
CAPITAL FACILITIES

PURPOSE: The purpose of the Capital Facilities Element is to identify and provide for public capital facilities.

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

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

- An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, and the location and capacity of these facilities.
- Establishment of Level of Service standards for public capital facilities based on quantifiable, objective measures of capacity.
- County population projections for Years 1998 – 2003.
- Determination of the public capital facilities necessary to serve future population based on the adopted Level of Service standards.
- Projected capital costs for those public capital facilities.
- A plan to finance those public capital facilities.

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

Element Amendment

This element is part of the 2002 Amendments to the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. One purpose of the Amendment is to address the addition of the Tri Area as a Urban Growth Area (UGA). The addition of a UGA was contemplated in the 1998 Plan following completion of a “Special Study.” This Special Study was initiated in 1998 but not completed until 2001. As part of the process, capital needs were addressed and the impacts fully explored in a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS 1999).

The Final SEIS provides estimates of utility needs based on a full build-out of the Tri-Area which, based on population trends, is not expected within the 20 year planning period. Therefore, these estimated needs are not included in this update but can be found in the Final SEIS.

Importantly, within the next 6 years, there are no changes anticipated in infrastructure needs because of the addition of the Tri Area as a UGA. This is due to the fact that the 2002 Amendments to this plan will not allow significant increases in growth density from those in the 1998 Plan until sewer facilities are developed for the area (see Land Use Element). While necessary planning and preliminary engineering is scheduled for these facilities, they will not be in place within the next 6 years.

Relationships with Other Comprehensive Plan Elements

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

Support Documents

Jefferson County's 1998 Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Element included three support documents:

1. **Capital Facilities Requirements:** An analysis of the need for additional facility capacity to serve current and future development. Multiple scenarios utilize different Levels of Service (i.e., current LOS vs. recommended LOS) to quantify needed capacity and to estimate capacity-related facilities costs.
2. **Financial Capacity Analysis:** A six-year forecast of the operating costs of revenue sources available to Jefferson County. This analysis identifies ending-fund balances. Positive balances represent funds that can be used for capital projects. Negative balances indicate no support for capital projects and potential "deficits", which must be eliminated by increasing revenue or reducing costs.
3. **Revenue Sources for Capital Facilities:** Forecasts of each source of revenue available to the County for capital facilities. These revenue sources include sources currently available as well as other potential known sources of revenue.

The three support documents are not included as attachments in the Comprehensive Plan. They are available for review at the Jefferson County Department of Public Works located in Port Townsend, Washington.

In addition, as part of the "Special Study" outlined the 1998 Plan, and completed in 2001, capital facilities for the Tri Area were analyzed and summarized in the SFEIS (1999). Also, as part of the Special Study, a specific report (Task 5) was prepared clarifying the potential capital facilities costs for the selected alternative – a Tri Area UGA.

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Capital Facility	LOS Unit Measurement
Corrections Inmate Facilities	Beds/1,000 population
Fire and Rescue	Average response time
Hospitals	Beds/1,000 population
Sheriff Administrative Facilities	Building Square Feet/1,000 population
Library	Collection size per capita and Bldg. Sq. Ft.. per capita
Parks	Acres/1,000 population
Roads and Streets	Actual traffic volume to roadway design capacity
Schools	Building Square Feet per student
Sewer	Gallons per customer per day and effluent quality
Solid Waste	Pounds per capita per day
Transit	Annual Transit Revenue Service Hours (ATRSH)/1000 Population
Water	Gallons per customer per day and water quality (Washington State Department of Health Drinking Water Standards)

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

Method for Using Levels of Service

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

- What is the quantity of public facilities that will be required by the end of Year Six: 2003?
- Is it financially feasible to provide the quantity of facilities that are required by the end of Year Six: 2003?

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

The Capital Facilities support document "Capital Facilities Requirements" contains many of the results of the use of this method to answer two questions for Jefferson County.

Question # 1: What is the quantity of public facilities that will be required by the end of Year Six: 2003?

Formula 1.1: Demand X Standard = Requirement

Where Demand is the estimated 2003 population or other appropriate measure of need (e.g., dwelling units) and Standard is the amount of facility per unit of demand (e.g., acres of park per capita).

The answer to this formula is the total of public facilities needed, regardless of the existing facilities being used by the public.

Formula 1.2: Requirement – Inventory = Surplus or (Deficit)

The Requirement is the result of Formula 1.1, and Inventory is the quantity of facilities available as of December 31, 1997 (The start date of the Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan: CFP). This formula assumes use of the existing public facilities inventory to offset the total requirement from Formula 1.1.

The answer to Formula 1.2 is the net surplus or deficit of public facilities. A deficit must be eliminated on or before December 31, 2003. If a net deficit exists, it represents the combined needs of existing development and anticipated new development. Detailed analysis reveals the portion of the net deficiency that is attributable to current development compared to the portion needed for new development (Please reference the CFE support document "Capital Facilities Requirements" for the delineation between current development and new development.)

Question # 2: Is it financially feasible to provide the quantity of facilities that are required by the end of Year Six: 2003?

A "preliminary" answer to Question 2 is prepared in order to test the financial feasibility of proposed Level of Service standards. The preliminary answers utilizes "average costs", rather than specific and detailed facilities total project costs. This approach avoids the inefficiency of developing detailed

projects and costs that would be unusable if the LOS standard proved to be financially infeasible. If the standards are feasible at the preliminary level, more detailed project cost models in preparation for a more "final" answer to Question 2. If, however, the preliminary answer indicates that a Level of Service is not financially feasible, The following options are available to the County:

1. Reduce the Level of Service standard which will reduce the cost and quality standard; or
2. Increase revenues to pay for the proposed Level of Service standard (higher rates and/or new sources of revenue); or
3. Reduce the average cost of the public facility (e.g., use alternative ownership or financing strategies) through life-cycle cost analyses to evaluate initial cost/benefit and quality; or
4. Reduce public facility demand by restricting population (i.e., revise the Land Use Element), which may cause growth to occur in other jurisdictions; or
5. Reduce public facility demand by reducing consumption (i.e., transportation demand management techniques, recycling solid waste, and water conservation, among other strategies.) which may provide cost benefit in a life cycle versus initial cost analysis.
6. Any combination of the preceding five options.

The preliminary answer to Question 2 is prepared using the following formulas (P = Preliminary):

$$\text{Formula 2.1P:} \quad \text{Deficit} \times \text{Average Cost per Unit} = \text{Deficit Cost}$$

Where Deficit is the result of Formula 1.2P and Average Cost per Unit is the usual cost of one unit of facility (e.g., mile of road, acre of park).

The answer to Formula 2.1P is the approximate cost of eliminating deficiencies of public facilities, based on the use of an "average" cost for each unit of public facility that is needed.

$$\text{Formula 2.2P:} \quad \text{Deficit Cost} - \text{Revenue} = \text{Net Surplus or (Deficit)}$$

Where Deficit Cost is the result of Formula 2.1P and Revenue is the money currently available for public facilities.

The result of Formula 2.2P is the preliminary answer to the test of financial feasibility of the Level of Service standards. A revenue surplus means the LOS standard of service is financially feasible with a resulting fund surplus. A deficiency of revenue relative to projected costs means that insufficient funds are available to develop the facilities; and, therefore the LOS standard is not financially feasible. Any LOS standard that is not financially feasible must be adjusted using the six strategies listed above. Please reference the CFE support document "Capital Facilities Requirements" for Jefferson County scenarios. The "final" demonstration of financial feasibility uses detailed costs of specific capital projects in lieu of the "average" costs of facilities used in the preliminary answer, as follows (F = final):

$$\text{Formula 2.1F:} \quad \text{Capacity projects} + \text{Non-capacity projects} = \text{Total Projects Cost}$$

Where Capacity Projects is the cost of all projects needed to eliminate the deficiency for existing and future development (Formula 1.2), including upgrades and/or expansion of existing facilities as well as new facilities. Non-Capacity Projects is the cost of remodeling, renovation or replacement needed to maintain the inventory of existing facilities.

$$\text{Formula 2.2F:} \quad \text{Project Cost} - \text{Revenue} = \text{Net Surplus or (Deficit)}$$

Where Project Cost is the result of Formula 2.1F and Revenue is the money available for public facilities from current/proposed sources.

The “final” answer to Question 2 validates the financial feasibility of the Level of Service standards that are used for each public facility in the CFE and in the other elements of the comprehensive plan. The financially feasible Level of Service standards and the resulting capital improvement projects are used as the basis for policies and implementation programs in the CFE.

Establishing the Levels of Service (LOS) Standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

Selection of a specific LOS as an "adopted standard" was accomplished in through a ten-step process:

1. The "current" Level of Service was calculated.

2. Service providers were given national/regional standards or guidelines and examples of local LOS from other local governments.
3. Service providers researched local standards from County studies, master plans, ordinances and development regulations.
4. Service providers recommended a standard for the County's CFE.
5. The first draft of the Capital Facilities Requirements support document forecast needed capacity and approximate costs of 2 Levels of Service (e.g., the current actual LOS and the providers' recommended LOS).
6. The Board of County Commissioners reviewed and commented on the first draft Capital Facilities Requirements report.
7. Service providers prepared specific capital improvements projects to support the current LOS (unless the Board of County Commissioner's workshop indicated an interest in a different LOS for the purpose of preparing the draft CFE).
8. The draft CFE was prepared using the 1997 LOS (unless the Board of County Commissioners indicated an interest in a different LOS).
9. A draft CFE was reviewed and discussed during Board of County Commissioners/Planning Commission joint workshops prior to formal hearings on the CFE by the Board of County Commissioners.
10. Three additional public workshops were held with the Board of County Commissioners to review the final draft of the CFE. Workshop I reviewed the capital facilities planning process framework. Workshop II reviewed potential financial plan strategies including known revenue sources available for capital facilities and Board of Commissioners preliminary "preferences". Workshop III reviewed two strategies for a six-year Capital Financial Plan.

The Board of County Commissioners support the Levels of Service standards and selected a six-year Capital Financial Plan in the CFE that includes two funding strategies, with a "Primary" strategy identified, and a "Secondary" strategy identified. Both strategies aggressively utilize grant funding for an initial funding source as indicated in Tables 12-5-A and 12-5-B. In developing the two funding strategies, the County's debt capacity (currently approximately \$56,000,000) and debt service capability were considered.

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

- LOS determines the need for capacity-related capital improvement projects (See Policy 2.1).
- LOS is the benchmark for evaluating the adequacy of public facilities for proposed development. (See Policy 3.2).

Population Growth Assumptions

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

Table 12-2

Population Growth Assumptions

Year	Countywide	Unincorporated County
1998	26,886	18,074
2003	30,012	19,997
2007	32,783	21,652
2015	38,698	25,097
2017	40,087	25,521

Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Cost Projections: 1998-2003

The 1998-2003 capital improvements cost projections are summarized on Table 12-3.

**Table 12-3
County-Owned/Operated Public Facilities Capital Cost Summary***

Type of Public Facility	1998-2003 Cost (x \$1000 in 1998 Dollars)
Transportation	\$12,013
Community Centers	706
County Corrections Inmate Facilities	942
County Sheriff Facilities	321
County Justice Facilities	10,900
County General Administrative Facilities	1,160
County Maintenance Shop Facilities	813
Parks and Recreation Facilities	6,294
Solid Waste Facilities	559
Storm Water Management/Flood Control Facilities	2,242
Water System Facilities	40
TOTAL REQUIRED	\$35,990

*This 2002 amendment recognizes the need for sewer facilities planning for the Tri-Area. Therefore, and additional cost of \$75,000 has been identified for this activity in the years 2002-2003.

Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Financing Strategy: 1998-2003

**Table 12-4
Revenue Source Summary***

Revenue Source	1998-2003 Revenue (x \$1000 in 1998 Dollars)
Existing Revenue	\$15,731
Revenue to be Identified (Refer to Tables 12-5-A and 12-5-B)	20,259
TOTAL REQUIRED	\$35,990

*This 2002 amendment recognizes the need for sewer facilities planning for the Tri-Area. Therefore, an additional cost of \$75,000 has been identified for this activity in the years 2002-2003. This will increase the revenue requirement identified above.

Table 12-5-A

**Primary Financial Strategy
Funding the Unfunded Balance Summary**

Table 12-5-B
Secondary Financial Strategy
Funding the Unfunded Balance Summary

Level Of Service (LOS) Impacts

The 1998-2003 Capital Facilities Six-Year Plan (CFP) enables Jefferson County to accommodate 14% population growth based on a projected 2003 population of 30,012 people. Modifications to Level of Service (LOS) standards for County-owned or managed facilities follow:

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

Facility	LOS Unit	1996 LOS Standard	CFP LOS Standard
Solid Waste	Lbs./Person/Day	3.99#	3.99#
Animal Control Shelter	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	79 SF	79 SF
Storm Water	Standards in Progress	Standards in Progress	Standards in Progress

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

Facility	LOS Unit	1996 LOS Standard	CFP LOS Standard
Corrections Inmate Facilities	Beds/1,000 population	1.57 Beds	2.08 Beds
County Sheriff Facilities	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	558 SF	656 SF
County Justice Facilities	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	789 SF	1,310 SF
General Administrative Offices	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	1,619 SF	1,860 SF
Trails	Miles/1,000 population	0.38 Miles	0.52 Miles

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

Facility	LOS Unit	1996 LOS Standard	CFP LOS Standard
Sewage Treatment	Gallons/ERU/day	None	230 Gallons

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

Facility	LOS Unit	1996 LOS Standard	CFP LOS Standard
Transportation	LOS A, B, C, D, E, F	LOS C or Better	LOS C or Better
Community Centers	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	1,621 SF	1,450 SF
Maintenance Shop Facilities	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	1,828 SF	1,738 SF
Regional Parks	Acres/1,000 population	18 Acres	11.50 Acres
Community Parks	Acres/1,000 population	1.30 Acres	0.51 Acres
Neighborhood Parks	Acres/1,000 population	0.24 Acres	0.14 Acres
Open Space	Acres/1,000 population	1.90 Acres	1.52 Acres
Campgrounds	Acres/1,000 population	1.70 Acres	1.30 Acres

CAPITAL FACILITIES CONCEPT PLAN: 1998-2003

This section identifies capital improvement schedules and the financing plan for County owned and/or operated public facilities. Also included are inventories of existing facilities, the Level of Service standards, estimates of future operating and maintenance costs associated with capital projects.

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

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

Level of Service Capacity Analysis: Table 2 information summarizes facility capacity. The analysis utilizes the same analytical technique and format as the support document "Capital Facilities Requirements". The statistical table at the top calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for Level of Service. The capital improvement projects that are projected to provide the capacity required are listed below the requirements table, and the resulting capacity is reconciled to the total requirement.

Capital Projects and Financing Plan: Table 3 includes a schedule of capital improvements that are intended to provide the capacity required to meet growth, and repair/replace existing facilities through December 31, 2003.

Individual capital improvement projects are identified. The cost for each of the next six fiscal years is shown in thousands of dollars. All cost projections are in 1998 dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the regular review and update of the Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). Capital improvement projects were prepared in association with the department managing the public facility.

Specific revenue sources and projected revenue amounts are shown. The revenue forecasts are based on data from two support documents ("Revenue Sources for Capital Facilities" and "Financial Capacity Analysis"), and reflect the results of the February and March 1998 work of a Jefferson County Governmental Financial Task Force. The Task Force identified potential financing strategies based on known potential revenue sources available.

The report "Financial Capacity Analysis" includes forecasts of existing revenue and expenditures that (1) reflect the County's overall financial position, and (2) identify existing Jefferson County revenue that can be used for future capital facility projects.

The report "Revenue Sources for Capital Facilities" forecasts new sources of revenue that the County could generate for capital facilities projects.

Additional revenue necessary to meet the requirements from the 2002 Amendments is minor relative to the overall County needs. Therefore these reports have not been updated.

Operating Impact of Capital Projects

Capital Facilities Concept Plan “Section Tables 5” forecast future operating/maintenance costs of capital improvement projects. The impacts are presumed to begin in the year after the year in which the project is completed. Since it is not possible to forecast the completion date of each project, no attempt has been made to identify impacts for any portion of the year in which the project is completed.

The costs in Table 12-9 reflect the amount by which each future year's operating budget may increase relative to current operations budgets. In other words, as a project is completed, the project may impact operating budgets in all future years.

The forecast of operating impacts is not required by the GMA, but is included due to the substantial cost impacts of some facilities to County expenditures. This impact may be substantive enough to warrant reconsideration of the County's decision to proceed with the project (and, perhaps, to modify the Level of Service standard). No "financing plan" is offered for the operating costs, but the County will be obliged to identify revenue to pay for such costs. Some of the revenue may come from increases to the tax base that accompanies new development that created the need for the public facility. There is no assurance, however, that increased tax revenue from new development will be sufficient to pay for the cost of operating new public facilities.

The total of all operating costs of all capital projects is calculated as the sum of all the Tables 12-9. The tables are listed in the Capital Improvement section describing each facility (e.g. Animal Control Shelter). The annual totals are:

Table 12-9
Summary of Capital Facilities Concept Plan Operating Cost Impacts

Year	Annual Impact (x \$1,000)
1998	0
1999	80
2000	128
2001	228
2002	357
2003	357

Selecting Revenue Sources for the Financing Plan

Sources of revenue are analyzed in two support documents "Revenue Sources for Capital Facilities," and "Financial Capacity Analysis" referenced on Page 12-2.

The process of identifying revenue requirements that provide the basis for the financing plan is as follows:

- Determine total estimated project costs for each category of County owned and/or operated public facility identified in Annual Capital Improvement Plans.
- Match existing restricted revenue sources to the type of facility to which they are restricted.
- Subtract existing restricted revenues from costs to identify unfunded deficit.
- Apply new restricted revenues to the type of facility to which they are restricted.

- Subtract new restricted revenues from costs to identify remaining unfunded deficits.
- Allocate new unrestricted revenue to unfunded deficits.

CAPITAL FACILITIES CONCEPT PLAN

ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER

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

TABLE 12-AC-1

**CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY
ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITY**

The inventory of the current Animal Control Facility includes the following:

Name	Capacity (Net Sq.Ft.)	Location
Animal Control Shelter	2,313	Critter Lane, Jefferson County
Total Net Sq. Ft.	2,313	

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed LOS of 79 square feet per 1,000 population requires only 57 square feet of additional space through the year 2003. This LOS will enable the County to respond to the need for additional square feet of animal control shelter space as the County-wide population continues to increase over time.

TABLE 12-AC-2				
ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County Proposed LOS = 79 Square Feet Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Sq Ft @ 0.07897 Per Capita	Current Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	2,123	2,313	190
1999 Growth	591	47	0	(47)
2000 Growth	607	48	0	(48)
2001 Growth	624	49	0	(49)
2002 Growth	643	51	0	(51)
2003 Growth	661	52	0	(52)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	2,370	2,313	(57)
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
No Proposed Projects			0	0
Proposed Total by FY 2003			2,313	(57)

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing: There are no capital projects proposed in the 1998-2003 CFP.

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: There are no net operating impacts during 1998-2003 included in the 1998-2003 CFP.

Planning Levels of Service and Adequate Facilities: In compliance with the GMA and Capital Facilities Policy 3.2, adequate animal control shelter space must be planned within the Capital Facilities Element.

COMMUNITY CENTERS**Current Facilities**

TABLE 12-CC-1			
CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY			
COMMUNITY CENTERS			
The inventory of the current community centers includes the following:			
	Name	Capacity (Net Sq.Ft.)	Location
	Brinnon Community Center	3,400	Brinnon
	Gardiner Community Center	5,000	Gardiner
	Port Townsend Community Center	17,708	Port Townsend
	Quilcene Community Center	3,850	Quilcene
	Tri Area Community Center	6,925	Chimacum
	Coyle Community Center	2,200	Coyle
	Total Net Sq. Ft.	39,083	

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed LOS of 1,450 square feet per 1,000 population will require an additional 4,477 square feet of space through the year 2003. This LOS will enable the County to respond to the need for additional square feet of community center space.

TABLE 12-CC-2				
COMMUNITY CENTERS				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County Proposed LOS = 1450 Square Feet Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Sq Ft @ 1.45003 Per Capita	Current Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	38,985	39,083	98
1999 Growth	591	857	0	(857)
2000 Growth	607	880	0	(880)
2001 Growth	624	905	0	(905)
2002 Growth	643	932	0	(932)
2003 Growth	661	958	0	(958)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	43,517	39,083	(4,434)
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
Community Center:			3,150	(1,285)
New Addition or Building				
Proposed Total by FY 2003			42,233	(1,285)

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing:

Table 12-CC-3							
COMMUNITY CENTERS							
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN							
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS							
(All Amounts x \$1,000)							
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
CTED/CDBG	0.00	0.00	350.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	350.00
Grants	0.00	33.00	300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	333.00
Facility Fund	6.00	8.00	9.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.00
Total Sources of Funds	6.00	41.00	659.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	706.00
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
Community Center Project							
	0.00	60.00	525.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	585.00
Total Capacity Projects	0.00	60.00	525.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	585.00
Non-Capacity Projects:							
Quilcene Community Center							
	10.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00
Port Townsend Community Center							
	13.00	12.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
Tri-Area Community Center							
	10.00	8.00	8.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.00
Gardiner Community Center							
	0.00	10.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00
Total Non Capacity Projects	33.00	40.00	48.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	121.00
Total Capacity & Non Capacity Projects	33.00	100.00	573.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	706.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	(27.00)	(59.00)	86.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: The net operating impact during 1998-2003 of the capital improvement projects required to maintain the adopted Level of Service standards is shown on Table 12-CC-5.

TABLE 12-CC-5							
OPERATING IMPACTS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE							
(All Amounts Are Times \$1,000)							
TYPE OF FACILITY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
Community Center	0.00	0.00	36.10	36.10	36.10	36.10	144.40
Total All Projects Costs	0.00	0.00	36.10	36.10	36.10	36.10	144.40

Planning Levels of Service (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with the GMA and Capital Facilities Policy 3.2, adequate community centers must be planned within the Capital Facilities Element.

COUNTY CORRECTIONS INMATE FACILITIES

Current Facilities: The current inventory of the corrections inmate facility totals 58 inmate beds, and serves both unincorporated and incorporated populations of the County. Table 12-CF-1 “Current Facilities Inventory,” lists the facility as well as its current capacities and location.

TABLE 12-CF-1		
CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY		
COUNTY CORRECTIONS INMATE FACILITIES		
The inventory of the current Correction Facilities includes the following:		
Name	Capacity (No. Beds)	Location
Correction Facility	58	Port Hadlock
Clearwater Annex	Holding Cell	Clearwater
Total Inmate Beds	58	

Level of Service (LOS)

TABLE 12-CF-2a				
COUNTY CORRECTIONS INMATE FACILITIES				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County Proposed LOS =2.08 Beds Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Beds @ 0.00208 Per Capita	Current Beds Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	56	58	2
1999 Growth	591	1	0	(1)
2000 Growth	607	1	0	(1)
2001 Growth	624	1	0	(1)
2002 Growth	643	1	0	(1)
2003 Growth	661	1	0	(1)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	61	58	(3)
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Beds Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
Additional Beds & Improvements			3	(0)
Proposed Total by FY 2003			61	(0)

COUNTY SHERIFF FACILITIES

Current Facilities: The current inventory of Sheriff Administrative Facilities is 9,451 square feet.

TABLE 12-CF-2b				
COUNTRY SHERIFF ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
Proposed LOS = 656 Square Feet Per 1,000		UNICORP.CO	Population	
Time Period	Service Area Population	Sq Ft @ 0.65590 Per Capita	Current Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	18,074	11,855	9,451	(2,404)
1999 Growth	359	235	0	(235)
2000 Growth	368	241	0	(241)
2001 Growth	381	250	0	(250)
2002 Growth	391	256	0	(256)
2003 Growth	404	265	0	(265)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	19,977	13,102	9,451	(3,651)
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
Sheriff Administrative Offices			3,470	(181)
Building Construction				
Proposed Total by FY 2003			12,921	(181)

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

TABLE 12-CF-3								
COUNTY CORRECTIONS INMATE FACILITIES & SHERIFF ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES								
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN								
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS								
(All Amounts x \$1,000)								
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL	
SOURCES OF FUNDS								
Capital Improvement Fund	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	60.00	
Facility Fund	15.00	20.00	25.00	10.00	5.00	15.00	90.00	
Public Vote: Local Option Sales Tax: 2nd 1/10 of 1%	100.00	684.60	308.10	5.00	0.00	15.00	1,112.70	
Total Sources of Funds	125.00	714.60	343.10	25.00	15.00	40.00	1,262.70	
USES OF FUNDS								
Capacity Projects:								
Inmate Beds and Jail Improvements	95.00	613.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	708.60	
Administration Expansion:	0.00	38.00	283.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	321.10	
Total Capacity Projects	95.00	651.60	283.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,029.70	
Non-Capacity Projects:								
Clearwater Annex:								
Plumbing/Painting/Gutters	15.00	10.00	15.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	
Correction Facility Upgrades:								
Drainfield/ADA/Plumbing	15.00	53.00	45.00	15.00	15.00	40.00	183.00	
Total Non Capacity Projects	30.00	63.00	60.00	25.00	15.00	40.00	233.00	
Total Capacity and Non Capacity Projects	125.00	714.60	343.10	25.00	15.00	40.00	1,262.70	
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: The net operating impact during 1998-2003 of the capital improvement projects required to maintain the adopted Level of Service standards is shown on Table 12-CF-5.

TABLE 12-CF-5							
OPERATING IMPACTS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE							
(All Amounts Are Times \$1,000)							
TYPE OF FACILITY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
Expansion of Beds and	0.00	106.90	106.90	106.90	106.90	106.90	534.50
Administration Area							
Total All Projects Costs	0.00	106.90	106.90	106.90	106.90	106.90	534.50

Planning Levels of Service (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with the GMA and Capital Facilities Policy 3.2, adequate corrections facilities must be planned within the Capital Facilities Element.

COUNTY JUSTICE FACILITIES

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

TABLE 12-CJF-1				
CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY				
COUNTY JUSTICE FACILITIES				
The inventory of the current County Justice Facilities includes the following:				
	Name	Capacity (Gross Sq.Ft.)	Location	
	Jefferson County Courthouse		Port Townsend	
	Superior Court	8,846		
	District Court/Probation	4,077		
	Juvenile Services/Family Court	2,934		
	Prosecuting Attorney	4,510		
	Total Gross Square Feet	20,367		

Level of Service (LOS): The LOS of 1,310 square feet per 1,000 population will require a net additional 18,950 square feet of space through the year 2003 based on current population projections (See Table 12-CJF-2). This LOS will enable the County to respond to the need for increased life and safety protection for the public and staff and provide additional square feet for both administrative offices work space and Courtrooms.

TABLE 12-CJF-2				
COUNTY JUSTICE FACILITIES				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County LOS = 1,310 Square Feet Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Sq Ft @ 1.31000 Per Capita	Current Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	35,221	20,367	(14,854)
1999 Growth	591	774	0	(774)
2000 Growth	607	795	0	(795)
2001 Growth	624	817	0	(817)
2002 Growth	643	842	0	(842)
2003 Growth	661	866	0	(866)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	39,316	20,367	(18,949)
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Sq Ft Increase	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
New Justice Facilities			19,633	684
Proposed Total Increase by FY 2003			19,633	684

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing: County Justice Facilities includes a capital placeholder of \$10,900,000 for the construction of a new approximately 40,000 square foot facility. The proposed financing plan is shown on Table 12-CJF-3.

TABLE 12-CJF-3							
COUNTY JUSTICE FACILITIES							
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN							
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS							
(All Amounts x \$1,000 in 1998 Dollars)							
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
Public Vote General Obligation Bond	272.50	1,635.00	817.50	3,270.00	4,360.00	545.00	10,900.00
Total Sources of Funds	272.50	1,635.00	817.50	3,270.00	4,360.00	545.00	10,900.00
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
New Justice Center	272.50	1,635.00	817.50	3,270.00	4,360.00	545.00	10,900.00
Total Capacity Projects	272.50	1,635.00	817.50	3,270.00	4,360.00	545.00	10,900.00
Non-Capacity Projects:							
None	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Non Capacity Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Capacity and Non Capacity Projects	272.50	1,635.00	817.50	3,270.00	4,360.00	545.00	10,900.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: The projected net operating impact during 1998-2003 of the capital improvement projects required to maintain the adopted Level of Service standards is shown on Table 12-CJF-5.

TABLE 12-CJF-5							
OPERATING IMPACTS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE							
(All Amounts Are Times \$1,000)							
TYPE OF FACILITY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
New Justice Facility	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	300.00
Total All Projects Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	300.00

COUNTY GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

Current Facilities: The current inventory of County government administrative offices includes two County-owned facilities (Courthouse and Multi-Service Building Annex) and two leased facilities (Castle Hill and Federal Building). Table 12-CAO-1 "Current Facilities Inventory", lists the facilities as well as the current building square footage and location.

TABLE 12-CGAO-1			
CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY			
COUNTY GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES			
The inventory of the current County General Administrative Offices includes the following:			
Name	Capacity (Gross Sq.Ft.)	Location	
County Courthouse General Admin. Offices	15,420	Port Townsend	
County Courthouse Storage Building	2,112	Port Townsend	
Castle Hill (Leased Facility)	15,208	Port Townsend	
Federal Building (Leased Facility)	9,037	Port Townsend	
Total Gross Square Feet	41,777		

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed LOS of 1,860 square feet per 1,000 population will require a net additional 14,854 square feet of space through the year 2003 based on current population projections (See Table 12-CAO-2). This LOS will enable the County to respond to the need for additional square feet of general administrative work space as the County-wide population continues to increase over time. No capital capacity-related projects are proposed. Additional space requirements are anticipated to be met, in part, through continued use of leased space.

TABLE 12-CGAO-2				
COUNTY GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County Proposed LOS = 1,860 Square Feet Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Sq Ft @ 1.86000 Per Capita	Current Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	50,008	41,777	(8,231)
1999 Growth	591	1,099	0	(1,099)
2000 Growth	607	1,129	0	(1,129)
2001 Growth	624	1,161	0	(1,161)
2002 Growth	643	1,196	0	(1,196)
2003 Growth	661	1,229	0	(1,229)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	55,822	41,777	(14,045)
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
No Projects Proposed: Lease Additional Space			0	(14,045)
Proposed Total by FY 2003			0	(14,045)

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing: The County's government administrative facilities includes only non-capacity related capital improvement projects.

TABLE 12-CGAO-3							
COUNTY GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES							
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN							
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS							
(All Amounts x \$1,000 in 1998 Dollars)							
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
Capital Improvement Fund	130.00	300.00	165.00	175.00	110.00	100.00	980.00
Grants	90.00	90.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	180.00
Total Sources of Funds	220.00	390.00	165.00	175.00	110.00	100.00	1,160.00
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
None	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Capacity Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non-Capacity Projects:							
Courthouse Administration Office							
Carpeting/Painting	130.00	90.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	620.00
Courthouse Building:							
Boiler/Windows/Doors/ADA	65.00	20.00	20.00	75.00	0.00	0.00	180.00
Multi-Service Building:							
Elevator Upgrade/Heat/ADA/Roof & Misc.	25.00	280.00	45.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	360.00
Total Non Capacity Projects	220.00	390.00	165.00	175.00	110.00	100.00	1,160.00
Total Capacity and Non Capacity Projects	220.00	390.00	165.00	175.00	110.00	100.00	1,160.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: The net operating impact during 1998-2003 of the capital improvement projects required to maintain the adopted Level of Service standards is shown on Table 12-CGAO-5.

TABLE 12-CGAO-5							
OPERATING IMPACTS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE							
(All Amounts Are Times \$1,000)							
TYPE OF FACILITY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
General Administrative	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total All Projects Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Planning Levels of Service (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with the GMA and Capital Facilities Policy 3.2, adequate County administrative facilities must be identified within the Capital Facilities Element.

COUNTY MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES

Current Facilities: The current inventory of County Maintenance Shop facilities totals 42,962 square feet, and includes four (4) County-owned facilities: Brinnon Storage/Shop, Quilcene Road Maintenance Shop, Hoh River Road Maintenance Shop, and the Port Hadlock Main Shop. Table 12-MF-1 "Current Facilities Inventory", lists the facilities as well as capacity and location.

TABLE 12-MF-1				
CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY				
COUNTY MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES				
The inventory of the current Public Works Maintenance Facilities includes the following:				
	Name	Capacity (Net Sq.Ft.)	Location	
	Brinnon Storage/Shop	1,250	Brinnon	
	Quilcene Road Maintenance Shop	4,000	Quilcene	
	Hoh River Maintenance Shop	7,712	West End	
	Port Hadlock Main Shop	30,000	Port Hadlock	
	Total Net Sq.Ft.	42,962		

Level of Service (LOS): Although the proposed LOS of 1,738 square feet per 1,000 population is 90 square feet per 1,000 population lower (5%) than the County's current LOS (See Table 12-MF-2), it represents a higher square feet requirement than does the current LOS (-21,010 sq. ft vs. -12,232 sq. ft). This occurs because a lower current inventory of square feet (30,000 sq. ft vs. 42,962 sq. ft as shown in Table 12-MF-1) is assumed in calculating the proposed LOS to reflect the recommended construction of replacement maintenance shop space. In short, this inventory adjustment avoids double counting existing square footage being replaced by new square footage construction, which incorrectly creates a higher LOS.

This LOS will enable the County to respond to the need for additional square feet of maintenance shop space as the County-wide population increases.

TABLE 12-MF-2				
COUNTY MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County Proposed LOS =1738 Square Feet Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Sq Ft @ 1.73793 Per Capita	Current Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	46,726	30,000	(16,726)
1999 Growth	591	1,027	0	(1,027)
2000 Growth	607	1,055	0	(1,055)
2001 Growth	624	1,084	0	(1,084)
2002 Growth	643	1,117	0	(1,117)
2003 Growth	661	1,149	0	(1,149)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	52,159	30,000	(22,159)
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Sq Ft Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
Brinnon New Maintenance Shop			1,500	(20,659)
Quilcene New Maintenance Shop			7,800	(12,859)
Hoh River New Maintenance Shop			7,500	(5,359)
Hadlock Maintenance Shop Addition			3,400	(1,959)
Proposed Total by FY 2003			50,200	(1,959)

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

TABLE 12-MF-3
COUNTY MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

(All Amounts x \$1,000 IN 1998 Dollars)

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
Existing Revenue Fund Balance (ER & R)	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	450.00
Asset Sale: Quilcene Shop	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	30.00
Current Operations Revenue	75.00	75.00	75.00	54.00	54.00	0.00	333.00
Total Sources of Funds	150.00	150.00	150.00	159.00	129.00	75.00	813.00
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
Relocate/Reconstruct Brinnon Maint Shop	0.00	85.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	85.00
Relocate/Reconstruct Quilcene Maint Shop	0.00	100.00	160.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	260.00
Construct Addition to Port Hadlock Maint Shop	0.00	99.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	99.00
Total Capacity Projects	0.00	284.00	160.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	444.00
Non-Capacity Projects:							
Relocate/Reconstruct Hoh River Maint Shop 7,500 Sq. Ft	369.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	369.00
Total Non Capacity Projects	369.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	369.00
Total Capacity and Non Capacity Projects	369.00	284.00	160.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	813.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	(219.00)	(134.00)	(10.00)	159.00	129.00	75.00	0.00

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: The net operating impact during 1998-2003 of the capital improvement projects required to maintain the adopted Level of Service standards is shown on Table 12-MF-5.

TABLE 12-MF-5							
OPERATING IMPACTS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE							
(All Amounts Are Times \$1,000)							
TYPE OF FACILITY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
Brinnon Maintenance Shop	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Quilcene Maintenance Shop	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hoh River Maintenance Shop	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Port Hadlock Maintenance Shop	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total All Projects Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Planning Levels of Service (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with the GMA and County CFE Policy 3.3, adequate County maintenance shops facilities must be planned for within the County's Capital Facilities Element (CFE).

PARKS AND RECREATION

Current Facilities

The 1997 County-owned parks (including the Park and Recreation District No.1 Coyle Community Center) inventory includes 543.7 acres of parks and 15 miles of trails:

**Table 12-11
Acres of County Owned Park**

Type of Park	Acres
Regional Parks	422.8
Community Parks	30.9
Neighborhood Parks	5.5
Open Space: Does not include "Public & Preserved Open Space" (National & State Parks) & "Active Open Space" (Marinas, Trails, Golf Courses, and Sportsfields)	45.8
Campgrounds	40.7
TOTAL ACRES	545.7

TABLE 12-PR-1

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY PARKS AND RECREATION		
The inventory of the current Parks and Recreation Facilities includes the following:		
Name	Capacity	Location (Net)
NOTE: The voluminous inventory of current parks and recreational facilities is available and on file in the Jefferson County Department of Public Works		
Total		

Level of Service (LOS): Acreage that is currently owned, regardless of its state of development, is included as "capacity" for the purpose of calculating LOS for County-owned parks.

The LOS are 11.5 acres per 1,000 population for Regional Parks; 0.51 acres per 1,000 population for Community Parks; 0.14 acres per 1,000 population for Neighborhood Parks; 1.52 acres per 1,000 population for Open Space; 0.52 miles per 1,000 population for Trails; and 1.3 acres for Campgrounds. The LOS will enable the County to respond to the need for additional park acres and facilities, and trail miles as the County population continues to increase over time.

TABLE 12-PR-2a				
PARKS AND RECREATION: REGIONAL PARKS				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County Proposed LOS = 11.5 Acres Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Acres @ 0.01151 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	309.43	422.80	113.37
1999 Growth	591	6.80	0.00	(6.80)
2000 Growth	607	6.99	0.00	(6.99)
2001 Growth	624	7.18	0.00	(7.18)
2002 Growth	643	7.40	0.00	(7.40)
2003 Growth	661	7.61	0.00	(7.61)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	345.41	422.80	77.39
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
None Proposed			0	0.00
Proposed Total by FY 2003			422.80	77.39

TABLE 12-PR-2b					
PARKS AND RECREATION: COMMUNITY PARKS					
JEFFERSON COUNTY					
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY					
County Proposed LOS = 0.51 Acres Per 1,000 Population					
Time Period	Service Area Population	Acres @ 0.00051 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)	
1998 Base year	26,886	13.82	30.90	17.08	
1999 Growth	591	0.30	0.00	(0.30)	
2000 Growth	607	0.31	0.00	(0.31)	
2001 Growth	624	0.32	0.00	(0.32)	
2002 Growth	643	0.33	0.00	(0.33)	
2003 Growth	661	0.34	0.00	(0.34)	
Total As Of 12/31/2003		30,012	15.42	30.90	15.48
CAPACITY PROJECTS					
Proposed Project			Proposed Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)	
None Proposed			0	0.00	
Proposed Total by FY 2003			30.90	15.47	

TABLE 12-PR-2c				
PARKS AND RECREATION: NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY				
County Proposed LOS = 0.14 Acres Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Acres @ 0.00014 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	3.79	5.50	1.71
1999 Growth	591	0.08	0.00	(0.08)
2000 Growth	607	0.09	0.00	(0.09)
2001 Growth	624	0.09	0.00	(0.09)
2002 Growth	643	0.09	0.00	(0.09)
2003 Growth	661	0.09	0.00	(0.09)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	4.23	5.50	1.27
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
None Proposed			0	0.00
Proposed Total by FY 2003			5.50	1.27

TABLE 12-PR-2d				
PARKS AND RECREATION: TRAILS				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County Proposed LOS = 0.52 Miles Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Miles @ 0.00052 Per Capita	Current Miles Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	13.96	15.00	1.04
1999 Growth	591	0.31	0.00	(0.31)
2000 Growth	607	0.32	0.00	(0.32)
2001 Growth	624	0.32	0.00	(0.32)
2002 Growth	643	0.33	0.00	(0.33)
2003 Growth	661	0.34	0.00	(0.34)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	15.59	15.00	(0.59)
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Miles Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
None Proposed			0.00	(0.59)
Proposed Total by FY 2003			15.00	(0.59)

TABLE 12-PR-2e				
PARKS AND RECREATION: OPEN SPACE				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
County Proposed LOS = 1.52 Acres Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Acres @ 0.00152 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
1998 Base year	26,886	40.77	45.80	5.03
1999 Growth	591	0.90	0.00	(0.90)
2000 Growth	607	0.92	0.00	(0.92)
2001 Growth	624	0.95	0.00	(0.95)
2002 Growth	643	0.98	0.00	(0.98)
2003 Growth	661	1.00	0.00	(1.00)
Total As Of 12/31/2003	30,012	45.52	45.80	0.28
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
None Proposed			0	0.00
Proposed Total by FY 2003			45.80	0.29

TABLE 12-PR-2f					
PARKS AND RECREATION: CAMPGROUNDS					
JEFFERSON COUNTY					
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY					
County Proposed LOS = 1.3 Acres Per 1,000 Population					
Time Period	Service Area Population	Acres @ 0.00130 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)	
1998 Base year	26,886	34.98	40.70	5.72	
1999 Growth	591	0.77	0.00	(0.77)	
2000 Growth	607	0.79	0.00	(0.79)	
2001 Growth	624	0.81	0.00	(0.81)	
2002 Growth	643	0.84	0.00	(0.84)	
2003 Growth	661	0.86	0.00	(0.86)	
Total As Of 12/31/2003		30,012	39.05	40.70	1.65
CAPACITY PROJECTS					
Proposed Project			Proposed Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)	
None Proposed			0	0.00	
Proposed Total by FY 2003			40.70	1.65	

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

TABLE 12-PR-3							
PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES							
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN							
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS							
(All Amounts x \$1,000 in 1998 dollars)							
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
User Fees	26.00	27.00	28.00	29.00	30.00	31.00	171.00
IAC Grant	0.00	0.00	300.00	0.00	300.00	0.00	600.00
Donations	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	440.00	0.00	440.00
Additional Grant Funding	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	80.00	0.00	480.00
Public Vote: Metropolitan Park District Levy	670.00	670.00	675.00	675.00	675.00	675.00	4,040.00
Public Vote: Park & Recreation District	21.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	131.00
Campgrounds: User/Program Fees & Donations	72.00	72.00	72.00	72.00	72.00	72.00	432.00
Total Sources of Funds	889.00	891.00	1,197.00	898.00	1,619.00	800.00	6,294.00
USES OF FUNDS							
Non-Capacity Projects:							
Larry Scott Park Trail Land							
Acquisition/Development (6.0 Miles)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Various Trail Park Land							
Acquisition (8.0 Miles)	0.00	0.00	0.00	240.00	240.00	0.00	480.00
Trail SubTotal	0.00	0.00	0.00	240.00	240.00	0.00	480.00
Regional Parks:							
H.J. Carroll Park							
Fields/irrigation/parking/lighting/etc	600.00	0.00	600.00	650.00	1,400.00	1,882.00	5,132.00
Memorial Field (Expand)							
Lights/Irrigation/Fencing/Etc	12.00	20.00	0.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	62.00
Gibbs Lake Park							
Relocate and replace caretaker housing	5.00	10.00	25.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	60.00
Regional Park SubTotal	617.00	30.00	625.00	700.00	1,400.00	1,882.00	5,254.00
Neighborhood Parks:							
Irondale Park							
Toilet/septic/shelter/lights/parking/etc	0.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	130.00
Neighborhood Park SubTotal	0.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	130.00
Campgrounds:							
Lake Leland							
Water/Elec/Dock/etc	0.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	130.00
Quilcene							
RV hookups	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	150.00
Chimacum							
Toilet/Septic/Electricity	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	100.00
Oak Bay							
Toilets for Upper Park	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
Campground SubTotal	0.00	20.00	230.00	50.00	100.00	30.00	430.00
Projects SubTotal	617.00	70.00	935.00	990.00	1,740.00	1,942.00	6,294.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	272.00	821.00	262.00	(92.00)	(121.00)	(1,142.00)	0.00

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: The net operating impact during 1998-2003 of the capital improvement projects required to maintain the adopted Level of Service standards is shown on Table 12-PR-5.

TABLE 12-PR-5								
OPERATING IMPACTS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE								
(All Amounts Are Times \$1,000 in 1998 Dollars)								
TYPE OF FACILITY		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
Non-Capacity Projects								
Regional Parks								
	H.J. Carroll Park	0.00	40.00	60.00	60.00	85.80	85.80	331.60
	Memorial Field	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Gibbs Lake Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Subtotal	0.00	40.00	60.00	60.00	85.80	85.80	331.60
Neighborhood Park								
	Irondale Park	0.00	0.00	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	4.40
	Subtotal	0.00	0.00	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	4.40
Park Campgrounds								
	Lake Leland Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Quilcene Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Chimacum Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Oak Bay Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Subtotal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bayshore Motel								
	Subtotal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Non Capacity		0.00	40.00	61.10	61.10	86.90	86.90	336.00

Planning Levels of Service (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with provisions of the Growth Management Act and Capital Facilities Element (CFE) Policy 3.3, adequate Parks/Recreation facilities must be planned within the Comprehensive Plan's Capital Facilities Element (CFE).

SOLID WASTE

Current Facilities: Jefferson County is responsible for the management of solid waste generated within the County. Presently, Jefferson County contracts with a private hauler to transport solid waste to a landfill site in Goldendale, Washington. The County and Skookum Environmental Services, a private, non-profit entity, manage recycling of the remaining solid waste. No solid waste is disposed at the closed County landfill. The County will continue to contract with private haulers to transport solid waste to landfills outside the County during the foreseeable future.

The County's recycling program includes three elements: (1) curbside recycling collected by private solid waste haulers; (2) market-driven programs, such as corrugated cardboard; and (3) the County

owned recycling bins at various sites (the Jefferson County Solid Waste Facility, Port Hadlock, Quilcene, Brinnon, and other sites determined by the County's recycling contractor, Skookum Environmental Services).

Level of Service (LOS): The current LOS is twofold: (1) 3.99 pounds of solid waste per person per day; and (2) 8.73% recycled material. The proposed LOS of 3.99 pounds per person per day is the same as the current LOS, while 12.0% recycled material by 2001 is 37% higher than the current LOS.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing: The County's solid waste program includes 2 capital projects at a cost of \$559,000. The proposed financing plan is shown on Table 12-SW-3.

TABLE 12-SW-3							
SOLID WASTE							
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN							
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS							
(All Amounts x \$1,000)							
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
Revenue Bonds	22.00	127.00	87.00	229.00	56.00	38.00	559.00
Total Sources of Funds	22.00	127.00	87.00	229.00	56.00	38.00	559.00
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
No Proposed Projects							
Total Capacity Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non-Capacity Projects:							
Solid Waste Transfer Station:							
Construction and Improvements	22.00	125.00	25.00	173.00	0.00	0.00	345.00
Solid Waste Management:							
Facilities Improvements/Equipment	0.00	2.00	62.00	56.00	56.00	38.00	214.00
Total Non Capacity Projects	22.00	127.00	87.00	229.00	56.00	38.00	559.00
Total Capacity and Non Capacity Projects	22.00	127.00	87.00	229.00	56.00	38.00	559.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: The net operating impact during 1998-2003 of the capital improvement projects required to maintain the adopted Level of Service standards is shown on Table 12-SW-5.

TYPE OF FACILITY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
Solid Waste Transfer Station	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Solid Waste Mgmt Facilities	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Planning Levels of Service (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with the GMA and Capital Facilities Policy 3.2, adequate solid waste facilities must be planned within the Capital Facilities Element.

STORM WATER/FLOOD CONTROL FACILITIES

Current Facilities: Flood Control: There are several major watersheds within Jefferson County including the Duckabush, Dosewallips, and Big Quilcene Rivers in the east County and the Bogachiel, Hoh, Clearwater, Queets, and Quinault Rivers in the west County.

Presently, the County does not have an adopted comprehensive County-wide surface water management plan that identifies specific needs and requirements, planned capital facilities projects, and a financing plan.

Unstable channel conditions on the Dosewallips and Big Quilcene Rivers have resulted in increased frequency of over bank flows, channel blockage, adverse impacts to fish habitat, and damage to shellfish beds. Routine channel changes on the Dosewallips River have eroded platted lots in the Lazy C development. Downstream at the Town of Brinnon aggradation on the lower reaches of the river has the potential to result in frequent overland flows and possibly radical channel changes.

Along the lower reaches of the Big Quilcene River, dikes have confined the river. This has led to the aggradation of the bed, which is now at a higher elevation than the surrounding area. Annual high water flows often cause the river to top the dikes. This has had adverse impacts on local residents and shellfish and fish resources.

The Department of Ecology awarded a grant to the County to prepare a Comprehensive Flood Management Plan for the Big Quilcene River. Subsequently, the Lower Big Quilcene River Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan was formally adopted by Jefferson County in July 1998. It is expected that significant facilities and projects based on this plan will need to be implemented, and, as a result, are included in the 1998-2003 Capital Financial Plan.

Current Facilities: Storm Water: Jefferson County does not own nor does the County operate storm water management facilities with the exception of collection and conveyance systems designed to manage storm water runoff from County roads. There are numerous private storm water management facilities that were constructed to serve private development projects. These private systems include collection, conveyance, and detention facilities. They are typically operated and maintained by private parties or homeowners associations.

Level of Service (LOS): Flood Control: Jefferson County will be developing options for a Level of Service standard for storm water management/flood control facilities.

Level of Service (LOS): Storm Water: Jefferson County does not have an adopted quantifiable Level of Service standard for storm water management facilities. The County has adopted a storm water management ordinance to guide planning, design, and construction of storm water management facilities by the County, State, and private parties. The standards for storm water management facilities are the standards of the Washington Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing: A range of potential non-capacity capital projects are included as capital placeholders recognizing that there is a possibility that the preliminary planning completed to date may progress to a more detailed level of planning and implementation within the 1998 – 2003 CFP timeframe.

TABLE 12-SWM-3							
STORM WATER/FLOOD CONTROL FACILITIES							
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN							
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS							
(All Amounts x \$1,000 in 1998 Dollars)							
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
	.						.
Grants	23.00	42.50	5.00	44.00	7.50	54.00	176.00
County-Wide & Flood SubZone Levies	345.00	345.00	344.00	344.00	344.00	344.00	2,066.00
Total Sources of Funds	368.00	387.50	349.00	388.00	351.50	398.00	2,242.00
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
None Proposed							
Total Capacity Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non-Capacity Projects:							
Lower Quilcene Flood Management Plan							
Planning and Implementation	0.00	50.00	800.00	1,142.00	0.00	0.00	1,992.00
Dosewallips River Land							
Acquisition	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	31.00	219.00	250.00
Total Non Capacity Projects	0.00	50.00	800.00	1,142.00	31.00	219.00	2,242.00
Total Capacity and Non Capacity Projects	0.00	50.00	800.00	1,142.00	31.00	219.00	2,242.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	361.00	350.00	(475.00)	(739.00)	299.00	204.00	0.00

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: There will be no operating impact (1998-2003) of the capital improvement projects required during 1998-2003 to maintain the adopted LOS (See Table 12-SWM-5).

TABLE 12-SWM-5							
OPERATING IMPACTS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE							
(All Amounts Are Times \$1,000)							
TYPE OF FACILITY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
Stormwater Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Planning Levels of Service (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with GMA and Capital Facilities Policy 3.2, adequate storm water management facilities must be planned within the County's Capital Facilities Element (CFE).

TRANSPORTATION

Current Facilities: The County's road system inventory consists of 390 County roadway miles (major collectors: 36 miles; minor collectors: 102 miles; and local access: 252) and 24 County-owned bridges. This does not include any streets within the City of Port Townsend. Other Inventoried transportation facilities include 125 miles of State highways (principal arterioles: 91 miles; minor arterials: 24 miles; and major collectors: 10 miles) and 25 State-owned bridges.

TABLE 12-TR-1			
CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY			
ROADWAY FACILITIES			
The inventory of the current Roadway Facilities includes the following:			
	Name	Capacity	Location
	Note: The voluminous Inventory of roadway facilities is available and located in the Jefferson County Department of Public Works and is included in the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element		
Total			

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

The Transportation Element sets forth the following County roadway LOS standards:

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

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing:

TABLE 12-TR-3							
RURAL & DESIGNATED TOURIST ROAD FACILITIES							
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN							
SOURCE AND USE OF FUNDS							
(All Amounts x \$1,000 in 1998 Dollars)							
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
SOURCE OF FUNDS							
Local Funds	332.00	678.00	776.00	1,047.66	540.67	318.67	3,693.00
Developer/RID Funds	680.00	627.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,307.00
CAPP Funds	0.00	126.00	126.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	252.00
RAP Funds	345.00	85.00	0.00	712.00	712.00	712.00	2,566.00
State (IAC/DOE) Funds	240.00	129.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	769.00
Federal Funds	784.00	205.00	205.00	332.00	332.00	332.00	2,190.00
Defer Implementation of Projects	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	1,236.00
Total Sources of Funds	2,587.00	2,056.00	1,413.00	2,397.66	1,890.67	1,668.67	12,013.00
USE OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
None Proposed							
Total Capacity Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non-Capacity Projects:							
IRONDALE RD.	0.00	444.00	486.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	930.00
CENTER ROAD	0.00	381.00	381.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	762.00
LARRY SCOTT MEMORIAL PARK	1,000.00	220.00	220.00	220.00	220.00	220.00	2,100.00
S. DISCO. R/R BRIDGE	419.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	419.00
6TH AVENUE	90.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	90.00
LITTLE QUILCENE BRIDGE	0.00	0.00	0.00	202.33	202.33	202.33	607.00
CHIMACUM RD. SO.	0.00	0.00	0.00	239.00	239.00	239.00	717.00
PARADISE RD. PHASE 1	0.00	0.00	0.00	304.00	304.00	304.00	912.00
PARADISE RD. PHASE 2	0.00	0.00	0.00	279.66	279.67	279.67	839.00
WILLOUGHBY BRIDGE	0.00	0.00	0.00	87.33	87.33	87.33	262.00
DOSEWALLIPS RD.	17.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.00
JACOB MILLER/LANDFILL INTERSECTION.	0.00	0.00	0.00	225.66	225.67	225.67	677.00
MILL RD.	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.34	100.00
DOSEWALLIPS RET. WALL	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	30.00	30.00	90.00
7TH AVENUE	0.00	0.00	0.00	108.33	108.33	108.34	325.00
5TH AVENUE	0.00	0.00	0.00	38.66	38.67	38.67	116.00
DUCKABUSH RD.	0.00	0.00	0.00	56.67	56.66	56.67	170.00
S. DISCOVERY RD.	0.00	0.00	0.00	213.33	213.34	213.33	640.00
E. QUILCENE ROAD	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.34	100.00
SAFETY PROJECTS	43.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	343.00
MISCELLANEOUS PROJ.	20.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	320.00
SR19/4 CORNERS INT.	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00
ROCKY BROOK ROAD	37.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.00
FISH PASSAGE BARRIERS	0.00	58.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	58.00
BYWATER BAY R.I.D.	645.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	645.00
COUNTRY RIDGE R.I.D.	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
BLUE SKY DRIVE R.I.D.	0.00	627.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	627.00
FUTURE PROJECTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Non Capacity Projects	2,381.00	1,850.00	1,207.00	2,191.63	2,191.66	2,191.69	12,013.00
Total Capacity and Non Capacity Projects	2,381.00	1,850.00	1,207.00	2,191.63	2,191.66	2,191.69	12,013.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.03	(300.99)	(523.02)	0.00

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements

There will be no operating impact (1998-2003) of the capital improvement projects required during 1998-2003 to maintain the adopted LOS (See Table 12-TR-5).

TABLE 12-TR-5							
OPERATING IMPACTS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE							
(All Amounts Are Times \$1,000)							
TYPE OF FACILITY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
County Roads	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Concurrency (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with the GMA and CFP 3.1, roads and transit facilities must meet the Level of Service Standards for existing and proposed development concurrent with proposed development. Table 12-TR-3 indicates there are no capacity-related capital projects planned because all Designated Tourist Road and Rural Road facilities in Jefferson County are projected to meet the LOS standards.

SEWAGE COLLECTION / TREATMENT

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

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed LOS of 230 Gallons / Day / ERU will be used to determine capacity needs for sewer service to the Tri Area.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing: There are no capital projects proposed in the 1998-2003 CFP.

Operating Impact of LOS Capital Improvements: There are no net operating impacts during 1998-2003 included in the 1998-2003 CFP.

Planning Levels of Service and Adequate Facilities: In compliance with the GMA and Capital Facilities Policy 3.2, adequate sewage treatment capacity is proposed within this Capital Facilities Element. The County is anticipating \$75,000 (2002 dollars) in planning sewer facility planning costs to be incurred by the end of 2003.

GOALS AND POLICIES

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

GOAL:

CFG 1.0 Establish appropriate Level of Service standards for public facilities.

POLICIES:

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

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

Category A Level Of Service Standards:

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

Apply Category A Level of Service standards to development approvals issued by Jefferson County after adoption date of this Comprehensive Plan. Category A Level of Service standards will guide the County's capital budget and capital improvements program beginning with the 1999 fiscal year.

Category B Public Facilities are the public facilities owned or operated by Jefferson County subject to Levels of Service standards.

Category B Level Of Service Standards:

Animal Control Shelter	79 square feet per 1,000 pop.
Community Centers	1,450 square feet per 1,000 pop.
Corrections Inmate Facilities	2.08 beds per 1,000 pop.
County Sheriff Facilities	656 square feet per 1,000 UNINC. pop.
County General Administrative Facilities	1,860 square feet per 1,000 pop.
County Justice Facilities	1,310 square feet per 1,000 pop.
County Maintenance Shop Facilities	1,738 square feet per 1,000 pop.
Neighborhood Parks	0.14 acres per 1,000 pop.

Community Parks	0.51 acres per 1,000 pop.
Regional Parks	11.5 acres per 1,000 pop.
Trails	0.52 miles per 1,000 pop.
Open Space	1.52 acres per 1,000 pop.
Campgrounds	1.3 acres per 1,000 pop.
Solid Waste	3.99 pounds per capita per day
Storm Water/Flood Control Facilities	Pending
Water System Facilities	Pending

Category B Level of Service standards will guide the County's capital budget decisions and the development of the capital improvements program beginning with the 1999 fiscal year.

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

Category C Level Of Service Standards:

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

Sanitary Sewer:

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

Water:

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

Airport:

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

Fire and Emergency Medical Services:

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

Fire District 7 (Clearwater):	2.0 fire units in service per 1,000 pop. 0 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Port Townsend Fire Department:	0.29 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Hospital:	
Jefferson General Hospital:	1.3 beds per 1,000 population
Library:	
Jefferson Co. Rural Library District. 1:	433 square feet per 1,000 population
School District facilities:	
Brinnon School District 46:	K-8: Not to exceed 23 students/classroom
Chimacum School District 49:	K-12: Not to exceed 27 students/classroom
Port Townsend School District 50:	K-3: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Port Townsend School District 50:	4-6: Not to exceed 30 students/classroom
Port Townsend School District 50:	7-12: Not to exceed 34 students/classroom
Queets/Clearwater School Dist.20:	K-12: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Quilcene School District 48:	K-12: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Quillayute School District 402:	K-12: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Sequim School District 323:	K-12: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Transit:	
Jefferson Transit:	472 Annual Transit Revenue Service Hour (ATRSR)/1000 pop.

Misc.:

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

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

- CFP 1.2** Urban and Rural Levels of Service: Jefferson County may create different Level of Service standards for Urban Growth Areas and rural areas of the County.
- CFP 1.3** Level of Service Standards in Unincorporated UGAs: Level of service standards for public facilities in the unincorporated portion of Urban Growth Areas are the same as the County's adopted standards.

GOAL:

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

POLICIES:

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

- CFP 2.2** **Priorities:** Establish priorities among capital improvements projects through amendments to the Capital Facilities Element and the County’s Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept and Transportation Improvement Plans.
- CFP 2.3** **Financial Feasibility:** Ensure that the estimated cost of all capital improvements does not exceed a conservative estimate of available revenues. A conservative estimate need not be the lowest estimate, but does not exceed the most likely estimate. It does not include revenues which require approval by a referendum, if that referendum has been rejected.
- CFP 2.4** **Budget Appropriation for Capital Improvements:** Include an appropriation in the annual budget for all of the capital improvement projects listed in the Capital Facilities Element for that year. Omit from the budget capital improvements for which there is a binding agreement with another party to fund those capital improvements in the same fiscal year.
- CFP 2.5** **Monitoring:** Monitor the implementation of the capital improvement program and development to ensure that the Land Use, Transportation, and Capital Facilities Elements are coordinated and consistent, and that established Level of Service standards for public facilities are achieved.
- CFP 2.6** **Financing Policies:** Finance capital improvements and manage debt consistent with Capital Improvement Plans and the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
- CFP 2.7** **Operating and Maintenance Costs:** Provide public facilities or accept their provision by other entities only if Jefferson County or the other entity is able to pay for subsequent operating and maintenance costs.
- CFP 2.8** **Revenues Requiring Referendum:** Revise the Level of Service standard for a public facility if either revenue for capital improvements for that facility requires approval by referendum and a referendum has not been held, or a referendum was held and did not meet the approval of the public.
- CFP 2.9** **Financial Responsibility:** Determine through a public process how to apportion the fair share of funding capital improvements for County-owned public facilities between existing and future developments.
- CFP 2.10** **Contingent Revenue:** Condition approval of private developments that require public facility capital improvements, which will be financed by contingent sources of revenue, upon acquisition of that revenue. An example of a contingent source of revenue is debt which requires approval by a referendum. Make provision in the approval conditions for substituting a comparable amount of existing revenue if the contingent funding sources are not approved.

GOAL:

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

POLICIES:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GOAL:

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

POLICIES:

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

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

GOAL:

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

POLICIES:

CFP 5.1 **Planning Coordination:** Establish interlocal/joint planning agreements with municipalities and other providers of public facilities to coordinate planning for and development of Urban Growth Areas.

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

STRATEGIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

-
- d. The excess capacity is part of a capital project financed by general obligation bonds approved by referendum. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0)
 3. All facilities scheduled for construction or improvement in accordance with this strategy will be evaluated to identify any plans by State or local governments or districts that affect, or will be affected by, the proposed County capital improvement. Project evaluation may also involve additional criteria that are unique to each type of public facility, as described in other elements of this Comprehensive Plan. (Corresponding Goal: CFG 5.0)
 4. The priorities for capital improvements among types of public facilities were established during the development of the Capital Facilities Element by adjusting the Level of Service standards and the available revenues until the resulting public facilities became financially feasible. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0)
 5. Jefferson County will direct its capital improvements within types of public facilities to:
 - A. Address current deficiencies;
 - B. Provide new or expanded capital facilities and services currently enjoyed by County residents;
 - C. Eliminate actual or potential threats to public health and safety; and
 - D. Retain the attractiveness of Urban Growth Areas as suitable for new residential development. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
 6. The priorities for capital improvements within a type of County-owned public facility will be in the following order:
 - A. Reconstruction, rehabilitation, remodeling, renovation, or replacement of obsolete or worn out facilities that contribute to achieving or maintaining adopted Level of Service standards.
 - B. New or expanded facilities that reduce or eliminate deficiencies in Levels of Service for existing demand. Expenditures in this category include equipment, furnishings, and other improvements necessary for the completion of a public facility.
 - C. New facilities and improvements to existing public facilities that eliminate public hazards.
 - D. New or expanded facilities that provide the adopted Levels of Service for new development and redevelopment during the next six fiscal years.
 - E. New facilities that exceed the adopted Levels of Service for new growth during the next six fiscal years by providing either:
 - 1) Excess public facility capacity that is needed by future growth beyond the next six years; or
 - 2) Higher quality public facilities than are contemplated in the County's normal design criteria for such facilities.
 - F. Facilities not described in the above priorities, but which Jefferson County is obligated to complete, provided that such obligation is evidenced by a written agreement the County executed prior to the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

7. In the event that the planned capacity within a type of County-owned public facility is insufficient to serve all proposed development and redevelopment, capital improvements for new and expanded public facilities of that type will be scheduled in the following order of priority to serve:
 - A. Previously approved redevelopment,
 - B. Previously approved development,
 - C. New approved redevelopment, and
 - D. New approved new development.(Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
8. The County may acquire land or right-of-way in advance of the need to develop a public facility.
(Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

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

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

1. Capital improvements financed by County enterprise funds (i.e., solid waste) will be financed by:
 - A. Debt repaid by user fees, charges, and excise taxes, and/or connection or capacity fees for enterprise services; or
 - B. Current assets (i.e., reserves, equity or surpluses, and current revenue, including grants, loans, donations and interlocal agreements); or
 - C. Formation of a taxing district; or
 - D. A combination of debt, current assets, and taxes.(Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)
2. Capital improvements financed by non-enterprise funds will be financed by:
 - A. Current assets (i.e., current revenue, fund equity and reserves), or
 - B. Debt, or
 - C. A combination of debt and current assets.(Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)
3. Financing decisions will consider which funding source will be:
 - A. Most cost effective,
 - B. Consistent with prudent asset and liability management,
 - C. Appropriate to the useful life of the project(s) to be financed, and
 - D. The most efficient use of the County's ability to borrow funds.(Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)
4. Debt financing will not be used to provide more capacity than is needed within the schedule of capital improvements for non-enterprise public facilities unless the excess capacity:

-
- A. Is an integral part of a capital improvement that is needed to achieve or maintain Level of Service standards (i.e., the minimum capacity of a capital improvement is larger than the capacity required to provide the Level of Service); or
 - B. Provides economies of scale, making it less expensive than a comparable amount of capacity if acquired at a later date; or
 - C. Is land that is environmentally sensitive or designated by the County as necessary for conservation or recreation; or
 - D. Is part of a capital project financed by general obligation bonds approved by referendum. (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)
5. When a referendum, which is intended to finance capital improvements, is unsuccessful, adjustments for lack of revenues may include, but are not limited to, the following:
- A. Reduce the Level of Service for one or more public facilities;
 - B. Increase the use of other sources of revenue;
 - C. Decrease the demand for and subsequent use of capital facilities; or
 - D. A combination of the above alternatives. (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)
6. The Board of Commissioners will determine whether impact fees, as allowed by law, are necessary to maintain Level of Service standards. If adopted, impact fee ordinances will require the same Level of Service standard as is required by Capital Facilities Policy 1.1 and may include standards for other types of public facilities not addressed under Capital Facilities Policy 1.1. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
7. Payments by existing development to fund capital improvements may take the form of user fees, charges for services, special assessments and taxes. Payments by future development to fund capital improvements may take the form of, but are not limited to, voluntary contributions for the benefit of any public facility, impact fees, mitigation payments, capacity fees, dedications of land, provision of public facilities, and future payments of user fees, charges for services, special assessments, and taxes. Future development will not pay impact fees for capital improvements to any public facility that reduces or eliminates existing deficiencies. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
8. Both existing and future development may have part of their costs paid by grant entitlements or public facilities from other levels of government and independent districts. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 4.0, 5.0)

C. STRATEGY TO REVIEW AND UPDATE THE CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

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

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

- A. Revise population projections;
 - B. Update inventory of public facilities;
 - C. Update cost of providing public facilities;
 - D. Review the Level of Service Standards;
 - E. Update capacity of public facilities (actual Levels of Service compared to adopted standards);
 - F. Update revenue forecasts;
 - G. Revise and develop capital improvements projects for the next six years;
 - H. Update analysis of financial capacity;
 - I. Amend the Capital Facilities Element, including amendments to the Level of Service standards, capital projects, and/or the financing plan sources of revenue. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
2. Jefferson County's annual budget will include capital appropriations for all projects identified in the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan that are necessary to maintain the Level of Service standards during that fiscal year. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 4.0)
 3. Jefferson County will prepare regular evaluation reports to monitor the implementation of the goals and policies of the Capital Facilities Element. The evaluation will include:
 - A. Regular reports of the Concurrency Implementation and Monitoring System.
 - B. Regular updates of the Capital Facilities Element, including updated supporting documents as appropriate. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
 4. The Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan may be adjusted by ordinance not deemed to be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for corrections, updates, and modifications concerning costs; revenue sources; acceptance of facilities pursuant to dedications which are consistent with the Element; non-capacity projects which do not affect scheduling of capacity projects; or the date of construction (so long as it is completed within the 6-year period). (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

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

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

1. Jefferson County will adopt an ordinance, which will establish policies and procedures for determining if there is adequate public facility capacity concurrent with development.
2. For all public facilities, except roads, in order to determine that capacity is available to serve development:
 - A. The facilities will be in place when a development approval is issued; or
 - B. The facilities will be under construction at the time a development approval is issued and will be in place when the impacts of the development occur; or
 - C. Development approvals may be issued subject to the condition that the facilities will be in place when the impacts of the development occur. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)

-
3. For Rural and Designated Tourist Road Facilities, in order to determine that capacity is available to serve development:
 - A. Any of the three provisions listed in Strategy D.1. may apply; or
 - B. The County will have in place a binding financial commitment to provide the capacity within six years. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)
 4. Jefferson County will issue preliminary development approvals which are subject to concurrency if the applicant complies with one of the following:
 - A. The applicant receives a determination of the capacity of Category A public facilities as part of preliminary development review and approval; or
 - B. The applicant requests preliminary development approval without a determination of capacity of Category A public facilities, provided that any such approval is issued subject to requirements in the applicable land development regulation or to specific conditions contained in the preliminary development approval that:
 - 1) Final development approval for the subject property is subject to a determination of capacity of Category A public facilities, and
 - 2) Neither rights to obtain final development approval nor any other rights to develop the subject property have been granted or implied by the County's preliminary development approval without determining the capacity of public facilities. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)
 5. The following conditions will apply to development approvals subject to concurrency:
 - A. The determination that facility capacity is available will apply to specific uses, densities and intensities based on information provided by the applicant and included in the development approval.
 - B. The determination of public facility capacity and the validity of the capacity for the same period of time as the development approval, including any extensions. If the development approval does not have an expiration date, the capacity will be valid for a period not to exceed two years.
 6. County Development Regulations will address the circumstances under which public facilities may be provided by applicants for development approvals at the applicant's own expense in order to ensure sufficient capacity of public facilities. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
 7. Development applications, which require the provision of public facilities by the applicant, may be approved subject to the following:
 - A. Jefferson County and the applicant enter into an enforceable development agreement which will provide, at a minimum, a schedule for construction of the public facilities and mechanisms for monitoring to ensure that the public facilities are completed concurrent with the impacts of the development, or that the development will not be allowed to proceed.
-

- B. The public facilities to be provided by the applicant may be contained in the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan of the Capital Facilities Element, and will achieve and maintain the adopted Level of Service standards. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
- 8. Jefferson County will adopt policies and procedures for reserving capacity of public facilities needed to serve vested development approvals. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
- 9. Jefferson County will reserve capacity of public facilities in order to serve approved development at the adopted Level of Service standard. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)
- 10. In the event that there is not sufficient capacity to serve the development which would use future public facility capacity, Jefferson County will develop criteria for determining which applications will be deferred to a future fiscal year because of insufficient capacity of public facilities during the current fiscal year. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 3.0)

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

The following strategy provides guidance for a monitoring system.

- 1. Jefferson County will establish and maintain a regular Monitoring System which will include the following components:
 - A. A regular report on the capacity and Levels of Service of public facilities,
 - B. A review of public facility capacity for development applications,
 - C. A review of changes to planned capacity of public facilities. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 4.0)
- 2. Report on the Capacity and Levels of Service of Public Facilities: This report will summarize the actual capacity of public facilities compared to the Level of Service standards adopted in the Capital Facilities Element. The report will also forecast the capacity of public facilities for each of the six succeeding fiscal years. The forecast will be based on the most current schedule of capital improvements in the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan. The report will provide the initial determination of the capacity and Levels of Service of public facilities for reviewing development permit applications during the following 12 months. Each application will be analyzed separately for concurrency, as described below. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)
- 3. Public Facility Capacity Review of Development Applications: Jefferson County will review applications for developments in the unincorporated areas of the County to determine whether there is adequate capacity of public facilities concurrent with development. Records of all development approvals will be kept to indicate the cumulative impacts on the capacity of public facilities.

Review will be conducted according to the terms of interlocal agreement(s) between the County and municipalities. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)
- 4. Review of Changes to Planned Capacity of Public Facilities: Jefferson County will review each amendment to this Capital Facilities Element in order to ensure that the schedule of capital

improvements is adequate to maintain the established Level of Service standards.
(Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 4.0).

APPENDIX 2

JEFFERSON COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

COUNTY-WIDE PLANNING POLICY

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

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