

INTRODUCTION—FEIS

The Final Environmental Impact Statement issued in conjunction with the consideration by the County of a Master Planned Resort proposal for the Brinnon Subarea known as the Pleasant Harbor Marina and Golf Resort consists of the following documents:

- The Final EIS issued November 27, 2007;
 - FEIS Introduction
 - DEIS sections with new responses to comments
 - Summary of conditions and supplemental reports
- The DEIS appendices issued September 5, 2007; and
- FEIS public comments (124-413)

Public Process

The Draft EIS was issued September 5, 2007 with a 45-day comment period through October 24, 2007. Public meetings were held by a Planning Commission committee on September 11, 18, and 25, 2007 in Brinnon at which members of the public were introduced to the project and the DEIS (September 11); representatives of the Jefferson County EDC and WSU extension office discussed economic, job, and community benefits and impacts (September 18); and September 25, 2007 when consultants responsible for the DEIS provided more detailed overviews of the proposal.

Public comment was accepted at all stages and recorded by the DCD Long-Range Planner, Karen Barrows. In addition, written comments were received between September 5 and October 24 from citizens, agencies, and Tribes. Comments are recorded in the FEIS appendices and responses to comments are provided in the FEIS under each of the scoped topics addressed.

Project Context and Regulatory Controls

The Pleasant Harbor Marina and Golf Resort ("the Resort") is located in the southerly area of Jefferson County in an area designated in the Comprehensive Plan/Brinnon Subarea Plan as appropriate for a Master Planned Resort as provided in RCW 36.70A.360 and Jefferson County Code Chapter 18.15.

The first step in that process is a decision on the 2007 Comprehensive Plan amendment for the Master Planned Resort designation and land use map. That decision, together with the Planning Commission recommendation, will be before the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners December 3, 2007 for a public hearing and is proposed to be acted upon by December 10, 2007.

If approved, the ordinance amending the Comprehensive Plan Map would identify the conditions of approval at this planning stage and direct the formulation of specific zoning sections and a development agreement, which would provide the basis for project-specific review and the enforcement of the conditions of approval set forth by the Board of County Commissioners and this FEIS.

How to Read this FEIS

The DEIS was used as a basis for the FEIS, with additions as follows: The new FEIS introduction describes the overview. Responses to comments were added within Chapter 3 at the end of each topic.

A new Chapter 5 includes a summary of FEIS mitigation requirements, technical comments, and the log of comments. The original text from the DEIS is incorporated except as modified by the materials described above.

Summary of Concerns and Responses

The EIS was the product of a scoping process identifying nine topic areas of concern: shellfish; water quality, quantity and use; transportation; public services; shorelines; fish and wildlife; rural character; archeology and cultural resources; and critical areas.

The County has been examining all public responses to the program (FEIS Appendix 1), with the DEIS comments as noted. All of the comments received have been sorted by topic or topics of concern and responses have been consolidated in Chapter 3 under each of the topics addressed in Sections 3.2-3.11 by the addition of a final section addressing comments and response to comments. Comments are published in the County public comment log, which is part of this FEIS.

As there was a great deal of overlap in the comments, the responses are by topic and concern, and each letter or comment considered is identified in the section. All comments made were noted, even those which did not warrant or merit specific responses under SEPA. This was usually because the concern addressed project-specific design topics that are premature for specific response at this stage and are covered by project-related review conditions or cumulative concerns addressed in the collective responses to each topic.

A final chapter (Chapter 5) is added in this FEIS, which is a summary of the environmental mitigation imposed on the project, to be implemented at the project-review level through, first, the development of specific zoning and development agreement guidelines incorporating the specific requirements, and then project-specific review for each phase of the development to be identified in the development agreement. Chapter 5 also includes the comment log in which comments are identified and the location of answers are addressed.

General Concerns

1. How much detail is appropriate at the Comprehensive Plan level, and when should detailed conditions be imposed?

The FEIS is to address the non-project probable adverse impacts of a proposal and provide means for avoiding, minimizing, and/or mitigating identified consequences. The EIS process has resulted in modification of the proposal from the original 1880 units (MLA 06-87 3-1-06 application) to the present 890 residential units. The FEIS identifies a substantial number of permit checks to assure that the project envisioned by the Board of County Commissioners through the Brinnon Subarea Plan in an approved Master Planned Resort are achieved in practice.

The FEIS process does not require or expect the community to speculate. It is appropriate for the County to set goals and objectives at this legislative stage, and define the processes to achieve those goals and objectives in regulatory tools, including development regulations and development agreements addressing how the project is to be reviewed at the project stage. The County can then process project-specific applications with the detailed engineering proposals and review that will allow the County and other review agencies to determine whether the goals and objectives for the project have in fact been met.

The project was processed with a "phased review" of this proposal. "'Phased review' means the coverage of general matters in broader environmental documents, with subsequent narrower documents concentrating solely on the issues specific to the later analysis (WAC 197-11-060(5))." WAC

197-11-776. The phased review at this step is the consideration of a Comprehensive Plan enabling the development of a Master Planned Resort at this site and the mitigating conditions necessary to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the potential impacts of such project. A subsequent and narrower phase of SEPA review occurs at the project-level phase when specific construction projects and specific mitigations are detailed to achieve the objectives of the project and the conditions imposed through SEPA and project review.

The first step of phased review, the Comprehensive Plan amendment, undertaken at this stage, has satisfied the question of what mitigations are necessary to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Master Planned Resort. Mitigating conditions and specific topics to be addressed at the permitting phase have been identified to make sure the community goals and objectives are achieved. Detailed engineering responses as to how to achieve certain goals and requirements are reserved for the project phase when the specifics of each phase can be addressed and analyzed in context. For this reason, specific response to many of the questions or comments addressing a need for additional detail as to how certain objectives are to be achieved are deferred to the project level, when detailed engineering reports and further project-specific studies are complete and available for evaluation of a specific proposal. This approach is particularly appropriate for a project that has a number of phases and may be constructed over a projected 5-10 year period.

All mitigation requirements, including the more detailed "how is an objective to be achieved" comments are noted in this FEIS and will be carried over to the project-level review through the FEIS and subsequent environmental review to make sure the concerns are addressed at the project level. SEPA review is required at each development permit stage. At permit review, the County is able to assure compliance with development regulations, County standards, and the requirements of this FEIS. In this way, achieving the public interest identified in the Comprehensive Plan, Brinnon Subarea Plan, Shoreline Master Program and other government regulations are achieved.

2. What are the key regulatory permits and how are conditions to be enforced?

A wide variety of permits are required for any resort of the magnitude proposed to be constructed, but four County permits and two State permits will provide the basic regulatory mechanism for controlling the project.

a. Water Rights. Under Washington law no project may be constructed unless the community has adequate water capability to service the project. The applicant has applied to the Washington State Department of Ecology for water rights approval, and no new project development can occur until WDOE certifies the amount of water available and the County determines that each project phase proposed can be constructed within allowable limits. Concerns about potential impact to the aquifer, potential impacts to other water users and their wells, and concerns about salt water intrusion are all addressed specifically at this stage.

b. Wastewater Treatment and Reuse. The Comprehensive Plan requirement for any Master Planned Resort is for onsite reuse of wastewater generated by the development. The applicant has proposed a reuse and recycling treatment system for use in toilet flushing and irrigation that requires approval of the Washington State Department of Ecology. Detailed engineering plans are submitted to WDOE, and issues about the ability of the system to achieve the Class A recycled water quality standard and maintain that standard during operation are addressed. In this case the engineering report would address in detail concerns raised about irrigation application and considerations for aquifer protection, including nitrogen and pathogen reduction and disinfection to prevent impacts on the aquifer through soil infiltration or transport to Hood Canal by reason of surface or subsurface water flows.

c. Stormwater Management. Jefferson County has a stormwater management program encompassed in a stormwater permit. At the project level, before any site grading is done, the County must review and approve detailed engineering plans which address (1) preservation of critical area habitat, particularly wetland water quality, quantity, and habitat protection; (2) relocation and restoration of disturbed wetlands (WDOE also has regulatory control over wetland mitigation projects); (3) construction period controls to assure that stormwater from the site is captured and treated and not discharged to Hood Canal or Pleasant Harbor; (4) that protected areas are adequately staked and protected to assure protection of natural areas to be retained on the site; (5) that temporary cover is adequate to control erosion and prevent runoff until final control structures are in place; and (6) pursuant to the FEIS requirements, that the stormwater system be able to handle maximum events, not just 100-year events, to achieve the no discharge objectives identified in the EIS.

d. Plat and Site Plan Review. All development on the site will require a subdivision application where new lots are to be created and site plan review for the development of existing or approved lots. During this process, issues of traffic, utilities, public safety, public access, and the many other requirements of the FEIS as well as the County development regulation requirements are implemented. Specific mitigating conditions are imposed at this stage and are enforceable through a preliminary approval that identifies the standards to be achieved, and a final approval that is not given until all conditions are met. This FEIS requires that memorandums of understanding with each of the public service providers be in place and provided during the approval process to assure that needs of the agencies serving the project are addressed and met concurrently with development. It is expected that mitigation will entail some combination of tax receipts, onsite facilities, and mitigation payments to agencies to meet identified needs as a result of the development. The list is not exclusive, but intended to identify that public service and public facility issues shall be addressed and resolved contemporaneously with any project phase approval.

e. Shoreline Substantial Development Permit. The Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is issued at the local level for all development within 200 feet of the water's edge at Pleasant Harbor based on Shoreline Master Program requirements. Since the Maritime Village is considered a single project, the entirety of the Maritime Village is subject to the approval of the Substantial Development Permit for all development within shoreline jurisdiction. Compliance with all requirements of the Shoreline Master Program and County development standards must be met, as well as Shoreline Management Act requirements (which are reviewed by WDOE). In addition, the Substantial Development Permit will specifically define and address the monitoring and adaptive management program required by this FEIS for Pleasant Harbor as the resort is phased in and as operations continue.

f. County staff will monitor all conditions and mitigations. Any citizen complaints will be processed through the DCD compliance division.

Specific Concerns

1. Shellfish

The FEIS documents that the Hood Canal area is a sensitive area with endangered salmon and important fish, crab, and shellfish beds, particularly at the Duckabush and Dosewallips River estuaries. Protection of water quality, eel grass, and the near shore and riparian habitats are important to maintaining these aquatic resources. Statesman proposes to use a low impact approach to development. Low impact development methods include steps to capture and treat all onsite stormwater from developed surfaces (including impervious surfaces as well as the golf course and other open areas). Stormwater is to be captured and retained onsite, even in extreme (over 100-year) events. The water use and water treatment permits will specifically address the issue of the aquifer and

seeps as a potential direct or indirect pathway for potential contaminants to assure that the treatment system proposed is adequate to provide the protection necessary to assure no impact to the fish or shellfish beds adjacent to or near the proposed facility.

The location of a resort in an area that has significant fishing and public shellfish beaches will increase pressure on the resource. But the resources are managed for public use and access, and the resort does afford the public a safe manner to come and stay in the area. Regulatory control of public access to public beaches, public shellfish, and fish are all controlled. The resort is required to provide public education programs to increase public awareness of the licensing requirements, limits, hunting and harvest seasons, and other information to facilitate the proper use and access to public resources.

2. Water Quality, Quantity, and Use

As described above, the acquisition of water rights and the approval of an onsite wastewater treatment and reuse system will be two of the key project-related permits. Permit review will address at the engineering level of detail how to protect the aquifer, how much water is in fact available, and how public health and safety are protected in the approval and monitoring of construction and operation of such facilities. No plats or site plans can be approved without sufficient water to assure the phase meets all public health and safety requirements. Water usage and recapture rates are aggressive, but within proven limits of technology. The plan for the project is to phase in the development, assuming standard rates of use for the early phases, reducing the per unit utilization only as early phases demonstrate the ability of the project to achieve the intended savings and efficiencies. This phasing will assure that at all times the project operates within allowable limits, including years with both heavy storm events and years when rainfall may be negligible. No building permits can be issued until adequate water access, treatment, and use facilities are identified to serve the phase.

In addition, the stormwater protection plan is required to address water quality protection and habitat protection, particularly for wetlands. This condition assures that even at the earliest site grading, habitat, wetlands, and the waters surrounding the site are protected as required by this FEIS.

Water calculations must include water necessary to maintain no net loss of wetland habitat function and value. Water for the resort must be in addition to water used to maintain habitat.

3. Transportation

Transportation studies show that even though the project is anticipated to substantially increase the auto traffic in the area, future traffic levels with the project would operate within the adopted levels of service required by the State and County. During preliminary plat review, the County and WSDOT will identify and approve designs for safe ingress and egress from the site. Both County and WSDOT approval is required for ingress and egress to US HWY 101, and any specific plan must meet both County and State standards for safe public passage.

Onsite, Black Point Road would need to be improved where it serves resort traffic to County standards, and the internal roads, whether public or private, must meet all requirements in size, composition, and connectivity for safe access and for fire and public safety purposes.

The project would have trails open to public access for walking, bicycles, and other non motorized transport. In addition, the project contemplates shuttle services, which would reduce local traffic and provide common transport to local areas of interest. The project has no plans for helicopter or seaplane service, and any proposal to include facilities for either would require supplemental environmental review to determine both the appropriateness of such service and if approved adequate conditions to assure safe operation and minimum community impacts.

Traffic mitigation at each phase may include both onsite and offsite mitigation, or contributions to state or local projects mitigating impacts from the project site. US HWY 101 is recognized as a highway that does contain limitations as to speed, auto, and nonmotorized safety. Control of the flow of traffic on US HWY 101 is through the WSDOT, and all project development is required to conform with the requirements and standards of that agency. Any offsite road improvements required as a result of increased traffic (such as Brinnon intersections) are controlled outside of the WSDOT right of way by the County, and such facilities must be improved and constructed to County standards and approvals identified at the time of preliminary plan or project development.

Public Services

South Jefferson County is an area with limited public services. Police, fire, transit, and public health services are all available, but without capability to meet significant increase in case loads that a major resort may bring. In addition, local schools are in financial downturns, with the grade school in need of significant upgrade and local students bussed to Quilcene High School. To address public service and facilities needs, the County is requiring specific analysis of the impact and meetings with each, in connection with plat and site plan review, and to negotiate a memorandum of understanding that will become a condition of any permit or approval. The memorandum of understanding is a binding agreement as to the needs of the particular service provider for the services and facilities necessary to meet the needs created by the resort and how those needs are to be met. In the event an agreement cannot be reached, the County may deny the application for development. The applicable standard will be that all requirements for public service and safety be met, and that in combination with the provision of tax revenues, agreed facilities and mitigation fees, the agency is able to meet its appropriate level of service reliably and over time.

Shorelines

The site is on Black Point with Conservancy and Suburban shorelines onsite and Natural shorelines nearby. No development is proposed along the southern shore where a 200-foot riparian buffer is proposed and the beach is to be closed for both public safety and environmental protection.

Public access to publicly controlled beaches and water-oriented, water-dependent and water-enjoyment uses are proposed within the footprint of the present physical development of the marina, service roads, and parking area of Pleasant Harbor Marina.

Setbacks, open space, bulk, and density requirements of the Shoreline Master Program and Shoreline Management Act must be met during review for the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit process. The proposal includes no change to the size and operations of the marina, but includes replacement of existing docks and walkways which are, in many places, dilapidated or obsolete and many are contaminated with an invasive species (tunicate) which the applicant and WDFW are working to eradicate in the Harbor.

Pleasant Harbor does have eelgrass, which is important to protect. The Coast Guard controls anchorage in harbors such as Pleasant Harbor. The marina is required to have a marina management plan that requires compliance with safe boating regulations, including sewage pump-out rules, limits repair and refueling activities that may pose a risk to water quality, and a monitoring and adaptive management program designed to protect Pleasant Harbor from unanticipated changes.

Fish and Wildlife

The upland site is not used by threatened or endangered species, though it abuts Hood Canal and Pleasant Harbor, which have several listed fish species, and is between both the Dosewallips and Duckabush River systems, which are important to existing fish production and species restoration

programs. Protection of water quality, as noted above, is the most significant feature to protect fish, shellfish, and other aquatic species.

The riparian habitat along the southern shoreline and the forested buffer along HWY US 101 are to be retained, except for point of ingress and egress on US HWY101. Some habitat use by larger mammals (deer, elk, and bear) may be interrupted, but the area was not identified as important or common habitat for larger mammals. Elk herds in the area are found in the Dosewallips and Duckabush River systems, but have not been observed within the project area. In response to comments raised, WDFW was contacted, and specific data from the resource manager was obtained to substantiate this point.

Habitat for birds, small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and particularly those which are wetland dependent are protected by limiting the program to 20% impervious surface at the golf course resort, and 22% at the marina, as well as pervious and natural areas that have the potential to provide habitat within areas to be used for public enjoyment. Some physical habitat loss is unavoidable. A habitat management plan is required to address habitat protection in the context of the resort.

Commentators have noted that the resort will increase pressure on fishing and access to public trails, land, and other facilities in the area. Master Planned Resorts are required to be located in areas of significant natural amenities, and the County has identified the public lands in the Olympic Mountain range and Hood Canal as such an amenity. The resort does promote public access and does increase pressure to use the public facilities, including trails and waterways. The resort is required to provide public education programs on the wise and appropriate use of public lands so the public may enjoy the area. Education will also include programs concerning regulations about public use designed to minimize public impact on managed fish and wildlife habitat and resources.

Rural Character and Population

The Master Planned Resort has been a divisive issue in the Brinnon community for a number of years. Many commentators want Brinnon to remain the same and not be subject to the impact of a Master Planned Resort. Others view the Master Planned Resort as essential to the economic revitalization of South Jefferson County. The community decision favoring a Master Planned Resort was expressed in the Brinnon Subarea Plan in 2002, which envisioned the concept of a Master Planned Resort at Black Point. This resort is tailored to the traveling public and short-term tourist, being different than the resort community found at Port Ludlow. The Brinnon Subarea Plan specifically called out a resort hotel or inn, 18-hole golf course, potentially 25 homes along the water, and a mixed use commercial facility astride US HWY 101. The plan was conceptual, but was to have onsite treatment facilities and avoid significant adverse environmental impacts.

The proposed resort and 18-hole golf course project is focused toward tourist use rather than permanent residency. With the exception of staff housing and 10% of the remainder which may be permanent housing, all other units are in the hotel rental pool and will be offered to seasonal and short-term tourists interested the area.

The resort will bring a substantial number of people to stay in the area (890 units with 85% average occupancy in the summer, 50% in mid season and 30% in the winter months). The resort population provides a demand for commercial and public services likely to be met through combination of onsite and offsite services and faculties, and particularly in the rural village at Brinnon.

The resort can have an impact on land valuations in the vicinity, but land values have been rising in the area for several years (independently of the resort). Estimates of property value increase in the Hood Canal properties range upwards of 25-30% per year for the past several years. This pressure has

reduced in 2007. Brinnon, within a 2-3 hour drive of most of the Puget Sound population, is within areas of increasing pressure for resort and vacation properties.

A Master Planned Resort was envisioned in the Black Point area when the County adopted its Comprehensive Plan and Brinnon Subarea Plan. Control on incidental growth is achieved by the mandate that the urban services in the Master Planned Resort not be used to serve properties outside the resort area. The County has land use plans in place under its GMA comprehensive plans, and no other changes in those plans or designations are proposed as a part of or as a result of the proposed Master Planned Resort.

While it is possible that the attractiveness of the Brinnon Area will be highlighted by the resort and some rural properties will be developed in South Jefferson County as a result of the resort (and part of its "cumulative effect"), some potential purchasers of resort or retirement property may be satisfied with the access provided by the resort, providing a fully-serviced area from which to enjoy the area, rather than having to build and maintain seasonal housing.

The resort will change the nature of Brinnon, simply by increasing the level of activity in the area. Continued implementation of the County's rural rules and regulations about development are the principal control on the consequences of that change.

Archeology and Cultural Resources

Preliminary site investigations revealed no active or obvious areas of significance. A site-specific review process during construction to assure that important finds are properly identified and protected during the construction process shall be required. The preliminary plats and shoreline permit conditions will provide detailed procedures by which such objectives shall be achieved.

Critical Areas

Critical areas onsite include wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, critical aquifer recharge areas, and geologically hazardous areas. Offsite they include flood hazard areas of both the Duckabush and Dosewallips Rivers. Critical area protection is built into the program in a number of ways. Wetlands have been formally delineated. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE) has determined the onsite wetlands are isolated and outside of their jurisdiction. However, both Jefferson County and the State have no net loss policies protecting the functions and values of the wetlands. Protection of water quality and water quantity, and preparation of a mitigation plan for any critical areas disturbed by project development are requirements before any site work can begin. A mitigation plan to define wetland compensation will be prepared that addresses this need during the project portion of any phased review.

Aquifer protection is an issue with the golf course. The FEIS requires a management plan to address nutrient and pesticide management, and golf course management to protect the aquifer (and surrounding waters) from adverse impacts by reason of the golf course construction, maintenance, and operation.

Habitat management is addressed through a habitat management plan that addresses areas and species to be saved and protected. Revegetation of disturbed areas, and use of native materials and low water use landscaping to retain the northwest character are designed to provide habitat protection and control during construction and operation. Existing vegetated buffers along US HWY 101 and shoreline at the marina are to be preserved and stabilized where possible.

The steep slopes on the southerly border are protected by a riparian buffer and closure of the beach trail to prevent public use and access. Structures are located several hundred feet back from the bluff

and stormwater plans are required to address how the stormwater management system will be designed to avoid adverse impacts to the southerly bluffs.

At the marina, existing vertical cuts creating parking areas are failing and require shoring and support to protect the forested buffer and ultimately US HWY 101. The proposal includes a support wall along the maritime village westerly side to stabilize the bank, and footings and foundation for the village within the existing footprint of the parking and building area of the present marina.

All development in the resort will comply with shoreline and critical area regulations through project review at each permit stage.

This Final EIS identifies the environmental risks of this proposal at a non-project level with proposed supplemental requirements in addition to County standards that are designed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate probable environmental impacts of the proposed Master Planned Resort contemplated in the alternatives of this FEIS. The environmental analysis with mitigation spelled out in this FEIS achieves that result and is hereby approved to be issued.

Published by Jefferson County

This 27th day of November, 2007

Stacie Hoskins, Planning Manager
SEPA Responsible Official

INTRODUCTION—DEIS

This Environmental Impact Statement addresses a proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and master plan approval proposed as a future project to be located in Jefferson County and to be known as the Pleasant Harbor Marina and Golf Resort. The EIS is prepared to allow Jefferson County and its citizens to review the plan amendment and master plan, its purpose and need, the affected environment, the range of alternatives, and an analysis of environmental impacts and potential mitigation. A Master Planned Resort (MPR) is a change from rural to urban uses which may be approved in a rural area under the guidelines of the Washington State Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.365; the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 3, Long-range Goal 24, and Policies 24-1-13; and the Brinnon Subarea Plan, which had previously identified the Pleasant Harbor-Black Point area as a potential location for a Master Planned Resort (2002).

The Brinnon Subarea Plan (BSAP) specifically considered potential uses for the 310.6 acres at the Black Point Pleasant Harbor area south of Brinnon, encompassed within a designated “potential” master planned resort area, including a resort with an 18-hole golf course, clubhouse facilities, and hotel/inn with conference center, health, athletic facilities “with on-site advanced stormwater and wastewater treatment systems” and the “infill” of associated visitor supported commercial, recreational and residential uses associated with the marina and a Master Planned Resort.

The Statesman Pleasant Harbor proposed resort area encompasses approximately 256 acres within the MPR potential area identified in the Brinnon Subarea. The proposal specifically includes an updated and expanded commercial center for the marina, golf course, and resort housing, including residential, restaurant, spa, hotel managed facilities, targeted to both long-term and short-term tourist facilities. The proposed resort is served by onsite advanced stormwater and wastewater treatment systems specifically contemplated in the Subarea Plan to protect community environmental values and particularly water quality in Hood Canal.

The Master Planned Resort approval process and criteria are detailed in the Jefferson County Code, JCC 18.15.115 – 18.15.135, with the requirements for approval by the Planning Commission set forth at Jefferson County Code, Section 18.15.132. These regulations will be the basis for the application, review, and possible approval of this Plan amendment and master plan approval. Project-specific permits are necessary to build a specific project, but any subsequent permits would have to be consistent with the approvals given in the Plan under consideration. The proposal is also reviewed under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and the County has required an EIS to assure that environmental issues are addressed at a logical time and in an appropriate context. As such, the environmental review is a staged or “phased review” which is permitted under SEPA. The master plan programmatic review presently before the County for review and approval considers the overall propriety and implications of the resort in the proposed setting and addresses how impacts may be avoided and necessary mitigation may be assured. Project-level review, which comes later in the process, occurs in connection with the application for a specific permit, so the specific engineering requirements to assure both compliance with the master plan and protection of the environment are achieved. As such, the programmatic view of the project is conceptual; the project review of the proposal will be site and time specific.

The master plan program in Jefferson County also requires a development agreement, authorized by RCW 36.70B.170, to identify development standards, phasing, responsibility for implementation, and period of vesting to County standards for the planned development to assure that the conceptual master plan will be carried out as proposed.

The EIS under review is a programmatic EIS issued to address non-project actions.¹ The Environmental Impact Statement is part of the project review and public process, which for this project will include a review by a Planning Commission, committee with public involvement particularly from the Brinnon Subarea, public hearing(s) before the Planning Commission, and ultimately a public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners before any final action is taken.

Due to the size of the project, and the areas involved, the County has determined that the public comment period for the EIS will last through the public hearings on the project by the Planning Commission. The Final EIS will incorporate all comments received and recommendations by the Planning Commission. The Final EIS is required to be issued at least seven days prior to action by the Board of County Commissioners, anticipated in December 2007.

During the environmental review process, written materials may be directed to the Department of Community Development at any time, and they will be made part of the record. In addition, public review before the Planning Commission committee and the Planning Commission will also address environmental issues. Once the Planning Commission makes its final recommendations, the County will complete its environmental review and issue the Final EIS before the Board of County Commissioners takes any action on the approval.

The EIS is processed by the County through the Environmental Review Official, Stacie Hoskins, and information about the EIS may be obtained at the Department of Community Development between the weekday hours of 9 am and 4:30 pm, located at 621 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend, WA 98368; telephone: 360/379-4450. Many materials are also posted on line at:
[http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Black Point MPR.htm](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Black_Point_MPR.htm)

Published by Jefferson County

This 5th day of September, 2007

Stacie Hoskins, Planning Manager
SEPA Responsible Official

¹ A non-project action is an agency decision on policies, plans, and programs (WAC 197-11-704) pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act, Chapter 43.21C RCW, and the implementing regulations at Chapter 197-11 WAC.

FACT SHEET

<i>Project Title</i>	Pleasant Harbor Marina and Golf Resort Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
<i>Description of Proposal</i>	The proposed action is a non project action to amend the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan to add approval for a Master Planned Resort in the Black Point area of the Brinnon Subarea Plan, Application MLA06-87. The proposed Master Planned Resort will be developed on 256± acres and will include a golf course, central resort facility, additional commercial uses, and residential additions to the Pleasant Harbor Marina area with a total of 890 residential units.
<i>Location of Proposal</i>	Pleasant Harbor, south of Brinnon at US HWY 101 & Black Point Rd. in Jefferson County, Washington. Parcel Numbers 502153002, 003, 023, 022, 021 & 020; APN 502154002; APN 502152005, 012, 013, 014, 015 & 016, in Sections 15 & 22, Township 25, Range 02 West, WM, located in Brinnon, WA 98320.
<i>Historic Reference</i>	Proposal area has been subject to logging and was formerly a 500-unit NACO/Thousand Trails seasonal campground for trailers and campers. Presently a 285-boat slip marina with associated retail commercial outlet and approval for 60-unit RV park are in place.
<i>Proposed Action</i>	Adoption of a Comprehensive Plan amendment approving the Master Planned Resort and associated approval of a development agreement confirming mitigation phasing and development regulation vesting rules required by the County.
<i>Proponent</i>	<p>Statesman Group of Companies U.S. Head Office 9300 E. Raintree Drive, Suite 100 Scottsdale, AZ, 85260 USA</p> <p>Corporate Head Office: 7370 Sierra Morena Blvd SW Calgary, Alberta, CANADA T3H 4H9</p>
<i>Date of Implementation</i>	Master Plan approval requested December 2007 as part of the County's overall Comprehensive Plan review process.
<i>Lead Agency</i>	Jefferson County Department of Community Development

Responsible Official	Stacie L. Hoskins Planning Manager Dept. of Community Development 621 Sheridan Street Port Townsend, WA 98368
Contact Person	Karen Barrows Assistant Planner Dept. of Community Development 621 Sheridan Street Port Townsend, WA 98368
Jefferson County File	MLA06-87
Date of Draft EIS	Issuance: September 5, 2007 Planning Commission Public Hearing: October 3, 2007 Comments: Through October 24, 2007
FEIS Published	November 27, 2007
Proposed Date of Final Action	Public Hearing: December 3, 2007 Final Action: December 10, 2007
Location of Final EIS for Review	Copies of the Final EIS will be available at: Jefferson County Department of Community Development 621 Sheridan Street Port Townsend, WA 98368 Fire District #4 Headquarters 272 Schoolhouse Road Brinnon, WA 98320
Cost of Final EIS	Initial 200 copies available at no charge; disks of the DEIS and Appendices available from Dept. of Community Development at \$1.10 each; each additional printed copy at cost (estimate \$90 each).
Additional Information	For more information, visit the County website at http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us and follow link to 2007 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle

REQUIRED APPROVALS

<p><i>Jefferson County – non project approval</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Comprehensive Plan Amendment to enable the Pleasant Harbor MPR site ❖ Land Use Map amendment to identify the Pleasant Harbor Master Planned Resort site ❖ Development agreement approval ❖ Master Plan approval ❖ Unified Development Code amendment to add a section on the Pleasant Harbor MPR
<p><i>Jefferson County— project approval (phased review applications filed after Master Plan approval):</i></p> <p>Golf Course Resort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golf Course • Hotel and related facilities • Resort Housing • Employee Housing • Wastewater Facility • Water Supply Facility 	<p>Local or County Permits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Preliminary/final plat for roads utilities and other infrastructure ❖ Stormwater permit for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ preliminary site grading, cut and fill ❖ new roads and impervious surfaces ❖ construction and operation of the resort properties ❖ critical area protection and modification. ❖ Class IV conversion Forest practice permit for predevelopment logging ❖ Shoreline permit for any development within 200 feet of the shoreline (close beach access to south and possible wetland mitigation and buffer work) ❖ Shoreline exemption for dock replacement for Tunicate eradication ❖ Building permits for construction
<p><i>Jefferson County— project approval (phased review applications filed after Master Plan approval):</i></p> <p>Maritime Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential • Commercial 	<p>Local or County Permits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Preliminary and final plat or binding site plan for new roads, utilities infrastructure and any lot modification ❖ Stormwater permit for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ preliminary site grading, cut and fill ❖ new roads and impervious surfaces ❖ construction and operation of the resort properties ❖ Critical area protection and modification

	<p>Local or County Permits (cont.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Class IV conversion Forest practice permit for predevelopment logging ❖ Shoreline Permit for all development within 200 feet of the shoreline of Pleasant Harbor. (Simple dock replacement as part of the Tunicate eradication program with WDFW is considered repair or replacement and would not require a shoreline permit.) ❖ Building permits for construction ❖ Fuel containment and fire plan (Fire Dist. #4)
<p>Jefferson County— project approval (phased review applications filed after Master Plan approval):</p> <p>Golf Course Resort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golf Course • Hotel and related facilities • Resort Housing • Employee Housing • Wastewater Facility • Water Supply Facility <p>Maritime Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential • Commercial 	<p>State Permits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Wastewater treatment and upland disposal (Class A recycled water) facility permits from WDOE ❖ Class A Water System approval by WDOH ❖ US HWY 101 right of way access permits for access to US HWY 101 from WDOT ❖ Well closure approval by WDOE ❖ Hydraulic project approval by WDFW for all work below OHWM in Pleasant Harbor ❖ Water rights certificate approval by WDOE ❖ Underground storage tank certification by WDOE ❖ Construction period air quality permits from air quality authority ❖ NPDES general permits for clearing from WDOE ❖ Water quality certification, wetlands, by WDOE
<p>Jefferson County— project approval (phased review applications filed after Master Plan approval):</p> <p>Maritime Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential • Commercial 	<p>Federal Permits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Section 404 and 10 permits for all work in waters of the U.S. and stream modification or crossing (road crossing streams a & b).

EIS AUTHORS AND PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTORS

Statesman CEO	Statesman Group of Companies Ltd 7370 Sierra Morena Blvd. SW Calgary, Alberta, CANADA T3H 4H9 Contact: M. Garth Mann Phone: 403-256-4151; Fax: 403-256-6100
Application Coordination and Processing	A. W. "Sandy" Mackie Perkins Coie LLP 111 Market Street NE, Suite 200 Olympia, WA 98501 Phone: 360-956-3300
Wetlands and Streams, Wildlife, Shorelines and Marina Assessment	GeoEngineers, Inc. 1550 Woodridge Drive SE Shorelines and Marina Assessment Port Orchard, WA 98020 Contact: Wayne Wright Phone: 360-769-8400; Fax: 360-956-1208
Geology and Soils, Aquifer and Hydrology Studies	Subsurface Group LLC 630 6th Street South Kirkland, WA 98033 Contact: Scott Bender Phone: 425-828-7545; Fax: 425-828-7548 Perrone Consulting, Inc. P.S. 11220 Fieldstone Lane NE Bainbridge Island. WA 98110 Contact: Vincent J. Perrone Phone: 206-778-8074
Civil Engineering and Water Reclamation/ Systems	2020 ENGINEERING, Inc. 700 Dupont Street Bellingham, WA 98225 Contact: Mark S. Buehrer Phone: 360-671-2020; Fax: 360-671-0322

Water Engineering Systems	NovaTec Consultants Inc. NovaTec Envirocorp Inc. Suite 101 - 2415 Columbia Street Vancouver, British Columbia Canada V5Y 1N5 Contact: Troy D. Vassos Phone: 604-873-9262; Fax: 604-873-2353
Historical and Cultural Resources Assessment	Western Shore Heritage Services, Inc. 8001 Day Road West, Ste. B Bainbridge Island, WA 98110 Contact: Glen Hartmann Phone: 206-855-9020; Fax: 206-855-9081
Traffic Impact Assessment	Transportation Engineering Northwest PO Box 65254 Seattle, WA 98155 Contact: Michael Read Phone: 206-361-7333 ext. 101; Fax: 206-361-7333

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<i>Copies mailed or delivered to:</i>	
<i>Jefferson County</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Commission members • Board of County Commissioners • Prosecuting Attorney's Office • Department of Public Works • Department of Health & Human Services, Natural Resources Division • Jefferson County Fire Protection District #4 • Jefferson County Library at Port Hadlock
<i>State Agencies</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development, Growth Management Services • Department of Ecology, SEPA Unit
<i>Notification of availability emailed or mailed to:</i>	
<i>Jefferson County</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All other County departments not listed above

Local Agencies & Organizations

- City of Port Townsend
- Jefferson County Public Utility District #1
- Port of Port Townsend
- Jefferson County Conservation District
- Brinnon School District
- Quilcene School District
- Jefferson Transit
- Mason County Department of Community Development
- Kitsap County Department of Community Development
- Clallam County Department of Community Development
- Washington Environmental Council
- Olympic Environmental Council
- Wild Olympic Salmon
- North Olympic Salmon Coalition
- Point-No-Point Treaty Council
- Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe
- Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe
- Skokomish Tribe
- Hoh Tribe
- Port Townsend & Jefferson County Leader
- Peninsula Daily News
- Forks Forum

<p><i>State Agencies</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Community, Trade & Economic Development (CTED) • Department of Natural Resources (Anne Sharrar & SEPA Review) • Department of Transportation (Bill Wiebe & SEPA Review) • Department of Health (John Aden) • Department of Social & Health Services (Elizabeth McNagny) • Department of Corrections (Rebecca Barney) • Department of Fish & Wildlife (Steve Penland, Tim Rymer, Jeff Davis & SEPA Review) • Department of Ecology (GMA Review) • Puget Sound Partnership (John Cambalik) • Parks & Recreation Commission (Bill Koss) • Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (Lorinda Anderson)
<p><i>Other Interested Parties</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Washington Association of Realtors • Bangor US Naval Submarine Base

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION—FEIS	i
INTRODUCTION—DEIS	xi
FACT SHEET	xiii
SUMMARY	xxiii
CHAPTER 1—THE PROPOSAL	1-1
1.1 Location of the Proposal	1-1
1.2 The Proposed Master Plan	1-4
1.3 Summary of the Proposal and Permitting Limitations	1-17
CHAPTER 2—THE PHYSICAL SETTING	2-1
2.1 Location of the Proposal and Alternatives	2-1
2.2 Brinnon Subarea	2-1
2.3 Existing Site Conditions (Black Point/Pleasant Harbor)	2-4
2.4 Hood Canal	2-6
2.5 The Olympic Mountains	2-8
CHAPTER 3—PROBABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT REVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL (including responses to comments)	3-1
3.1 Existing Conditions	3-1
3.2 Shellfish	3-2
3.3 Water Resources: Use, Reuse, Management, Treatment, and Disposal	3-14
3.4 Transportation	3-39
3.5 Public Services (including tax burden, rescue services, and health services)	3-55
3.6 Shorelines	3-69
3.7 Fish and Wildlife	3-72
3.8 Rural Character and Population (including housing density, mix retail and rental affordability)	3-74

3.9 Archeological and Cultural Resources	3-78
3.10 Critical Areas	3-78
3.11 Other Issues	3-84
CHAPTER 4—DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES REVIEWED AND IMPACTS	4-1
4.1 No Action Alternative	4-1
4.2 Brinnon Subarea Plan Alternative	4-12
4.3 Hybrid Plan	4-20
CHAPTER 5—FEIS MITIGATING CONDITIONS FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW, TECHNICAL COMMENTS, AND COMMENT LOG	5-1
5.1 Conditions for Permit Approval in Any Phase of the Approved Proposed MPR	5-1
5.2 Technical Comments	5-13
5.3 County Comments Received After the Issuance of the DEIS	5-22
PUBLIC COMMENTS (in separate volume)	
DEIS APPENDICES (in separate volume)	
Appendix 1	Historic Reference site plan and topography maps of American Campground
Appendix 2	<i>Marina Impact Analysis</i> , 8/15/06, prepared by GeoEngineers
Appendix 3	<i>Shoreline Characterization Report</i> , 8/3/06, prepared by GeoEngineers
Appendix 4	<i>Soils and Geology Evaluation</i> , 8/10/07 prepared by Subsurface Group
Appendix 5	<i>Water Supply and Groundwater Impact Analysis</i> , 6/26/06, revised 8/14/07, prepared by Subsurface Group
Appendix 6	<i>Transportation Impact Study</i> , 8/28/07, prepared by Transportation Engineering Northwest
Appendix 7	<i>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment</i> , 7/20/06, prepared by GeoEngineers
Appendix 8	<i>Cultural Resource Assessment for the Proposed Pleasant Harbor Marina and Golf Resort, Jefferson County, WA</i> , 6/30/06, prepared by Western Shore Heritage Services
Appendix 9	<i>Wetland Delineation</i> , 7/20/06, prepared by GeoEngineers
Appendix 10	Example of a Notice of Mariners with map showing restricted or closed areas of Dabab Bay (DBRC)

SUMMARY

The EIS describes a proposal for an amendment to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and development regulations to add a new Master Planned Resort in the Brinnon Subarea of Jefferson County. The Master Plan proposal sets forth a conceptual plan for a resort hotel and rental units, combined with a significant expansion of the Marina Village facilities at Pleasant Harbor. The proposal under review would establish a Master Plan allowing up to 890 units and corresponding resort commercial development within the Master Plan area, subject to conditions imposed by the County through the approval of the amendment, if granted. The approval at this stage is only "programmatically" and additional environmental review is required at the project level when the specifics of any phase are identified in more detail and reviewed for permit approval.

The County issued a scoping notice asking the applicant to respond to nine different specific issues including: (1) shellfish; (2) water quality, quantity, and use; (3) transportation; (4) public services, including tax burden, rescue services, and health services; (5) shorelines; (6) fish and wildlife; (7) rural character; (8) archeological and cultural resources; and (9) critical areas, including wetlands, aquifer recharge, frequently flooded areas, fish and wildlife conservation areas, and geologically hazardous areas.

The project description is set forth in more detail in Chapter 1, and the setting and amenities in the surrounding area are identified in Chapter 2. The potentially significant adverse environmental impacts are identified in Chapter 3 and the comparative impact of the alternatives is identified in Chapter 4. The alternatives include a no action alternative, a resort encompassing the entire area identified in the Brinnon Subarea Plan as a potential Master Planned Resort, and a hybrid alternative that identifies a combination of Master Plan approval for the proposed project and rural resort type development on adjacent properties.

The potential impacts are identified under the topic headings noted, and each section has detailed mitigation requirements to be imposed at the project level. Specific project caps and limits were set forth in the project review to make sure County concerns at the programmatic level were addressed.

(1) Shellfish—The area is an important shellfish area and the waters around Pleasant Harbor and in Hood Canal are important for all varieties of fish as well as shellfish, so water quality is a major element.

Key mitigation points:

- Class A reuse and recycling program required to avoid process water discharge to Hood Canal.
- Treatment of all waters at the marina area to assure 2005 Puget Sound water quality standards are met for all discharges.
- Tunicate eradication program in concert with WDFW to help eradicate an invasive species.
- Stormwater management plan for all clearing and grading to assure that the goal of no discharge of contaminants to the waters of Hood Canal or Pleasant Harbor is achieved.

The detailed mitigation requirements are found at Section 3.2.7, and detailed discussions of water quality and harbor and marina-related issues are found in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3.

(2) Water Resource Use, Reuse, Management, Treatment, and Disposal—The proposal is required to use an onsite wastewater treatment reuse and recycling program with no discharge to Hood Canal for

storm and treated waters. The proposal also looks to a rainwater harvesting program to supplement existing water rights and looks to both low impact development and low flow fixtures to provide a reduced water service demand for the project.

The key conditions include:

- A requirement to obtain necessary water rights in advance of proceeding to preliminary plat approval or public hearing for the project, including investigation of alternate water resources that may be available.
- A requirement to have approved and installed a wastewater treatment system that is capable of processing all site water demands to Class A recycled capability.
- A requirement to have sufficient onsite water storage to provide year around irrigation and sustainable firefighting capability on site.

The detailed mitigation requirements are found at Section 3.3.8, and a detailed discussion of water-related issues are discussed in the Water Supply and Groundwater Impact Analysis, Appendix 5.

(3) Transportation—The project fronts US HWY 101 and is projecting a significant increase in traffic in the local area once the resort is operational. Levels of Service (LOS) away from the resort are not significantly impacted, but traffic control at the intersection is a major concern and will need to be addressed in detail at the permitting stage (project level).

Key transportation issues and concerns:

- The entry and exit points for the marina and resort need to be sufficiently far from US HWY 101 to permit the intersection to operate safely. For this reason the entry to the golf resort is proposed to be 0.7 miles east on Black Point Road, and the proposed access near US HWY 101 limited to emergency and limited purposes only.
- The resort is providing bicycle and pedestrian pathways to encourage nonmotorized circulation through the resort and to provide a "safe haven" for bicyclists who are on US HWY 101 and seek to get off the highway for the length of the resort.
- The resort is required to do a detailed traffic report at the commencement of each phase submitted for permits to get approval of intersections from the State Highway Department for US HWY 101 and from the County for all other public and private roads to assure (1) all roads are constructed to appropriate standards, (2) emergency access and escape is provided for all units, and (3) all necessary infrastructure to serve traffic and circulation is completed with each phase.

The detailed traffic mitigation requirements are included at Section 3.4.4, and the Transportation Impact Study is at Appendix 6.

(4) Public Services—Additional community concerns include: the ability of the community to provide public facilities and public services to the community, and how to design the community to provide the economic benefits intended by the Comprehensive Plan and still minimize impact on the overall character of the community. The issues are addressed in detail in Section 3.5.

Public capability and services are identified and the additional new services are to be identified through a memorandum of understanding with the public service providers, including County, health, schools,

and emergency services. (See 3.5.1.5, Fire Protection and Emergency Service Mitigation and 3.5.2.2., 3.5.3.1, 3.5.4.)

An additional concern was the combination of economic and rural character implications of locating a major resort in the Brinnon area. The County Comprehensive Plan currently identifies the site as an appropriate location for a Master Planned Resort.

At the Master Plan approval level, the EIS examines the economic and environmental issues and recommended mitigation. (See Section 3.5.5, Economy, Housing and Employment.)

Brinnon is short of rental housing for a large construction crew that is expected to be onsite for about five years as the project develops. The applicant identified using the existing 60-unit RV park on the Black Point property for construction workers during the development to mitigate the impact of a large influx of new workers.

The project is expected to provide new employment and spending in the community, create demand for new facilities and services in the Brinnon Rural Village Center, and impact the local property values to some degree, which is already occurring as a result of the County's indication in the Comprehensive Plan that the Brinnon Subarea is a target for some form of a Master Planned Resort. Land values are also increasing independently of the resort proposal (which has been discussed for many years), simply due to the increasing demand for recreation and retirement property which Hood Canal fits so well due to its proximity to major metropolitan areas.

Mitigation designed to protect the overall rural character and yet assure the development of a successful resort are to hold the overall density to less than four units per acre (roughly the density of the waterfront development surrounding the project and along Hood Canal in the vicinity); provide specific limits on the number of units and impervious surface; provide for the protection of the shoreline bluffs and preservation of significant wetland and natural buffer areas; and build the taller buildings into the hillside with below level parking to have most structures be at a residential height level (35 feet) when viewed from off the property. The overall area's rural character is also preserved by the County rural density and limited uses in the rural zones, which are in place surrounding the resort, together with the limitation that the resort public facilities (sewer and water) cannot be used to serve uses outside of the resort.

More detailed requirements are set forth at Section 3.5.9.

(5) Shorelines—The Pleasant Harbor Resort is located on Suburban (Pleasant Harbor) and Rural (Hood Canal) Shorelines and as such are subject to the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program for Jefferson County. A detailed discussion of the shoreline requirements and Master Plan response is set forth in Section 3.6 and addresses land use (particularly the prohibition for stormwater or other discharge to Hood Canal to protect water quality), the preservation of a shoreline buffer on the south shore to provide a natural riparian zone for water quality and habitat protection, limiting public access to the Pleasant Harbor side where safe access and water quality issues can be addressed, and closing off public access to the south shore where safe access cannot reasonably be provided due to the steep cliffs and where water quality protection could be in jeopardy. Shoreline conditions are detailed at Section 3.6.7.

(6) Fish and Wildlife—Fish and wildlife are addressed in Section 3.7, with specific details discussed in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment, Appendix 7. The site evaluation identified some habitat benefits for the project site, but no primary association by threatened or endangered species. The site is retaining over 39% natural open space in addition to the golf course and other open areas, and providing both wetland and wetland buffers and the riparian buffer along the south canal shoreline for

habitat value. There is also a buffer strip of mature trees between US HWY 101 and the Maritime Village, which provides existing habitat benefits and is to be retained. The development of more than 100 acres of the site into a golf course, Maritime Village, resort housing, and related facilities will necessarily have an impact on the wildlife that does use the site presently. But these tend to be local birds and small mammals in no danger of extirpation in the area. The native habitat that does remain is to be retained in patches rather than small strips, which does improve habitat quality and usefulness over a wider range of species. Habitat mitigation is found in Section 3.7.4 and Appendix 7, and the requirement at the permit level to provide specific habitat mitigation plans in concert with each development phase to control stormwater and assure that wetlands, buffers, and protected open space habitat are identified and protected through all phases of operation and construction.

(7) Rural Character and Population—This section (Section 3.8) also addresses the issues of housing and the potential changes in the Brinnon Subarea as a result of the resort. Mitigation is identified in Sections 3.5.7 and 3.5.9 discussed above.

(8) Archeological and Cultural Resources—Any large-scale project needs an archeological assessment to make sure that cultural and archeological resources are not disturbed or compromised. An assessment was done finding no sites of significance in the areas to be developed. (See Cultural Resources Assessment, Appendix 8.) Mitigation includes a requirement to notify proper authorities if such resources are identified during any level of project development.

(9) Critical areas—The EIS discusses the key critical areas affected by the project, including the wetlands (Section 3.10.1), aquifer recharge areas (Section 3.10.2), fish and wildlife conservation areas (Section 3.10.3), and geologically hazardous areas (Section 3.10.5). The site has no flood hazard areas. The objective of the proposal was to avoid impacts where possible, so the steep bluffs of the south shore are protected by a significant setback, and the steep slope rules provide for setbacks in the Marina Village area where slopes occur. Wetlands and buffers are also avoided, with the exception of Wetland B in the golf course area, which is in the kettle necessary for the irrigation and water reuse reservoir. Where this wetland is being disturbed, however, mitigation plans require a significant replacement wetland and buffer to be identified and installed prior to any actions to remove the existing wetland. Requirements are also in place to protect the water quality of the wetlands during both construction and operations, and to make sure the golf course is operated consistent with County regulations for golf courses in aquifer sensitive areas. (The County has adopted King County standards for such uses.) Critical area mitigation measures are identified at Section 3.10.6.

Alternatives were evaluated, including the no action alternative, a proposal to designate the entire BSAP MPR area as a resort, and a hybrid looking at the Pleasant Harbor proposal east of US HWY 101 and a rural development directed to recreational use consistent with rural regulations, but recognizing the proximity with the resort would generate demand for more intense rural uses with the resort than without. All of the alternative uses and potential impacts are addressed in Chapter 4.

With the exception of the No Action Alternative, the alternatives all have similar impacts since the bulk of the property is put to resort uses, which mean they share similar impacts in terms of clearing, grading, and development and share common mitigation requirements with the proposal to avoid, minimize, or protect and mitigate the environmental values discussed.

The principal differences are discussed.

The No Action Alternative presumes the existing proposals for west of US HWY 101 would be in place and the marina would continue in its current status, but that the property east of US HWY 101 would be developed into a small local golf course and 24 home sites, plus six on the existing marina lots, for a total of 30 new residences. The major differences are that the No Action Alternative would be solely

Rural (through a Planned Rural Residential Development) and would have to rely on existing water rights and individual wells on the separate properties. Mitigation to avoid water quality impacts would be required, but the site would be less developed and significantly less traffic would be attracted to the site for use. The major differences are lack of public water and sewer facilities, less of the overall site developed and more retained in natural settings, and significantly less traffic. The No Action Alternative also does not provide the economic and community benefits contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan of a Master Planned Resort.

The Brinnon Subarea Plan Alternative assumes a different format for the development, with 24 units in houses on 15 lots along the southern shore and marina properties, and a 200-unit hotel resort conference center on the property south of Black Point. The major difference with the Pleasant Harbor Resort proposal is that the entire 310 acres would be brought into the resort and the resort would develop a resort village with commercial services on the properties west of US HWY 101. The intense development of the MPR property would require similar facilities and conditions as the Master Plan proposal under review.

Water, sewer, and other public facilities can accommodate the proposal and the same mitigation requirements would be in place for the BSAP Alternative as the Master Planned Resort under review. The major difference is in traffic. The US HWY 101 alignment, speed, grade, and site distances are such that crossing movements would be a safety factor and likely unable to retain the "C" level of service required on US HWY 101. A signalized intersection would not be permitted under current standards for highway design, and as such grade separation for both traffic and pedestrians would be required.

The Hybrid Alternative assumes the Master Plan for the east side of US HWY 101, so the programs and mitigation identified in Chapter 3 would be required. On the west side the additional development is permitted under County rural rules, but would be limited by the need to serve the project with septic tanks and individual wells. Here again, water quality and quantity conditions are required to protect water quality. The issue of traffic separation and ingress and egress onto US HWY 101 is an issue to be addressed at the permit level and will pose challenges due to the volumes of traffic and the need to avoid any unsafe turning movements. Coordinated traffic planning will be important and will be the principal issue. The other impacts and mitigations are similar to the Master Plan and the BSAP Alternative and similar conditions would be expected.

Additional information on permit-related conditions may be found in the Appendices.

57577-0001/LEGAL13724133.2

