwater Management Plan for the UGA has been created to support changes in the CP and the decisions relative to this proposed Amendment. The UGA Stormwater Management Plan is a planning document that provides guidance to minimize adverse effects of stormwater runoff on ground and surface water, including aquatic resources and habitats, water quantity. It identifies water quality and quantity problems associated with stormwater runoff that may adversely affect the environment and community and provides recommendations for improvements and programs including a cost analysis and an implementation schedule.

The Plan identifies specific structural and non-structural solutions to conveyance and water quality problems within the UGA. Structural solutions include constructing detention and infiltration ponds, pipes, and treatment facilities. Non-structural solutions include stormwater management facility inspection and maintenance, public education and outreach, water quality monitoring, and encouraging low impact development.

The Plan was developed in conformance with Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Appendix G: Review of Drainage, Flooding, Stormwater Management Issues and Polluted Discharges. It meets the stormwater management recommendations of the Puget Sound Water Quality Action Plan and the technical standards of the 2001 Washington Department of Ecology *Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington* (DOE Manual).

The primary goal of the UGA Stormwater Management Plan is to preserve and protect water quality and the hydraulic regime within the UGA's drainage basins and the receiving waters of Chimacum Creek and Port Townsend Bay.

As additional development occurs within the UGA limits, the amount of impervious surfaces will increase which will ultimately increase peak surface-water runoff rates.

To this end, the County intends to manage stormwater to minimize contact with contaminants, mitigate the impacts of increased runoff due to development within the UGA's drainage areas, provide management of runoff from large and small construction sites, and to preserve fish and wildlife habitat. These efforts would meet County goals to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the local citizenry and to preserve surface water resources within the UGA.

Capital needs associated with implementation of the Stormwater Plan have been included as part of the UGA Capital Facilities Element and the amended CP Capital Facilities Element.

### **2.3.1.3 UGA Specific Language Amendments (Attachment 5)**

Specific language changes to the CP have been prepared – specifically focused on consistency with the new UGA Chapter. Consequently, these changes do not represent any departure from previous policy and from a staff report and SEPA perspective, the impacts have been addressed in the discussion and analysis above.

### **2.3.1.4 UDC Amendments (Attachment 6)**

Amendments to the UDC represent the development regulations which implement the vision, goals, and policies of the CP. The UDC amendments include an appendix of regulations specific to the UGA in Irondale/Hadlock and a line out of regulations in the UDC that are in conflict with the new appendix.

## **2.3.2 Evaluation of Amendments – UDC Criteria**

### **2.3.2.1 Growth Indicators**

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

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

*Discussion:* The Office of Financial Management is the State agency responsible for compiling population projections under the Growth Management Act (GMA). The most recent OFM Population Determination for Jefferson County, based on a corrected Federal Census count, shows a year 2003 (April 2003) population of 26,700. The 1996 “base year” population estimate used in the Comprehensive Plan (see page 3-3) was identified as 25,756 residents. This represents an increase of 944 individuals over that five-year period between 1996 and 2003 or a less than 1% growth rate over the last 6 years. Should this trend continue over the next five years, Jefferson County would see a 2007 population of 27,513— a number that falls below the 2006 projected population of 32,116 adopted by the City and the County based on the Watterson Report (see Jefferson County Resolution 17-96). OFM projects an intermediate series population of 28,308 for Jefferson County by the year 2005.

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

YEAR	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2001	2003
County Population	8300	6420	8346	8918	11618	9639	10661	15965	20406	26299	26700
Port Townsend	4181	2847	3970	4683	6888	5074	5241	6067	7001	8430	8430
Percent in Port Townsend	50%	44%	47%	53%	59%	53%	49%	38%	34%	32%	32%

**Jefferson County Population 1910-2003**

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

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

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

*Discussion:* The number of service providers in the County has not decreased and the County, with the exception of policy decisions made as a result of economic conditions, continues to be equipped to provide the same level of services available at the time of Comprehensive Plan adoption. Completion of capital facilities and provision of services analysis related to this proposed Amendment and the 2002 designation of an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in the Irondale & Port Hadlock area could result in a situation whereby the level of service available in the County increases.

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

*Discussion:* Based on the current population allocation contained in County Resolution No. 55-03, the analysis related to creation of the UGA in 2002, and the continuing trend for the county's population "share" to increase relative to Port Townsend, it appears that the urban land zoning (within the UGA) proposed in these Amendments is appropriate. See the Irondale and Port Hadlock UGA Build-out Analysis, Mark Personius, March 4, 2004.

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

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

Jefferson County has, since the beginning of GMA planning, been evaluating the Irondale and Port Hadlock areas as a potential UGA. This has involved considerable analysis of this area which is characterized by urban growth. In the seven years since Comprehensive Plan adoption, Jefferson County has completed a "Regional Economic Analysis and Forecast" (Richard Trottier: January 26, 1999) that suggests that the County has a deficit that exceeds 200 acres of commercially and industrially zoned land. This analysis, which was referenced and anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan, provides general direction for the County regarding the designation of rural commercial lands and supported the creation of the UGA in 2002.

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

*Discussion:* The most effective way to judge whether changes in countywide attitudes have occurred, aside from reference to local election results, is through statistically significant public opinion surveys. The last such survey in Jefferson County took place in 1991 through the "Jefferson 2000 Public Opinion Survey" conducted by Elway Research. Many of the opinions expressed through this survey are reflected in the policy assumptions that form the basis for the Comprehensive Plan. That said, the opinions expressed through the Jefferson 2000 survey were

*not intended to predict the future and an updated survey would be the most effective way to gauge whether changes in countywide attitudes have actually manifested.*

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

*Discussion: To some degree, circumstances have changed since Comprehensive Plan adoption in August of 1998. Taken from a broad perspective, these changing circumstances include: issues surrounding affordable housing, specific salmon species listings under the Endangered Species Act, County adoption of final development regulations which are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Growth Management Act, Growth Management Hearings Boards clarifications through case law related to specific provisions of the GMA, the adoption of Unified Development Code amendments establishing a process for locating Major Industrial Development, and the completion of the Tri-Area/Glen Cove Special Study and adoption of the Irondale & Port Hadlock UGA. Changes in circumstance such as these suggest that components of the Comprehensive Plan may need to be amended.*

7. Whether inconsistencies exist between the Comprehensive Plan and the Growth Management Act or the Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Planning Policy for Jefferson County.

*Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan is consistent with both the Growth Management Act and the Countywide Planning Policies. Pursuant to the Growth Management Act, the County conducted a review of the Comprehensive Plan and the UDC relative to adoption of a new UGA in order to ensure consistency between those documents and the Growth Management Act. This review is incorporated into the proposed UGA Comprehensive Plan amendments and the proposed UDC amendments.*

### **2.3.2.2 Planning Commission Criteria**

Pursuant to UDC section 9.8.1(b) [page 9-5], the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners shall develop findings and conclusions which consider specific criteria. For the UGA, this analysis was completed as part of the 2002 Amendment. The previous staff evaluations are still applicable. Additional comments are provided below:

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

Basic circumstances related to the proposed Amendment and area in which it is located have not substantially changed since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan (1998). The area was, and is, characterized by urban densities and growth. However, the creation of the UGA in 2002 was a significant policy change for the area which has established an urban future of the area, and the basis for the proposed Amendments.

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

The assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based continue to be valid. Land use planning is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Whether the proposed amendment reflects current widely held values

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

UDC section 9.8.1(c) outlines the findings that the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners must make for formal site-specific amendment proposals. Because a specific area is involved in this proposal and specific parcels of property are affected, staff presents observations concerning those findings below, as well as additional evaluation and a staff recommendation.

The proposal meets concurrency requirements for transportation and other public services

It is not anticipated that the proposed expansion would result in substantial reduction in the ability to provide public services. Analysis and planning have been conducted to assure key services such as transportation, sewer, and stormwater management are provided in a timely manner.

The proposal is consistent with the various elements of the Comprehensive Plan

These proposed Amendments have been developed in response to a Compliance Order by the Hearings Board, and are therefore deemed consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposal will not result in probable significant adverse impacts to capital facilities

Part of the purpose of this proposed Amendment is to provide analysis of and make provisions for capital facilities. From a utility standpoint, UGA growth is expected and plans have been developed accordingly.

The parcel(s) is physically suitable for the requested designation regarding access, utilities, and compatibility with surrounding uses

As proposed, the revised area is physically suitable for the requested designation regarding access, utilities, and compatibility with surrounding uses.

The proposal will not create a pressure to change the designation of other properties

It is not anticipated that the proposed revision has the potential to create a pressure to change the land use designation for surrounding properties. The UGA should provide a focus for development and reduce pressure to develop outside the boundary.

The proposal does not materially affect land use and population growth projection assumptions

Population growth projections that are the basis of the Comprehensive Plan as part of the 2002 UGA adoption have been revised upward per updated 2003 OFM population projections for Jefferson County. Therefore, the UGA is anticipated to accommodate a greater amount of population growth than was expected in 2002. The proposed amendment does affect land use by allowing more intense densities and intensities of use in limited areas compared to the original UGA designation in 2002 in order to help accommodate that additional growth.

If within an urban growth area (UGA), the proposal does not materially affect the adequacy of facilities

Part of the purpose of this Amendment is to provide adequate capital facilities. This evaluation has been developed and the Amendment proposes provision of adequate facilities.

The proposal is consistent with the GMA and the County-Wide Planning Policy

The proposed amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act. Staff are unaware of any applicable inter-jurisdictional policies or agreements, or any other local, state or federal laws with which the proposed amendment would be inconsistent.

**2.3.2.3 Discussion of Amendment according to questions set forth in SEPA Rules (Section D. Supplementation Sheet for Nonproject Actions**

SEPA review for the Irondale & Port Hadlock UGA boundary and corresponding Comprehensive Plan text amendments was substantively addressed through adoption of existing environmental documents, particularly the SEIS and addenda for the Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments (a.k.a., Tasks III and IV of the Tri- Area / Glen Cove Special Study). The adopted SEIS specifically examined potential environmental impacts associated with adoption of the alternative Irondale & Port Hadlock (Tri-Area) UGA boundaries. This boundary has not changed. Regardless, the non-project SEPA checklist questions are answered with respect to the proposed CP and UDC Amendments.

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

*Population is increasing in most places, but the UGA will be a focus for growth. The impacts of this were analyzed as part of the UGA adoption in 2002. These proposals will not increase*

*emissions to water, air, etc. beyond those anticipated previously. It is highly likely that the levels of emissions and environmental impacts will be less than anticipated, because the capital facilities planned for the UGA benefit from more detailed information on land use and other patterns, but they also are designed to meet the most current regulations and guidelines (e.g. stormwater).*

*Although the sewer system is not envisioned to serve the entire UGA, the soils in the area are capable of accommodating the single family units expected in the next 20 years. Increased areas with sewer service and high density are provided to provide additional incentive to use the sewer system and focus population and utilities into an efficient core area until data and demand require expansion.*

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

*These proposals benefit from impact mitigation resulting from water quality regulations and guidance for on-site, community, and regional sewage handling, stormwater management, and activities over critical areas (e.g. critical aquifer recharge areas). The proposals are not expected to significantly affect fish or marine life, and may result in improved conditions for these species. However, vegetation removal is a normal effect of urbanization and was anticipated with the approval of the UGA. These proposals are consistent with previous analysis of the impacts of the UGA.*

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

*Energy and natural resources consumption is dependent on technology, population increase, and conservation. Nothing in these proposals will affect these factors, except for the possibility that more precise planning and more orderly development may result in more efficient systems and lower energy and natural resource consumption.*

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

*The proposals take into consideration Critical Areas established by the County. Critical Areas are protected by regulations in the UDC and will continue to be protected into the future. These proposals may help to lower the effect on environmentally sensitive areas, endangered species, etc. though the use of better and more focused planning within the UGA.*

*The Critical Aquifer Recharge Area requirements of the County's Critical Area Ordinance will protect the UGA aquifers by prohibiting residential septic systems designs, or densities, which might pose a threat to these resources.*

*Community and public agency efforts have increased nearshore habitat functions and values, and public access. Local salmon recovery efforts have increased the population of Summer Chum (an endangered species).*

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

*These proposals will not affect land and shoreline use over that currently allowed. Nothing in these proposals changes the County's Shoreline Master Program provisions.*

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

*Population growth in the UGA was continuing without restriction prior to the UGA creation. The UGA will provide a focus on the provision of utilities, transportation, and other services for this urbanizing area. Nothing in these proposals will increase demands over those anticipated previously.*

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

*Nothing in these proposals will conflict with any local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.*

### **2.3.3 Staff Recommendation**

These UGA Amendments have been prepared in a manner envisioned by and consistent with the County Commissioners in the UGA Ordinance (Ordinance 19-1220-02, 2002). These Amendments are also consistent with the Hearings Board decision (August 22, 2003), requiring the County to specify levels of service and capital facilities needs for the proposed UGA.

State law also requires development of a General Sewer Plan whenever a County formally considers construction of sewage facilities. Adoption of this General Sewer Plan as part of the CP is consistent with law, and as part of the capital facilities assessment required by the Hearings Board.

Various "line-in / line-out" revisions to the CP have been prepared to complement those adopted in 2002 to provide clarification and consistency with the proposed UGA.

At this stage of environmental review (a non-project review under SEPA), environmental impacts and mitigation have been addressed in previous environmental documents (adopted by reference). The analysis of new information provided by this Addendum does not indicate any new, significant, adverse, impacts which were not previously analyzed. This level of analysis does not

preclude the need for further project level analysis in the future for activities implementing these amendments.

Based on the above and other documentation within this report, and those adopted and incorporated by reference, the staff recommend adoption of the proposed UGA Amendment and related UDC Amendments.

### **3 Supporting Record, Analyses, and Materials (Incorporation by Reference)**

Listed below are existing environmental documents and other documents and information utilized for the development of this 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Staff Report and Addendum. This Addendum supplements the information presented in prior environmental documents prepared for adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, other legislative actions, and other County decisions and activities.

- County-Wide Planning Policies (Res. No. 40-99): Jefferson County; December 21, 1992
- Draft EIS – CP Adoption – Jefferson county; February 24, 1997
- Final EIS – CP Adoption – Jefferson county; February 24, 1997
- Special Study - Land Use Inventory Report; Jefferson County; January 26, 1999
- Special Study - Regional Economic Analysis; Jefferson County; January 26, 1999
- Draft Supplemental EIS – CP Amendments – Jefferson County; June 30, 1999
- Final Supplemental EIS – CP Amendments – Jefferson County; August 18, 1999
- Tri-Area UGA Capital Facilities Special Study; Jefferson County; November 2001
- Integrated Staff Report and DSEIS/FSEIS for the 2002 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket: Jefferson County; August 21, 2002 and November 25, 2002
- Ordinance 19-1220-02 of the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners – Adopting the UGA; December 2002
- Resolution 55-03 of the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners – Adopting an Update to the Countywide Growth Management Planning Population Projection; September 22, 2003.
- "Irondale-Hadlock Urban Growth Area Transportation Plan and Transportation Capital Facilities Plan" –
- Irondale and Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area Stormwater Management Plan, Gray and Osbourn, May 2004
- Irondale and Port Hadlock UGA Build-out Analysis, Mark Personius, March 4, 2004.
- Planning Commission Recommendation for Establishment of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Final Docket; Department of Community Development; March 1, 2004
- Jefferson County Irondale and Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area On-Site Sewer Capacity Report, October 2003.

## **4 Distribution List**

### ***Copies mailed or delivered to:***

#### **Jefferson County:**

Planning Commission members (8 persons)  
Board of County Commissioners  
Prosecuting Attorney's Office  
Department of Health & Human Services Natural Resources Division  
Jefferson County Library at Port Hadlock

#### **State Agencies:**

Office of Community Development: Growth Management Program  
Department of Ecology SEPA Unit

### ***Notification of availability emailed or mailed to:***

#### **Jefferson County:**

All other County departments not listed above

#### **Local Agencies & Organizations:**

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

## Vigilance

### **State Agencies:**

Department of Natural Resources (Anne Sharar & SEPA Review)  
Department of Transportation (Bill Wiebe & SEPA Review)  
Department of Health (GMA/SEPA Review)  
Department of Social and Health Services  
Department of Corrections  
Department of Fish & Wildlife (Millard Deusen, Jeff Davis, & SEPA Review)  
Department of Ecology (GMA Coordinator)  
Puget Sound Action Team (Harriet Beale and John Cambalik)  
Parks & Recreation Commission (Bill Koss)  
Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (Lorinda Anderson)

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Threshold Decision (DS)
2. Notice of Adoption
3. UGA Chapter (including Transportation Plan / Stormwater Management Plan)
4. General Sewer Plan (GSP)
5. Comprehensive Plan Line-in/Line out
6. UDC Amendments
7. UGA Buildout Analysis