

JEFFERSON COUNTY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR GROWTH MANAGEMENT

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

WHAT IS A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANALYSIS OF THE DISCUSSION DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

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

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

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

Planning Objective IV - Allocation of Land to Meet Anticipated Needs

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

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

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

Planning Objective V - Continuous and Ongoing Public Involvement

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

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

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

PLAN OVERVIEW

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

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

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

Amendments are to be justified through findings from monitoring of “growth management indicators” (i.e., population growth [actual v. projected], land capacity [actual v. projected], economic indicators [property values/comparative sales compared to statewide averages and local trends], changes in technology, omissions or errors, or a declared emergency).

Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan must conform to the following:

- a. The requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act, Chapter RCW 36.70A and the State Planning Enabling Act, Chapter RCW 36.70.
- b. Any proposed amendments to the Plan must be submitted by the County to the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development at least 60 days prior to final adoption by the Board of County Commissioners (RCW 36.70A.106).
- c. Proposed amendments must be consistent with Federal and State laws, the Comprehensive Plan, the County-wide Planning Policy, related plans, and the comprehensive plans of other counties or cities with which the County has, in part, common borders or regulated regional issues (WAC 365-195-630[1]).
- d. Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan will be considered on an annual basis (no more frequently than once per year), except when the following circumstances apply: (i) the initial adoption of a subarea plan that does not modify the comprehensive plan policies and designations applicable to the subarea, and (ii) the adoption or amendment of a shoreline master program pursuant to RCW 90.58. All proposals will be considered concurrently so the cumulative effect of the various proposals can be ascertained (WAC 365-195-630[2]). The County may consider adopting amendments more frequently than once per year if a declared emergency exists.
- e. Consistent with the timelines contained in the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A), the County must review all Urban Growth Area boundaries, as well as the densities permitted within both the incorporated and unincorporated portions of each Urban Growth Area. If necessary, the Urban Growth Area boundaries will be revised to accommodate the urban growth projected to occur in the County for the succeeding 20-year period.
- f. Amendments or changes to natural resource lands and critical area designations should be based on consistency with one or more of the following criteria:
 - Change in circumstances pertaining to the Comprehensive Plan or public policy.
 - A change in circumstances beyond the control of the landowner pertaining to the subject property.
 - An error in designation.
 - New information on natural resource land or critical area status (WAC 365-190-040[2][g]).

Comprehensive Plan Policy Amendments

Policy amendments may be initiated by the County, or by other entities, organizations, or individuals through a petition submitted on forms provided by the County and subject to fees as determined by the BOCC. The merits of proposed policy amendments shall be measured against the petition submittal requirements contained in Jefferson County's adopted development regulations to ensure consistency in the review and decision-making process. In general, these requirements will address the following:

- a. A detailed statement of what is proposed to be changed and why.
- b. A statement of anticipated impacts to be caused by the change, including geographic area affected and issues presented.
- c. A demonstration of why existing Comprehensive Plan policies should not continue to be in effect or why existing policies no longer apply.
- d. A statement of how the amendment complies with the Comprehensive Plan's community vision statements, goals, policy and strategy directives.
- e. A statement of how functional plans and Capital Improvement Plans support the change.
- f. A statement of how the change affects implementing land use regulations (i.e., zoning) and the necessary changes to bring the implementing land use regulations into compliance with the Plan.
- g. A demonstration of public review of the recommended change.

Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments

Comprehensive Plan Map amendments may be initiated by the County, or by other entities, organizations, or individuals through petitions. The boundaries separating the Urban Growth Area, Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands designations are intended to be long-term and unchanging. Land use designations may be subject to minor refinements, but only after full public participation, notice, environmental review, and an official assessment of planning growth management indicators.

Amendments must comply with the same petition submittal requirements as policy amendments (see a-g above which are incorporated herein as a-g) and the additional following items:

- a. A detailed statement describing how the map amendment complies with Comprehensive Plan land use designation criteria.
- b. Urban Growth Area boundary changes shall be supported by and dependent on population forecasts and allocated urban population distributions, existing urban densities and infill opportunities, phasing and availability of adequate services, proximity to designated natural resource lands and the presence of critical areas.
- c. Rural Areas and Natural Resource Land map designation changes shall be supported by and dependent on Growth Management Act criteria, population forecasts and allocated non-urban populations distributions, existing rural area and natural resource land densities, and/or infill opportunities. Natural Resource Land designations should also satisfy the criteria in Section 1 (f) above (WAC 365-190-040 [2][g]).

General Comprehensive Plan Amendments

A general Comprehensive Plan amendment is a policy or land use designation which is applied to a broad class of situations and to a large number of parcels and persons that are not readily identifiable.

Petitions for a general amendment proposal are to be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners (Board) for consideration. The Board may or may not act on the proposal (petition) to amend the Comprehensive Plan. The Board is not required to take any action on such amendment proposals. A decision by the Board to initiate the plan amendment process is procedural only, and does not constitute a decision by the Board on whether the amendment will ultimately be approved.

Site-Specific Comprehensive Plan Amendments

A site-specific comprehensive plan amendment is a policy or land use designation that is applied to a specific number of parcels which are in readily identifiable ownership. A proposal which formulates policy yet affects relatively few individuals will generally be characterized as a site-specific action.

Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals (petitions) which apply to a specific site, frequently in conjunction with an identifiable development proposal, may be initiated by a petitioner through the following amendment process:

General requirements for a site-specific amendment include:

- a. **Fees.** The petitioner shall pay to the Department of Community Development the application fee prescribed by the approved fee schedule as now or hereafter amended. Fees for amendments to correct mapping errors may be waived by the Administrator.
- b. **Petition.** The petitioner must submit to the Department of Community Development a written application, on forms provided by the Department, containing appropriate amendatory language and, if applicable, a map drawn to scale, showing the proposed change. The petition shall also address policy or map evaluation criteria as described above. Incomplete petitions shall not be accepted. Depending on the nature of the application, the petitioner may be required to attend a meeting to discuss the petition with Department staff.
- c. **Timing.** Petitions shall be submitted to the Department of Community Development by the application deadline established through Jefferson County's adopted development regulations. Late or incomplete applications shall not be accepted.
- d. **Approval for Consideration.** When a petition application is considered complete the Department of Community Development shall submit it to the Board, with a recommendation as to whether the Board should consider or reject the proposed petition. After receiving the Department's recommendation, the Board, in a public meeting, shall determine whether to consider or reject the proposed petition. A decision by the Board to initiate the plan amendment process is procedural only and does not constitute a decision by the Board as to whether the amendment will ultimately be approved.
- e. **Environmental Review.** If the Board approves consideration of the amendment, the petitioner shall submit to the Department of Community Development an environmental checklist. Upon receipt of the environmental checklist and supporting documentation, the Department shall issue an environmental threshold determination on the proposed

amendment. If necessary, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement should be published. (State Environmental Policy Act Rules [Chapter 197-11 WAC]).

- f. **Process.** The Department of Community Development will process the amendment pursuant to the procedures contained within Chapter 36.70 RCW and the Jefferson County development regulations, this process shall include at least one public hearing before the Planning Commission and one public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners.

Emergency Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Emergency amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are allowed pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(2)(b): “Except as otherwise provided in (a) of this subsection, all proposals shall be considered by the governing body concurrently so the cumulative effect of the various proposals can be ascertained. However, after appropriate public participation a county or city may adopt amendments or revisions to its comprehensive plan that conform with this chapter whenever an emergency exists or to resolve an appeal of a comprehensive plan filed with a growth management hearings board or with the court.”

Future Subarea Plans as Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan

Subarea plans refine Comprehensive Plan countywide policies for application to specific sub-regions or communities within the county. Subarea plans may reflect differences between local circumstances and values and those generally found countywide, but they must also be “consistent” with the Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act. Because of changes to land use districts and policies as a result of the adoption of subarea plans, the reader must take care when interpreting tables and analysis within the Comprehensive Plan to note whether the particular page has been amended. Amended pages contain a notation in the page footer. If a particular page has not been amended, the contents reflect analysis at the time of the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. Analysis specific to subarea planning is generally contained within the adopted subarea plan itself.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Appeals

Growth Management Hearings Board Review

Challenges to amendments to the Comprehensive Plan or related plans that are within the jurisdiction of the Growth Management Hearings Board shall be processed according to the law governing such challenges.

Judicial Review

Any judicial action to review any decision concerning the amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, including related plans, shall be commenced within twenty-one (21) days from the date of the decision. The plaintiff bringing any such action shall pay the full cost of transcription of the record prepared for judicial review and other costs as may be imposed.

MONITORING PLAN EFFECTIVENESS

The monitoring of growth management indicators such as population growth, land capacity, economic factors, natural resource consumption, and public health and safety improves the effectiveness of public policy and allows progress in achieving the goals and objectives behind that policy to be measured. Use

of growth management indicators assures accountability to the public. It demonstrates how effectively the County is moving toward identified goals. Ongoing monitoring allows public resources to be prioritized in order to meet goals and, if the desired outcome is not achieved, to consider modifying the goals or implementing regulations. Growth management indicators work well with the public participation process of the planning cycle. Through the use of growth management indicators, citizens and decision-makers can review growth management policy and make changes that reflect present day realities.

LAND USE AND RURAL ELEMENT

PURPOSE: The purpose of the Land Use and Rural Element is to identify specific uses, densities and development regulations that protect rural character and are consistent with all other requirements of the Growth Management Act.

INTRODUCTION

Jefferson County is a rural county. The City of Port Townsend has a separate comprehensive plan and coordinates planning with the County through the Countywide Planning Policies (see Appendix B for a discussion of County-wide Planning Policies). The integration of GMA requirements to protect rural character and prevent low-density sprawl is accomplished by integrating the Land Use and Rural elements, which were treated separately in the Draft Plan. An exception to the County's rural designations is the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort, which is addressed in separately in this element.

The final Comprehensive Plan includes a number of changes in land use designations from the 1997 Draft Plan. The revisions reflect not only changes in the Growth Management Act through the 1997 amendments, but also reflect a lengthy public debate on interpretation of the 1997 amendments and their application to Jefferson County.

LAND USE AND RURAL STRATEGY GUIDELINES

Based on the requirements of the Growth Management Act, County-wide Planning Policies, community input, and Growth Management Hearings Board rulings (see Appendices), Jefferson County determined that the County's land use and rural strategy must include the following key policy guidelines:

- The County must ensure that an adequate supply of rural residential land is available to accommodate the projected rural residential population growth.
- The County must ensure that areas, which may have more platted lots than needed to address population growth (and allow for market factors), are designated for low-density residential development such as 1 residential unit per 5 acres (1:5), 1:10, and 1:20.
- The County must ensure that rural areas of more intensive residential, commercial and industrial development are contained in a manner that preserves rural character.
- The County must ensure that rural commercial development located outside designated Urban Growth Areas is appropriately scaled to serve the needs of the local rural community and the traveling public, and to protect and enhance rural character.

In order to develop a land use and rural strategy that encompassed the policy guidelines, it was necessary to:

like many rural counties, has local conditions and circumstances that were difficult to address within the original GMA framework. Changes from the Draft Plan also reflect the statewide evolution of the GMA to a better understanding of the needs of rural counties.

Early iterations of the plan contained elements of a planning approach that continue to guide this Plan. These elements are: recognizing the importance of existing historic development patterns found in rural areas; providing for the economic vitality of the rural commercial base at appropriate levels of commercial services, and preserving the character of the county's rural lands.

In the February 24, 1997 Draft Comprehensive Plan ("Draft Plan"), rural commercial levels of service were defined based on the provision of basic goods and services to service areas defined by drive times of 10 and 20 minutes. The Draft Plan did not recognize the existing variety of uses in commercial areas or the level of service that exists to meet the needs of the large number of visitors and commuters traveling through areas of Jefferson County. The 1997 GMA amendments allowed the County to recognize existing areas and uses of more intensive commercial development, and to provide for limited infill within boundaries that contain commercial activities

Commercial land in rural Jefferson County will be continuously assessed in this Comprehensive Plan by:

- Identifying existing areas and uses of more intensive commercial development;
- Designating rural commercial areas and land use classifications guided by existing levels of service;
- Establishing logical boundaries for existing rural commercial areas and uses based predominantly on the pre-July 1, 1990 built environment; and
- Designating a limited UGA in the Tri-Area (Irondale/Port Hadlock/Chimacum) to recognize areas already characterized by urban growth and to provide new urban economic development opportunities.

Designation and Classification of Rural Commercial Lands

The commercial areas proposed in the 1997 Draft Plan included Rural Village Centers at Port Hadlock, Port Ludlow, Quilcene, and Brinnon. The Draft Plan proposed Rural Crossroads at Chimacum, Discovery Bay, Four Corners, Nordland, Mats Mats, Beaver Valley, and Wawa Point. In the final Plan, Jefferson County applied 1997 GMA amendment language to recognize existing commercial areas and uses at Ness' Corner, Irondale Corner, Gardiner, and State Route 19/20 Intersection, in addition to the crossroads originally proposed in the 1997 Draft Plan. The designation for the commercial area of Port Ludlow was changed from Rural Village Center to Village Commercial Center within a Master Planned Resort.

A discussion of Jefferson County's criteria for designation and classification of commercial areas follows, while a discussion of criteria for drawing logical boundaries for those areas begins on page 3-15.

The criteria used to designate rural commercial areas are:

- The commercial area existed as an area or use of more intensive commercial development on July 1, 1990;
- The area or use presently has a commercial zoning designation; and
- The area provides basic necessities or multiple commercial services to the local community.

Classification of rural commercial areas was based on a Rural Commercial Level of Services (RCLOS) analysis². The study included an inventory of commercial development and an analysis of the nature of the service area for existing rural commercial areas. The study recognized four rural commercial levels of service:

- Local – supplies basic goods and services with a limited selection.
- Community – supplies a large variety of goods and day-to-day services and a limited range of professional, public, and social services.
- Regional – supplies both the rural and urban population with additional public and social facilities, access to government institutions, and a wide range of special retail stores and services.
- Transportation/Resource Related – serves the traveling public and provides for recreational activities through uses such as motels, restaurants, RV parks, resorts, marinas, and gift shops. This level of commercial services does not define any service areas and could be supplied by both types of rural commercial zones: Rural Crossroads and Rural Village Centers.

Using the data from the 1996 study, County staff determined that commercial areas exist that contain a wider range of uses than those for a Local Level of Service, but not as wide a range as the Community Level of Service. In addition, several commercial areas in the Tri-Area/Glen Cove Study Area include limited regional uses. Based on 1997 GMA amendments allowing for recognition of existing commercial uses (RCW 36.70A070(5)(d)), Jefferson County also recognized a Commuter-Traveling Public Level of Service for commercial activities serving commuters and travelers with goods and services that may not be associated with a destination resort, such as restaurants, specialty stores aimed at attracting tourists, and overnight accommodations on a limited scale.

The following table describes the revised commercial area designations, which are interim designations until the Special Study is completed and the boundaries are revisited at the first amendment cycle of this Plan. Crossroads are hierarchical in terms of allowed uses, so that uses allowed in a more restrictive crossroad is allowed in a less restrictive crossroad unless otherwise noted.

A more specific list of uses will be provided in implementing ordinances. Permitted uses will be balanced with performance standards to prevent urban-style development. In addition, the unique and individual character of each crossroad will be preserved by limiting certain uses to specific crossroads in which they already exist. For example, for Neighborhood/Visitor Crossroads, motels will be allowed only at Discovery Bay, and for General Crossroads, auto retail will be allowed only at the State Route 19/20 Intersection.

² *Jefferson County Rural Commercial Zones*, Madrona Planning and Development Services, September, 1996.

Designation*	Level of Service Characteristics	Examples of Services Provided
<i>Convenience Crossroads</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nordland • Beaver Valley • Wawa Point 	Single convenience/general store serving a lower intensity population base at a local level of service. May serve the traveling public, as well.	Basic food staples, basic house-wares, gasoline and oil, basic hardware and convenience items, video, espresso, café.
<i>Neighborhood/Visitor Crossroads</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mats Mats • Discovery Bay • Gardiner • Four Corners • Chimacum 	Multiple uses serving a rural neighborhood at a local level of service with limited community uses, and serving commuters and the traveling public.	All convenience uses and grocery, restaurant, tavern/bar, auto parts & repair, gift shops, limited range of specialty stores and professional services.
<i>General Crossroads</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ness' Corner • Irondale Corner • SR 19/20 Intersection 	Multiple uses providing limited regional and multiple community levels of service.	All convenience and neighborhood/visitor uses and building materials, hardware and farm equipment, clothing and accessories, mini-storage, RV sales, carpeting, and an expanded range of specialty stores, professional services, and public and social service offices.
<i>Rural Village Center</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Hadlock • Quilcene • Brinnon 	Historical rural community providing all essential goods and day-to-day professional, public, and social services at a community level of service. Residential uses include duplex, triplex, assisted living facilities.	All convenience, neighborhood/visitor, and general crossroads services, a broad range of specialty stores, professional services, and public and social services.

* Upon final designation of an Urban Growth Area, Port Hadlock, Ness's Corner, and Irondale Corner commercial districts will be appropriately re-designated as part of the Tri-Area UGA.

The commercial area within the Port Ludlow Master Planning Resort is designated a Village Commercial Center, a final Plan revision that recognizes the difference between a Master Planned Resort and historical rural communities. These differences will be reflected in the land use classifications and permitted uses provided in the County's development regulations.

Commercial development within rural commercial areas will be regulated by an interim controls ordinance until final land use ordinances are developed in a public process. Land use ordinances will include:

- A Land Use Table with future permitted uses corresponding to levels of service for existing uses;
- Development standards, including an upper building size cap for each zone and corresponding bulk and dimensional standards designed to preserve the existing rural character of the neighborhood through regulation of size and scale; and
- Special conditions related to site-specific constraints.

Local Circumstances

The 1997 amendments to the Growth Management Act legislated in ESB 6094 included the following language allowing for local discretion regarding the application of criteria to local circumstances:

“Because circumstances vary from county to county, in establishing patterns of rural densities and uses, a county may consider local circumstances, but shall develop a written record explaining how the rural element harmonizes the planning goals in RCW 36.70A.020 and meets the requirements of this chapter.” (RCW 36.70A.070(a))

Jefferson County recognizes distinct circumstances and conditions in certain areas of the county that have been considered in the designation of commercial areas and policies to address these circumstances.

The Tri-Area/Glen Cove Study Area

The Tri-Area of eastern Jefferson County includes the communities of Irondale, Chimacum, and Port Hadlock and surrounding areas of higher population and commercial development than other areas of the County. It is an area characterized by a dense development pattern that borders on urban densities in some areas. Commercial development along State Route 19 at Ness’ Corner and Irondale Corner, as well as in nearby Four Corners, the State Route 19/20 Intersection, and Chimacum provide commercial levels of service that include some regional uses and multiple community uses. The Tri-Area and an area of existing light industrial and associated commercial development at Glen Cove were identified as potential urban growth areas. The County, in partnership with the City of Port Townsend, initiated the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Special Study to collect and analyze detailed information regarding existing land uses, future commercial and industrial land needs, and the cost and feasibility of infrastructure necessary to serve urban uses and densities in the study area. The study developed options for land use designations in Glen Cove and the Tri-Area.

The options developed within the Special Study were based on a countywide inventory of commercial lands.

The economy of Jefferson County is experiencing a significant “retail leakage” to Urban Growth Areas in Kitsap and Clallam Counties, as well as Seattle metropolitan areas (see Economic Development Element). Retail leakage is an economic signal that regional commercial levels of service are not being met for County residents, and suggests that commercial development is inadequate to meet the needs of recent growth. The Special Study concluded that the County could experience a significant shortage of commercial and industrial lands over the next twenty years if an average annual employment growth rate of 4% was maintained. A lower growth rate of 3.1% would reduce that need and a rate below that would essentially require no additional industrial or commercial lands beyond existing levels. However, the Special Study also noted that the lack of a full range of urban public facilities and services and available developable vacant land in the designated rural commercial centers placed significant constraints on employment growth.

Based on the fact that the Tri-Area is already characterized by urban growth, as stipulated in the County-wide Planning Policies, the County is moving forward with UGA implementation and capital facility planning to provide urban levels of service for this area consistent with the requirements of the GMA. The Tri-Area UGA will encompass the existing commercial areas of Ness’ Corner, Irondale and Port Hadlock but will also offer additional urban commercial development opportunities to help stimulate job creation and provide new commercial services in the County—including an increased range of allowed

commercial uses, intensities of use and mixed-use residential uses to help create more affordable housing.

Glen Cove was determined to not be suitable for UGA designation at the present time due to urban capital facility constraints, but was analyzed for consistency with the “limited areas of more intensive rural development” (LAMIRD) provisions of the GMA and “final” LAMIRD boundaries are recommended for this area.

The South County

The southern region of eastern Jefferson County, known as the South County, includes the communities of Quilcene and Brinnon and the surrounding areas. This region has not experienced the high rate of

- Gardiner

The Gardiner commercial area is located on U.S. Highway 101, and historically served the community with a grocery and gas station that closed during the 1980s. Current uses include a bird feeding supplies store, U-fish pond, an antique store, espresso, and a fishing tackle store. The logical boundary around the triangular commercial area has been drawn using Highway 101, the Old Gardiner Road, and the Gardiner Beach Road. A limited amount of infill is allowed in order to accommodate the community's desire for future development of uses such as a convenience store.

- Chimacum

Chimacum is a historic commercial area that includes a post office and is located adjacent to the public school, therefore serving as a focal point for the local community. Based on 1997 GMA amendments, the crossroad boundary has been extended north on Chimacum Road to recognize a pre-1990 cluster of businesses that was not included in the Draft Plan. Existing uses such as a farm equipment and supply store serve nearby agricultural activities in the Chimacum Valley, while other uses such as ministorage provide a community level of service. The logical boundary recognizes and contains existing commercial uses and provides for limited infill on a parcel along Chimacum Road. Infill will be temporarily limited as a result of the recent downsizing of the City of Port Townsend water system service area; an issue that will be addressed a revision of the Jefferson County Coordinated Water System Plan by the Water Utility Coordinating Committee for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

- Four Corners

The Four Corners Neighborhood/Visitor Crossroads, which historically served the nearby area with a sawmill, contains a convenience store and gas pump, a construction yard, and an auto recycling yard, an UPS distribution office, and a ministorage rental. The boundary of this commercial area recognizes and contains the existing uses, and allows for limited infill development only through subdivision or redevelopment of existing parcels, all of which are developed. A water supply for new development will not be available until purveyorship issues are resolved between Jefferson County P.U.D. #1 and the City of Port Townsend during the revision of the Coordinated Water System Plan.

3. General Crossroads - General Crossroads are existing commercial areas that provide a broad range of commercial goods and services for a higher population base in the northeastern part of Jefferson County. These areas provide several regional uses, as well as multiple uses at community levels of service. Uses in these areas will include Convenience and Neighborhood/Visitor uses, as well as building materials, hardware and farm equipment, auto repair with subordinate auto sales, appliance sales and repair, clothing and accessories, ministorage, RV repair and sales, and an expanded range of specialty stores, professional services, and public and social service offices. Performance standards for general commercial uses will allow for sizes and scales of new development larger than those for Neighborhood/Visitor Crossroads, but more limiting than those for Rural Village Centers.

- Ness' Corner(Upon final designation of a Tri-Area UGA the Ness' Corner General Crossroad will be appropriately re-designated)

The Ness' Corner intersection, located on State Route 19, is a relatively large commercial area with a number of specialized commercial uses and professional services. It serves the high population base of the Tri-Area, and includes some uses that provide several regional, community, and traveling

public levels of service, as well as services for the local rural population. Existing commercial uses, which have gradually extended along the highway, have been contained by the logical boundary, with limited areas where infill will be allowed.

- Irondale Corner (Upon final designation of a Tri-Area UGA the Irondale Corner General Crossroad will be appropriately re-designated)

Irondale Corner is located north of Ness' Corner on State Route 19 and includes uses similar in level of service to those at Ness' Corner. Under 1994 commercial zoning, these two areas were joined. This Plan divides the previous commercial zone based on a strict application of the criteria for recognizing and containing existing development. Residential development divides the Ness' Corner from the Irondale Corner General Commercial Crossroads for approximately 1200 feet on the east side of the highway. On the west side of the highway, an undeveloped area near the City of Port Townsend's public water supply well for the Tri-Area service area separates the two designated commercial areas for about 1200 feet.

- State Route 19/20 Intersection

Under the criteria for commercial crossroads boundaries, this area has been downsized considerably from 1994 zoning designations. Existing development on one side of State Route 19 was recognized and contained, consisting of a nursery/garden supply store, an auto dealership under a Binding Commercial Site Plan, and a vacant parcel with a vested building permit application. Commercial uses excluded from the crossroad include an auto repair business adjacent to residential uses, and a drive-in movie theater. These uses have been excluded to limit traffic access at an intersection with high traffic volumes and a relatively high incidence of accidents. Auto retail will be allowed in this crossroad only, in order to limit this regional commercial use from occurring in other crossroads.

Rural Village Centers

Rural Village Centers are established, historically settled areas with commercial uses that address most of the essential needs of the rural population, supply a large variety of goods and day-to-day services, and provide a broad range of professional and social services. The three designated Rural Village Centers contain mixed residential and commercial uses, and are designated for residential as well as commercial uses according to historic patterns of mixed development.

1. Brinnon

The historic community of Brinnon is located on U.S. Highway 101 at the mouth of the Dosewallips River. The traditional community boundaries are the river on the south, the steep valley wall to the north, and Hood Canal on the east. The designated core area consists of mixed commercial and residential uses. The Draft Plan boundary has been revised to limit development in the frequently flooded area near the river. Existing uses farther from the river, such as a nursery and a mixed commercial/residential short plat with an existing ministorage and a vested application for a new post office, have been recognized in the final Plan.

The boundary allows for areas of infill in Brinnon based on the distressed economy of the area as a result of decreased employment in logging and fishing. The seasonal increase in the visitor population is expected to increase in the future as a result of ongoing regional growth in Puget Sound. Limited areas of infill in the Brinnon Rural Village Center will provide employment opportunities for local residents in the transition to a more diversified economy as Brinnon attempts

to promote small-scale tourist and recreation-oriented businesses based on a location on Highway 101 adjacent to the Olympic National Park.

Areas of limited infill are also provided in support of the community goal of an extended care or assisted living facility. A high priority for the community is a facility that allows elderly residents to stay in the community rather than moving 40 miles away from family and friends to facilities in Port Townsend.

2. Quilcene

The historic community of Quilcene, similar to Brinnon, is distinct from the Port Hadlock and Port Ludlow communities because of a location at a distance from the Port Townsend UGA and a distressed economy due to the recent decline in forestry and fishing employment. Quilcene, located on Hood Canal and Highway 101 at the gateway to Olympic National Park, has an opportunity to serve visitors and seasonal residents to build a more diversified economic base.

Areas of commercial infill are intended to provide employment opportunities in a distressed and changing economy. Commercial development can take advantage of a high volume of visitors based on a location on both Highway 101 and Center Valley Road. The community is currently considering a public water system with the assistance of the County Health Department and the Jefferson County P.U.D. The amount of commercial infill development will depend on the availability of a water system. A Local Utility District election planned for late 1998 will allow the community to determine the future of the water system. The County will revisit the Quilcene water supply issue following the election to assess the results in light of Comprehensive Plan issues.

Community concerns in Quilcene, as in Brinnon, indicate a priority need for areas of infill in the commercial core area that might allow an assisted living or extended care facility for elderly residents of the community. Although such facilities will be permitted conditionally in residential areas, both communities prefer that they be located in the Rural Village Centers. While recognition of the existing commercial development pattern in Quilcene results in somewhat irregular boundaries, several commercial uses southeast and southwest of the boundary have been excluded in order to avoid creating a large area of infill that would promote sprawl.

3. Port Hadlock (Upon final designation of a Tri-Area UGA the Port Hadlock Rural Village Center will be appropriately re-designated)

The Port Hadlock commercial center serves a large population base in the Tri-Area. Commercially designated land within this portion of the Tri-Area UGA will be limited to an expanded core area because of the relatively high density of residential uses in the adjacent area, including multi-family housing units, a UGA designation is viewed as a means of accommodating the need for affordable housing close to jobs centers and retail services. This portion of the UGA will continue to allow for and promote mixed-use commercial and residential developments—consistent with adopted urban levels of service—as one means to provide for more affordable housing.

Port Ludlow Village Commercial Center – Final Boundary

The Master Planned Resort of Port Ludlow has a large residential community that is served by a Village Commercial Center. The designated commercial area is consistent with the 1993 Environmental Impact Statement, and has been agreed to by community planning groups. Land use activities and performance

Quilcene as light industrial (**LI**), and forest resource-based industrial zones (**RBIZ**) at Gardiner, Center, and the West End. All areas met the following minimum criteria for designation of industrial land:

1. A pre-July, 1990 existing area or use of more intensive development;
2. The area is currently zoned as industrial; and
3. Is not located on designated natural resource lands.

Port Townsend Paper Mill Heavy Industrial Area

The Port Townsend Paper Mill has provided employment for several generations of Jefferson County residents. The mill property has been designated as heavy industrial (**HI**) for the mill and for activities ancillary to the mill. Within the designated industrial area, the County will allow the development of only those uses that are directly related to the mill. The property includes a water treatment lagoon and a port facility on Port Townsend Bay that are directly related to activities at the mill. The mill is recognized as a heavy industrial activity because it is a large-scale and intensive industrial activity that must meet extensive environmental permitting requirements under industrial standards for air quality, water quality, and wastewater treatment.

Glen Cove Industrial Area

Uses for the Light Industrial/Commercial (**LC**) designation at Glen Cove include commercial and retail uses that are directly associated with the light industrial uses. Associated commercial and retail uses may include commodities and products, mechanical or electrical supplies, warehousing and storage, or may provide support services to those who work in the industries, such as a small café. Allowing broader commercial uses at Glen Cove would require addressing concerns regarding pedestrian and traffic safety, infrastructure, and incompatible uses both visually and in terms of hazardous materials storage. Thus the commercial designation for Glen Cove is restricted to uses which differ considerably from those in Rural Crossroads and Rural Village Centers.

Light industrial/commercial uses allowed at Glen Cove include but are not limited to: industrial parks, light manufacturing, construction yards, engine repair, metal fabrication or machining, plumbing shops and yards, printing and binding facilities (non-retail), research laboratories, excavating contractors, furniture manufacturing, software development, lumber yards, vehicle repair and restoration, warehousing and storage, boat building and repair, craft goods, blacksmith or forge, commercial relay and transfer stations, boat storage, and associated commercial uses as discussed above. Also permitted as conditional uses are those such as: amateur radio towers greater than 65 feet in height, café, car wash, electronic goods repair, fitness center, kennels, ministorage, and nursery/landscape materials.

The Glen Cove industrial boundary for light industrial/commercial uses recognizes a contained cluster of existing uses.

When the logical boundaries were created based on ESB 6094 standards (RCW 36.70A.070), they were drawn conservatively pending the outcome of the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Special Study. The Special Study evaluated a range of options for Glen Cove related to infrastructure needs and the potential for an Urban Growth Area. Ultimately, however, due to constraints on providing needed urban levels of service at the present time, the County moved forward with designation of an expanded LAMIRD at Glen Cove. Several businesses were excluded from the interim logical boundaries, but are included in the final Glen Cove LAMIRD boundary designation in recognition of their legal existence consistent with the provisions of RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d).

During the planning process, the County held discussions with the City of Port Townsend regarding the final land use designations at Glen Cove, the Port Townsend Paper Mill, and all commercial areas, to determine compliance with Countywide Planning Policies. The City may have an interest in annexing the Glen Cove area to the Port Townsend Urban Growth Area, an issue that may be addressed during future amendments to the Plan.

Quilcene Industrial Area

The light industrial area at Quilcene was recognized in the final Plan based on criteria in 1997 amendments to the GMA allowing Counties to recognize and contain existing areas and uses of more intensive industrial development (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)). The industries need not be limited to those serving the local population. Other criteria and considerations used for this designation include: a minority report from the Planning Commission recommending a light industrial area in Quilcene, the need to provide local employment in an area of distressed economic conditions located at a distance from the Urban Growth Area, and the desire to reduce commuter-related traffic pressures on County roadways.

The existing industrial uses include a sawmill, a machine shop, and industrial storage. A vested project for additional industrial storage is the basis for recognition of an adjacent parcel. Light industrial uses allowed in the Quilcene Industrial Area include but are not limited to those described above for Glen Cove, with the exception of the associated commercial and retail uses.

Transportation access is adequate, as the area is on Highway 101. New development will be restricted until water supply issues related to adequate fire flow are addressed following the community election for a Local Utility District in late 1998.

Forest Resource-Based Industrial Zones

Forest resource-based industries at Gardiner, Center Valley, and the West End have been designated as Resource-Based Industrial Zones to recognize active sawmills and related activities at those sites, based on 1997 GMA amendments codified as RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i) recognizing existing industrial uses and allowing for their intensification. The Resource-Based Industrial Zones are limited to forest resource-based industrial uses in order to prevent the establishment of a wider range of industrial uses. It is also intended to support employment in a distressed economic sector that, while it has seen a decline in employment, will continue to have long-term economic importance for the County.

Forest resource-based industrial zone boundaries were determined based on criteria in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) for determining logical boundaries. The reduction in acreage allows for limited infill, and contains the industrial activity and associated uses to an area based on the pre-1990 developed area.

Jefferson County recognizes that the cyclical nature of the forest industry will continue to result in economic upturns and downturns as reforested areas become available for harvest. In order to maintain facilities that continue to operate, the County recognizes that conversion of machinery and facilities into forest-related production activities would help to support this industry from one cycle to the next. During the next year, the County will develop and evaluate criteria for the permitting and regulation of conversion and/or intensification of these areas for related uses that may involve adapting existing equipment and facilities, recycling, or adding limited value to the forest resource products and byproducts (see LNP 12.4). Such criteria and types of uses will be developed and reviewed in a public process by the Planning Commission and will be adopted as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan prior to allowing conversion or adaptation of these facilities.

The 1997 GMA amendments codified in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) that allow recognition of areas of more intensive residential development have not been applied in this Plan, as additional analysis and public process is required to develop criteria for such areas. During the next year, the application of ESB 6094 criteria in 1997 GMA amendments will be considered for existing platted developments such as Cape George, Kala Point, and other areas of more intensive residential development. The County will develop, evaluate, and apply such criteria in a public process for a future amendment of the Comprehensive Plan (see LNP 3.4).

Existing Lots of Record

In addition to recognizing legal pre-existing land uses, Jefferson County recognizes existing lots of record as legal lots. While some of these lot sizes may not meet current minimum lot size requirements, they were created consistent with laws in effect at the time and are considered legal lots of record. However, in terms of development, some of the smaller lot sizes will require consolidation with other lots to meet current Health Department standards and other regulations such as critical areas, resource lands, and shoreline overlays. For example, lots which are served by a public water system but must develop an individual septic system are required to have a minimum lot size of approximately twelve thousand five hundred (12,500) square feet. In some areas of the County, for property without public water, a minimum lot size of one (1) acre or greater is required.

Strategies proposed to minimize the cumulative adverse effects of developing platted small lots include:

- A recommendation to increase the minimum lot size required for a building permit; and
- Opportunities to encourage the replatting of some of these urban-size pre-existing lots to less urban densities.

Land Use and Zoning Densities

As determined by the Growth Management Hearings Boards' decisions, rural areas should provide for a variety of rural land use densities. Clustering, density averaging, design guidelines, conservation easements, transfer of development rights, and other innovative site planning techniques can aid in the preservation of significant open space areas that are important for maintaining the rural character of the County. The County will evaluate such techniques for inclusion in development regulations during the public process for developing final implementing ordinances.

Jefferson County is proposing three *residential* land use densities ranging from five (5) acres to ten (10) acres, to twenty (20) acres in size. *Agricultural Resource* lands have a designated twenty (20) acre minimum density. *Forest Resource* lands have a forty (40) acre and eighty (80) acre minimum parcel size (see Natural Resources Element). In 2002, a *Forest Transition Overlay* district was established to address potential conflict between forest resource lands and pre-platted high density residential parcels of one acre or less in size. This overlay district has a density of one dwelling unit per five acres (1:5) and requires utilization of the Planned Rural Residential Development provisions contained in the county's development regulations.

Regulations will be developed to encourage residential "clustering" in the rural areas of Jefferson County (see LNG 23.0). Residential clustering may occur in agriculture production districts if several criteria are met (see Natural Resources Element). Subdivision of large parcels for residential purposes in designated commercial forest lands is not permitted except in the Forest Transition Overlay district. The criteria for designation of rural densities are provided in Table 3-8 below. Table 3-8 includes various land use and zoning designations, criteria used for such designation, and the principal land uses:

Engrossed Senate Bill 5019 and codified as RCW 36.70A.365 as a master planned location for a specific manufacturing, industrial, or commercial business, but it cannot be for the purpose of commercial shopping development or multi-tenant office parks.

3. Small-scale recreational or tourist-related uses will be reviewed through the conditional use permitting process according to criteria provided in the goals and policies of this element. The activity must rely on a rural setting and nearby natural features for its location. Conditionally permitted uses such as RV parks, boat rentals, marinas, horse arenas and stables, and campgrounds are typical of this type of use. Land Use Goal 7.0 provides policies for these economic activities.
4. Home-based businesses may be permitted in order to provide opportunities to supplement a family income, start up a business, or establish a work-place at home. Home-based businesses must be clearly incidental and secondary to the primary use of the premises as a residence. The goals and policies of this element provide limits on home-based businesses designed to prevent adverse impacts from such activity on the preservation of rural character (see LNG 6.0).
5. Cottage industries will be reviewed through the conditional use permitting process, and must be clearly incidental and subordinate to the residential use of the property. Cottage industry is defined as limited small-scale commercial or industrial activities, and shall not grow beyond the scale permitted unless it is moved to a location designated for commercial or industrial uses. The limitations provided in land use policies are intended to prevent the activity from detracting from adjacent land uses and the rural character of the area (see LNG 6.0).

This Plan includes a “Matrix of Opportunity” outlining development opportunities that references policies in the Plan with more information on opportunities for development. The table also informs the public of issues related to possible development restrictions, and will be available to interested parties at the Jefferson County Permit Center.

URBAN GROWTH AREAS

Introduction

The Growth Management Act authorizes the designation of urban growth areas (UGAs) in RCW 36.70A.110 to include cities and other areas characterized by urban growth or adjacent to such areas. UGAs are intended to accommodate a projected population growth for the next twenty years. The GMA specifies that future growth should, first, be located in areas that already have public facilities and service capacity and, second, in areas where such services, if not already available, are planned for. In Jefferson County, there are two UGAs:

- City of Port Townsend UGA; and
- Tri-Area Unincorporated UGA.

The City of Port Townsend is subject to its own Comprehensive Plan and development regulations affecting urban growth and the provision of public facilities and services in the City. The Tri-Area UGA is an unincorporated UGA, subject to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan (CP) and implementing regulations.

An urban growth area defines where urban developments will be directed and supported with typical urban public facilities and services, such as storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, fire and police protection services, and public transit services. Urban growth areas enable new

development to locate close to vital capital facilities and urban services or "infill" in existing urbanizing areas. UGAs enable fiscal resources associated with capital facilities and urban services to be operated more cost-effectively.

The Urban Growth Area is an area where urban public facilities and services are available, or are planned. Provision of urban public facilities and services may be available through a number of service providers, such as the City of Port Townsend, Jefferson County, Public Utility District #1, or some other entity such as a sewer and water district. Discussion regarding specific planning for public facilities and services in the Tri-Area UGA can be found in other chapters of the Comprehensive Plan, including the Transportation Element, Utilities Element, and Capital Facilities Element as well as the *Tri Area/Glen Cove Special Study*.

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

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

Urban growth areas include those areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facilities and service capacities to serve such development or areas for which such facilities are planned. Designating UGAs recognizes the existing urbanized development pattern in the county. By designating UGAs, the requirements of both the GMA and County-wide Planning Policies (CWPPs) must be met to ensure that expansion of urban services are provided to encourage infill where logical and feasible.

CWPPs provide a broad framework for UGA planning that were developed in a collaborative process between the City of Port Townsend and the County. Countywide Planning Policy #1.3 provides specific guidance on criteria for the sizing and delineation of UGA boundaries outside of cities:

- Adequate amount of developable land to accommodate forecasted growth for the next twenty years.
- Sufficient developable land for residential, commercial and industrial uses to sustain a healthy local and regional economy.
- Sufficient area for the designation of greenbelts and open space corridors.
- Topographical features or environmentally sensitive areas which may form natural boundaries such as bays, watersheds, rivers, or ridge lines.
- Lands already characterized by urban development which are currently served or are planned to be served by roads, water, sanitary sewer and storm drainage, schools and other urban services within the next twenty years; provided that such urban services which are not yet in place are included in a capital facilities plan.

- The type and degree of existing urban services necessary to support urban development at the adopted interim level of service.

The County-wide Planning Policies also provide selected guidance for the phasing of urban growth commensurate with the provision of adequate urban services to UGAs:

- Land use plans, regulations and capital facility plans for each UGA will be designed to accommodate the projected population. Growth should first be directed into two tiers: Tier 1—existing commercial centers and urbanized areas where the six (6) year capital facilities plan is prepared to provide urban infrastructure; Tier 2—areas included within the capital facilities plan to receive the full range of urban services within twenty (20) years. Infrastructure improvements necessary to support development in the second tier will be provided by the developer concurrent with development, or by public entities as a result of implementing all or a portion of the capital facilities plan. (CWPP 1.5)
- Before adopting boundaries of UGAs, interim level of service standards (LOSs) for public services and facilities located inside and outside of UGAs must be adopted. (CWPP 1.7)
- The full range of governmental urban services at the adopted level of service standards will be planned for and provided within UGAs, as defined in the capital facilities plan, including community water, sanitary sewer, piped fire flow, and storm water systems (CWPP 2.1)
- New development will meet the adopted level of service standards for the UGA as a condition of project approval. Said standards will include interim provisions for those urban facilities identified in the capital facilities plan but not yet developed. New development will contribute its proportionate share towards provision of urban facilities identified in the capital facilities plan. (CWPP 2.3)

Tri-Area UGA Phased Implementation

The Tri-Area lacks the full range of urban services needed for immediate UGA implementation indicated in CWPP 2.1, above. Therefore, the CP must plan for the provision of those services as required by RCW 36.70A.110(3). To accomplish this the Tri-Area UGA will be implemented in several phases.

Phase 1—The first phase will involve amendments to the Jefferson County CP to adopt the final UGA boundary, land use map and interim levels of service for urban facilities as well as goals and policies guiding the development of the UGA. This will include identification of additional plans and capital facilities (including costs and funding sources) needed to implement the full range of urban services and facilities within the UGA.

The existing permitted land use densities and intensities of use, bulk and dimensional, and other development standards will remain intact during this period.

Phase 2—The second phase will involve preparation and adoption of “UGA Overlay” development regulations in the Unified Development Code (UDC), including new urban permitted land use tables and new bulk and dimensional standards for implementation upon the concurrent availability of the full range of urban public services (e.g., sanitary sewer). This phase will also include carrying out further studies and completing the necessary capital facility plans needed to implement the full range of urban services required in CWPP 2.1, including urban storm water standards and a sanitary

sewer system. This will include identification of development area “tiers” within the UGA based on where the six (6) year capital facilities plan is prepared to provide urban infrastructure “concurrent” with development.

During the capital facility planning period or until those identified urban facilities are available for development, the interim land use densities and intensities of use and other development standards will remain intact or consistent with the adopted interim levels of service.

Phase 3—Upon completion of the identified capital facility plans or projects, identification of any remaining needed projects in the six (6) year capital facilities plan, adoption of final urban level of service standards, and/or the availability of the necessary urban services and facilities concurrent with development, the “UGA Overlay” designation shall replace the existing or interim permitted land use densities and intensities of use and related development standards - in those portions or “tiers” of the UGA where the full range of urban services can be provided concurrent with development.

In portions of the UGA where the full range of urban services have not been planned for in the six (6) year capital facility plan, the interim level of service standards and associated development regulations shall remain in effect.

The adoption of interim and final urban LOSs allows time for capital facility planning, funding and implementation to ensure that urban development occurs concurrent with the provision of those urban services and that the provision of those services can be done in a feasible manner. During the interim period, development regulations may not allow the full range of urban land use densities and intensities of use intended in the UGA until the full range of urban public facilities and services have been (or can be) provided consistent with the six (6) year capital facility plan.

URBAN GROWTH AREA DESIGNATION CRITERIA

The GMA specifies certain minimum requirements for UGA formation. These include the following provisions of RCW 36.70A.110:

An urban growth area may include territory that is located outside of a city only if such territory already is characterized by urban growth whether or not the urban growth area includes a city, or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth. (RCW 36.70A.110(1))

The vast majority of the Tri-Area UGA is *already characterized by urban growth* as stated in CWPP 1.4. In addition, the boundary for the UGA was delineated based on the criteria in CWPP 1.3 with guidance from the Tri-Area Community Plan and public input from local residents, as required by CWPP 1.3 and 1.4. Only limited areas *adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth* are included in the UGA to: 1) interconnect areas characterized by existing urban growth; 2) incorporate sufficient developable land to sustain the urban growth projected to occur during the 20-year planning period; or 3) provide for a reasonable land market supply factor to discourage adverse land and housing price increases. The Tri-Area UGA is significantly smaller and more compact than originally proposed in the *Special Study*.

Based upon the growth management population projection made for the county by the office of financial management, the county and each city within the county shall include

areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county or city for the succeeding twenty-year period. 36.70A.110(2)

Adequate land area for the expected growth for the planning period has been designated based on both the projected 20-year residential population growth for the Tri-Area identified in the CP as well as the need for commercial/industrial lands identified as a part of the *Special Study*. The CP population growth projections indicate a 20-year projected growth of 1,165 residents (or about 520 households) for the Tri-Area planning area—an area predominantly encompassed by the UGA. The CP also indicates a large number of existing platted residential lots in the area—although many of these lots are not buildable and will require consolidation, making them less likely to be available for development over the course of the planning period. The UGA sizing analysis indicates a residential holding capacity of approximately 652 new dwelling units (including vacant platted lots) which approximates a net new population capacity of 1,377 persons (or about 606 households) during the next twenty (20) years. Therefore, the boundary (i.e., sizing) of the UGA included only those areas “*characterized by urban growth...or...adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth*” necessary to accommodate the urban growth projected to occur consistent with the Act.

Although the Tri-Area UGA contains a significant amount of *existing* single-family urban residential development—from a future urban growth perspective—its main intent is to provide more economic development opportunity to serve the unmet needs of the County identified in the *Special Study*. Secondly, UGA designation and the provision of urban facilities and services will allow for development of higher density (and more affordable) multi-family housing and mixed-use pedestrian friendly commercial/residential development and redevelopment—especially in the Port Hadlock core—which is not presently feasible given density restrictions and the lack of a sanitary sewer system.

Each urban growth area shall permit urban densities and shall include greenbelt and open space areas. 36.70A.110(2)

Urban density residential development will average at least 4 dwelling units per acre in UGA residential areas. The Low Density Single-Family Residential designation on the Tri-Area UGA Land Use Map will require a minimum density of 4 dwellings units per acre. Open space and greenbelt areas have also been identified for the UGA, especially along the Chimacum Creek corridor, in associated wetland areas and along the Port Townsend Bay marine shoreline at the mouth of Chimacum Creek.

An urban growth area determination may include a reasonable land market supply factor and shall permit a range of urban densities and uses. 36.70A.110(2)

Single-family and multi-family residential, urban commercial, light industrial, lands for public purposes, and open space and greenbelt land needs are incorporated in the development of the Urban Growth Area boundary for the Tri-Area. Sizing of the UGA was intended to include only those areas “*characterized by urban growth...or...adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth*” consistent with the Act. A reasonable land market supply factor of 25% (accepted by the Growth Management Hearings Boards) was applied to discourage adverse increases to land and housing values in the UGA. Reduction factors to account for lands needed for roads and utilities and preservation of environmentally sensitive areas were also applied based on the specific findings recommended in the *Special Study*. Allocations relating to population, residential and commercial/industrial lands are included in the CP. Documentation of supporting population and land area analysis are found in the *Special Study*.

Cities and counties have discretion in their comprehensive plans to make many choices about accommodating growth. 36.70A.110(2)

Planning for the Tri-Area UGA has been on-going since the initial GMA Comprehensive Plan for the County was adopted in 1998. The *Special Study* was a collaborative joint planning process between the City and the County that entailed a broad analysis of population and employment growth and land use needs as well as alternative UGA boundary configurations and their associated impacts. It presented many choices about accommodating growth. One of the key findings of the *Special Study* was that the County experienced a significant amount of “retail leakage” to urban areas in adjacent counties due to an inadequate commercial land use base in the County. The City and the County also jointly chose through the Joint Growth Management Steering Committee to accommodate new growth through formation of a Tri-Area UGA rather than accommodate the unmet demand for commercial growth in the existing Port Townsend UGA.

The CP and the CWPPs both identify the Tri-Area as the primary regional commercial growth center for the unincorporated County. However, the lack of a UGA designation and the full range of urban services, including a sanitary sewer system, has been an impediment to significant commercial development and job creation. The Tri-Area UGA planning process involved an extensive amount of public involvement. The *Implementation Plan* for the *Special Study* identified and analyzed more specific UGA land use alternatives for the Tri-Area. As a result of the extensive public involvement process and capital facilities impact analysis conducted throughout the life of the *Special Study*, the Tri-Area UGA represents a significantly smaller, more compact and more fiscally viable UGA than originally proposed in the DSEIS/FSEIS prepared as a part of the *Special Study*.

Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas.
36.70A.110(3)

The *Special Study* included several alternative UGA boundaries and permitted land use alternatives for UGAs in Jefferson County. One of these alternatives (Alternative 1) was *not* to adopt a new unincorporated UGA but rather accommodate the unmet need for regional commercial growth identified in the *Special Study* through intensification of the existing Port Townsend municipal UGA. Following issuance of the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Amendments, dated August 1999*, the Joint Growth Management Steering Committee (comprised of three City Councilors and three County Commissioners) decided on August 24, 1999 (by a vote of 5 to 1) to move forward with UGA implementation for the Tri-Area and to reject implementation of Alternative 1—effectively precluding allocation of the unmet employment and commercial growth needs identified in the *Special Study* to the existing Port Townsend UGA.

The Tri-Area is presently served by a range of public services, including a potable water system, piped fire flow, public transit, and public safety (fire, EMS and sheriff). Outside of the City of Port Townsend, the Tri-Area and Glen Cove are the only areas of the county with that complement of existing public services. The Glen Cove light industrial area has been designated a “limited area of more intensive rural development” under RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d). It lacks a sanitary sewer system and is not subject to an urban growth area designation under the CP. A community sanitary sewer system and adopted urban storm water and transportation level of service standards are the only public facilities lacking in the Tri-Area that preclude a UGA designation. Adoption of “interim” urban level of service standards is a component of UGA implementation. Adoption of appropriate standards and identification of public

service purveyors (e.g., sanitary sewer service provider) and plans for the provision of adequate public services and facilities to serve the UGA is discussed in the appropriate sections of the Utilities, Capital Facilities, and Transportation Elements of the CP.

In general, cities are the units of local government most appropriate to provide urban governmental services. In general, it is not appropriate that urban governmental services be extended to or expanded in rural areas except in those limited circumstances shown to be necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development. 36.70A.110(4)

The CP and the CWPPs (#2.4) specify that urban public facilities and services are to be provided only within designated Urban Growth Areas unless needed to remedy a threat to public health or welfare or to protect an environmentally sensitive area. The Act does not prohibit unincorporated UGAs—it only suggests a greater level of scrutiny to ensure adequate capital facility planning and provision of urban governmental services. The feasibility of providing the full range of urban services to the Tri-Area rests largely upon the levels of service adopted for those facilities and services. Since most urban services are already provided to local residents (i.e., water, public safety), it is the establishment of a community sanitary sewer system that will likely have the greatest fiscal impact. The implementation, phasing, and fiscal requirements of such a sewer system will be planned and analyzed in the near term, including identification of projected costs and funding sources. The CP calls for establishment of “interim” urban level of service (LOS) standards for identified facilities and long range plans for the provision and cost of those urban services over the 20-year planning period. In essence until a sewer system is actually “in the ground”—the interim urban LOSs will maintain the existing or interim development regulations in place. New urban permitted land use tables will be prepared for the UGA based on the planned implementation of “final” urban LOSs (i.e., a sanitary sewer system). However, the new permitted “urban” uses (including revised bulk and dimensional standards) may only be implemented within the UGA upon satisfaction of all adopted urban LOSs. The Utilities, Transportation and Capital Facilities Elements address these issues in more detail.

CAPITAL FACILITY PLANNING

Capital facility planning for Urban Growth Areas should be coordinated among the City, County, and special purpose districts or other service providers who may be affected by the advent of new urban growth and the need to plan for the provision of new urban levels of service for public facilities such as sanitary sewer, potable water and public safety. For affected non-County agencies—who may provide these services—to meet their own capital facility plan goals, the County needs to ensure that it does not permit activity which would be inconsistent with their future plans.

County-wide Planning Policy #3 identifies specific actions to be taken regarding joint planning between the City of Port Townsend and Jefferson County that affects *incorporated* UGAs. The Tri-Area UGA is an unincorporated urban growth area. Nevertheless, the need for continued joint planning with affected public service providers and local residents is a critical component to UGA implementation. Of special importance will be the identification of a purveyor for urban sanitary sewer services and the fiscal impacts of such a system on local residents. Potable water service is already provided by the PUD #1.

Although it is an unincorporated UGA, the Tri-Area UGA is sufficient in size and scope of urban densities and intensities of uses to allow for potential incorporation—should local residents desire and choose to do so at some point in the future. The County will continue to work with local residents on the provision of adequate and financially feasible capital facilities for the Tri-Area.

The strategy of joint capital facility planning is to encourage jurisdictions and service providers to enter into inter-local agreements to facilitate planning in areas of mutual concern. The use of an inter-local agreement enables the affected local governments and special purpose districts involved to work together to review, consider, and resolve issues of mutual concern. The County, PUD #1, local residents and other affected agencies should continue to work together towards the provision of adequate public facilities and services. Possible issues include:

- Identifying service purveyor for sanitary sewer facilities
- Sizing, design and service area for a community sewer system
- Level of service standards
- Phasing of growth commensurate with the provision of adequate public facilities and services
- Capital facilities planning and financing; and
- Transformance of governance

Tri-Area UGA Land Use Analysis

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The UGA encompasses approximately 1,245 gross acres. Based on the year 2000 census, the resident population is estimated to be approximately 3,200 persons. The UGA is estimated to contain approximately 1,400 existing housing units. The existing land use pattern is characterized by commercial development concentrated along the major highway corridors (Rhody Drive, Ness' Corner Road, and Chimacum Road) and existing developed single-family neighborhoods in Irondale and Port Hadlock in the northern part of the UGA. There are scattered multi-family apartment complexes mostly located at the fringe of the Port Hadlock commercial core area.

The predominant land use type in the UGA is single-family residential development. It accounts for close to one-half of the existing land uses. Most of the residential neighborhoods south of Irondale Road are largely built-out, although there are a significant number of pre-existing platted lots (from early in the century) that remain undeveloped. In fact, vacant lands constitute about one-third of the UGA—most of which are concentrated north of Irondale Road and south of Chimacum Creek. Many of these lots are “substandard”—meaning that they cannot meet minimum lot size requirements for on-site septic systems—and therefore must be consolidated in order to build upon. Under current regulations, the County may authorize single-family home development on pre-existing platted lots provided they meet Jefferson County Environmental Health Department standards for on-site septic systems and drainfields—usually requiring a minimum 12,500 square foot lot (if served by a public water system). Current developed single-family residential lots in the UGA range from 4,000 to 20,000 square feet in size and average about 13,000 square feet. Undeveloped “pre-existing” platted lots may be found as small as 2,000 square feet and typically average 5,000 square feet or less.

The remaining existing land use distribution in the UGA includes public and quasi-public facilities such as churches, the Library and Chimacum Creek Elementary School, the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office and Jail, Jefferson County Public Works Department Maintenance Yard, and the City of Port Townsend's Sparling Well facility along Rhody Drive. In addition there are several neighborhood parks and open space areas.

The most distinguishing physical feature of the area is Chimacum Creek and its associated riparian wetland system. Chimacum Creek includes habitat for summer chum salmon—a listed species under the

Endangered Species Act (ESA)—and also contains steelhead, coho salmon and cutthroat trout. It runs from north to south through the area and determines the northern boundary of the UGA where it empties into Port Townsend Bay. It is contained within a narrow valley and is designated a Class 1 stream—subject to a 150 foot development setback along both sides of the creek—according to the *Jefferson County Unified Development Code*. The creek’s riparian corridor and associated setback function as a greenbelt within the UGA consistent with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.110(2).

The entire UGA is served by a public water system now owned and operated by Public Utility District #1 (PUD) of Jefferson County. The water source is groundwater acquired by two different wells. The primary source is the Sparling Well located at the intersection of Rhody Drive and Kennedy Road on the western border of the UGA. A secondary well, the Kively Well, is located just southeast of the Port Hadlock core area of the UGA.

There is no sanitary sewer system presently in the UGA. All wastewater treatment is provided either by individual on-site septic systems or small community-based on-site systems. The Jefferson County Environmental Health Department records indicate no significant failure rates for existing on-site systems in the UGA. Although the concentration of existing on-site septic systems, given the density and proximity of development to the Sparling Well, is an issue of concern that should be addressed as a part of the capital facility planning for a new sanitary sewer system.

Projected Growth

The adopted CP 20-year population growth projections indicate a 20-year projected growth of 1,165 residents (or about 520 households) for the Tri-Area planning area—an area predominantly encompassed by the UGA.

One of the key efforts of the *Special Study* was the assessment of future demand for commercial/industrial lands in the County (based on assumed employment growth and other variables). This analysis is contained in the *Regional Economic Analysis and Forecast* prepared by Trottier Research Group dated January 26, 1999 and further addressed in the document titled *Memorandum: Comments on Estimates of Additional Land Needed for Employment Growth* prepared by Trottier Research Group dated September 27, 1999. Hereafter collectively called the “*Trottier Report*”. The *Trottier Report* analysis indicated that the Jefferson County economy experiences significant “retail leakage” to urban areas in adjacent counties. Retail leakage is an economic signal that regional commercial levels of service are not being met for County residents, and suggests that the level of commercial development may be inadequate to meet the needs of the existing population as well as new growth. The *Trottier Report* concluded that the County could experience a significant shortage of commercial and industrial lands over the next twenty years if an average annual employment growth rate of 4% was maintained. A lower growth rate of 3.1% would reduce that need and a rate below that would essentially require no additional industrial or commercial lands beyond existing levels.

However, the *Special Study* also noted that the lack of a full range of urban public facilities and services and available developable vacant land in the designated rural commercial centers placed significant constraints on employment growth. In the case of the Tri-Area, the lack of a community sewer system is a significant impediment to economic activity since it limits overall employment density and certain economic activities that may be water-use intensive or require special waste processing needs. Furthermore, rural land development standards in effect under the 1998 CP precluded the most efficient utilization of many existing commercial enterprises—during the *Special Study* many existing businesses in the Tri-Area expressed frustration with the ability to expand existing operations due to building coverage or lot size constraints. Some businesses have left the area to relocate into UGAs elsewhere

where the land supply and urban capital facilities and services are more readily available. Even with designation of additional *vacant* lands for commercial purposes, the majority of the commercial lands designated in the Tri-Area UGA comprise lands already characterized by urban growth or are surrounded by such lands.

Future Land Use Allocation

Future land use analysis and allocations for the UGA are shown in the following tables. UGA land use designations are illustrated in the Tri-Area UGA Land Use Map (see Appendix).

**Table 3-9
Tri-Area UGA Land Use Distribution**

Land Use Designation	Total Acres (Gross)	Percent of Total Acres	Vacant Acres (Gross)	Percent of Vacant Acres
Single-Family Residential (SFR) Low Density	797	64%	307	75%
Multi-Family Residential (MFR) High Density	23	2%	6	1%
Commercial (new)	91	7%	55	14%
Commercial (existing)	131	11%	34	8%
Light Industrial	24	2%	5	1%
Public Facilities	87	7%	0	0
Parks and Open Space	92	7%	0	0
TOTALS	1,245	100	407	100

Source: Jefferson County Central Services

Residential. Low Density Single-Family Residential (SFR) accounts for the largest share of designated land use in the UGA. Under the UGA, the Low Density SFR zone will allow housing at a density of four (4) dwelling units per acre. This zone accounts for a total of 797 gross acres although only 307 acres are undeveloped (including vacant platted lots). High Density Multi-Family Residential (MFR) zoning accounts for 23 total acres within the UGA. Under the UGA, the High Density MFR zone will allow housing at a density of 8-12 dwelling units per acre. The residential holding capacity analysis in Table 3-10 indicates the total residential holding capacity potential at buildout for the UGA. Table 3-11 compares the UGAs sized capacity for growth with the CP projected twenty-year population growth for the Tri-Area. The analysis indicates that the UGA has the capacity to only accommodate approximately 17 % more new households than projected during the next sixteen years (2000-2016). The UGA capacity assumes complete buildout of all vacant platted residential lots in the UGA. Actual UGA growth capacity, however, may be somewhat less during the planning period, given the pattern and prevalence of very small platted lots that are likely to be unbuildable under the interim levels of service for wastewater treatment and disposal. The requirement for lot consolidation—in order to build new housing units—means that at least some of those lots are less likely to be available for development during the planning period.

**Table 3-10
Tri-Area UGA Residential Holding Capacity Analysis (2000-2016)**

Tri-Area UGA Residential Holding Capacity									
Land Use Designation	Gross Acres Vacant Land	Gross/Net Land Reduction Factor (1)	Land Supply Market Availability (2)	Net Acres Vacant Land	Density (Units/Acre)	Net Housing Unit Capacity	Net Households (3)	Household Size (4)	Net Population Growth Capacity (2000-2016)
Low Density SFR	307	0.675	0.75	155	4	622	578	2.27	1,312
High Density MFR	6	0.675	0.75	3	10	30	28	2.27	64
TOTALS				158		652	606		1,377

Sources: Jefferson County Central Services; Jefferson County Department of Community Development; Earth Tech, Inc.
 Notes: (1) Reduction factor to account for internal roads and rights-of-way, utilities, lands for public purposes, and environmentally sensitive areas (per *Special Study*)
 (2) Reasonable land market supply factor to account for lands not likely to be brought to market
 (3) Assumes a standard housing unit vacancy rate of 7%
 (For informational purposes, the housing unit vacancy rate reported in 1999 by the U.S. Census for Port Hadlock-Irondale was 8.5%)
 (4) Average household size is per the adopted Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan (Housing Element, pg. 5-4)

Table 3-11
Tri-Area UGA Population Growth Capacity (2000-2016)

Growth Component	Existing (1) (Year 2000)	Net Increase Capacity (2000-2016)	Total UGA Capacity (2016)	Tri-Area Planning Area (1996-2016) Projected Growth	Comprehensive Plan Growth Comparison (UGA Growth Capacity as % of Tri-Area Projected Growth)
Housing Units	1,383	652	2,035	na	na
Population	3,128	1,377	4,505	1,165	118%
Households	1,266	606	1,872	520	117%

Sources: Census 2000, U.S. Department of Commerce; Jefferson County Department of Community Development; Earth Tech, Inc.

Note: (1) Year 2000 data assumes that UGA comprises 90% of the Port Hadlock-Irondale CDP (Census Designated Place)

Commercial. The UGA designates a total of 222 gross acres for commercial land use, but only 91 gross acres of new commercial land use designations beyond that amount previously designated in the adopted 1998 CP as Irondale General Crossroad Commercial, Ness' Corner General Crossroad Commercial, and the Port Hadlock Rural Village Center. The Port Hadlock core commercial area will continue to be a mixed-use zone allowing both commercial and higher density residential uses. Of the 91 acres of new (year 2002) designated commercial land, only 55 acres are presently vacant—the remaining 36 acres comprise existing underdeveloped residential parcels in Irondale and Port Hadlock that could be redeveloped to commercial or commercial/residential mixed-uses under the provisions of the UGA.

Light Industrial. Approximately 24 acres of land is designated as light industrial in the UGA—all of but 5 acres of which are already in light industrial use. These uses are located in the southwest corner of the UGA well buffered from the bulk of the residential neighborhoods in the community.

Public Facilities. Public facilities comprise 87 acres, including the Library and Chimacum Creek Elementary School, the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office and Jail, Jefferson County Public Works Department Maintenance Yard, and the City of Port Townsend's Sparling Well facility along Rhody Drive.

Parks and Open Space. The UGA includes 92 acres of parks and open space lands ranging from privately dedicated open space to neighborhood and regional parks and public open space. The largest park is H.J. Carroll Regional Park.

Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map

The Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map on page 3-63, adopted as a part of this Comprehensive Plan, is the graphic representation of the density and locational criteria outlined above, and the goals, policies and strategies contained within this plan. The Land Use Map was developed based on community involvement, the mitigation measures contained within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the results of an inventory of existing rural residential and commercial development patterns, the 1996 Rural Commercial Zones Study, 1997 amendments to the Growth Management Act, and the specific criteria contained within this element.

The Land Use Map has zoning designations to guide Jefferson County in the revision and adoption of development regulations, and in future land use decisions. The Growth Management Act requires that the zoning designations be consistent with the Land Use Map designations. This requirement will be met by Jefferson County with the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

GOALS AND POLICIES

As in all elements of this Plan, the goals are general statements while policies are more specific. Goals state the general growth management intentions of the County while the policies are the specific guidelines. Strategies address implementation of goals and policies through specific projects and programs.

The Land Use element is combined with the Rural element of this Comprehensive Plan. The element includes an inventory and designation of land uses in rural areas that will aid in defining future development, and goals for the preservation of rural character that outline the general definition of the "rural environment" of those areas.

The goals and policies of the Land Use and Rural element provides direction for both the development and preservation of Jefferson County's rural areas. They outline specific criteria for the development of rural Jefferson County, incorporating issues and opportunities identified by County residents in the public planning process.

Land Use and Rural policies will provide the basis for revising the development standards contained in the Zoning Code, land use and environmental protection ordinances such as the Critical Areas Ordinance, the Subdivision Ordinance, and other development regulations.

GENERAL LAND USE

GOAL:

LNG 1.0 Comply with the Growth Management Act, the County-wide Planning Policy, this Comprehensive Plan, and the Land Use Map in all adopted land use, environmental and development regulations, and subsequent land use decisions and approvals.

POLICIES:

LNP 1.1 Incorporate opportunities for continuous and ongoing public participation into both the comprehensive planning process and the implementation of the resulting Comprehensive Plan.

LNP 1.2 Acknowledge and protect the rights of private property owners in preparing land use, development, and environmental regulations, prohibit arbitrary and discriminatory actions, and preserve reasonable uses for regulated properties.

LNP 1.3 Review and amend the Comprehensive Plan on a minimum schedule of once every five (5) years, and preferably on an annual basis, consistent with the requirements of the Growth Management Act. Revisions to the Land Use Map may be considered on an annual basis, and shall be in strict compliance with the Comprehensive Plan criteria.

LNP1.4 Modification of designations and boundaries may include the designation of Urban Growth Area and/or full implementation of the criteria provided in 1997 amendments to the GMA under ESB 6094.

LNP 1.5 Establish a process by which the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Map may be amended in accordance with 36.70A and other applicable regulations:

LNP 1.5.1 Designate five categories of Comprehensive Plan amendments as outlined in Chapter 2 of this Plan:

1. Policy amendments
2. Map amendments
3. General amendment
4. Site specific amendment
5. Emergency Amendments

LNP 1.5.2 Allow for the submission of petitions to the County for map amendments related to:

1. Errors in mapping. The fee may be waived only for those petitions determined to be an error in mapping.
2. An error in interpretation of the criteria for land use designation.

LNP 1.5.3 Mapping errors that are clearly erroneous based on inaccurate information or technical error on the part of the County may be corrected at the discretion of the Board of County Commissioners. Map corrections of this nature shall not require a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

LNP 1.6 Establish development regulations which provide clear guidance on County land use permitting processes and standards, and implement the land use goals and policies of this plan.

LNP 1.7 Encourage the use of innovative site planning and design techniques, including lot consolidation opportunities, as a means of preserving rural character, open lands, and protecting the natural environment through development regulations.

LNP 1.8 If the County chooses to adopt an impact fee ordinance, determine through a public process how to apportion the fair share of funding for required public facilities, services, and amenities.

LNP 1.9 Ensure appropriate services are provided as needed and that the duplication of services is avoided by promoting the coordination of local governmental programs and planning.

- c. parcels immediately adjacent to the boundaries of the Rural Village Centers; and
- d. as an overlay to pre-existing developed “suburban” platted subdivisions.
- e. parcels designated as Forest Transition Overlay.

LNP 3.3.2 A rural residential land use designation of one dwelling unit per 10 acres (RR 1:10) shall be assigned to those areas throughout the County with:

- a. an established pattern of the same or similar sized parcels (i.e., 10 acres);
- b. parcels along the coastal area of similar size;
- c. areas serving as a “transition” adjacent to Urban Growth Areas; and,
- d. critical area land parcels.

LNP 3.3.3 A rural residential land use designation of one dwelling unit per 20 acres (RR 1:20) shall be assigned to those areas throughout the County with:

- a. an established pattern of the same or similar sized parcels (i.e., 20 acres) or larger;
- b. parcels along the coastal area of similar size;
- c. areas serving as a “transition” to Urban Growth Areas or the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort;
- d. critical land area parcels;
- e. agriculture resource designated parcels;
- f. publicly owned forest lands; and
- g. lands adjacent to forest resource land.

LNP 3.4 Review areas of more intensive residential development and consider measures to allow infill development at comparable densities. Measures shall be considered to limit and contain these areas once identified and designated. Designation shall be through an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

LNP 3.5 Allow minimum lot sizes within the designated boundaries of Rural Village Centers which are flexible and determined by such considerations as: septic or sewer availability, potable water availability, zoning and building regulations such as setbacks and parking requirements, fire prevention measures, and community character.

LNP 3.6 Facilitate the multiple use function of Rural Village Centers (**RVC**) by establishing siting and design criteria to provide buffering and mitigation between potentially incompatible uses.

RURAL COMMERCIAL LAND USE

GOAL:

LNG 4.0 Establish and maintain the size and configuration of the County’s Rural Village Centers and provide for the development of appropriately scaled commercial uses.

POLICIES:

- LNP 4.1** The land use designation of interim Rural Village Center shall be zoned Rural Village Center (**RVC**). This zoning designation shall accommodate both commercial and residential land uses.
- LNP 4.2** Encourage a variety of commercial, retail, professional, tourist-related, community service, cottage industry, and residential uses, including duplexes, triplexes and assisted living facilities, within the designated boundaries of Rural Village Centers (**RVC**) at a scale appropriate to protect the rural character of the natural neighborhood.
- LNP 4.3** Establish logical outer boundaries based upon all of the following criteria:
- LNP 4.3.1** Consistency with the rural provisions and planning goals of the Growth Management Act.
- LNP 4.3.2** Contained and concentrated commercial and residential areas and uses defined and delineated predominately by the pre-July 1990 built environment.
- LNP 4.3.3** Rural Village Centers are defined as established, historically settled geographical areas serving the immediate community and the traveling public. The three existing settlements that have been designated Rural Village Centers are:
- Port Hadlock (Upon final designation of the Tri-Area UGA, the Port Hadlock Rural Village Center will be appropriately re-designated)
 - Quilcene
 - Brinnon
- LNP 4.3.4** Avoid low-density sprawl by establishing and maintaining logical outer boundaries, based on the criteria in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c) and (d) and the following local considerations pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070(5)(a):
- a. Regional transportation concerns, including traffic volumes, access, and safety.
 - b. Proximity to incompatible uses.
 - c. A large parcel that is partially developed for existing uses may not be designated in its entirety, if such a designation would promote sprawl.
 - d. Home businesses/cottage industries should not be used to determine boundaries.
 - e. Provide employment opportunities for local residents, in particular in areas of insufficient economic growth or economic decline.
 - f. Support the community vision and rural community cohesion.
 - g. Need for multi-family and special needs housing opportunities.
 - h. Avoid creating new nonconforming uses.

- LNP 4.4** Concentrate and contain the existing built environment through development regulations allowing for infill development within Rural Village Center boundaries.

- LNP 4.5** Ensure the provision of a variety of goods and day-to-day services and a limited range of professional, public, and social services through new infill development and existing development which addresses most of the essential needs of the rural population and the commuting/traveling public, such as: community clubs, realty offices, churches, specialty shops (sporting goods, yarn, flowers, hobby, furniture, frame shop), laundromats, supermarkets, beauty parlors, antique dealers, banks, coffee shops, medical clinics, taverns, restaurants, liquor stores, video stores, building supply, gas stations, auto repair, bakeries, professional offices, ministorage, art galleries, post offices, and motels/hotels, as well as multi-family housing opportunities such as emergency housing, transitional housing, assisted living, group homes, duplexes/triplexes, and senior housing.

- LNP 4.6** Ensure visual compatibility of Rural Village Center commercial infill development with the surrounding rural area, through the creation and implementation of community based “rural character” design and development standards. Uses within Rural Village Centers shall be scaled and sized to preserve the natural character of the neighborhood.

- LNP 4.7** Commercial land use designations and boundaries may be modified consistent with the policies of this Plan and the criteria provided in RCW 36.70A.070 (5)(d).

- LNP 4.8** Assist the community of Brinnon, within the limits of available resources, in a public process to investigate the feasibility of an additional location for future commercial development, through a comprehensive study to examine factors including but not limited to environmental issues, economic viability, future growth projections, and infrastructure requirements, consistent with GMA requirements. The community planning process associated with the Brinnon Subarea Plan is a principal tool used to fulfill this objective.

- LNP 4.9** Evaluate the need for revised development regulations in Quilcene following a community Local Utility District election regarding a public water system, in order to address issues related to the adequacy of commercial fire flow.

GOAL:

- LNG 5.0** **Establish and maintain the location and size of the County’s Rural Crossroads to provide access to a limited range of non-residential uses.**

POLICIES:

- LNP 5.1** All rural commercial lands shall be designated based on the provisions of the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A).

- LNP 5.2** Establish logical outer boundaries based upon the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A).

- LNP 5.3** Concentrate and contain the existing area of predominantly pre-July 1990 built environment through development regulations for infill development within the boundary.

LNP 6.1.13(c) Exemptions allowed under this section shall be regulated subject to LNP 6.1.10. Any hearings associated with regulation under LNP 6.1.10 or conditional permitting under LNP 6.1.13(b) shall be held in Western Jefferson County close to the residents who may be affected.

LNP 6.1.14 Home-based businesses in the Brinnon Planning Area shall be regulated according to provisions established in the Brinnon Subarea Plan for the Brinnon Planning Area—Remote Rural overlay district. The intent of the Brinnon Planning Area—Remote Rural overlay district is to allow for expanded rural-compatible employment opportunities in a sparsely populated rural area that is isolated and remotely located from commercial and urban growth areas. The Brinnon Planning Area is characterized by high unemployment, a distressed resource-based economy, low residential densities, and a very limited projected 20-year population growth.

LNP 6.2 Permit cottage industries conducted as an accessory use within a single family dwelling or building accessory to a dwelling and which are wholly incidental and subordinate to the residential use of the property throughout the unincorporated portions of the County, subject to conditional use permit review procedures and the following criteria:

LNP 6.2.1 Cottage industry shall be defined as limited small-scale commercial or industrial activities including fabrication or production of goods, if the approval authority finds that such activities can be conducted without substantial adverse impact on the residential environment in the vicinity.

LNP 6.2.2 The scale of the proposals to be considered through this mechanism is typically greater than could be accommodated through a home occupation permit, but shall be considerably less than would require an outright rezone to industrial or commercial districts. A cottage industry may include occupations such as dressmaking, upholstering, weaving, baking, ceramic-making, painting, sculpting, the repair of personal items, computer software development, carpentry, metal working, and blacksmithing.

LNP 6.2.3 The following occupations are prohibited as cottage industries: auto, truck, or heavy equipment repair shop, autobody work or paint shop and large-scale furniture stripping.

LNP 6.2.4 Cottage industries are permitted in order to provide opportunities to supplement a family income, start up a business, or establish a work place at home. A cottage industry shall not grow beyond the scale permitted for such activities unless it is moved to a location designated for commercial or industrial uses.

LNP 6.2.5 Cottage industries should be considered independent of, and unconnected to, the rights that run with the property.

LNP 6.2.6 Cottage industries are not considered to be legal existing non-conforming uses as described under LNG 8.0.

LNP 6.2.7 Cottage industry activities shall consist of a limited-scale service or fabrication, and be conducted indoors, except that activities related to growing and storing plants may be conducted outdoors. Sales shall be limited to mail order and phone sales with off-site delivery.

designated for commercial or industrial uses. Instead they may be permitted conditionally at a non-residential location under provisions of RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)iii.

LNP 6.2.16(c) Exemptions allowed under this section shall be regulated subject to LNP 6.2.12. Any hearings associated with regulation under LNP 6.2.12 or conditional permit review procedures shall be held in Western Jefferson County close to the residents who may be affected.

LNP 6.2.17 Cottage industries in the Brinnon Planning Area shall be regulated according to provisions established in the Brinnon Subarea Plan for the Brinnon Planning Area—Remote Rural overlay district. The intent of the Brinnon Planning Area—Remote Rural overlay district is to allow for expanded rural-compatible employment opportunities in a sparsely populated rural area that is isolated and remotely located from commercial and urban growth areas. The Brinnon Planning Area is characterized by high unemployment, a distressed resource-based economy, low residential densities, and a very limited projected 20-year population growth.

SMALL-SCALE RECREATIONAL AND TOURIST RELATED USES

GOAL:

LNG 7.0 Foster economic development in rural areas which is small-scale recreational or tourist-related and that relies on a rural location and setting.

POLICIES:

LNP 7.1 Small-scale recreational or tourist uses that do not include new residential development shall be provided for by the conditional use permitting process or alternative permitting process established with the adoption of specific Small-scale Recreation and Tourist (SRT) overlay districts, subject to all of the following criteria:

LNP 7.1.1 Small-scale recreational or tourist uses shall demonstrate under the permit review process that the proposed wholly new location or use or expansion of existing location or use is reliant upon a particular rural location and setting.

LNP 7.1.2 Small-scale recreational or tourist uses shall be defined as those uses reliant upon the rural setting, incorporating the scenic and natural features of the land. These uses may include uses similar to campgrounds, U-fish ponds, hot springs, trails, boat launches and docks, outdoor/recreational equipment rental, private parks, recreational, cultural or religious retreats (non-residential), mini-golf, historic sites, gardens open to the public, animal viewing farms or wild game farms, horse arenas and stables, shooting ranges, music festivals/festival sites, and marinas. Under no circumstances should this policy be interpreted to permit new residential development or a Master Planned Resort pursuant to RCW 36.70A.360.

LNP 7.1.3 The primary use of the site shall be for the small-scale recreational or tourist use. Commercial facilities, as provided for within an approved conditional use permit for small-scale recreational or tourist uses, shall serve only those recreational and tourist uses and shall be clearly accessory to and dependent upon the primary recreational or tourist uses.

LNP 7.1.4 Small-scale recreational or tourist uses shall not include new residential development, except that necessary for on-site management.

- a. preserving the character of the existing natural neighborhood;
- b. physical boundaries such as bodies of water, roadways, and land forms and contours are used to assist in delineation of the site;
- c. abnormally irregular site boundaries are prevented;
- d. public facilities and services are provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl; and
- e. protecting critical areas and surface and groundwater resources.

LNP 7.1.8 Within Jefferson County’s isolated West End, allow small-scale recreation and tourist uses to provide basic goods and services to meet the needs of a local population living at a distance from commercial areas. This limited expansion of uses is also intended to allow for the creation of local jobs in an area of high unemployment and distressed economic conditions.

LNP 7.1.9 When a specific area is identified through community planning as appropriate for the intensification/expansion of existing small-scale recreation and tourist uses and for new small-scale recreation and tourist uses, a Small-scale Recreation and Tourist (SRT) overlay district for the identified area may establish variations from the conditional use permitting process and the criteria in this section, so long as the overall goals of the Rural Element are maintained (see criteria a. through e. in LNP 7.1.7).

LEGAL EXISTING USES

GOAL:

LNG 8.0 **Support the continued existence and economic viability of legally established land uses which become nonconforming as a result of Comprehensive Plan adoption.**

POLICIES:

LNP 8.1 Existing commercial and industrial uses that become nonconforming will be allowed to continue and to expand within limits as defined in LNP 8.5. Legal existing uses may be sold without jeopardizing the continuation of the use or activity.

LNP 8.2 Existing commercial and industrial uses in areas designated as Rural Residential will have the right to continue and not be subject to nuisance claims if operating in compliance with all County regulations.

LNP 8.3 Existing commercial and industrial uses should be allowed to expand or be replaced in Rural Residential areas provided that:

- a. they do not require additional urban levels of government service;
- b. they do not impose uncompensated additional costs to the taxpayers of Jefferson County for the provision of infrastructure, its replacement or improvement;
- c. they do not conflict with natural resource-based uses;
- d. they are compatible with surrounding rural uses, and

- e. the expansion results in no further adverse environmental or neighborhood impacts, unless mitigated.

LNP 8.4 Businesses that do not meet the above criteria shall not be expanded or rebuilt if destroyed.

LNP 8.5 Expansion of structures housing legal existing uses or replacement of structures occupied by legal existing nonconforming uses shall be subject to the following criteria:

property shall not be deemed abandoned and be allowed to remain vacant for up to three (3) years.

- LNP 8.11** Legal existing use nonconforming status only applies to businesses which were established prior to the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan as legal commercial establishments. This section does not apply to Home Businesses and Cottage Industries.

URBAN GROWTH AREAS

GOAL:

- LNG 9.0** Encourage a balance of commercial and industrial uses for urban-scale and regional-scale economic activities within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs).
- LNG 9.1** Provide for the orderly development of urban land uses in urban growth areas consistent with the provision of adequate and feasible urban levels of public facilities and services.

POLICIES:

- LNP 9.1** Encourage and facilitate regional-scale economic activities in UGAs which provide employment opportunities within the County.
- LNP 9.2** Encourage urban-scale and regional-scale commercial land uses in UGAs to provide goods and services that exceed the standards for rural commercial levels of service established by this plan.
- LNP 9.3** New urban growth should be channeled into areas that are already characterized by existing urban growth. Within the confines of the GMA, urban levels of services for capital facilities should be scaled to the needs of urban growth areas and the ability of businesses, homeowners, workers and the public to finance them.
- LNP 9.4** Future infrastructure improvements must be appropriate for the planned development densities in the County. UGAs will be implemented where urban public facilities and services are necessary to support higher density residential and/or commercial growth. The level of urban infrastructure must serve the needs of the public, protect the environment and be affordable.
- LNP 9.5** Encourage growth in the Tri-Area UGA commensurate with the appropriate level of existing urban public facility and service capacities consistent with adopted plans and interlocal agreements.
- (a) Manage development and redevelopment through revisions to the Unified Development Code (UDC) and the application of UGA overlay land use and zoning classifications that can be implemented consistent with the adopted levels of service for urban public facilities and services.

- (b) Provide urban governmental services at urban levels of services (see Capital Facilities Element, Policy CFP 1.1 for list of urban public facilities and their adopted interim and final levels of service) prior to or concurrent with development.
- (c) The County shall coordinate with the respective purveyor, special district, agency or other entities delivering, or who are anticipated to deliver, urban public facilities and services to ensure that growth and development are timed, phased, and consistent with the provision of adequate urban level facilities and services.
- (d) Where the County is not the urban public facility or service provider for the unincorporated UGA, the County shall adopt an Interlocal Agreement with the appropriate service provider, where necessary, to ensure the provision of adequate levels of service for urban public facilities and services. Such agreements, when utilized, shall include the level of urban public facilities and services.

LNP 9.6

Encourage growth in UGAs that will be served by a combination of both existing urban public facilities and services and any additional needed urban public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources.

- (a) Development within the Tri-Area UGA shall be limited to the interim densities and intensities of use, bulk and dimensional, and other development standards in effect at the time of initial UGA adoption, or as revised consistent with the adopted interim urban public facilities levels of service, until such time as the final sanitary sewer level of service (adopted in the Capital Facilities Element, CFP 1.1) can be provided concurrent with development.
- (b) For residential uses in the areas designated as Single-Family Residential (SFR) and Multi-Family Residential (MFR) in the Tri-Area UGA, a maximum interim density of one residential dwelling unit per 5 acres shall remain in effect until the full range of urban public facilities and services, including a sanitary sewer system, are available to service that development at urban levels. Consistent with current regulations, the County may authorize single-family home development on pre-existing platted lots provided they meet Jefferson County Environmental Health Department standards for on-site septic systems and drainfields—including a minimum 12,500 square foot lot (if served by a public water system). All new residential subdivisions—not involving pre-existing platted lot consolidation—shall meet the interim density standards and be designed to include not more than one acre for each parcel and the remaining acreage shall have conditions, covenants, and/or restrictions until such time as the full range of urban level public facilities and services are available. An alternative is to subdivide at the proposed urban density and use a combination of lots to provide the area needed to support on-site sewer until a community sanitary sewer system is available. In all cases, building placement will be reviewed for compliance with anticipated UGA overlay zoning. This is to ensure an orderly conversion to denser uses at the appropriate time.
- (c) Ensure that the location of proposed easements and road dedications, structures, drainage, and septic drainfields are consistent with the orderly future development of the property at urban densities.
- (d) Implementation of the full range of final urban densities and intensities of use—identified in the UGA overlay land use classifications—should be planned to occur commensurate with where adequate urban public facilities and services can be provided concurrent with development. The final urban densities and intensities of use identified in the UGA overlay land use designations shall only be implemented

in areas where the six (6) year capital facilities plan is prepared to provide “final” urban levels of service for public facilities and services (which includes a sanitary sewer system). The interim densities and intensities of use shall remain in effect in the remaining portions of the UGA until such time as the final sanitary sewer system level of service (adopted in CFP 1.1) can be made available concurrent with development in those areas.

CAPITAL FACILITIES

GOAL:

LNG 10.0 Limit the establishment or expansion of urban-style development and infrastructure to Urban Growth Areas and Master Planned Resorts.

POLICIES:

LNP 10.1 Ensure that expansion of urban-style infrastructure occurs only in coordination with designated land uses based on projected growth estimates and will be concurrent with amendments to the comprehensive plan.

LNP 10.2 Periodically review and update the Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP) to ensure consistency with the joint population projection and all land use designations.

LNP 10.3 Ensure that any impact fees adopted by the County require that a “fair share” of development costs are borne by the developer. Land use decisions should consider cost efficiency regarding publicly-funded infrastructure.

- LNP 10.4** Ensure that where the County assumes maintenance responsibilities for infrastructure, the infrastructure is adequately designed to meet the area growth projections and to fulfill the functions the infrastructure is intended to perform.
- LNP 10.5** Require the provision prior to or concurrent with development of an appropriate level of facilities and services. These services shall include, but are not limited to, potable water supply, commercial fire flow, adequate sewage disposal, and roads, including sidewalks and pathways if safety is an issue.
- LNP 10.6** Ensure that rural areas are served by a rural level of public services sufficient to meet the health and safety needs of community residents. Avoid installation of public infrastructure with reserve capacity in excess of that needed to maintain the identified level of public services for projected growth, in order to discourage additional, unanticipated growth.
- LNP 10.7** Allow community water facilities and community sewage facilities in rural commercial zones in order to support projected growth, or where necessary to protect public health and safety.

INDUSTRIAL LAND USES

GOAL:

- LNG 11.0** **Coordinate efforts with the City of Port Townsend to establish a process for authorizing the siting of major industrial developments outside designated Urban Growth Areas that is consistent with RCW 36.70A.365.**

POLICIES:

- LNP 11.1** Major industrial development shall be located within Urban Growth Areas and may be provided for by the conditional use permitting process and allowed in rural areas consistent with all the criteria in RCW 36.70A.365.
- LNP 11.2** Any proposed major industrial development located outside of a designated UGA and which shall meet all the criteria set forth in RCW 36.70A.365 cannot be developed as a commercial shopping development or as multi-tenant office parks.
- LNP 11.3** Recognize and contain the following pre-July, 1990 areas and uses of more intense industrial development within boundaries that may allow for limited areas of infill development:
- LNP 11.3.1** Designate the Port Townsend Paper Mill property as Heavy Industrial Zone as shown on the Land Use Map.
- LNP 11.3.2** Designate the Glen Cove area boundary as Light Industrial as shown on the Land Use Map, consistent with the provisions of RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d).

be revisited upon completion of the Tri-Area/Glen Cove Study through an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, consistent with LNP 1.4.

LNP 11.3.3 Designate the Quilcene industrial area as Light Industrial as shown on the Land Use Map.

LNP 11.3.4 The Brinnon Subarea Plan establishes a Light Industrial district north of the Brinnon Rural Village Center.

GOAL:

LNG 12.0 **Locate new natural resource-based industries in rural lands and near the resource upon which they are dependent, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.365.**

POLICIES:

LNP 12.1 Encourage the establishment of sustainable natural resource-based industrial uses in rural areas to provide employment opportunities.

LNP 12.2 Natural resource-based industries shall be located near the agricultural, forest, mineral, or aquaculture resource lands upon which they are dependent.

LNP 12.3 Recognize and designate existing pre-1990 forest resource-based industrial uses and activities at Center, Gardiner, and the West-End as Resource-Based Industrial Zones (**RBIZ**).

LNP 12.4 Existing forest resource based industrial uses and activities shall be recognized as areas of more intensive rural development under RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i). These Resource-Based Industrial Zones should be allowed to accommodate conversions and/or an intensification of these uses and activities under regulations to be developed in a public process under the provisions contained in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii).

LNP 12.4.1 While not all-inclusive, the following criteria shall be used when considering approval of criteria for a proposed change of use of activities at these sites. These criteria are:

- the proposed new use or activity will adapt or utilize the existing facility and/or equipment;
- the proposed new use or activity will utilize some form of the original natural resource as an input of production; and,
- the proposed new use or activity will add value to the original resource-based product or by-product.

LNP 12.4.2 New uses or activities proposed for existing RBIZs shall be limited in size and scale and shall not require the extension of urban services and/or infrastructure.

Since the adoption of the Interim Forest Lands Ordinance in January, 1997, the County has heard from both timber owners and adjacent landowners regarding conflicts over forest lands activities adjacent to residential lots that were previously platted in sizes too small to provide an adequate buffer from effects of activities such as noise and the spraying of herbicides. In 2002, a *Forest Transition Overlay* district was established to address potential conflict between forest resource lands and pre-platted high density residential parcels of one acre or less in size. However, this *Forest Transition Overlay* was limited in scope and does not preclude the necessity of convening a task force to explore potential incompatibility issues. These issues regarding limited and distinct areas raised in the public planning process will be addressed by reconvening the parties that negotiated the Interim Forest Lands Ordinance, including timber owners, environmental groups, landowners, and other interested parties to discuss measures to mitigate these effects. This public process is intended to result in recommendations that may include mitigative measures the timber owners can implement, as well as site-specific solutions. Any change in the Forest Lands Ordinance or Forest Lands designations would require full public review and should be based on agreement of the parties involved. Policy NRP 4.8 provides for convening the group of parties to initiate discussions.

All forest practices in Jefferson County must comply with the Washington State Forest Practices Act (RCW 76.09), administered by the Department of Natural Resources. Additionally, forest practices in designated Shoreline Environments must comply with the requirements of Jefferson County's Shoreline Management Master Program. These laws are designed to protect water quality, shorelines, fish and wildlife habitat and the public's opportunity to enjoy these resources. Regulations will also be developed and applied to incorporate the recommendations of agreed-upon watershed and salmon recovery plans related to land and resource management, which is further discussed in the Environment Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Landowners choosing to convert their land to non-forest uses also must state their intent on the Forest Practices Application. As provided in the Forest Practices Act, these landowners must conduct their forest practices in accordance with applicable local government regulations, which may include, but are not limited to, the Critical Areas Ordinance and the State Environmental Policy Act.

Forest lands being converted to non-forest uses should be managed to guide the manner and extent of alteration and to minimize adverse environmental impacts. The 1997 State Legislature enacted Substitute Senate Bill 5714, requiring local governments to issue forest practice permits for harvest sites which will be converted to non-forestry purposes (Class IV – General). The bill also mandates that local governments develop a public process for lifting the six-year moratorium on conversion required when the landowner does not state an intent to convert or when a harvest project occurs without obtaining the appropriate Forest Practice application. This law expands the County's regulatory role in forest practices, and will require closer coordination with the State Department of Natural Resources. The County will revise the Interim Forest Lands Ordinance to address these new requirements and, where necessary, will establish standards which meet or exceed current Forest Practice requirements based on the goals and policies of this plan.

In addition, a County clearing and grading ordinance with more comprehensive standards than those that apply under the Forest Practices Act will be developed to protect surface and ground water quality and quantity, control storm water runoff, and minimize damage to fish and wildlife habitat. More information on the clearing and grading ordinance is provided in the Environment Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

NRP 3.5 Support and facilitate the improvement of state and local environmental regulations affecting the forest products industry in order to improve operational predictability, minimize regulatory costs to forest land owners, and encourage protection of the forest environment and surrounding watersheds.

GOAL:

NRG 4.0 **Minimize potential conflicts between forest management activities and land use activities within or adjacent to designated forest lands.**

POLICIES:

NRP 4.1 Prohibit the subdivision of designated Forest Lands for residential purposes except for lands that have been designated as Forest Transition Overlay. Allow one dwelling unit on each legal lot of record in accordance with State law.

NRP 4.2 Adopt a final Forest Lands Ordinance that includes criteria from the Growth Management Act and the interim ordinance for conditional uses in Forest Lands.

NRP 4.3 Minimize conflicts with Forest Land activities by developing site and design requirements for land use activities adjacent to designated forest land.

NRP 4.4 Minimize dangers from natural disasters such as fire, through siting and design criteria for structures on designated Forest Lands.

NRP 4.5 Minimize conflict between primary and secondary forest production facilities and related developments and forest management activities through siting and design requirements.

NRP 4.6 Prohibit the extension of service areas of utility local improvement districts, fire districts, or sewer, water, or public utility districts into designated Forest Lands except for lands that have been designated as Forest Transition Overlay.

NRP 4.7 Address community concerns and land use conflicts which may arise as a result of forest practices in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, forest landowners, and the general public.

NRP 4.8 Facilitate a cooperative process bringing together timber company representatives, environmental groups, landowners, and other interested parties to address concerns related to incompatible land uses between parcels existing adjacent to forest lands at the time of adoption of Ordinance #01-0121-97, the interim Forest Lands Ordinance.

GOAL:

NRG 5.0 **Encourage the continuation of forestry on lands which are not designated as commercial forest resource lands.**

POLICIES:

NRP 5.1 Evaluate proposals for conversion of forest land through a public process to assess the long-term economic impact of decreasing the amount of land available for sustainable forest production and harvest.

5. Economic Development	Housing affordability is affected by two interdependent factors: housing cost and household income. Housing costs have continued to inflate steadily over the past twenty-five years, while real household income has declined. The result has been a nationwide housing affordability crisis. While the Housing Element focuses on housing cost issues, the Economic Development Element addresses household income. In order to correct the wage-housing mismatch and enhance affordability, it is necessary to work incrementally on both factors.
6. Capital Facilities	Infrastructure is one of the most significant costs in housing development. Higher density housing is more affordable because it spreads the cost of infrastructure across a greater number of units, reducing each unit's share. However, higher density uses require higher levels of services. Therefore, capital facilities improvements and extensions are an essential method of encouraging affordable housing, particularly within the Tri-Area UGA, Rural Village Centers and Port Ludlow. The levels of service, phasing and design of facilities must be done carefully to keep the cost of necessary infrastructure within the affordable limits of local residents and businesses.
7. Transportation	The physical proximity of jobs, services and housing is an important component in housing affordability. A mixture of uses in one location reduces transportation costs, which increases disposable income. Additionally, higher density land uses are essential to cost effective public transit systems.

HOUSING BACKGROUND AND EXISTING CONDITIONS

Introduction

The first step in assessing the present and future housing requirements of Jefferson County is to analyze the characteristics of its existing and projected population, including age, household size, income, location and special needs. These characteristics provide an indication of the nature of the demand for housing over the 20-year planning period.

The overall demand for housing is projected to increase significantly over the next twenty years. Jefferson County, including the City of Port Townsend, is expected to add approximately 13,600 people, or 6,800 households¹, over the 20-year planning period. Approximately forty percent (40%) of these households are anticipated to locate within the city limits of Port Townsend.

The second step in assessing the housing requirements of County residents is to analyze the characteristics of the existing and expected housing supply, including location, size, cost, and condition.

By comparing the needs of the population to the resources of the housing stock, the gaps in the housing market can be identified. This comparison of demand and supply allows Jefferson County to develop housing policies for lands under its jurisdiction and to prioritize implementation strategies. The issues facing the County are:

1. Where to direct population growth given environmental constraints, the cost of providing public services, and the requirements of the Growth Management Act;
2. How to ensure that a range of housing types and prices are available; and,
3. How to maintain and enhance the vitality and character of established rural residential neighborhoods.

¹ Assuming two persons per household

GOALS AND POLICIES

The goals outlined below provide a general direction for housing policy in Jefferson County. These goals are based on the requirements of the Growth Management Act, which outlines specific criteria for the provision of housing affordable to all segments of the population.

As in all elements of this Plan, the goals are general statements while policies are more specific. Goals state the general growth management intentions of the County while the policies are the processes for implementation. Strategies identify the specific projects or programs that will be used to implement the policies.

HOUSING

GOAL:

HSG 1.0 **Encourage and support efforts to provide an adequate supply of housing for County residents of all income groups.**

POLICIES:

HSP 1.1 Promote the provision of an adequate supply of housing through interjurisdictional and public-private cooperative efforts.

HSP 1.2 Encourage a regional fair share housing allocation process that establishes affordable and special needs housing targets for urban growth areas and the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort.

HSP 1.3 Promote regionally coordinated low income housing in coordination with the Jefferson County Housing Authority, non-profit housing providers, and other public and private housing interests.

HSP 1.4 Support the Jefferson County Housing Authority and the Community Action Council, in their efforts to develop a home repair program, funded through State administered block grant funds, or the State Housing Assistance Program.

GOAL:

HSG 2.0 **Promote a variety of affordable housing choices throughout the County through the use of innovative land use practices, development standards, design techniques, and building permit requirements.**

POLICIES:

HSP 2.1 Establish consistent development regulations and procedures which promote environmental quality, public health, and safety standards while minimizing the economic impact on the development of housing.

While Jefferson County can influence the first three components through its policies and regulations, the latter four are, for the most part, independent of local government. In order to provide the housing needed by the residents of Jefferson County, it will be necessary to develop new relationships with the City of Port Townsend, Washington State, and the private sector.

Regionalism and Fair Share

Based upon the population projections in the mutually adopted Watterson West Report, the City of Port Townsend has developed housing policies for the Urban Growth Area under City jurisdiction in its Comprehensive Plan. These policies provide for the accommodation of the City's Fair share of household growth over the 20-year planning period.

Under GMA, the County's designated Urban Growth Area must bear responsibility for locating higher density and multi-family residential areas. This type of housing can be developed much more affordably than single family housing that occurs in the rural areas. However, the County is severely constrained to accommodate this type of housing because of infrastructure requirements. High density and multi-family housing requires a full range of urban services, including public water, sewer, transportation, and complementary and supportive land uses for employment and retail needs.

Port Ludlow is the only unincorporated community in Jefferson County which also has a full range of urban services including public water and sewer. Some of its undeveloped lands are currently designated for future higher density, multi-family residential. Port Ludlow is responsible for its share in developing affordable higher density and multi-family housing both for purchase and for rent.

This presents the opportunity for regional cooperation and coordination. In regional housing markets, housing issues cut across all jurisdictions and communities. The actions of each jurisdiction affect the other. No jurisdiction or community is independent of another regarding the difficulty of encouraging affordable housing to a growing population. Although each jurisdiction is taking steps to provide housing for future household growth, regional coordination is needed.

A monitoring system should be implemented to determine the success of efforts to encourage housing for low and moderate income households. Since both the City and the County will need to develop this process, it is important to take a coordinated regional approach using consistent surveys, modeling, assumptions, and techniques. Because of its role in the regional housing market, the Housing Authority of Jefferson County may be the best organization to lead this process.

This process should provide low and moderate income targets for the jurisdictions that are achievable in a progressive manner over the 20-year planning period. That is, short term and long term affordable housing needs should be addressed. The process should identify programs and finance mechanisms that will result in meaningful progress toward the targets.

If the monitoring system identifies shortfalls in accommodating the Fair share housing targets, a cooperative process to determine appropriate inter-jurisdictional and inter-community solutions should be developed. Potential strategies include regional funding for low and moderate income housing, density transfers, and resource donations.

To plan adequately for the provision of open space, priority areas need to be identified. The majority of land that should receive priority attention in terms of open space designation within Jefferson County includes most environmentally sensitive areas including stream and drainage corridors. Other areas that should receive priority attention consist of those currently facing development pressure (i.e., actual building activity or land division).

The map on Page 6-11 illustrates some priority areas for open space designation as determined by the Jefferson Land Trust (identified in light blue). The primary areas consist of: the North Quimper Peninsula Corridor area connecting the Cape George area to Fort Worden; an open space area extending from Tibbals Lake south through the valley adjacent to Jacob Miller Road; the Chimacum Creek watershed; and the headwaters of Discovery, Quilcene and Tarboo Bays.

PARKS AND RECREATION STRATEGY

Jefferson County contains many park and recreational assets (see map on page 6-13). Approximately three-fourths of the 1,808 square miles of land area in the County is in public ownership. The two largest publicly owned areas are the Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest.

Of the one hundred and seventeen (117) recreational areas found in the County, thirty four (34) are locally managed: twenty (20) by Jefferson County, seven (7) by the City of Port Townsend, and seven (7) by the Port of Port Townsend. The Jefferson County Parks and Recreation Department conducts organized recreational activities and instruction that include baseball, basketball, soccer, volleyball, hiking, swimming, exercise, bicycling, and sailing.

The demand for County park and recreational facilities comes predominantly from the following groups:

- Jefferson County residents;
- Tourists en route to other recreational areas, including the Olympic National Park and National Forest, Clallam County recreational facilities, Vancouver Island and other scenic areas in Canada; and
- Recreational enthusiasts including hikers, bicyclists, campers, and beachcombers who visit the many State parks, such as Fort Worden and Fort Flagler, as well as the many County parks.

The Jefferson County Parks Comprehensive Plan estimates the need and demand for parks and recreation areas and facilities in the County. This element of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan provides need and location criteria as well as proposes means for eliminating existing deficiencies in the County's system of parks and recreation areas. However, because the Growth Management Act defines recreation facilities as a component of necessary public facilities, the Capital Facilities Element will reflect the established demand and proposed planning policies in respect to parks and recreation.

The Jefferson County Parks Comprehensive Plan

The purpose of the Jefferson County Parks Comprehensive Plan is to identify how park, recreation and open space needs should be addressed and implemented, for the benefit of both County residents and visitors alike. In order to achieve this, the Parks Comprehensive Plan defines a set of policies and proposals adopted by the various local jurisdictions in the County. The goals of the planning process are as follows:

- To reflect the desires and needs of Jefferson County citizens as expressed through community involvement by survey and public meetings and workshops;
- To define specific projects and project goals;
- To coordinate County programs and services through cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies;
- To aid in developing, correlating, and coordinating official regulations and guidelines; and
- To obtain funding for parks and recreational needs and projects.

The Plan addresses the location and available services of all existing park and recreation facilities, the results of the public survey and public meetings, and specific capital improvement projects. The Plan also makes recommendations on implementing identified park and recreation goals.

Because the Jefferson County Parks Comprehensive Plan is the adopted parks and recreation policy document for Jefferson County, its conclusions and recommendations were used as a starting point and prioritization for the goals and policies of this Element. Future revisions of the Jefferson County Parks Comprehensive Plan will ensure its compliance with the County's Comprehensive Plan, including the goals, policies, and strategies of both this element and the Capital Facilities Element.

Two successful projects that have responded to the high level of community interest in additional park and recreational opportunities in Jefferson County are the H.J. Carroll Park and the Larry Scott Memorial Park Trail.

The H.J. Carroll Park was constructed in Chimacum on a 40-acre parcel that was the former site of the Anderson Gravel Pit. The purpose of the park was to provide a regional multi-purpose recreational facility. Due to its scope, this will be a phased project. The first phase has provided a sports field for football, baseball and soccer. Trails, restrooms and picnic facilities have also been constructed.

Later phases envision the development of a picnic shelter, aquatic center, playground, environmental learning center, and facilities for multi-purpose recreational activities including volleyball courts, basketball courts and a skateboard area.

This ambitious County Park project constituted one of the largest County Park projects undertaken to date and was made possible through a partnership of public and private interests. The completion of this facility will take a number of years, but the end result will provide great benefit to the residents of Jefferson County for many years to come.

The vision for the Larry Scott Memorial Trail is to provide future generations with a safe, non-motorized recreation and transportation corridor connecting Port Townsend with rural Jefferson County. As proposed, the route extends approximately seven miles from the Port of Port Townsend Boat Haven to Four Corners Road. The long-term vision is to extend the trail to Discovery Bay and eventually to points further west.

The first phase of this project involved the construction of a two-mile segment extending from the Port of Port Townsend to Mill Road. This initial phase included the gravel surfacing of the pedestrian trail, installing regulatory and interpretive signage, fencing, and the construction of a trail terminus area with seating, an information kiosk, landscaping, and an informal stairway to the beach. Later phases will extend the trail system to Four Corners.

- EDP 6.3** Allow for low-impact home-based businesses and cottage industries, including bed and breakfasts, in rural residential areas, subject to review procedures and permitting.
- EDP 6.4** Encourage the provision of technology that fosters home-based businesses, (i.e., telecommuting, fiber optics, etc.).
- EDP 6.5** Develop criteria for the variety and siting of home-based businesses with low impacts on rural residential properties and amend the zoning code as necessary.
- EDP 6.6** Encourage small businesses and cottage industries that manufacture value-added wood products and products using regional agricultural commodities.
- EDP 6.7** Encourage local recycling industries.
- EDP 6.8** Encourage businesses which focus on environmental management, research and restoration.
- EDP 6.9** Conserve and enhance existing agriculture and encourage future innovative agriculture ventures and technologies.
- EDP 6.10** Direct new industrial/associated commercial development in the Glen Cove area to areas within the logical boundaries established under the provisions of RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) while continuing to work with the City of Port Townsend regarding capital facility, land use and transformance of governance issues affecting potential future implementation of a UGA in the area.

GOAL:

- EDG 7.0** **Support the full range of human and social services necessary to encourage a strong local economy.**

POLICIES:

- EDP 7.1** Support development of social service facilities and programs that support employment opportunities, meet community needs and help maintain Jefferson County's quality of life.
- EDP 7.2** Support the location, development and maintenance of special needs, social service facilities within the boundaries of designated Rural Centers, including but not limited to job retraining, health care, day care, elder care, education, transportation, nutrition programs, and food banks.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

PURPOSE: The purpose of the Transportation Element is to provide a framework of goals, policies, and strategies necessary to develop the transportation facilities that will serve Jefferson County in the future. The element describes the service standards desired for the County's transportation system, projects the impact that the land use pattern recommended in this comprehensive plan will have on the transportation system, and identifies the improvements necessary to meet future demand.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) provides for a systematic approach for estimating and planning for future transportation needs based on an analysis of existing conditions and a projection of future conditions. This Transportation Element meets the requirements of the GMA.

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 transportation 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 (see the Capital Facilities Element), 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 (see Capital Facilities Element).

Relationship with Other Comprehensive Plan Elements

Land use and transportation are inextricably connected -- it is the use of the land that determines the demand for travel to, from, and through various locations. The future land use identified in the Comprehensive Plan is, in turn, shaped by the values and goals expressed in the other elements of the Plan. The Plan addresses such issues as the protection and use of natural resources, the amount and type of open space and recreational opportunities available in the County, the locations and types of housing to be made available, the types and locations of various economic activities, and the funding priorities of the County. This Transportation Element has been developed in accordance with the other Comprehensive Plan elements, and has been integrated with the other elements to ensure consistency throughout the Plan.

While the main focus of the goals and policies in the Transportation Element are transportation system-related and addressed solely in this element, this element reflects the policy intent of the other elements as well. Policies relating to design of pedestrian environments, recreation and pedestrian trails, support

for urban densities through appropriate transportation facility design, protection of the characteristics of the rural environment, protection of sensitive areas, and encouraging conservation of energy are reinforced in a transportation context. Goals and policies that relate more directly to these areas are found in the following elements: Land Use, Rural, Housing, Economic Development, Natural Resources Conservation Environment, and Capital Facilities.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT STRATEGY

Jefferson County's strategy for managing its transportation network is to encourage efficient multimodal transportation through implementation of the policies of the transportation element which address: the County's highways and arterials; public transportation needs and services; nonmotorized transportation facilities; land development standards associated with the County's transportation network; state, regional, and local intergovernmental coordination; promotion of transportation demand management programs; protection of the environment and conservation of energy in transportation activities; and development of a transportation improvement program that will identify and rank projects for funding.

INTRODUCTION

This Transportation Element describes all relevant modes of travel contained in the overall county transportation system, including automobile, transit, freight, air, ferry, bicycle and pedestrian. The Element presents travel forecasts; level of service standards and analysis; and transportation goals and policies developed by the Jefferson County Transportation Planning Advisory Board in conjunction with the Planning Commission. Recommendations for transportation improvements are contained in the Capital Facilities Element.

The Transportation Element was developed over a period of several years, during which time, five Technical Memorandums were prepared and reviewed by the Transportation Planning Advisory Board, Planning Commission, and coordinated with the goals, policies, and plans of other appropriate state, regional, and local jurisdictions. These Technical Memorandums and discussion papers (listed below) provide the background data and initial analysis that are the foundation for the Transportation Element as it has evolved:

<u>Technical Memorandum/Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
1. Public Participation Program	11/6/92 (final)
2. Transportation Data Inventory	9/29/92 (initial draft; data updated in subsequent versions)
3. Goals and Policies	6/23/93 (final, as accepted by Transportation Planning Advisory Board)
4. Outline and Format of the Transportation Plan	1/8/93 (format revised since this report)
5. Transportation Facility Adequacy: Existing and Forecast	7/15/93 (updated in subsequent drafts)
<u>Discussion Papers</u>	<u>Date</u>
Transportation Mitigation and Policy Review	4/25/95
Transportation Alternatives Analysis	5/5/95
Transportation Concurrency: Requirements and Potential Solutions	5/10/95

All background data and reports relating to the development of the Transportation Element, including the Technical Memorandums, are available in the County's Public Works Department.

More recently, Port Hadlock has been selected for designation as a UGA. This decision followed completion (2001) of a "Special Study" assessing the impacts of creation of a Tri-Area UGA. As part of that process, a detailed transportation analysis was completed and included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS – August 1999).

Intergovernmental Coordination

The Growth Management Act requires that comprehensive plans, including the Transportation Element, be prepared through a process which includes not only public participation but also intergovernmental coordination. In the case of the development of the Jefferson County Transportation Element, this has included coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO), City of Port Townsend, Port of Port Townsend, Jefferson Transit, and Community Planning Groups.

Washington State Ferries are also a part of the freight transport system in the County, carrying commercial trucks from East Puget Sound via Keystone to Port Townsend. Port Townsend Paper Corporation also owns a 600-foot dock that can accommodate large ocean-going vessels. Due to shallow waters, ships cannot leave fully loaded. The Port Townsend Paper Corporation generates more than 40 in-bound trucks per day. In-bound freight consists primarily of raw materials such as wood chips, and outbound trucking freight is paper goods. Most air freight is handled at Fairchild International Airport in Port Angeles. Regularly scheduled commercial air service is provided by Horizon Airlines, Federal Express, United Parcel Service, and Pony Express Air Service. Port locations are depicted in **Figure 10-3**, along with airport locations.

Freight travel can have impacts on County roadways and roadway needs. The heavy weight of trucks breaks down pavement structure and is a significant factor in the need for maintenance of roadways. Road characteristics such as width, alignment, and sight distance on some roads may be inappropriate for trucks.

Nonmotorized Transportation System

This section was revised in conjunction with the adoption of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan in 2002.

Pedestrian Circulation and Bicycle Facilities

Given the rural nature of Jefferson County, travel occurs predominantly by motorized vehicle. However, bicycle and pedestrian circulation are important transportation modes that are used by County residents. More residents would likely use non-motorized transportation modes if adequate and more extensive facilities were available. Many County roads lack adequate shoulders that would make bicycling and walking safer and more enjoyable. Pedestrian facilities including sidewalks and walking paths would improve conditions for walking to school and in densely developed areas such as Port Hadlock. Off-road trails would provide alternative routes for non-motorized travel.

In order to fulfill policies and action items of the Transportation Element and develop a systematic approach for providing additional non-motorized transportation facilities, the Public Works Department conducted a non-motorized transportation and trails planning process during 2001 and 2002. A Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan was developed in conjunction with an update of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan.

The planning process began with a series of public workshops that were held in communities throughout Jefferson County. An inventory of existing non-motorized transportation and trails facilities was compiled, as well as a vision of the facilities that County residents would like to have. This vision included providing a system of on-road and off-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities linking communities, commercial and employment centers, schools, and recreational areas and developing the Olympic Discovery Trail from the end of the Larry Scott Trail at Four Corners to Clallam County.

The Public Works Department convened a Non-motorized Transportation Task Force to assist in developing goals and policies and facility design standards and prioritizing non-motorized transportation projects. A survey of County voters was conducted to determine opinions regarding project priorities and alternative funding sources. A Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan was developed. The Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan was adopted as a stand-alone document during the 2002 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle. The Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan has a detailed inventory of non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities, goals and policies, design standards, a list of potential projects, discussion of alternative funding strategies, and alternative capital facilities plans.

Figure 10-4 depicts existing and proposed on-road bicycle routes identified in the Plan.

Figure 10-4

Multi-purpose Trails

Washington State Ferries are also a part of the freight transport system in the County, carrying commercial trucks from East Puget Sound via Keystone to Port Townsend. Port Townsend Paper Corporation also owns a 600-foot dock that can accommodate large ocean-going vessels. Due to shallow waters, ships cannot leave fully loaded. The Port Townsend Paper Corporation generates more than 40 in-bound trucks per day. In-bound freight consists primarily of raw materials such as wood chips, and outbound trucking freight is paper goods. Most air freight is handled at Fairchild International Airport in Port Angeles. Regularly scheduled commercial air service is provided by Horizon Airlines, Federal Express, United Parcel Service, and Pony Express Air Service. Port locations are depicted in **Figure 10-3**, along with airport locations.

Freight travel can have impacts on County roadways and roadway needs. The heavy weight of trucks breaks down pavement structure and is a significant factor in the need for maintenance of roadways. Road characteristics such as width, alignment, and sight distance on some roads may be inappropriate for trucks.

Nonmotorized Transportation System

This section was revised in conjunction with the adoption of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan in 2002.

Pedestrian Circulation and Bicycle Facilities

Given the rural nature of Jefferson County, travel occurs predominantly by motorized vehicle. However, bicycle and pedestrian circulation are important transportation modes that are used by County residents. More residents would likely use non-motorized transportation modes if adequate and more extensive facilities were available. Many County roads lack adequate shoulders that would make bicycling and walking safer and more enjoyable. Pedestrian facilities including sidewalks and walking paths would improve conditions for walking to school and in densely developed areas such as Port Hadlock. Off-road trails would provide alternative routes for non-motorized travel.

In order to fulfill policies and action items of the Transportation Element and develop a systematic approach for providing additional non-motorized transportation facilities, the Public Works Department conducted a non-motorized transportation and trails planning process during 2001 and 2002. A Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan was developed in conjunction with an update of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan.

The planning process began with a series of public workshops that were held in communities throughout Jefferson County. An inventory of existing non-motorized transportation and trails facilities was compiled, as well as a vision of the facilities that County residents would like to have. This vision included providing a system of on-road and off-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities linking communities, commercial and employment centers, schools, and recreational areas and developing the Olympic Discovery Trail from the end of the Larry Scott Trail at Four Corners to Clallam County.

The Public Works Department convened a Non-motorized Transportation Task Force to assist in developing goals and policies and facility design standards and prioritizing non-motorized transportation projects. A survey of County voters was conducted to determine opinions regarding project priorities and alternative funding sources. A Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan was developed. The Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan was adopted as a stand-alone document during the 2002 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle. The Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan has a detailed inventory of non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities, goals and policies, design standards, a list of potential projects, discussion of alternative funding strategies, and alternative capital facilities plans.

Figure 10-4 depicts existing and proposed on-road bicycle routes identified in the Plan.

Figure 10-4

Multi-purpose Trails

set a goal of seven days a week while Jefferson Transit primarily provides regular service five days a week.

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING METHOD

Analysis Of Alternatives

The County considered several land use alternatives in developing the Comprehensive Plan. To meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act and to allow the community the opportunity to analyze the various land use alternatives, travel forecasts were developed for the alternatives and the baseline condition. The analysis of these land use scenarios and their impacts on transportation in the County is available in the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Comprehensive Plan and the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments.

Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan

The alternative chosen for the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan adopted in August, 1998 designated one Urban Growth Area, Port Townsend. However, the Plan recommended studies to analyze whether the Port Hadlock/Irondale (Tri-Area) and Glen Cove should become Urban Growth Areas. Based on the results of the Tri-Area / Glen Cove Special Study, an Urban Growth Area has been designated in Port Hadlock and Irondale. This designation will permit commercial, industrial, and residential development at an urban scale and density. Transportation studies that were conducted for the Tri-Area / Glen Cove Special Study provide useful information regarding the transportation facilities necessary to support urban development in the Port Hadlock UGA.

Port Ludlow has been designated as a Master Planned Resort. This designation permits urban-style development that is consistent with the MPR designation.

Commercial areas in Quilcene and Brinnon are designated as Rural Village Centers. These established historic rural business centers will continue to serve as commercial and service centers serving their respective surrounding communities and rural neighborhoods, and are not to be regarded as future urban growth areas.

The type and intensity of future commercial growth within the Rural Village Centers will be regulated so as to allow for only development that serves the needs of the surrounding rural area, including the expected needs of the projected future residential population.

The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan requires that any future subdivision of rural residential land not exceed 1:5, 1:10, or 1:20 acre densities. The overall land use pattern intended for unincorporated Jefferson County outside of the Port Hadlock UGA is rural in nature, with rural commercial activities focused in the Rural Village Centers.

It is recognized that the County has an excess of buildable lots needed for the growth projected for the County. A large number of these lots are located within the Port Hadlock UGA. Many of these lots are at densities greater than the 1:5 rural density specified in the Land Use Element. Since these lots are recognized as existing lots of records, they can be developed provided that they meet Health Department requirements. As these lots are developed in the future and additional traffic is generated, transportation system improvements, including non-motorized transportation facilities, may be necessary.

It is important to note, however, that transportation growth and needs anticipated in the 1998 Plan will remain unchanged with the addition of the Port Hadlock area as a UGA for the near-term. This is due to the continuing constraint placed on development in Port Hadlock through lack of sewer facilities. Therefore, past analysis of population and transportation and the analysis contained in the 1998 plan are still applicable until such time as sewer planning is complete (within the next Plan update). With the designation of the UGA, sewer planning will begin, but facilities will not be in place over the next six years. An analysis of the build-out impacts (beyond the 20 year planning horizon) due to the Port Hadlock area UGA addition, are contained in the FSEIS for the proposed Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments.

The Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization utilized a composite growth rate developed from the individual growth rates established by the four counties (Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap, and Mason) within the region. This regional growth rate factor identified the same State Route segments as exceeding capacity within the planning horizon. The Washington State Highway System Plan provides a statewide analysis. Under the "financially constrained" alternative, the state system plan also identifies the same segments of US 101, SR 104, and SR 20 as exceeding capacity as identified in this plan.

Motorized Transportation System - Transit, Airports, Ferry Service, and Freight Travel

The Capital Facilities Element Requirements presents proposed capacity-related improvements for Capital Improvements for Jefferson Transit service. Capacity-related projects for airports and ferry service are also presented in the Capital Facilities Element Requirements. Freight service is partially addressed by the County in its evaluation of roadway and airport facilities; rail service and other port-related freight services are addressed by those entities.

Nonmotorized Transportation System

Capacity-related needs for nonmotorized modes of travel are presented in the Capital Facilities Element of this Plan. This table shows Jefferson County's adopted level of service of 0.52 miles of trails per 1,000 population and an inventory of 15 miles in 1998. The table shows there would be a deficiency of 0.59 miles in 2003, if additional facilities are not provided. Since 1998 Jefferson County has developed 4.8 miles of the Larry Scott Trail, 5 miles of walking and mountain bike trails at Gibbs Lake Park, and 1.5 miles of trails at HJ Carroll Park. Based on these facility additions, Jefferson County exceeds its adopted level of service. More detailed information is available in the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

Non-Capacity Analysis

Motorized Transportation System - Vehicular

While the primary focus of this plan's analysis was capacity, a number of non-capacity deficiencies were noted by the Jefferson County Department of Public Works staff and in community meetings. Non-capacity projects include those related to the safety of the transportation facility, the need for improvement maintenance of the facility, or the preservation of the facility. These non-capacity projects were identified using the County priority rating systems for road segments and intersections. Recommended improvement projects, along with funding sources for these projects, are listed in the Six-year Transportation Improvement Program adopted by the County and appear in this Plan's Capital Facilities Element.

Motorized Transportation System - Transit, Airports, Ferry Service, and Freight Travel

Noncapacity transit, airports, ferry service, and freight travel needs are not specifically identified in the Capital Facilities Element of this plan. Additional detail on projects is available in the Element's background data found in the Capital Facilities Element Requirements. Similarly, transit facility and equipment needs identified in Jefferson Transit's Capital Improvement Program are also presented in that document.

Nonmotorized Transportation System

Detailed information regarding non-capacity-related non-motorized transportation and recreational trail projects can be found in the Non-Motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

- TRP 2.6** Identify and invest in road and pedestrian improvements that support transit reliability and safety, and encourage use of the public transportation system.
- TRP 2.7** Promote and enhance passenger and freight travel opportunities, including development of air and water transportation alternatives.

NONMOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION

GOAL

- TRG 3.0** **Provide safe, accessible and convenient routes, trails, parking facilities, trail heads, and other amenities that promote the use of nonmotorized travel in a manner that is integrated with other forms of transportation.**

POLICIES

- TRP 3.1** Using established standards and in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan, provide facilities for safe bicycle and pedestrian travel.
- TRP 3.2** Encourage development of a non-motorized transportation network between all major activity centers in Jefferson County in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.
- TRP 3.3** In coordination with the County Parks and Recreation Division, federal, state and regional agencies, utilities and other agencies, and citizen groups, promote the development of new trails and linkages between trails in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.
- TRP 3.4** Promote development of an integrated trail system in the County in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan by seeking opportunities to provide links between existing trails during planning for improvements to the County transportation system and in review of land development proposals.
- TRP 3.5** Promote coordinated bicycle, equestrian, and pedestrian way improvements in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan, emphasizing access to schools, parks, employment and service centers, and mass transit facilities (ferry, bus, etc.).
- TRP 3.6** Require that roadway improvements and new subdivisions within the defined school pedestrian walking zone meet established standards intended to ensure the safety of pedestrians.
- TRP 3.7** Support educational opportunities for children and adults that will encourage safe use of roadways, trails, and sidewalks for all transportation modes.
- TRP 3.8** Promote safe, convenient, and protected bicycle parking at activity centers such as schools, parks, commercial centers, employment and service centers, and mass transit facilities (ferry, bus, etc.) in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

TRP 3.9 In coordination with the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan and the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreation Trails Plan, provide signage for on-street segments of bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian routes in accordance with the Federal Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

TRP 3.10 Promote development of adequate pedestrian walkways and crossings, where appropriate, including facilities separated from the roadway, in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. Evaluate safety issues associated with pedestrian and bicycle travel near school sites and identify potential improvements.

LAND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

GOAL

TRG 4.0 **Encourage land use types, mixes, and densities that promote efficient multimodal transportation systems.**

POLICIES

TRP 4.1 Reinforce the link between land use and public transportation by promoting urban residential densities within urban growth areas.

TRP 4.2 Encourage land development proposals that are consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element and Rural Element and utilize the capacity of the existing transportation system, including the capacity of transit and nonmotorized modes, and avoid costly expansion of the system.

TRP 4.3 Consider the use of impact fees as a means to ensure that adequate facilities (including, but not limited to transit, pedestrian facilities, bikeways or roadways) are available to serve new growth and development, and to maintain adopted level of service standards for those facilities.

TRP 4.4 Enhance transportation system safety by requiring appropriate facility design, including providing landscaping and setbacks adjacent to transportation facilities.

TRP 4.5 Protect outstanding scenic vistas accessible from transportation facilities through site design, and provide visual, and where possible and appropriate, physical, access to these resources.

TRP 4.6 Require that subdivision and commercial project designs address the following issues:

- a. Cost effective transit and delivery of emergency service;
- b. Provisions for all transportation modes;
- c. Dedication of rights of way for existing and future transportation needs;
- d. Motorized and nonmotorized access;
- e. Sidewalks and bicycle pathways;
- f. Compatibility between motorized vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users;

- TRP 10.5** Address environmental retrofitting of transportation facilities, including the implementation of storm water facility best management practices and the replacement of culverts that impede fish passage, as opportunities and funding allows.
- TRP 10.6** Transportation facilities and services shall be sited, designed, or buffered to fit in harmoniously with their surroundings, as appropriate. When sited within or adjacent to residential areas, special attention should be given to noise, light, and glare impacts.
- TRP 10.7** Encourage buffering between motorized travel and nonmotorized transportation modes, where appropriate and economically feasible.

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

GOAL

- TRG 11.0** **Develop a transportation improvement program that is consistent with the comprehensive plan.**

POLICIES

- TRP 11.1** Roadway improvement projects included in the County's six-year transportation improvement program shall be consistent with the goals and policies of the Transportation Element, other elements of the County's Comprehensive Plan, and the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.
- TRP 11.2** Projects included in the transportation improvement program shall be evaluated and ranked using the County's adopted Road Project Priority Programming System and Intersection Rating Procedure and the criteria included therein.

STRATEGIES

Action Items

1. Monitor traffic volumes on all arterial and major collector facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)
2. Develop access management techniques to regulate driveway access, including use of shared driveway access. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)
3. Discourage direct access from individual lots to present and planned future arterials wherever possible; access from these sites should be provided through local or collector roadways that connect to arterials. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)
4. Develop a method to assess the need for rural area parking facilities on County routes using appropriate service standards. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 2)
5. Develop site design standards for public transit facilities to be incorporated into County land use codes and regulations. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 2)
6. As appropriate, require that construction of new roadways and improvements to existing roadways address the safety needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in conformance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
7. Address the needs of nonmotorized users of the transportation network by developing a non-motorized comprehensive plan. The plan will include strategies that; develops a Non-motorized Project Priority Programming System that identifies and ranks projects necessary to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian travel; develops operation standards and a maintenance program that addresses the safety needs of non-motorized travelers, and; develops a proposal to the Board of County Commissioners for inclusion in the six year transportation improvement plan a strategy potentially allocating a percentage of transportation funds to be used to support non-motorized projects. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3) (This action item has been addressed through the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.)
8. Encourage opportunities to develop abandoned railroad rights-of-way or utility corridors as future transportation corridors such as bikeways, pedestrian/equestrian trails, and roadways. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3) (This action will be addressed through the implementation of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.)
9. Develop incentives for developers to dedicate land for expansion of the County's trail network and adopt into land development regulations. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
10. Develop and adopt bicycle/pedestrian facilities standards compatible with County road standards and those applicable standards of adjacent jurisdictions and require compliance with these standards in the permitting and review process. (Corresponding Goals: TRG 3 and TRG 4) (This action item has been addressed through the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.)
11. In cooperation with school districts, identify the boundaries of school pedestrian walking zones, develop standards and criteria for roadways within these areas, and define the types of improvement projects that would need to comply with these standards. (This portion of the action item has been addressed through

- the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.) Adopt the standards into the county subdivision code. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
12. Encourage area school districts to discourage unsafe pedestrian and bicycle activities by students. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
 13. Identify existing deficiencies related to pedestrian walkways and crossings, and incorporate improvements into the six-year Transportation Improvement Program. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
 14. Consider acquisition of out-of-use railroad rights-of-way to preserve these resources as future transportation corridors such as bikeways, pedestrian or equestrian trails, and roadways. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3) (This action item has been addressed through the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and Trails Plan.)
 15. Develop criteria to be met to justify expansion of transportation system, and a list of alternatives to be considered before system expansion will be permitted. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)
 16. Develop and adopt standards that enhance safety for inclusion into implementing ordinances. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)
 17. Consider use of street design and traffic management alternatives to discourage unsafe travel speeds and inappropriate through traffic in neighborhoods, such as traffic calming devices, intersection configuration, or the use of curvilinear streets. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)
 18. Develop and adopt site design standards and guidelines that encourage the preservation of outstanding vistas. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)
 19. Design residential transportation facilities to discourage high speed through traffic, by utilizing appropriate design criteria, such as traffic calming facilities when supported by the surrounding area. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)
 20. Develop a plan and criteria for the use and financial support for traffic calming facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)
 21. Review and revise, as necessary, performance standards for the review of proposed developments that ensure the proper functioning of transportation facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)
 22. As necessary, review and revise minimum requirements for setbacks and rights-of-way (including pedestrian and nonmotorized facilities) for new and existing roadways, based on the roadway functional classification. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)
 23. Develop and adopt criteria for the establishment of public roadways based on function, capacity, health and safety, access, public need, adopted County Road Standards, and the financial capability for maintenance and preservation. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)
 24. As needed, develop and adopt standards that require and promote efficient access, mobility and compatibility for motorized vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4, TRG 5, and TRG 6) (This action item has been in part addressed through the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.)
 25. As necessary, develop and adopt land development standards that provide guidance in how to include transit-friendly design elements in developments, and require all developments to adhere to these standards. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)

UTILITIES ELEMENT

PURPOSE: The purpose of the Utilities Element is provide goals and policies to guide Jefferson County in (1) reviewing private utility development proposals, including service provision and siting of facilities; and (2) reviewing and regulating utility services and facilities provided by other public agencies and the private sector.

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 (see the Capital Facilities Element), 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 (see Capital Facilities Element).

Relationships With Other Comprehensive Plan Elements

The Utilities Element and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan collectively address utility planning issues:

1. The siting of domestic water systems and sanitary sewer systems, defined under WAC 365-195-200 as being public facilities, is addressed within the Utilities Element and the Essential Public Facilities Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The process for siting utility facilities (those subject to a separate siting process, in cases of siting difficulty) is contained in the Essential Public Facilities Element. The Capital Facilities Plan Element identifies levels of service and policies for utilities (including solid waste) owned by Jefferson County.
2. The Capital Facilities Plan Element discusses the financial feasibility of providing capital facilities to accommodate anticipated growth; but does not provide siting criteria. The Utilities Element presents policies concerning how utilities are to be sited and, in general terms, designed, but does not address financing issues.
3. The Environmental Element provides goals and policies for the protection of water resources for public water supplies.

EXISTING FACILITIES

Facilities Background and Description: This section provides an overview of the existing facilities locations, service area, capacity, general issues, regulatory concerns and an historic perspective on each utility as it relates to planning for existing service and future system expansion.

Electrical Utilities: Introduction

Most of the discussion in the electricity section will be focused on Puget Sound Energy (PSE), as it provides electricity to over 90% of the residents of unincorporated Jefferson County. PSE (formerly Puget Sound Power & Light Company and Washington Natural Gas Company) is an investor-owned, private utility headquartered in Bellevue, Washington. PSE provides electricity and natural gas services to approximately 1,300,000 metered customers (as of 1998) within the company's 6,000 square mile service territory. This territory includes Eastern Jefferson County, with the exception of the Brinnon area. PSE is regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). As a public service corporation, PSE has a duty under law to furnish electricity to all persons and corporations who may apply and be reasonably entitled to thereto (RCW 80.28.110).

The State's mandated "duty of service" requires electrical utilities to furnish and supply service and facilities that are safe, adequate, efficient, and in all respects, just and reasonable. The WUTC applies this standard by reviewing and approving the terms and conditions under which electrical service is provided. These terms and conditions relate to both the cost and levels of service.

A key principle underlying this regulatory structure is that utility facilities must be provided on a uniform basis to all customers and equitably recovered through uniform rates. Regulatory law therefore prohibits Puget Sound Energy from differentiating among jurisdictions as to the cost or levels of service.

Mason County P.U.D. is a public utility district that provides electricity to 1700 residents of the southeastern portion of Jefferson County in the Brinnon area.

The Grays Harbor County P.U.D. is a public utility district that provides electricity to 172 residents of the southwestern portion of Jefferson County in the Queets/Clearwater and Quinault areas.

The Clallam County P.U.D. is a public utility district that provides electricity to 200 residents of the northwestern portion of Jefferson County in the Hoh River area.

Electrical Utilities: Issues

Siting of New Facilities: As development occurs within Jefferson County, a proportionate increase in area electrical service demand and resulting service load is anticipated. Due to the service on demand requirements of this utility, it is important that the County and utility providers maintain open lines of communication regarding siting of new facilities. The timing of construction of new and/or expanded facilities will be driven by the rate of growth and the need to improve reliability in an area.

Capacity of Electrical Utility Facilities: As the local transmission system is designed as an integral component of a regional power system, development occurring outside the County may have local impacts on system capacity. At the same time, growth in the County will contribute to the electrical service load of the regional power system and the potential need for systems facilities outside the County. Building codes and utility facility siting policies affect the service loads and the capacity to upgrade existing facilities.

Description and Capacity of Existing Electrical Facilities

The Puget Sound Energy electrical system serving the projected Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) of Jefferson County is geographically bounded in general by the Admiralty Inlet to the north, Puget Sound to the east, Hood Canal to the south, and the Olympic National Forest to the west.

The Puget Sound Energy planning subarea for Jefferson County contains approximately 250 square miles, and includes the communities (from South to North) of Quilcene, Port Ludlow, Chimacum, Port Hadlock, Gardiner, Nordland, and Port Townsend. The County's electrical system includes a wide range of service demand intensities, from areas of wetlands with no demand to areas of high demand commercial customers.

Please refer to Page 11-16 of the Utilities Element which identifies the specific service areas of Mason County PUD, Clallam County PUD, Grays Harbor County PUD and Puget Sound Energy in January 1998.

Generation: There are no Puget Sound Energy generation facilities within Jefferson County's designated Urban Growth Area (UGA) other than small capacity generation at the Port. In summary, only the utility transmission network and distribution substations support the County UGAs.

Transmission Network: Puget Sound Energy's transmission network transports electricity from generation resources to transmission substations, and from transmission substations and switching stations, to distribution substations.

Electrical utility service is supplied to Jefferson County by Puget Sound Energy through the larger regional transmission grid (interconnected system of electric lines and associated equipment) at 500 kV (500,000 volts) and 230 kV (230,000 volts) voltages from distant generating plants along the mid-Columbia River. The region's transmission grid lines carry this power from the generation facilities westerly to the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) Olympia Transmission Substation.

From this point, a majority of the Olympic Peninsula, including Puget Sound Energy's Kitsap County and Jefferson County regional loads, are served to the north via the BPA Shelton Transmission Substation to the BPA Kitsap and BPA Fairmount transmission substations. At the Fairmount transmission substation, the power is transformed down from 230 kV to 115 kV and 66kV for delivery to neighborhood distribution substations within the County.

Power transformed from 230 kV to 115 kV and 66 kV is provided by two transformers at the BPA Fairmount Transmission Substation. These voltages are used to serve specific Jefferson County distribution substations.

Transmission Lines: In the most recent improvements, 115kV lines have been installed on the Irondale-Shine line and the Port Townsend #1 line. These newer lines allow for contingencies when one major transmission line is out of service. The older 66 kV lines in Jefferson County were designed to only serve distribution substation loads only; therefore, these newer lines allow for alternate service if for any reason one major transmission line is out of service. The majority of the existing electrical system within the County relies on the supply of bulk power flowing through BPA lines. As the electrical service demand in Jefferson County and adjacent counties continues to grow, additional 230 kV lines may be required to raise the transfer capability of the transmission network. A cost-benefit analysis was performed on upgrading the main service lines from Kitsap across Hood Canal, although due to the resulting non-economical cost/benefit analysis, this project has been deferred.

Distribution Substations: There are six (6) existing distribution substations within Jefferson County which serve distribution feeder lines (circuits from a distribution substation to the customer, usually

energized at 4, 12 or 34 kV). These distribution substations are located at Discovery Bay, Hastings Rd., Irondale, Kearney Street, Port Ludlow, and Quilcene.

Telecommunications Systems: Introduction

Telecommunications include a wide range of rapidly expanding services, including conventional telephone service, personal wireless services, and video delivery systems. The most pressing reality confronting the telecommunications services industry is dramatic and constant change. Technology is moving forward at a pace, which makes planning or even speculation extremely difficult. Due to the rapid advances in telecommunications technologies, the subsequent changes in transmission equipment and capabilities, and federal legislation encouraging future development, it is important that the County and telecommunications services providers maintain open lines of communication.

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) regulates many utility and transportation providers to ensure safe and reliable service to consumers at reasonable rates. All of Washington's investor-owned electric, natural gas, water, and telecommunications utilities are regulated by the WUTC. As a result of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, it is anticipated that telecommunications services regulations will continue to be developed and refined.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulates the telecommunications airwaves including radio frequency emissions standards, all antenna and dish structures used for telecommunications services, and is responsible for issuing licenses to operate wireless common carriers services (cellular telephone, personal communication services, mobile radio services, and other wireless common carriers).

Local government involvement in regulation of the development of telecommunications services, particularly wireless common carriers, includes identifying systems facilities siting criteria and a permit review process on applications for the placement, construction, or modification of a wireless common carrier facility site.

Local governments have been preempted by federal case law from regulating Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) covered facilities. The FAA reviews location and height of proposed towers to prevent interference with operations of airports and flight paths. The FAA regulates proposed towers that exceed 200 feet and smaller towers located within 20,000 feet of a major airport and 10,000 feet of general aviation airports. The FAA does not have the authority to deny a FCC construction permit, but it can cite a proposed tower as a hazard to navigation.

Conventional Telephone: Qwest Communications International provides the majority of conventional telephone service in the County. US West Communications offers telecommunications services to 25 million customers in 14 western states. Telecommunications regulations require US West Communications to provide adequate telecommunications services on demand.

Telephone exchange areas define the area within which QWest Communications International is permitted to transport their services. These areas are called Local Access and Transport Areas (LATAs). Calls outside of the Local Access and Transport Area require long distance carriers such as AT&T, US Sprint, or MCI. There are 94 US West exchanges located in the State of Washington.

The facilities in which calls are switched are called Central Offices. From each Central Office, there are four main cable routes generally headed North, South, East, and West. Connected to these main feeder routes are branch feeder routes from which service is routed to all subscribers through local loops. These types of facilities may be aerial or underground, and copper or fiber. Technology such as fiber optics

allows for multiple paths over a single wire. The technology used by telecommunications facilities in Jefferson County means that capacity is not a problem for telephone companies providing service locally.

Wireless Common Carriers (Including Cellular Phone Service): Cellular telephone in the County is provided by AT&T Wireless Services, and by Verizon Wireless. The FCC limits to two the number of licensed providers in each Cellular Geographical Service Area (CGSA) in order to ensure there is market competition. Service must be available to all customers within a service area, but there are no level of service standards. Cell sites must be located so that radio signals from the systems stay within the boundaries of the CGSA.

Signals to and from mobile phones are handled by a system of low powered transmitting antennae, which are called cell sites. The signal coverage radii are called a cell. Cells meet in a hexagonal grid pattern, so calls are in effect handed from one cell to another over a given area. Calls are routed through a central computer called a Mobile Telephone Switching Office (MTSO), and are connected to their destinations. Cells can provide continuous coverage over an urban area, or they can provide coverage along well-traveled transportation corridors. Because all cellular systems are compatible, callers can travel from one system to another, and still be able to use their cellular telephones.

Cable Television: Cable television services are provided to residents of the County via existing franchise agreements with Summit Cablevision, Hood Canal Telephone, Western Cable Service and Interstate Cable Inc.. The franchise agreement(s) states that cable services must be provided on demand in all areas as follows:

- Interstate Cable Inc.: All County areas south of the Port Townsend City limits east of Olympic National Forest lines consisting of density minimums of 19 homes per mile.
- Hood Canal Telephone: All County areas that include Range 2 West, Township 26 North, Sections 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29, 30, 28, 27, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. Range 2 West, Township 25 North, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 29, 30, 31, and 32. Range 3 West, Township 35 North, Section 36.
- Western Cable Service: All County areas that include County roads lying in Sections 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, and 36, Township 30 North, Range 2 West, W.M.; and in Sections 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, Township 28 North, Range 1 West, W.M.; and in Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, and 18, Township 27 North, Range 1 East, W.M..
- Summit Cablevision: All that portion of Jefferson County lying East of the Olympic National Park

Located at the origin of a cable system are a receiver and a headend. The headend includes electronic equipment such as antennae, frequency converters, demodulators, and preamplifiers. The headend processes the signals in a manner that allows them to be distributed to the network. Trunk lines carry this signal, and amplifiers located along the system maintain its strength. Amplifiers allow for feeder line connections and the eventual hookup of individual customers. The cable franchise agreement(s) allows the provider to use County rights-of-way for their equipment.

Telecommunications Systems: Issues

Rapidly Changing Technology, Services, and Providers: Telecommunication services, which were once discrete systems, are becoming linked with competition encouraged through Federal legislation. The

Telecommunications Act of 1996 promotes enhanced service and system development through open market competition. Ownership alliances are rapidly shifting, making it very difficult to predict future products, regulatory systems, and service providers.

Ability of Utilities to Provide Telecommunications Services: Antennae and towers are used by utilities to provide communications and electronic controls. Utilities must have the ability to provide telecommunications services.

Expansion of Local Calling Areas: The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) provides the sole control for local calling area regulations.

Co-location of Telecommunications Facilities: The co-location of telecommunications facilities using existing structures is desirable because it is an efficient use of land, and potentially has less of an impact aesthetically. As more cellular cell sites are located within an area, the transmitting antenna structures, which are required, become smaller. Although it is desirable to co-locate facilities, the County is aware that there may be circumstances where co-location is impossible.

Adverse Effects from Radio Frequency (RF) Energy: Electromagnetic fields (EMF) produced by cellular telephones are known as non-ionizing, as opposed to ionizing sources, such as x-rays. Cellular telephones use frequencies (UHF) which previously have been used by UHF television stations, so their presence is not new. The American National Standards Institute has established a standard for exposure to EMFs. The standard recommends that the specific absorption rate (SAR) is less than 1.6 watts/kilogram for an exposure of thirty or more minutes. The maximum output from a portable cellular phone is 0.45 watts/kilogram, well below this established threshold. The RF energy from a cellular phone is less than from a hand-held CB radio, or from standing one foot away from a typical microwave oven. The Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 requires that all telecommunications antenna structures meet the radiation standards set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Competition among Cable Companies: State and federal laws do not allow an exclusive use by an individual provider on public rights-of-way. Any franchised cable company can serve unincorporated Jefferson County. However, exclusive cable providers are allowed to serve private properties, such as apartment complexes and condominiums.

Description and Capacity of Existing Telecommunication Facilities

Conventional Telephone: US West Communications, Inc., United Telephone, and PTI Communications provide service to the residents of Jefferson County. Statistical customer information is not available on the basis of local political jurisdictions because exchange territories are not compatible with local political boundaries. Disclosure of certain information would be disadvantageous to these communications companies, limiting the amount of information that can be outlined here. Calls outside the local service areas require a long distance carrier.

There are 8 exchanges, which cover the Jefferson County area. These exchanges are 379, 385, 437, 765, 732, 796, 797, and 374. The Central Office, which serves most of the County, is located in the general vicinity of Port Townsend. There are also Central Offices located in Quilcene, Port Ludlow and Forks. The capacity of each Central Office is dependent on the type of switch it uses. A single area code and prefix can carry 10,000 phone numbers. Digital transmission allows US West to increase the capabilities of switches. Due to the competitive nature of the telecommunications business, US West is unable to provide statistics on the number of customers they currently serve. However, with an increase of approximately 6500 new households projected in the County including the City of Port Townsend by 2016, there will be a significant impact on existing facilities, and the need to plan for new facilities.

Wireless Common Carriers (Including Cellular Phone Service) Service: AT&T Wireless Services currently has 6 cell sites located in Jefferson County. These cell sites contain low powered transmitting antennae. AirTouch Cellular currently has 6 cell sites located in Jefferson County. These cell sites contain low powered transmitting antennae.

Where feasible, cellular facilities utilize existing tower structures, poles, and buildings where antennae can be mounted on rooftops and electronic equipment located within the building itself. Topography and other engineering constraints can influence specific site selection because of the need to "hand off" the signal so that it can be picked up by another facility. Efforts are made to construct cell sites that are compatible with surrounding land uses.

Cable Television: Cable television service is provided by 4 companies: Summit Cablevision, Hood Canal Telephone, Western Cable Service and Interstate Cable Inc.. Summit Cablevision is the only active service provider in January 1998 and Summit estimates they provide service to approximately 1,400 – 1,500 subscribers within Jefferson County including Port Townsend, Shine and Kala Point areas. Summit Cablevision currently provides a base package providing customers access to 40 channels, in addition the cable company offers 4 pay-for-view channels, resulting in a current system capability of 44 channels. Summit Cablevision's communications signal is transmitted via both coaxial cable and fiber optic cables.

Sanitary Sewer: Introduction

The major federal law governing sanitary wastewater treatment is the Federal Clean Water Act. The Act requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish national effluent standards, authorizes grants for wastewater treatment facilities, requires the use of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, and allows EPA to impose penalties for violations. The Act allows delegation of responsibility to the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) for administration of federal water quality regulations, and grants DOE the authority to develop and adopt additional standards.

The State's laws regulating sewage service and treatment are contained in the State Water Pollution Control Act (Chapter 90.48 RCW), the Management of Sewage Sludge/Biosolids Act (Chapter 70.95J RCW), and the Sewerage, Water and Drainage Systems Act (the County Services Act) (Chapter 36.94 RCW), which authorizes Jefferson County to establish and operate a sewerage system. Under these laws, the State establishes and requires use of specific planning and design standards for wastewater facilities, and water pollution controls and abatement plans for sewage drainage basins.

The main sanitary sewer service areas serving Jefferson County's population include the Port Ludlow service area, various smaller service areas in East County managed by PUD No.1, and other service areas including the City of Port Townsend.

Port Ludlow Service Area: Olympic Water and Sewer owns and operates the wastewater facilities, treatment plant, and outfall to Ludlow Bay (Admiralty Inlet). An alternative service agreement with Jefferson County PUD No.1, calls for the PUD to operate the wastewater collection facilities if Olympic Water and Sewer is unable or unwilling to properly operate and maintain the facilities.

Public Utility District (PUD) No.1 Service Area: It is the intent of PUD No.1 to continue to assume the management of community septic systems within eastern Jefferson County. The PUD also provides municipal oversight services (MOS) for individual septic systems throughout eastern Jefferson County. As of 1998, the PUD provides inspections for more than 400 active septic systems. An additional 300 inactive systems are listed on PUD No. 1 records.

Other Service Areas: The City of Port Townsend provides wastewater treatment and collection for City residents. Sanitary sewer service in eastern Jefferson County is currently provided via septic systems for existing and new development.

Sanitary Sewer Description And Capacity Of Existing Facilities

The main sanitary sewer service areas serving Jefferson County's population include the Port Ludlow service area, various smaller service areas in East County managed by PUD No.1, and the City of Port Townsend.

Port Ludlow Service Area: The sanitary sewer service areas for Port Ludlow, a master-planned community established in 1967, include the North Bay and South Bay Service Areas. The North Bay Service Area includes the original plats of Port Ludlow Divisions 1 through 6, and the Resort/Marina areas. However within this service area, not all platted lots are served by the sanitary sewer service. The existing South Bay Service Area includes the original plats of South Bay 1 through 3, plus Ludlow Point tracts, Inner Harbor Bay View Village, and other approved development sites. Ludlow Point tracts are at the northern end of South Bay Lane. Sanitary sewer service was provided to these lots as part of the Inner Harbor project approved by DOE on September 6, 1989.

Public Utility District (PUD) No.1 Service Area: Presently, sanitary sewer service within the PUD's service areas is provided via septic systems. Most of the septic systems throughout the eastern County area are constructed by developers to support new development. Table 11-1A identifies the septic systems owned and managed by PUD No.1 as of 1998:

**Table 11-1A
Current P.U.D. No. 1 Septic Systems**

Septic System	Location	Current Connections	Maximum Connections
Levine Drainfield	Gardiner	3	8
Discovery Ridge	Quimper Peninsula	5	40
Ocean Grove	Quimper Peninsula	5	49
Schoenfeld Phase I	Coyle Peninsula	3	12

**Table 11-1B
Future Septic Systems**

Septic System	Location	Current Connections	Maximum Connections
Discovery Yacht and Racquet Club	Discovery Bay	0	53
Old Alcohol Plant	Port Hadlock	0	0
Schoenfeld Phase II	Coyle Peninsula	0	12
Wally Pederson's Trail's End	N/A	0	12
Suquamish View	N/A	N/A	N/A
Steve Wakefield	N/A	N/A	N/A

Tri-Area Service Area: As of January 1998 existing Tri-Area residential and non-residential areas utilize septic systems for sanitary waste and effluent control.

Solid Waste Management: Introduction

In the State of Washington, local governments have lead responsibility for solid waste management and moderate-risk waste management. However, local governments must manage and handle waste according to State laws, which are comprehensive in scope, and include specific mandates for solid waste management, handling, and disposal systems. Local governments do not manage hazardous wastes, but are required to adopt a local hazardous waste plan for moderate-risk waste (household hazardous waste).

The State Solid Waste Management--Reduction and Recycling Act designates the Department of Ecology (DOE) as the State department responsible for overseeing solid waste regulations. The administrative codes, which implement the law's requirements, are Chapters 173-304 and 173-351 WAC, established Minimal Functional Standards (MFS), and established Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills. The Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste provides standards and criteria for the location, design, operation, and maintenance of solid waste facilities.

The Washington Administrative Code (WAC) requires that each type of solid waste facility possess an approved solid waste permit. Solid waste permits are reviewed and issued by the Jefferson County Environmental Health Department annually. The Department of Ecology (DOE) has review and ultimate approval authority over solid waste permits.

State law authorizes counties to own and operate disposal facilities, but prohibits counties from operating a solid waste collection system, otherwise known as a "solid waste utility." Cities are delegated authority to establish collection utilities. Counties are allowed to establish a collection district for mandatory solid waste collection, and a disposal district that allows a county to levy a tax to fund solid waste operations. As of January 1998 Jefferson County has not established a solid waste district.

Although counties cannot contract for solid waste collection, they can contract for residential recycling collection. However, the County can contract for handling services such as transport of solid waste to disposal sites. As of January 1998 Jefferson County contracts with a private commercial carrier to transport the majority of the County's solid waste to a landfill site in Goldendale, Washington. Jefferson County and private recycling activities manage the remaining solid waste material.

Solid Waste: Issues

Achievement of Recycling Goal in a Cost-Effective Manner: The County has the opportunity to develop and implement a variety of recycling collection programs and facilities, but these programs can be costly. The County needs to continue to build incentives into its recycling programs; encourage private recycling and composting businesses; and devise new and increasingly economical ways to remove products from the disposed waste stream currently handled at the Recycling Center.

Special Waste Handling: The County has established a funding source through Washington State Department of Ecology for the implementation of a Hazardous Waste Management Plan, for collection programs and facilities for household hazardous waste and small quantity waste. Working in close collaboration with the Port of Port Townsend, Jefferson County presently operates a facility that collects, recycles, and disposes of household and small quantities of hazardous waste (Moderate Risk Waste). Funding is also specifically used for educational programs for businesses regarding proper management of moderate risk waste.

Description and Capacity of Existing Solid Waste Facilities

The County Landfill has been closed for use as a disposal site. The County will continue to contract with private commercial carriers to transport solid waste to other landfill sites outside the County during the

foreseeable future. On Page 11-21 of the Utilities Element a map identifies the location of existing Jefferson County solid waste collection and management facilities.

Water: Introduction

Water for residents in Jefferson County comes from two types of “systems.” The primary systems of supply are public water systems. However, a significant number of residents obtain their supply from wells, springs, or other “individual” water systems.

According to Washington Department of Health (DOH) records, the County had 166 “public water systems” as of March 1995. According to DOH regulations, any domestic water supply system serving more than a single family residence is classified as a public water system. Water systems are further divided into “Groups”. Systems with fifteen (15) or more permanent connections are defined as Group A systems. Systems with two to fourteen (2 to 14) permanent connections are defined as Group B systems. (DOH regulations currently allow a waiver of requirements to residential systems with two services - a two party system.) Also included in the Group categorization are subgroups of community and non-community (business) systems, transient (State Parks), and non-transient systems. In Jefferson County, approximately half of the “public water systems” are Group A systems.

Location of Jefferson County Water Service Areas in eastern Jefferson County is depicted on Page 11-22 of the Utilities Element. The large Group A Systems include: Cape George Colony Club, Inc.; Kala Point Water System; Ludlow Water Company; the Jefferson County PUD; and the City of Port Townsend.

It is recognized that many residents of the County receive their water supply from private sources (individual water systems) such as wells or springs. This practice is expected to continue in the future, at least in the rural areas. In developing a water demand forecast related to public water supply needs, it is prudent that an allowance be included for that segment of the population expected to remain on private-source individual water systems.

An estimate of the number of people utilizing private domestic wells or springs can be derived using Department of Health (DOH) records, existing population estimates, and deducting those populations from the County total. In 1992 DOH developed an estimate in preparation of the Draft Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP Draft 1992). According to that analysis, approximately 8,000 people in Jefferson County, approximately 30 percent of the County population were utilizing private-source-individual-water systems, typically wells.

Water: Issues

Issues Relating to Public Water System Planning: The Public Water System Coordination Act, enacted in 1977 and codified as Chapter 70.116 RCW, establishes a procedure for the State's water utilities to coordinate their planning and construction programs with adjacent water utilities and other local governmental activities.

This Act specifies that either the Department of Health (then entitled Department of Social and Health Services) or Jefferson County (County) Legislative Authority may declare an area within a County as a Critical Water Supply Service Area (CWSSA). This declaration must be based upon the findings of a Preliminary Assessment identifying issues related to:

- Inadequate water quality
- Unreliable service

- Ineffective and uncoordinated planning

Based upon the findings of the Preliminary Assessment, the County Board of Commissioners, with the support of the water purveyors, declared the County to be a CWSSA, by resolution on October 24, 1983. The First Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP) was completed in 1986 consistent with the Coordination Act.

In 1995 the original Assessment and CWSSA boundaries of water systems were reviewed. The Assessment and boundaries were again confirmed by the County Commissioners in September 1995, indicating a continuing need to address these issues.

The Jefferson County Water Utility Coordinating Committee prepared an update of the Jefferson County Coordinated Water System Plan which was approved by the State DOH in May, 1997. The plan is currently under revision following adoption of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan.

Issues Related to Water Resources Development for Public Supply

Indian Treaty Rights: The 1974 “Boldt” decision held that the Indian Tribes signatory to 1855 treaties (in what is now Washington) were entitled to the opportunity of harvesting half of the harvestable salmon and steelhead returning to off-reservation fishing grounds. A subsequent decision held that the right to harvest fish implies a right to protection of the fisheries habitat. The method by which the Tribes were to execute this right to protect the habitat has not been defined.

In the 1980s, the State and the Tribes entered cooperative arrangements to manage the fisheries, and to explore the implications of the Boldt decisions on water resources and habitat management. Discussions of these topics eventually lead to a 1990 retreat at Lake Chelan to formulate and implement a cooperative watershed planning initiative for the State.

Watershed Planning: Development of watershed plans generally involve local committees and considerable local, state, and federal agency involvement. In Jefferson County, the Quilcene/Dabob Bay Watershed Action Plan (June 1991), the Ludlow Watershed Action Plan (November 1993), and the Discovery Bay Watershed Management Plan (March 1995) have been developed.

The most comprehensive watershed planning effort to date is the Dungeness-Quilcene (DQ) Planning Process, funded in 1990 by the State as a pilot planning effort under the Chelan Agreement. Representatives of state, local and tribal governments, and agricultural, business, environmental, fisheries, and recreational interests participated through caucuses to gather and evaluate information which led to the final DQ Plan, dated June 30, 1994.

The DQ Plan provided regional strategies and recommendations to address water use, management, conservation, and related habitat issues for both the Dungeness and the Quilcene watersheds. A special recommendation for the region was to conduct a comprehensive hydrogeologic investigation of the quantity and quality of surface and ground water. A work plan for a five-year study was developed by the United States Geological Survey for the DQ project. An accompanying recommendation included continuing water quality and quantity data monitoring and management which is recognized as essential for ongoing water resource and land use planning efforts.

Recommendations of the DQ Plan specific to Eastern Jefferson County included limiting new surface water rights or permits until such time as instream flows for each stream are adopted by rule by the Department of Ecology. Ground water, habitat, fish management, education, and conservation strategies were also developed. It was recommended that a Watershed Council representative of all interests be

formed to focus and coordinate habitat restoration effort, to investigate the resources, to design and implement projects, and to work with Ecology on instream flow and water rights issues.

The Jefferson County Water Resources Council was formed in January 1995 in order to implement the DQ and other watershed plans. In October 1997, the County joined the Water Resources Council. The Council has been designated as the watershed planning and management unit for the Quilcene-Snow Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA 17) under state funding for watershed planning. The DQ Plan will serve as the basis for the next level of watershed planning, technical studies, and policy development.

In 1998, the Watershed Planning Act was passed by the State Legislature (Chapter 90.82 RCW). This law changed the approach to watershed planning, yet building on the "pilot" efforts such as the DQ. Since passage of the Act, watershed planning has been initiated in several Jefferson County WRIsAs (WRIA 16, WRIA 17, and WRIA 18).

The watershed planning process will require new coordination and organizational efforts across both watershed and jurisdictional boundaries.

The proposed listing of salmon and bull trout native to Jefferson County streams under the Endangered Species Act highlights the need to integrate watershed and fish habitat recovery plans. The County will work with local, state, and federal agencies to implement potential recovery projects and develop land use regulations based on these plans to protect the water resources of the County for use by future residents and to recover the salmon and other fish species that are threatened with extinction.

Existing Water Facilities

Water Rights: In preparation of Jefferson County's Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP - 1996 Draft), systems serving over 50 connections were examined to determine the adequacy of existing supply and capacity for future growth. These systems, in addition to others in the County, are identified in Table 11-3. A summary list of water rights and water systems is identified in Table 11-7 (listed by historic County planning sub-area boundaries).

Adequate water rights are a requisite for regional water supply development and planning. Being able to acquire new water rights is a necessary component of new source selection and development.

The City of Port Townsend: The City is in a unique situation because the municipality possesses substantial water rights, has current capacity to contract water supply to several other entities, and thus act as a water "wholesaler."

The City's water rights include:

- 19.39 MGD from the Big Quilcene River (perfected, primary water right).
- 6.18 MGD from the Little Quilcene River (perfected, low flow restricted, water right).
- 32.32 MGD from the Dosewallips River (application only, not a perfected water right).
- 3.53 MGD from the Chimacum Valley in the form of ground water (perfected water rights).

The combined surface water rights equal 25.57 MGD and ground water rights equal 3.53 MGD for a total of 29.1 MGD. The Little Quilcene water right is low flow restricted, making the combined use of the Little and Big Quilcene sources difficult during summer months. However, both of these sources can be used to fill storage reservoirs (e.g., Lord's Lake and City Lake).

Supply to the City of Port Townsend (and Port Townsend Paper Company) is restricted by the existing pipeline capacity (19.4 MGD). The City's available average supply is a combination of the pipeline

capacity (19.4 MGD) and Chimacum Valley ground water pumping and treatment capacity (0.900 MGD) for a total of 20.3 MGD.

City service to the Tri Area in the past has been provided by surface water and groundwater supplies referenced above. However, because of the surface water disinfection requirements, the City discontinued the use of surface water and has been serving the area entirely from groundwater supplies in recent years.

**Table 11-2
City of Port Townsend Water Supply Commitments (1998)**

The City is under contract to supply 14.9 MGD of its water, as shown below:

User	Quantity (MGD)
Port Townsend Paper Company	14.400
Navy/Indian Island	0.114
Fort Flagler	0.015 (5.5 MG/Year)
Fisheries	0.042 (15.5 MG/Year)
PUD (S. Hastings)	0.280
PUD (Glen Cove)	<u>0.050</u>
Total Supply	14.901

PUD and PUD Satellites: PUD Systems (1998) are listed below:

- Bywater Bay
- Glen Cove Water System (Commercial and Residential)
- Glen Cove South
- Lazy "C" Water System (LUD No. 8)
- LUD No. 3 (Hastings Loop South)
- LUD No. 1 (Gardner)
- Triton Cove Estates-Marshall Addition - (LUD No. 6)

The PUD’s LUD No. 3 and the Glen Cove System have been dependent on water supply from the City of Port Townsend (with some supplemental groundwater rights owned by the PUD).

The remainder of the current PUD systems is dependent upon ground water for their source. In general, the current availability of water appears adequate, although as indicated in the table of water rights information (Table 11-7), some systems may need to confirm water rights or secure additional supply.

In addition to the systems noted above, the PUD has several additional small systems. It is anticipated that the PUD will increase its acquisition of systems in the future as small systems abandon their struggle to meet regulatory requirements.

PUD / City of Port Townsend Service Area Changes in 2001

As indicated above, the PUD’s LUD No. 3 and the Glen Cove Systems have been dependent on water supply from the City of Port Townsend. Although the PUD has some water rights to supplement City supply, the dependency has remained.

Discussions of the possibility of a “service area swap” between the PUD and the City have been occurring for several years. The concept was for the PUD to take over the Tri Area and the City’s extended service areas and have the City take control of the Glen Cove South and Glen Cove Water Systems. This idea

had merit for several reasons. First was the thought that it might be more appropriate for the City to serve lands adjacent to the City (and under consideration as a UGA), and these areas were dependent on City water anyway. Second, the PUD seemed a more appropriate entity to serve the unincorporated Tri Area where citizens would have representation on the PUD Board.

This arrangement was executed in an agreement at the end of 2001. Implementation of the exchange is well underway now (2002), but official service area maps, etc. remain to be developed and approved by DOH. Tables and maps in this document will be updated when final documents are developed. Tables and maps included in this Utilities Element should be interpreted assuming the transfer of service areas and water rights as indicated above (specifically, water rights for Glen Cove and the Glen Cove Service Areas are the City's, and water rights for the Tri Area, and service areas are transferred to the PUD).

Other Systems: Other Group A systems in Jefferson County include the following:

- Jefferson County Water District No. 1
- Jefferson County Water District No. 3
- Cape George Colony Club
- Ludlow Water Company
- Kala Point Water System
- Bridgehaven Water System
- Olympic Mobile Village
- Olympus Beach Tracts, Inc.
- Pleasant Tides Water Co-op
- Seamount Estates Community Club

There are no reported critical problems with any of these systems, and water availability appears adequate for current needs.

**Table 11-3
Jefferson County Water Systems**

Identification Number	Facility Name
PUD Systems**(Expanding)	
17741X	Glen Cove (Commercial and Residential)
025164	Glen Cove South
00058D	LUD No. 3 (Hastings Loop South)
07877W	LUD No. 1 (Gardner)
02676T	Lazy "C" Water System (LUD No.8)
02043P	Bywater Bay (Pope Resources)
894470	Triton Cove Estates - Marshal Addition (LUD No. 6)
Other Systems	
69000R	Port Townsend, City of
08330N	Bridgehaven Water System
11050C	Cape George Colony Club, Inc.
36705Y	Jefferson County Water Dist. No.1
375006	Kala Point Water System
68700L	Ludlow Water Co.
367115	Jefferson County WD No. 3
205141	Olympic Mobile Village
637009	Olympus Beach Tracts, Inc.

03313C
76986X

Pleasant Tides Water Co-op
Seamount Estates Community Club

SURFACE/STORM WATER UTILITIES

Surface/Storm Water Quality: Introduction

In November 1996 the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners determined that a County storm water management ordinance was necessary in order to comply with the 1991 (revised May 1994) Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan, and to meet the applicable goals of the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW 36.70A.

The 1991 (revised May 1994) Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan requires that all cities and counties in the Puget Sound Basin adopt ordinances requiring storm water controls for new development and redevelopment including:

1. Control of off-site source water quality and quantity (as related to quality) impacts.
2. Use of best management practices (BMPs) for source control and treatment.
3. Use of the Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin (The Technical Manual) and BMPs for the effective treatment of the storm size and frequency (design storm) for proposed development.
4. Use of infiltration (downward movement of water from the surface to the subsoils), with appropriate precautions, as the first consideration in storm water management.
5. Protection of stream channels and wetlands.
6. Erosion and sediment control for new development and redevelopment projects.

Jefferson County's Storm Water Management Ordinance (No. 10-1104-96) adopts the Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin (current edition) as the storm water manual, adopts thresholds for determining development requirements, and provides a means of regulating land disturbing activities on private and public land and subsequent storm water runoff. The Ordinance defines "storm water" as follows: "That portion of precipitation that does not naturally percolate into the ground or evaporate, but flows via overland flow, interflow, channels or pipes into a defined surface water channel, or a constructed infiltration facility."

Surface/Storm Water Quality: Issues

Jefferson County's strategy for future management of surface/storm water systems will be based on a coordinated approach, including collaborative watershed management, with an emphasis on water quality and quantity management. The key future activities include:

1. Development of a comprehensive County-wide Surface/Storm Water Management Plan that includes infrastructure inventory, public outreach, technical basin planning requirements, financial planning, and operational components.
2. Development of Flood Control Management plans, in collaboration with local and regional groups such as flood control advisory boards, watershed planning groups, and other agencies, that includes financing and implementation components.
3. Development of a Jefferson County Ordinance for storm water facility maintenance. Participate as a member of the Water Resources Council for Water Resources Inventory Area 17 and other areas of eastern Jefferson County, and as a member of watershed management unit(s) formed by multi-jurisdictional and community interests for watersheds in western Jefferson County.
4. Review and update the County Storm Water Management Ordinance as surface/storm water management plans become available for implementation.

PROPOSED FACILITIES

Facilities Background And Description: This section gives an overview of the proposed facilities locations, service area, capacity, general issues, regulatory concerns on each utility as it relates to planning for future system expansion.

Electricity: Future Capacity Needs and Requirements

Future Capacity Needs: The future electric load for Jefferson County is the current MVA customer demand and anticipated 1998-2018 MVA load growth (Megavolt-Ampere electric power requirement in 1,000,000 volt-ampere units). Jefferson County population and employment forecasts (OFM) for the 20 year planning period are converted to demand in MVA, which in turn can be used to determine the amount of new capital facilities needed to meet future needs of customers within the County.

13 MVA is the load predicted to be added to Puget Sound Energy's service areas of Jefferson County during the 20 year planning period, including: Chimacum, Gardiner, Port Hadlock, Nordland, Port Ludlow, Port Townsend, and Quilcene. This projected increase in MVA is expected to be reduced by 6.3% and 9% due to the impacts of future conservation and demand-side management, respectively. Overall, the projected net increase in MVA load during the next 20-year planning period is shown below.

**Table 11-4
2018 Projected Load Level**

Existing Load (1997)	72.0 MVA
Less: Projected Conservation	(4.5)
Less: Projected Demand-Side Mgt.	(6.5)
<u>Projected Load Increase (Growth)</u>	<u>24.0</u>
TOTAL	85.0 MVA

The 2018 planning horizon for Jefferson County is based on a peak winter load of 85 MVA. An analysis of capacity needed to meet growth is contained in Puget Sound Energy's Draft Electrical Facilities Plan for the Jefferson County SubArea.

Future Facilities Requirements: Capital facilities are required during 1998-2018 to (1) serve the County's projected load growth, and (2) remedy specific transmission/distribution problems within the existing electrical system. The following projects reflect a combination of overall system improvements, transmission substation/line improvements, and distribution substations construction: 115 KV Conversion; Port Townsend 66kV Loop Transmission Line; Irondale Transmission Substation Additions, BPA Fairmont-Shine 230 kV Conversion/Hood Canal Crossing, New Chimacum Distribution Substation, and New Teal Distribution Substation.

Telephone: Future Capacity Needs and Requirements

Conventional Telephone: State law requires Quest to provide adequate telecommunications services on demand. Accordingly, Quest or other telecommunications providers will provide facilities to accommodate growth within Jefferson County, regardless of growth pattern. Various regulations speak to growth within service territories. WAC 480-120-086 requires maintenance of adequate personnel and equipment to handle any reasonable demand and traffic. Furthermore, WAC 480-120-071 requires establishment of a line extension policy, which is contained in Quest's tariff WNU-24 Schedule 9, filed with the WUTC. The same tariff contains the company's policy for underground utilities, as required by WAC 480-120-076.

Quest's construction planning is driven by the needs of its Jefferson County customers. As the County grows and telecommunications services evolve, facilities are upgraded to ensure adequate service levels. Quest's goal is to maintain routes at 85% capacity. When usage exceeds 85%, additional facilities will be planned, budgeted, and installed.

Quest submits local planning and construction documents with Jefferson County and/or the City of Port Townsend to obtain necessary development permits and authorizations. Quest's ability to meet its capacity commitments is affected by the efficiency of the local land use permit process. County and Municipal Departments of Public Works and Planning can also affect Quest's ability to maintain adequate public facilities. Quest works with private developers, Jefferson County, City of Port Townsend, and other community planners to develop plans that meet customer service demands. At the present time, Quest does not plan to expand current service areas.

Wireless Common Carriers (Including Cellular Phone Service): Unlike other utilities, the cellular phone industry does not necessarily conduct long-range strategic facilities planning. Market demand is analyzed to determine expansions into new service areas. Cellular phone service can be expanded in a given area to provide better service to cellular customers in two ways:

- Extending the coverage to new areas, or
- Increasing the capacity of the system within the current service area.

A decision to expand the system depends on a number of factors. First, the number of current customers within the area and the capacity of the current system are analyzed to identify the need to expand. Second, the quality of service within the area is continually evaluated, both electronically, at the switching equipment, and through feedback from customers. If there are a significant number of service failures reported, including dropped calls, continuous busy signals, or an "all circuits are busy" message, the capacity of the system must be evaluated and usually improved to maintain consumer market share. Third, the FCC license granted to the cellular carrier requires that service be provided to 75% of its Cellular Geographical Service Area (CSGA) within five years from the date the license is granted. Maintaining a high quality, interference-free service is essential in order to comply with these FCC requirements.

In general it is anticipated that additional sites within the Jefferson County service area will be located responsive to customer service needs, generally following increases in population densities and high volume traffic corridors.

Sanitary Sewer: Future Capacity Needs and Requirements

Port Ludlow Service Area: Growth in the Port Ludlow area has been steady since 1967, despite fluctuations in regional housing demands. Sewer connections were provided to 845 ERU (Equivalent Residential Unit = 785 residential + 60 commercial ERU) by the end of 1995, another 80 ERU were to be connected through 1996, and an additional 521 ERU (Equivalent Residential Unit = 230 gallons per day [GPD] @ 100 GPD per Table 14A person X 2.3 persons per household) were forecasted during 1997-2002 (growth estimated @ 80 residential per year + 47,500 sq. ft of commercial @ 200 GPD/1,000 sq. ft).

The current and recommended LOS for wastewater treatment and transmission is 230 gallons per day/ERU (Equivalent Residential Unit @ 2.3 persons per household). This is based on 100 GPD per person, which is the Department of Ecology (DOE) design criteria required for developing sanitary sewage treatment facilities.

There are approximately 1,446 total sanitary sewer connections anticipated through 2000, which include 845 ERU for Actual 1995 (785 residential + 60 commercial ERU); 80 estimated additions during 1996; and an additional 521 ERU during the 1997-2002 growth period (growth estimated at 80 residential per year plus 47,500 sq. ft of commercial @ 200 GPD/1,000 sq. ft).

The total average daily gallons per day (GPD) wastewater treatment requirement resulting from growth demands (ERU) though 2002 will be 0.34 million gallons per day (MGD) at the current and recommended LOS of 230 gallons per day/ERU.

The wastewater treatment plant (WTP) will be upgraded to treat 0.64 million gallons per day (MGD) maximum monthly average flow (with the addition of the third aeration basin). This capacity upgrade is anticipated to accommodate the projected 1997-2002 growth in ERU.

The capacity of the WTP, by conditions of various permits, cannot be expanded beyond the maximum-monthly-average flow capacity of 0.64 million gallons per day (MGD). Therefore, the WTP capacity controls the number of sewered residential and commercial ERU in the Port Ludlow community.

Public Utility District (PUD) No.1 Service Area: The systems are being constructed to a specific, limited size, and will not be increased beyond the original design capacity.

Tri-Area Service Area: At the present time, septic systems provide the only mechanism for wastewater disposal and treatment.

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 current and recommended LOS for wastewater treatment and transmission is 230 gallons per day/ERU (Equivalent Residential Unit @ 2.3 persons per household). This is based on 100 GPD per person, which is the Department of Ecology (DOE) design criteria required for developing sanitary sewage treatment facilities.

When Tri Area sewage systems are developed they will need to meet this LOS. For the purposes of this Plan Amendment, it is important to understand that no increases in density will be allowed during the remainder of the initial plan duration (until 2003), and that the creation of the UGA will require utility planning to be undertaken to meet the needs for the future.

Solid Waste: Future Capacity Needs and Requirements

As of January 1998, Jefferson County has a services contract with a private commercial carrier to transport the majority of its solid waste to a landfill site in Goldendale, Washington. The County and private recycling efforts manage the remaining solid waste material.

The County will continue to contract with private commercial carriers to dispose of solid waste at landfill sites outside of Jefferson County for the foreseeable future. The County will also continue the use of private contractors to manage the solid waste recycling effort. The County will continue to manage the collection of Moderate Risk Waste at the County facility constructed in 1995. The Moderate Risk Waste is packaged and shipped off site for disposal outside of Jefferson County.

Table 11-5 shows the 20-year forecast demand and recommended Levels of Service (LOS) for solid waste management. The elements of analysis are as follows:

1. **Time Period:** Beginning with 1994 and continuing annually through 2017.
2. **County-Wide Population Projection by Year:** This population base is used since the County's responsibility for solid waste operations is regional.
3. **Annual Demand Tons:** Refers to the annual total amount of tons of solid waste and recyclables generated during the growth periods 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997-2002, and 2003-2017.
4. **Level of Service (LOS):** Refers to the forecasted waste demand in pounds on a per capita basis. This demand level is predicted to increase based on an average rate of 3.99 pounds of solid waste generated per person per day in conjunction with projected increases in Jefferson County population.
5. **Recycled Tons:** Refers to the amount of tons of solid waste that is recycled on an annual basis. This data has three components: (1) curbside recycling collected by private solid waste commercial carriers; (2) market-driven programs such as corrugated cardboard; and (3) the County recycling programs at the recycling stations located permanently at the Solid Waste Management Facility, Port Hadlock and Quilcene Transfer Stations, and other areas in the County as determined by the County, providers, and the recycled materials market.

Table 11-5 reflects a recycling LOS which follows a County-wide (Jefferson County Department of Public Works) 1997-2002 goal of 15% average recycling effort through the County's private recycling contractor. It is anticipated the recycling goal would gradually increase to a 20% average from years 2003 through 2016, and Table 11-5 reflects this assumption.

6. **Recycled Material Percentage:** Gives the percentage of waste recycled each year as either the result of forecast tonnage or as a LOS, as described above.
7. **Waste Tons Migrating:** Refers to the tonnage (15%) migrating out of the County's solid waste system, predominantly construction and demolition material, because facilities are not available to accept this waste, or because of lower cost alternatives for disposal or recycling compared to the County's tipping fee.
8. **Residual Tonnage Requiring Disposal:** Refers to the remaining solid waste that is neither recycled nor "lost" due to migration under the County's current policy of not using the landfill. The privately hauled tonnage for the preferred LOS is based on the County-wide recycling percentage goal (20%) for 2003-2016.

TABLE 11-5
Solid Waste Forecast and Recycling LOS For Jefferson County

Recommended LOS=3.99 lbs. per person per day with a 15% recycling effort by 2002

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Time Period	County Population	Annual Demand Tons	Level of Service	Recycled Tons	Recycled Material %	Waste Tons Migrating	Residual Tonnage Requiring Disposal
1994	24,300	16,960	3.86	1,930	11.30%	2,544	12,486
1995	25,196	18,341	3.99	2,383	13.00%	2,751	13,207
1996	25,754	18,805	3.99	2,445	13.00%	2,821	13,539
1997	26,312	19,160	3.99	2,491	13.00%	2,874	13,795
1998	26,886	19,578	3.99	2,741	14.00%	2,937	13,900
1999	27,477	20,008	3.99	2,801	14.00%	3,001	14,206
2000	28,084	20,506	3.99	2,871	14.00%	3,076	14,559
2001	28,708	20,904	3.99	3,136	15.00%	3,136	14,632
2002	29,351	21,373	3.99	3,206	15.00%	3,206	14,961
2003	30,012	21,854	3.99	3,278	15.00%	3,278	15,298
2004	30,693	22,411	3.99	3,586	16.00%	3,362	15,463
2005	31,394	22,860	3.99	3,658	16.00%	3,429	15,773
2006	32,115	23,385	3.99	3,742	16.00%	3,508	16,135
2007	32,783	23,872	3.99	4,058	17.00%	3,581	16,233
2008	33,469	24,438	3.99	4,154	17.00%	3,666	16,618
2009	34,175	24,885	3.99	4,230	17.00%	3,733	16,922
2010	34,900	25,413	3.99	4,574	18.00%	3,812	17,027
2011	35,645	25,956	3.99	4,672	18.00%	3,893	17,391
2012	36,412	26,587	3.99	4,786	18.00%	3,988	17,813
2013	37,200	27,088	3.99	5,147	19.00%	4,063	17,878
2014	38,012	27,679	3.99	5,259	19.00%	4,152	18,268
2015	38,698	28,179	3.99	5,354	19.00%	4,227	18,598
2016	39,397	28,766	3.99	5,753	20.00%	4,315	18,698
2017	40,087	29,190	3.99	5,838	20.00%	4,378	18,974

Water: Future Capacity Needs And Requirements

Water Demand: Estimates of water demand can be performed with multiple levels of sophistication and for a range of planning timeframes. For individual water system planning, estimates are generally focused on a 20-year horizon. However, special emphasis should be made to the short-term (six years) for capital planning and short term projects, and to the long-term (50 years) for major infrastructure planning. The challenges associated with a 50-year forecast include the level of uncertainty, and the lack of equivalency of the uncertainties between water systems. These uncertainties can be worse when planning on a regional basis, where land use and economics can encourage growth in a variety of directions over time. For the purposes of this Plan, a 20-year population projection and demand forecast have been used.

Based upon the population growth projected in planning areas represented in Table 11-6, an average day demand and peak day demand for the area was determined. To arrive at these numbers, data from various utilities and data derived during the development of the Jefferson County’s Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP - 1996 Draft) was used. An average day per capita use of 120 gallons per day (GPD) was appropriate for use in all areas except for the City. For the City, data indicated that the per capita use was closer to 200 gpd, in all likelihood due to commercial and industrial use in the area.

**Table 11-6
Jefferson County Population Growth Projections**

Number	Area	1996	2016	Change	Growth Rate/YR
1	Port Townsend	8,366	13,876	5,501	2.56%
2	Quimper Peninsula	2,927	4,076	1,149	1.67%
3	Marrowstone Island	839	1,015	176	0.96%
4	Tri-Area	4,324	5,489	1,165	1.20%
5	Discovery Bay	1,085	1,470	385	1.53%
6	Center/Inland Valleys	1,351	1,759	408	1.33%
7	Port Ludlow/Oak Bay	1,985	4,900	2,916	4.62%
8	Shine/Paradise Bay	897	1,471	574	2.50%
9	Coyle/Toandos Peninsula	411	596	185	1.88%
10	Quilcene	1,308	1,797	489	1.60%
11	Brinnon	1,299	1,943	644	2.03%
12	West End	962	1,005	43	0.22%
Total		25,754	39,389	13,635	2.15%

The use of these figures is consistent with those provided as Level of Service Standards (LOS) in the Capital Facilities Element since a per capita figure should generally be multiplied by 2.2 (for Jefferson County) to get a per connection figure. The resulting number should then be multiplied by 2 or 2.5 to get a anticipated peak day demand. Translating the above figures into a span for peak day demand (per connection) of between 660 GPD and 880 GPD. For long range and County-wide planning, these numbers compare well with the LOS and DOH standards of 400 GPD (average) and 800 GPD LOS (peak). This is particularly true given the uncertainties of the effects of conservation programs and the variety of demand throughout the County.

Table 11-7 shows the results of this analysis. By 2016, the County can expect to be using over 6,500 acre feet of water a year. On a peak day (using 2.5 as a peaking factor), the anticipated population of 39,000 people will demand about 14.6 MGD. These figures do not take into account conservation measures yet in effect as of January 1998.

With the general demand calculations as a function of population, the high demand areas are those where mentioned high rates of growth are anticipated. Accordingly, Port Townsend, Port Ludlow, Brinnon, and Shine/Paradise Bay are anticipated to provide the largest increase in demand.

Assessment of Needed Capacity: The assessment provided below is broken down into 12 planning areas (historic Jefferson County Planning Sub-areas). Although the discussion focuses on several of the larger water systems in each area, smaller water systems and individual supplies will continue to be significant in meeting future demand.

The following analysis is intended to put the water supply needs in perspective to available supply. The major assumption used for this analysis is that people will want to go, or will go, where there is supply. The record is clear that construction and demand are geographically a function of perceived and desired lifestyle, economics, and regulation (resource management). If the economics are such that a lifestyle can be obtained with private water supply, and there is no regulatory (or resource) reason to prohibit well construction or diversions, then private supplies will be developed regardless of public supply availability.

Again, any comparison of water rights to demand and system capacity with regional demand, must be done with these limitations in mind. It is interesting and valuable, however, to know whether public supply in an area (planning area in this case) is in a position to meet some, most, or all of the area's anticipated growth. This information can serve to highlight critical supply issues, or draw attention to areas where on a relative basis, supply may not be as much of a problem.

The following analysis, is provided for this purpose and is not intended to portray a precise prediction of supply needs.

Port Townsend: The City has a surface water withdrawal right of up to 25.57 MGD. However, pipeline capacity is limited to 19.4 MGD. The paper mill (Port Townsend Paper) has contract rights to 14.4 MGD of this diversion and other contracts to total 14.8 MGD. The remainder (5 MGD) is available to meet the City's growth.

Population and related peak day demand at 2016 could be in the range of 6.9 MGD. The current 5 MGD surface water supply will be insufficient to meet the City's needs on a peak day basis. The City has projected a buildout scenario (City limits) of 25,000 people (included in "Population Change in Jefferson County: The Next 20 Years", April 1992, Jefferson County). With this scenario, at 200 GPD average day, demand might reach 5 MGD (with peak day at nearly 13 MGD). This might be a conservative estimate. With the growth rate continuing at the Watterson Report rate (2.62 percent per year) to the year 2046 (50 years), Port Townsend's population would be expected to reach about 30,000. Under either scenario, existing supply of 5 MGD will not meet these needs in the absence of conservation measures now in effect.

Quimper: The Quimper area's water systems have the capacity and water rights to serve only about 75 percent of the anticipated population increase. Total increase in this area is expected to be about 1,150 people by 2016. The largest available capacity exists on the PUD's South Hastings Loop (LUD No. 3) where capacity and water rights for about 250 connections currently exists. Cape George and the Glen Cove Systems both expect to serve significant increases over the next 20 years (collectively increasing from the current 614 connections to 1,065), but both currently lack water rights and capacity to do so.

GOAL:

UTG 4.0 Identify, conserve and preserve resources, and to provide cost effective services.

POLICIES:

UTP 4.1 Research and, as appropriate, implement resource conservation technologies in all areas of new construction and large scale renovation of public facilities.

UTP 4.2 Maintain operating efficiency of existing resource consuming facilities in Jefferson County.

UTP 4.3 Investigate, maintain current information, and, as appropriate, support implementation of changes in technology and other changes that improve the provision of utility services and provide for enhanced conservation.

WATER UTILITIESGOAL:

UTG. 5.0 Promote coordination of water utility planning among purveyors, government agencies, and citizens to ensure an adequate potable water system, to protect the quality of the water supply, and to conform with the Comprehensive Plan.

POLICIES:

UTP 5.1 The creation and the extension of public water supply systems outside Urban Growth Areas shall be consistent with the rural densities specified in the Land Use Element, and shall be financed entirely by the benefited properties and not the general rate payer.

UTP 5.2 Support the County Water Utility Coordinating Committee's (WUCC) routine review of the Department of Health (DOH) records of the County water systems operational and financial status, and work with the WUCC, DOH, and purveyors to determine required corrective actions.

UTP 5.3 Participate in and assist the facilitation of regional discussions and analyses on water quality and quantity issues through the WUCC, the Water Resources Council and other regional forums.

UTP 5.3.1 Work in cooperation with, and as a member of, the Jefferson County Water Resources Council in a cooperative process to assess the availability of water for future growth in the context of a watershed planning process integrated with salmon recovery planning

UTP 5.4 Update the adopted Jefferson County Coordinated Water System Plan (1997) incorporating the adopted land use, population allocations, and pertinent policy identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

UTP 5.5 Take an active role in approving Satellite Management Agencies that are allowed to own and operate multiple water systems that are not physically connected (satellite systems).

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 includes 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 in 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 equivalent residential unit (ERU) 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.

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.

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.