

JEFFERSON COUNTY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR GROWTH MANAGEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Jefferson County is located in the north-central portion of Washington's Olympic Peninsula. The County is bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, and on the east by the waters of the Admiralty Inlet and Hood Canal. Clallam County and the Strait of Juan de Fuca define the northern border, while the southern boundaries are defined by Mason and Grays Harbor Counties. Jefferson County comprises 1,808 square miles, and is the eighteenth largest of the State's thirty-nine counties. The Olympic National Park and National Forest, which bisect the County into western and eastern halves, comprise approximately 65 percent of the County's 1.16 million acres of land. The majority of the County's population, nearly 96 percent, resides in eastern Jefferson County. A map of the entire County is shown on page 3.

Jefferson County is largely a rural County with one incorporated city, Port Townsend, and one Master Planned Resort, Port Ludlow. The County's population (25,754 as of 1996) is located primarily in the northeast portion of the County, in the communities of Port Townsend, Tri-Area, Quimper, and Port Ludlow. Quilcene and Brinnon are the largest communities in the southern portion of the County. Port Townsend is the largest community with 8,366 residents. The remaining communities of the County range in population from 400 to 1,200 people.

The County is comprised primarily of agricultural and forest lands, and is dotted by clusters of small communities. This rural quality of life is what attracts many residents and tourists to the County and is what most residents have expressed a desire to protect. Recent growth rates have made eastern Jefferson County one of the fastest growing areas of the State. As a result of this rapid growth rate, Jefferson County was required to participate in the State's Growth Management Act, which provides guidelines and assistance for managing growth throughout the State.

Jefferson County has prepared a Comprehensive Plan that outlines goals and policies that help define, direct and guide future growth and development throughout the County. The Plan was drafted with considerable input from the community, which remains committed to maintaining Jefferson County's high quality of life while, at the same time, providing economic, recreational and other opportunities to its residents.

WHAT IS A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Comprehensive Plan is a legal document that serves as a decision-making guide for both officials and citizens, and is intended to serve as a tool for making decisions about future growth and development in the County over the next 20 years. The Plan is comprehensive in that it identifies the major issues that influence future growth and development issues. It proposes actions to address the issues, and it targets use of the County's resources in the most efficient way.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLAN

To date, Jefferson County's comprehensive planning process can be characterized as one of conflict and challenges. Yet out of this charged environment has emerged a unique opportunity to direct the participation of the community into a meaningful and enduring vision that is pragmatic and responsible. This Comprehensive Plan has been crafted to incorporate the lessons learned in a difficult planning process. It is the intent of this Plan to accept and build on the difficulties of the past; identify appropriate solutions consistent with relevant laws, decisions, adopted policies, and community involvement; and propose a responsible strategy with which the County can effectively face the future.

COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLANNING

Comprehensive land use planning is a systematic process designed to define a long-range community vision. The process unites a clear understanding of existing conditions within a community with the development of goals and policies that enable that community to make decisions from which its long-range vision will be addressed. The process is a powerful tool for turning promising possibilities into long-term realities.

Planning enhances our ability to weigh competing needs in our community and make judicious allowances for each. It affords us the opportunity to balance the demands of development with benefits of economic development and environmental protection. It provides us with tools for supplying family wage jobs and affordable housing without compromising our rural character. In addition, it prepares us to harness the rewards of a growing population while simultaneously meeting the challenge of providing safe, healthy, and convenient community services for everyone. Planning enables us to address the current needs of the community before development begins and then directs how and where that growth should occur.

The Comprehensive Plan includes assessments of existing conditions containing baseline data for key areas. The data provide a "snapshot" of Jefferson County including:

- Existing land use patterns;
- Population projections and distribution trends;
- Inventories of historical and cultural resources;
- Housing supply, conditions and affordability; and
- Critical areas located within the unincorporated portions of the County.

A more complete analysis of existing conditions and land use needs and demands are included in the March, 1995 Existing Conditions Report Alternatives¹ and the February 24, 1997 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)² for the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan. This Draft Environment Impact Statement was prepared to assist citizens and decision-makers in formulating a new long-range Comprehensive Plan for Jefferson County as required by the Growth Management Act (GMA). The DEIS is prepared according to the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

¹ Berryman and Henigar, *Existing Conditions Report Alternatives, Staff Drafts*, Jefferson County, WA, March 1, 1995.

² *Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement*, Jefferson County, WA, February 24, 1997, 164 pages plus maps and bibliography.

The purpose of the DEIS is to compare and analyze the possible environmental impacts of the plan alternatives which have been prepared by the planning staff and Planning Commission with input from the County's community groups and residents. The alternatives include a Preferred Alternative as well as three (3) other alternative means of distributing future growth throughout the County. The "No Action" Alternative is the existing Comprehensive Plan which must be included in the SEPA review but which is not consistent with the provisions of the GMA. The four alternative "Growth Scenarios" that are presented and analyzed in the DEIS are:

- The Focused Growth Alternative
- The Dispersed Growth Alternative
- The Moderate Growth Alternative
- The Preferred Growth Alternative

The GMA requires that Jefferson County and the cities within it prepare comprehensive plans to manage population and employment growth for the next 20 years (1998-2018). The County has worked to meet this mandate with extensive public involvement and community outreach, including work with 14 community planning areas covering the County.

The DEIS evaluates environmental impacts that may result from the implementation of the proposed alternative plans. Adoption of a plan is a programmatic or non-project action and SEPA requires that the analysis of non-project actions, therefore, be general in nature in order to address the broad implications of the alternatives.

In addition to the discussion of potential impacts, the environmental analysis is also intended to provide for public review and comment, to assist the elected officials in making decisions, and to provide a framework for subsequent environmental review that will be associated with implementation measures such as development regulations and projects.

The analysis and findings resulting from the environmental review are based on technical studies which were completed in the planning process. The DEIS and the Draft Comprehensive Plan are, therefore, companion documents which together were considered in the public review and adoption process. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) of May 27, 1998 includes additional analysis and findings resulting from public comments on the DEIS. The FEIS includes all comments received in writing along with County responses to the comments.

This Comprehensive Plan includes goals, policies, and strategies which, when implemented, will assist the County in achieving its desired land uses, which are depicted on the Land Use Map. The Land Use Map illustrates how, and where, the County will accommodate future land uses. While interim controls are being adopted concurrent with the Comprehensive Plan, more detailed development regulations that implement the Comprehensive Plan will be established subsequent to the adoption of this Plan.

Individual "elements" of this Comprehensive Plan describe goals and policies that have been developed to provide clear policy direction for community land use decision-making in the future. Each element also includes strategies that implement the goals and policies.

The Plan includes provisions for:

- Monitoring the effectiveness of the Plan in achieving goals.
- An amendment process which allows yearly review and analysis of the Plan.

- Implementing strategies or “tasks” which will ensure that the goals are met.

THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

Through the Growth Management Act, the State of Washington provides a new framework for land use planning and the regulation of development in response to challenges posed to the quality of life by rapid growth.

Within the framework established by the Act, a wide diversity of local visions for the future can be accommodated; however, certain procedural criteria must be met. Recognition of the variations and diversity in local communities is implicit in the framework of Growth Management. A “Bottoms Up” approach to planning is recommended. “Bottoms Up” planning originates at the community level with the articulation of a vision statement, which encompasses the values of as many different community members as possible. The vision is then translated into goals and policies, and eventually regulations. The main requirement is that the vision is consistent with the goals and intent of the Growth Management Act.

It is important to note that a “Bottoms Up” approach does not mean that procedural and regulatory constraints may be ignored. Successful “Bottoms Up” planning is predicated on allowing a community to choose the appropriate “tools” for the job, provided that those selected are located entirely within a “tool box” defined by the Growth Management Act. It is critical in the planning process for a jurisdiction to provide sufficient guidance so that a community understands the need to avoid selecting “tools” which are found outside of the “GMA toolbox.” Failure to provide adequate guidance will likely result in inappropriate choices being made.

The Growth Management Act establishes a number of requirements for local comprehensive planning. The Act identifies specific goals for all Comprehensive Plans, prescribes the elements each plan is to contain, provides requirements for interim regulations, mandates the establishment of “Urban Growth Areas,” requires local governments to demonstrate how they will pay for the improvements and facilities called for in their plans, and mandates extensive public participation in the planning process.

The Growth Management Act changed the process for developing Comprehensive Plans in a number of important ways:

- It established 13 statewide goals with which local Comprehensive Plans and regulations must be consistent.
- In addition to the mandated goals, local Comprehensive Plans must contain the following elements:
 - Land Use Element
 - Rural Element for rural counties
 - Housing Element
 - Capital Facilities Element
 - Utilities Element
 - Transportation Element
- Local governments were required to adopt interim regulations to protect critical areas and natural resource lands.

- Local governments must demonstrate how the capital facilities necessary to support the development envisioned by their Comprehensive Plan will be provided and paid for as development occurs, or within a specified time thereafter.
- The Comprehensive Plans of counties, and cities or towns within those counties, must be consistent with one another.
- Counties and cities or towns must agree on Urban Growth Areas "within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature." The Urban Growth Area must be able to accommodate growth that is expected to occur over 20 years.
- Counties and cities or towns must jointly adopt County-wide Planning Policies which establish guidelines on how their Comprehensive Plans will be developed in order to be consistent.

THE PLANNING PROCESS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Figure 1-1 on the following page describes how the various pieces of the planning process fit together. Concurrent with environmental review, public hearings and workshop meetings have been held by both the Jefferson County Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.

Figure 1-1
Comprehensive Planning Process Diagram

The Comprehensive Planning Process

The State legislature, responding to the Growth Strategies Commission Report on Long-Range Planning in the State of Washington, adopted the Growth Management Act in 1990.

Jefferson County Commissioners voted to “opt-in” to the Growth Management Act in late 1991. It is important to note that Jefferson County subsequently would have been required to plan under GMA due to the County’s rapid rate of growth. Public involvement in the planning process began immediately with the formation of citizen task forces to develop Interim Critical Area, Mineral Land and Forest Resource Land Ordinances.

Concurrently, the County developed a questionnaire, titled Jefferson 2000, which surveyed County residents’ opinions about their vision for the future. Jefferson 2000 also asked residents to rank “values,” such as economic growth, environmental protection, visual beauty, and the accessibility of services.

The County convened the Jefferson 2000 Strategic Planning process, which involved 26 separate taxing districts and service providers responsible for water, fire protection, libraries, and similar services to County residents. Jefferson 2000 Strategic Planning used information generated by the Jefferson 2000 questionnaire and analysis of existing services, facilities, and long-range plans of the service providers to begin capital facilities planning required by the GMA.

The Joint Growth Management Steering Committee was created in 1991 to oversee the development of GMA planning in Jefferson County. The Steering Committee consisted of three representatives from the City of Port Townsend, the only incorporated city in Jefferson County, and the three County Commissioners. The Steering Committee was formed with a provision that, should additional Urban Growth Areas be designated, the Steering Committee would be expanded to accommodate representation from the newly designated UGA. The Joint Growth Management Steering Committee was staffed by representatives from the City and County planning departments and other agencies as necessary, including the State Department of Community Development (now the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development), State Department of Health (water issues), and State Department of Ecology.

The County-wide Planning Policy (CWPP) was developed cooperatively between City and County staff consistent with the requirements and procedural criteria of the Growth Management Act, and was reviewed by the Joint Growth Management Steering Committee. Public hearings were held on the CWPP, and both City and County government adopted these policies by resolution on December 21, 1992.

The Planning Commission reviewed the existing 1979 Comprehensive Plan for consistency with the criteria and requirements of the Growth Management Act and County-wide Planning Policy. The Planning Commission also reviewed those community plans that were existing at the time and developed a community involvement process to encourage ongoing participation consistent with the direction of the Growth Management Act. In addition, the Planning Commission met to develop goals, review draft elements prepared by consultants and staff, and hold public hearings on interim ordinances.

Planning Under GMA: Community Planning

The intent of the Community Involvement Process was to recognize the diversity of communities, lifestyles and interests found in Jefferson County. It afforded citizens a more direct, hands-on influence in the planning process for their particular community. Some communities had existing plans adopted

consistent with the 1979 Comprehensive Plan. For other communities, this was the first experience with community plans.

Communities with existing adopted plans:

- Brinnon (1982)
- Coyle Area (1977)
- Gardiner (1989)
- Marrowstone Island (1978)
- Tri-Area (1982)

Communities which were identified in the Community Involvement Plan but which did not have formally adopted plans:

- Discovery Bay
- West End
- Quilcene
- Shine
- Quimper
- Port Ludlow
- Paradise Bay

Additional Communities which requested permission to develop community plans:

- North Port Ludlow
- Lake Leland

Draft Community Plans were reviewed by both Planning Commission and staff. The results of the Community Planning Process and the Draft Community Plans have been integral to the identification of goals and policies included in this Plan.

Planning Under GMA: Interim Plans and Regulations

To ensure protection of critical areas and resource lands, the Growth Management Act required the speedy adoption of specific interim plans and regulations prior to the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. The adoption of these interim regulations was significantly delayed because a consensus-based solution could not be reached between community members.

Four interim ordinances have been adopted:

Critical Areas Ordinance	July 8, 1994 (amended June 26, 1995)
Forest Lands Ordinance	January 21, 1997
Agricultural Lands Ordinance	May 25, 1995
Mineral Lands Ordinance	May 25, 1995

The Growth Management Act also requires that counties, in consultation with their cities, designate Interim Urban Growth Areas. The Act requires that growth which is urban in nature is only to occur in those areas which are designated as “Urban Growth Areas”. Designation of Interim Urban Growth Areas is intended to provide guidelines for comprehensive planning and establish certainty for land owners as the planning process proceeds.

Jefferson County has taken several steps to comply with these interim planning requirements. The first Jefferson County Interim Urban Growth Areas Ordinance, Ordinance #02-0110-94, was passed in January, 1994, and included the designation of the City of Port Townsend, Port Ludlow and the Tri-Area (Port Hadlock, Chimacum and Irondale) as Interim Urban Growth Areas (IUGAs).

The designation of the Tri-Area and Port Ludlow IUGAs was appealed to the Growth Hearings Board, and the designation was invalidated. Jefferson County, in compliance with the Hearings Board ruling, rescinded the initial IUGA designations, and designated the City of Port Townsend as the sole IUGA in Jefferson County (Ordinance # 15-1028-94). The Tri-Area, Port Ludlow and Glen Cove were identified as “study-areas.” The County enacted the Growth Strategy Ordinance, No. 05-0214-96, an emergency zoning ordinance declaring all lands outside of the Port Townsend IUGA as “rural.”

In January, 1995, The Board of County Commissioners adopted Ordinance #01-0117-95, which amended Ordinance #15-1028-94, and included the designation of Port Ludlow as an Interim Urban Growth Area.

The designation of Port Ludlow as an Interim Urban Growth Area was appealed to the Growth Hearings Board, where the designation was invalidated, and Ordinance # 01-0117-95 was repealed in October, 1995.

In the decision overturning Jefferson County’s designation of Interim Urban Growth Areas, the Hearings Board cited the need for land use analysis, capital facilities feasibility study, and continuous public involvement as the basis for interim Urban Growth Area designation. Jefferson County undertook a land use analysis study, the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Special Study, in cooperation with the City of Port Townsend to determine the Countywide need for commercial and industrial lands, and to provide options for addressing commercial and industrial growth in Glen Cove and the Tri-Area. During the study, all commercial area boundaries and the boundaries of the Port Townsend Paper Mill and Glen Cove industrial areas were interim.

The policy direction of the County—as an outcome of the Special Study—is to proceed with designation of the Tri-Area as an Urban Growth Area, and re-evaluate and designate “final” rural commercial/industrial area boundaries in Glen Cove consistent with the Growth Management Act, based on RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d), and the Comprehensive Plan. Recognizing that UGA implementation of final urban levels of service in the Tri-Area involves community input, engineering studies, and service provider negotiations, which will take more time, interim urban levels of service for public facilities will be established for the Tri-Area UGA.

ANALYSIS OF THE DISCUSSION DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Following extensive review of preliminary draft plans by the Planning Commission, Jefferson County released a Comprehensive Plan - Discussion Draft on June 1, 1995. This Discussion Draft included goals and policies organized by GMA elements, an Executive Summary of Existing Conditions, and an Executive Summary of Comprehensive Plan Alternatives.

This Draft Plan was reviewed with mixed results. On the one hand, an analysis of the Discussion Draft by County staff indicated that many of the plan’s goals and policies (as proposed) were inconsistent with the Growth Management Act and recent Hearings Board decisions. On the other hand, the analysis indicated that many of the proposed goals, policies, and strategies accurately reflected community concerns, were consistent with the requirements of the Growth Management Act, and would be appropriate for inclusion in the final Comprehensive Plan. As a result of this analysis, it became apparent that the Discussion Draft should be substantially restructured and revised.

The results of the Jefferson 2000 Visioning process also were used to more fully develop existing goals, policies, and/or strategies, or develop new ones. In instances where compliance with the above-mentioned criteria was assured, but additional guidance was required to appropriately revise a previously proposed draft goal, policy, and/or strategy, additional information was obtained through a series of Jefferson County Board of County Commissioner's Workshops on specific elements. These public workshop meetings were a vital link in keeping the community updated on the progress of the plan and integrated into the continuing planning process.

The “Legs” of Jefferson County’s Compliance Strategy

This Comprehensive Plan has been crafted based on four fundamental sources of support and guidance. Like legs of a table, each is essential to the stability and functionality of the whole. These “legs” include two provided by State government and two developed locally. Together, they provide the framework for a Comprehensive Plan which is responsive to local needs and regionally unique land use patterns, and is in compliance with the goals and requirements of the Growth Management Act.

- The first “leg” is compliance with the goals and procedural criteria of the Growth Management Act and its accompanying legislation.
- The second “leg” is compliance with County-wide Planning Policy (CWPP), adopted jointly by the City of Port Townsend and Jefferson County, to ensure that local plans are consistent with each other and with the GMA.
- The third “leg” is continuous, open public participation in the planning process.
- The fourth “leg” is analysis and compliance with the Growth Hearings Board decisions and decisions made by Washington State courts.

The GMA goals and procedural criteria, and analysis of the Growth Hearings Board decisions, set the State-wide framework. The County-wide Planning Policy and public participation supply local detail for realizing the broader GMA goals within Jefferson County.

Discussions related to each of the four legs in relation to each of the Plan elements are included as appendices to the Plan.

The First “Leg”: Requirements of the Growth Management Act

The opening section of the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A) sets forth the following legislative finding:

"...uncoordinated and unplanned growth together with a lack of common goals expressing the public's interest in the conservation and the wise use of our lands, pose a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety, and high quality of life enjoyed by the residents of the state."

The passage of the Growth Management Act (GMA) fundamentally changed the way comprehensive land use planning is carried out in the State. The GMA requires that cities and counties update their comprehensive land use plans consistent with State-wide goals and minimum requirements as established by the statute and that they coordinate their planning efforts.

The central theme behind the Growth Management Act is that spontaneous and unstructured growth and development is wasteful of our natural resource base and costly to the provision of public services and facilities. By managing growth and development, the negative effects can be minimized and the benefits can be maximized.

The GMA was originally passed by the legislature in 1990 and later amended in 1991, 1993, 1995 and 1997. The Act enumerated thirteen planning goals which are to be used to guide the development and adoption of Comprehensive Plans and the development regulations that support the Plan. Local plans must implement these goals in a balanced manner. The goals are:

1. Urban Growth: Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.
2. Reduce Sprawl: Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.
3. Transportation: Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with County and City Comprehensive Plans.
4. Housing: Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.
5. Economic Development: Encourage economic development throughout the State that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans. Promote economic opportunity for all citizens of the State, especially for unemployed and disadvantaged persons, and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the State's natural resources, public services and public facilities.
6. Property Rights: Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners shall be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.
7. Permits: Applications for both state and local governmental permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.
8. Natural Resource Industries: Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible uses.
9. Open Space and Recreation: Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks.
10. Environment: Protect the environment and enhance the State's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.
11. Citizen Participation and Coordination: Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

12. **Public Facilities and Services:** Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.
13. **Historic Preservation:** Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures, that have historical or archaeological significance.

Washington Administrative Code

The Growth Management Act provides the general legal requirements for the County's Comprehensive Plan, and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) provides guidance on implementation. The WACs provide specific content requirements for the individual elements. Included within the WACs are requirements to adopt interim ordinances to designate Urban Growth Areas, protect critical areas, and mineral, agricultural and forestry resources. The WACs also contain specific minimum guidelines for classification of agriculture, forest and mineral resource lands, and critical areas. In addition, the WACs also include guidelines for public process and the adoption of ordinances and plans to implement the GMA.

The discussion of the requirements of the Growth Management Act related to each of the Plan elements are contained in Appendix A.

The Second "Leg": The County-wide Planning Policy

On December 21, 1992, Jefferson County and the City of Port Townsend adopted a joint resolution establishing the County-wide Planning Policy (CWPP) as a policy framework to guide the development of comprehensive plans.

The goal of the adopted County-wide Planning Policy is to ensure that local planning efforts will be consistent with one another and consistent with regional growth management planning. According to the Growth Management Act, each local Comprehensive Plan should demonstrate that such policies have been followed in its development.

The County-wide Planning Policy recognized the need for counties, cities, special purpose districts, and those agencies and jurisdictions involved in the delivery of public services, to coordinate the independent development of local Comprehensive Plans. The implementing legislation to the Growth Management Act required that counties and cities agree upon policy statements in eight subject areas, including:

1. The designation of Urban Growth Areas;
2. The promotion of contiguous and orderly development and the provision of urban services to such development;
3. Joint county and city planning within Urban Growth Areas;
4. The siting of essential public facilities of county or state-wide significance;
5. The need to develop county-wide transportation facilities and strategies;
6. The need for affordable housing for all economic segments of the population;

7. County-wide development and employment; and
8. Rural Areas.

In addition, the City of Port Townsend and Jefferson County agreed to include policies pertaining to:

9. The requirements to analyze fiscal impacts associated with the impacts of growth; and
10. The context within which the County-wide Planning Policy is to be used.

The County-wide Planning Policy was developed through a collaborative process between County and City service providers, utilities, and community organizations, and represents a composite framework, not a series of individual, stand-alone concepts. The Joint Growth Management Steering Committee had oversight of this process.

The following table offers a guide to the relationship between the County-wide Planning Policy and the Comprehensive Plan Elements. Compliance with the County-wide Planning Policy has been integral to the development of individual elements of this Plan. A detailed analysis of relevant CWPPs has been included for each element in Appendix B.

Table 1-1
Relationship Between County-wide Planning Policies and Plan Elements

COUNTY-WIDE PLANNING POLICY	COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT
1. Contiguous and Orderly Development and Provision of Urban Services	Utilities Element Capital Facilities
2. Joint County and City Planning within Urban Growth Areas	Land Use/Rural Element
3. The Siting of Essential Public Facilities of County or Statewide Significance	Essential Public Facilities Element
4. County-wide Transportation Facilities and Strategies;	Transportation Element Essential Public Facilities Element
5. Affordable Housing	Housing Element
6. County-wide Development and Employment	Economic Development Element
7. Rural Areas	Land Use/Rural Element
8. Fiscal Impacts Analysis	Capital Facilities Element Transportation Element All elements
9. County-wide Planning Policy: Use and Amendment	Plan Implementation and Monitoring

Compliance with the County-wide Planning Policy ensures that Jefferson County's Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the plans of other jurisdictions and service providers within the County, and that future plans proposed by service providers or jurisdictions will be consistent with the County's Plan.

The Third "Leg": Public Involvement

Public involvement is the cornerstone of long-range comprehensive planning for any community. Complying with the requirements of the Growth Management Act in Jefferson County has engaged

community leaders, interested citizens, developers, property rights advocates, environmentalists, and neighborhoods in a dynamic, active public process.

The citizens of Jefferson County have participated in the development of the Comprehensive Plan in many significant ways. Early in the planning process, “community forums” brought together residents with varied backgrounds and interests to discuss growth management and its application in Jefferson County. The success of these forums provided the foundation for public participation in the Community Plans and the development of the interim ordinances. Citizen task forces have helped develop interim ordinances and helped to establish goals and policies throughout the planning process.

Public participation has occurred not only through citizen participation in task forces and goals-setting workshops, but also under the auspices of the Planning Commission. Consistent with the Planning Enabling Act, the Planning Commission has been actively involved in comprehensive planning in Jefferson County.

The Community Planning Process was adopted by motion of the County Commissioners on June 7, 1993, and community planning groups were formed in 12 communities. Additional community planning groups were later formed in Lake Leland and North Port Ludlow.

In each of these communities the community planning process recognized the diversity of communities, life styles, and interests in Jefferson County. It afforded citizens a more direct, hands-on influence in the planning process for their particular community. The results of this citizen-based process have been incorporated in the development of this Plan.

In addition to citizen participation in development of interim ordinances, Urban Growth Areas designations and community plans, numerous public meetings have been held, both by the Planning Commission and by the Board of County Commissioners. The Planning Commission held a series of 37 public meetings on the February 26, 1997 Draft Plan, prior to producing the February 2, 1998 Planning Commission Recommendations. To ensure public input and awareness of the draft plan, the Board of Commissioners (BOCC) held four public hearings followed by 29 public workshops during the spring and early summer of 1998. On May 15, 1998, the BOCC revisions of the Plan were published for public comment, and a public hearing was held.

Additional revisions developed in two public workshops were based on public input and a legal review, and were published in the Final Draft Plan of July 31, 1998. A public hearing was held on the Final Draft and additional public comments were considered prior to adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. Throughout the process, citizens have had the opportunity to speak in community workshops held in various locations in the County, Board of Commissioner workshops, and public hearings, and written testimony has been received and considered in the development of this Plan.

Furthermore, Jefferson County initiated a number of public awareness programs to inform and involve the public throughout the comprehensive planning process:

- The County produced a video entitled “*It’s Your Plan,*” which was widely distributed to libraries, community centers, and video stores and was broadcast on local television.
- The Comprehensive Plan was posted on the Internet, making it accessible not only to County residents, but to interested parties elsewhere, as well.
- The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) toured the County (BOCC On the Road) and discussed residents’ concerns on a wide range of issues, including development of the Comprehensive Plan.

- The local newspaper, *The Port Townsend Leader*, has published numerous articles and has provided a written forum for residents to voice concerns about the planning process and growth management issues.

Public involvement in comprehensive planning is required for compliance with the GMA and has been identified by the Hearings Board as essential to proper development and adoption of plans. In addition, public participation is essential in adopting a Plan which preserves the character of Jefferson County as envisioned by community residents.

Community participation specific to individual plan elements is discussed in Appendix C.

The Fourth “Leg”: The Decisions of the Growth Management Hearings Boards

The Growth Management Hearings Boards, which are comprised of three-member panels appointed by the Governor, were created to review comprehensive plans and associated development regulations for compliance with the goals and procedural criteria of the Growth Management Act. The Hearings Boards provide guidance on questions of compliance through the review of plans in general or of specific plan elements, goals or policies. For the purposes of developing this Comprehensive Plan and its required elements, these decisions are treated as “case law.” As case law, the decisions can be used to establish precedent and provide specific guidance on achieving compliance with the requirements of GMA. In general, the decisions or rulings state how a plan, element, goal or policy is not consistent with GMA. Through the analysis of these decisions, additional guidance can be obtained as to appropriate land uses and implementation of the Growth Management Act within specific localities.

The Growth Management Hearings Boards’ decisions provide not only legal guidance for Jefferson County, but also a solid framework for preparation of the various elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Individual Elements in this Comprehensive Plan have been crafted after review of applicable Growth Hearings Board’s decisions. A discussion of relevant decisions applicable to compliance for each of the Plan’s elements is contained in Appendix D of this Plan.

Compliance with Hearings Board and court decisions also ensures that the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan is consistent with both the requirements of the State Growth Management Act and with other communities within the State, and forms the final leg of the “table.”

Organizing Principles: Planning Objectives

This Comprehensive Plan represents a synthesis between a thorough analysis of existing conditions, the history of development patterns, anticipated population growth, the requirements of the Growth Management Act, the opportunities for new land uses, and the planning objectives which were identified by the community. These planning objectives or principles are the heart of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and represent the connection between community vision, existing land uses, and the goals of the Growth Management Act.

Planning Objective I - Preserving Rural Character

The criteria contained within the GMA and the Growth Management Hearings Board decisions as they relate to rural areas clearly indicates that the preservation and enhancement of rural character is a desired outcome of the planning process. The GMA and the decisions of the Hearings Board originally approached the definition of rural character somewhat indirectly by providing guidance largely on what is detrimental to the preservation of rural character. In 1997, the State legislature amended the GMA to provide a definition of rural character. This important amendment to the GMA afforded greater latitude to

rural counties through recognition of local discretion in the planning process. The amendment enacted through ESB 6094 is discussed in further detail in the Land Use/Rural Element.

Prior to the 1997 amendments, Jefferson County adopted a working definition of rural character for the purposes of this Plan which is based on the relationship between three key elements: Environmental Qualities, Appropriate Land Uses, and Rural Aesthetics.

These elements exist in a state of constant interaction and dependency. None of the component elements taken independently can be used to adequately describe rural character. It is only through the interrelationship of all three elements that a working definition can be crafted.

Planning Objective II - Letting the Land Speak First

Jefferson County has experienced rapid population growth over the past twenty years. In general, development has occurred primarily in the northeastern portions of the County. The Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort has been the catalyst for a significant portion of this residential growth. However, other areas such as the Quimper Peninsula and the Port Hadlock/Irondale/Kala Point vicinity have absorbed significant additional residential growth adjacent to the city limits of Port Townsend. Observed limitations to development have been topographic features, critical areas, ownership patterns, and those portions of the community which are not, and/or cannot be served by roads and/or utilities.

Current development patterns were identified through the analysis of aerial photographs, Assessor's records, environmental mapping, and field inventories. Tables were prepared which illustrated the relative development density throughout the County, the type of development, and the potential for additional development. Review of these areas indicated those portions of the County which are fully "built-out," as well as identifying those areas where new development and/or infill development might occur. The results of the environmental analysis were used to identify appropriate strategies for preserving rural character while accommodating anticipated rural population growth.

Planning Objective III - Enhancement of the Rural Economy

The economic opportunities historically provided by the County's natural environment are no longer as abundant and/or profitable. Enhancing the local economy depends upon shifting from a primary reliance on natural resource extraction activities to more diversified economic activities that utilize the natural environment and other resources (i.e., labor pool) in new and innovative ways. The County is also encouraging businesses that may not have considered locating in the area previously.

Because the nature of rural economies differs greatly from urban economies, opportunities for new growth and development are dissimilar to those found in urban environments. Because of historical growth patterns, rural areas are less likely to entertain economic development proposals that would have a major impact on the local or regional economy. However, through 1995 and 1997 amendments to the GMA, rural areas can accommodate, within limits, new economic endeavors that contribute to the growth and evolution of a new economic base.

To ensure that Jefferson County can accommodate new economic development opportunities, policies are contained within this plan which: encourage developing the necessary land base and rural infrastructure and services to accommodate modern economic activities; promote the County's natural environment as a basis of economic activities that are tourist or recreation-oriented; encourage and provide incentives for businesses to create "family wage" employment opportunities; and ensure that the County's quality of life is preserved as it is enhanced.

Restructuring the local economy is a process that is dependent on both the public and private sectors. Efforts to strengthen communication and cooperation between these two sectors can provide a strong foundation upon which a more diversified and flexible economy may emerge. The Comprehensive Plan is the necessary foundation upon which this communication and cooperation will develop more fully.

Planning Objective IV - Allocation of Land to Meet Anticipated Needs

Through this Plan, Jefferson County will continuously identify and allocate sufficient commercial and industrial land to meet future needs based on the 1997 amendments to the GMA allowing rural counties to recognize “existing areas and uses”. This Plan includes strategies to ensure a land supply which is adequate to meet future economic development by inventorying available commercial and industrial lands in the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Special Study. The study investigated the feasibility of expanded economic development in both the Glen Cove and Tri-Area.

The County’s land supply to accommodate projected rural residential growth is sufficient. Because the County recognizes existing legal lots of record, the County has included policies to consider for the intensification of development of some existing areas of more intensive rural residential development if environmental and health standards can be achieved. These areas constitute a relatively small proportion of the County’s rural residential lands. In all other areas, the County has substantially downzoned rural residential land.

Associated with ensuring adequate lands for different land uses is the need to ensure that appropriate services and infrastructure can be provided in a timely and cost effective manner. This Plan contains policies which support development where services and infrastructure exists.

Planning Objective V - Continuous and Ongoing Public Involvement

Opportunities for meaningful public involvement are key to successful comprehensive planning. Jefferson County is committed to bringing community leaders, interested citizens, property rights activists, environmentalists, and neighborhood groups together in a public process that resolves issues and make choices in the implementation and future amendments to developed this Comprehensive Plan.

Planning Objective VI - Compliance with the Requirements of the Growth Management Act

Consistency with the thirteen goals of the Growth Management Act, the decisions of the Growth Management Hearings Boards, and the County-wide Planning Policy were used as a framework to develop a comprehensive compliance strategy.

PLAN OVERVIEW

In order to reduce the size of the Plan, much of the background information in earlier drafts used to educate and inform the public has been relocated to separate appendices to the Final Plan.

While much of the technical information has been relocated to the Appendices, the Plan, as a comprehensive policy document guiding future land use decisions, must contain sufficient detail and discussion to provide clear and reasonable interpretation of the included policies and strategies. This can only be provided through a large volume of information and analysis. For this reason and in an attempt to make the Plan more manageable, we have bound the Transportation, Utilities, and Capital Facilities Elements in a separate volume.

The Final Plan provides brief narratives or abbreviated requisite background material necessary to the understanding of the goals, policies and strategies of each element. Certain Plan elements, such as Land Use/Rural, Economic Development and Housing are more detailed than others owing to the need to identify existing resources and make assumptions regarding future trends. The remaining element narratives have been reduced in size from previous drafts.