COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

SECTION E: APPENDICES

first prepared
December 30, 1996

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

POPULATION PROJECTIONS, BUILDOUT ANALYSIS, AND LAND USE INVENTORY

December 30, 1996

APPENDIX 1

POPULATION PROJECTIONS, BUILDOUT ANALYSIS, AND LAND USE INVENTORY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. POPULATION PROJECTIONS

A. Historic Population Change.

Table 1, *below*, identifies historic changes in San Juan County's population from 1870 to 1995. Table 2, *below*, identifies the population distribution by island based on 1990 Census data and maps.

Table 1. San Juan County Population, 1870–1995.[1]

Year	Population	Year	Population	Year	Population
1870	554	1930	3,097	1990	10,035
1880	948	1940	3,157	1991	10,700
1890	2,072	1950	3,245	1992	11,300
1900	2,928	1960	2,872	1993	11,900
1910	3,603	1970	3,856	1994	12,100
1920	3,605	1980	7,838	1995	12,300

Note:

1. Data from Washington State Office of Financial Management.

Table 2. Distribution of 1990 Census-Counted Population.

Island	Population
Ferry-Served Islands	
San Juan (unincorp.)	3,449
Orcas	3,194
Lopez	1,483
Shaw	163
Subtotal, Ferry-Served Islands (unincorp.)	8,289
Town of Friday Harbor	1,492
TOTAL, Ferry-Served Islands	9,781
Non-Ferry-Served Islands	
Blakely	29
Brown	14
Center	14
Charles	3
Crane	11
Decatur	54
Dinner	2
Double	4
Fawn	2
Johns	1

Table 2. Distribution of 1990 Census-Counted Population.

Island	Population
Obstruction	2
Pearl	5
Sheep	1
Stuart	40
Waldron	70
Yellow	2
[Remaining islands]	0
TOTAL, Non-Ferry-Served Islands	254
COUNTY TOTAL	**10,035**

B. Overview of Population Projection Methodologies.

Cohort Survival. This is the method used by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) to prepare the county forecasts. With this method population size, age-sex composition, and other characteristics of an area play a large role in determining the number of children that will be born, the number of persons dying, and an area's ability to retain population and/or attract persons from other locations. Birth, death, and migration are measured by sex and age group.

Baseline Projections. This method extrapolates based on past patterns established in a given time period. The time period (for example, 1960 to 1990) is referred to as the "baseline". The future growth is simply an illustration of what would occur if the pattern of growth established in the baseline were continued.

Estimates. While population estimates are not actual population counts they differ from projections in that they are based on actual data about the estimate year, such as births, deaths, housing starts, school enrollment, voters, automobile registration and federal tax returns. Estimates are used to monitor the accuracy of projections; however, because of delays in data availability, estimates generally lag behind the current year.

C. Office of Financial Management (OFM) Projections.

As part of the requirements of the Growth Management Act, the county must address the population projections prepared by OFM. RCW 36.70A.110(2) states that "Based upon the growth management population projection made for the county by the office of financial management, the urban growth areas in the county shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county for the succeeding twenty-year period."

Pursuant to RCW 43.62.035, as amended by Engrossed Senate Bill 5876 in 1995, the OFM prepared twenty-year county population projections for growth management planning. OFM provides county populations at five-year intervals between 1990 and 2010, and single-year intervals from 2010 through 2020. OFM released the first set of GMA county projections in 1992. The first series provided a single, most likely, projection for each county. The 1995 projections provided a middle, most likely, series for each county, with high and low population projection alternatives. GMA population planning targets, according to present interpretation of the statute, should fall on, or between, the high and low projection alternatives.

According to OFM, the county projections were generated using a version of the standard "cohort-component" approach to projecting population. Cohort-component simply means that populations are disaggregated into age-sex cells and propelled through time using age-sex-specific rates of fertility, mortality and migration for each projection interval. County populations were then compared and reconciled to the statewide age-sex, birth, death, and net migration projections for each five-year interval from 1995 to 2020.

The middle series projections are based on a set of broad propositions that are related to migration, the main driver of relative population change of subnational areas such as counties. The 1995 projections incorporate the impact of a "rural rebound" growth trend experienced by most of the western states since the early 1990s. This trend was not anticipated when the initial GMA projections were prepared in 1991. Much of the rural and non-metropolitan growth in Washington since 1990 was far greater than anticipated.

OFM notes that independently developed county projections, using the same methods and similar assumptions may not match these projections because independent expectations for births, deaths, and migration for individual counties are not reconciled to the state total. The County chose to accept OFM's 1995 medium series projections for growth management planning for the twenty year planning period 1995-2015. Table 3, *below*, shows population change from 1950 to 1990 and OFM projections for 2000 to 2020.

Table 3. San Juan County Population Change and Projections, 1950-2020[1]

Decade	Initial Population	Population Statistics by Decade				Terminal Pop.	Ave. Annual Growth Rate (%)
		Births	Deaths	Net Migration	Change		
1950-1960	3,245	449	-352	-470	-373	2,872	-1.21
1960-1970	2,872	351	-461	1,094	984	3,856	2.99
1970-1980	3,856	556	-536	3,962	3,982	7,838	7.35
1980-1990	7,838	1,044	-742	1,895	2,197	10,035	2.50
1990-2000	10,035	1,213	-1,178	3,807	3,842	13,877	3.29
2000-2010	13,877	1,728	-1,554	3,315	3,489	17,366	2.26
2010-2020	17,366	2,247	-1,839	3,336	3,744	21,110	1.97
2015 Population Forecast: 19,168							

Note:

1. Data from Washington State Office of Financial Management.

According to Table 3, the total year-round population of San Juan County in the 1990 census was 10,035. The OFM medium series projection indicates that the 1990 population should increase by 9,133 persons by 2015. Based on the 1995 OFM population of 12,300, a 2015 population of 19,168 would be achieved at an average annual growth rate of 2.23 percent for the planning period. It is important to note that growth patterns based on historical averages typically smooth annual variations in population change.

D. San Juan County *Comprehensive Housing Needs Assessment*.

A *Comprehensive Housing Needs Assessment* was prepared for the San Juan County Planning Department (completed in October 1992) by the Madrona Group with the assistance and input of the Citizen Advisory Committee on Housing (CACH). As part of evaluating housing needs in San Juan County, the Madrona Group prepared population projections. It noted that in 1992 OFM's population projection for the County corresponded to an average annual growth rate of about 1.1 percent; but, that since county annual growth

rates have been higher than 1.1 percent nearly every year since 1970, it chose to make housing projections based on two additional growth rates: a medium estimated annual growth rate of 2.5 percent, and a high estimated growth rate of 4.0 percent. Table 4, *below*, shows population forecasts to the year 2012 based on the three different average annual growth rates in the *Comprehensive Housing Needs Assessment*.

Table 4. Population Projections from the 1992 *Comprehensive Housing Needs Assessment*

Annual Growth Rate (%)	Population 1992	2002	2012
1.1	11,300	12,606	14,064
2.5	11,300	14,465	18,516
4.0	11,300	16,727	24,760

E. Other Data Sources.

Local Government. Much of the data in this report have come from the various economic and demographic studies which have been completed for local government agencies as part of previous planning efforts, such as, the *Comprehensive Housing Needs Assessment*.

State Agencies. The primary source of population data at the state level is the Office of Financial Management; however, other state agencies, such as the Department of Transportation (DOT), do gather and use population data for special studies. Information collected by DOT on ferry usage provided an excellent resource for estimating peak summer population.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. In addition to the decennial census, the Census Bureau conducts a variety of other surveys and censuses, including population surveys, local censuses, housing surveys, censuses of governments and economic activities. The 1990 census has two components. The 100 percent component (short form) includes the following population information: household relationship, sex, race, age, marital status and Hispanic origin; and, the following housing information: number of units in structure, number of rooms in unit, tenure, value of home or monthly rent, congregate housing, and vacancy characteristics. The sample component (long form) includes additional, more detailed information about social and economic characteristics and housing.

San Juan Island School District No. 149. The recommended student enrollment projection in the report entitled "Enrollment Projections 1992-1997" (Olympic Associates, 1/30/92) was five percent. This was based upon a cohort survival analysis of enrollment data with an emphasis placed on the three most recent years. According to the report, "the result of placing emphasis on the past three years, however, did show more aggressive growth than the State's trend lines [of 3.5 percent]." Additionally, the report stated that "the recent growth of enrollment in the San Juan Schools, the results of the enrollment project studies, and the positive picture that San Juan Island gives as a place to live, are significant enough for us to opt for the more aggressive trend lines of the studies that included the 'three-year emphasis.' It is felt that a school housing program built around a five percent, rather than the State's 3.5 percent projected annual growth, would best serve the District's interests."

The school enrollment projection described above may differ significantly from projections of the entire county population for the following reasons: the focus is on a narrow age group within the population; the projections are based primarily on enrollment statistics; and the time frame for the projection is limited to five years.

Orcas Island School District. To date, the Orcas Island School District has not prepared any projections beyond those required for next year.

Lopez Island School District. To date, the Lopez Island School District has not prepared any projections beyond those required for next year; however, the office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction has projected that enrollment (K-12) will increase from a headcount of 281 in 1992 to 491 in 1998.

Orcas Power and Light Company (OPALCO). According to their 1992 Power Requirement Study, OPALCO is expecting the number of residential members to increase at a compound growth rate of 3.1 percent through the year 2001. OPALCO also forecast the population of San Juan County to increase at a ten year average compound annual growth rate of 3.1 percent (14,292 by the year 2001); however, this estimate of population may be high. Historically, as a result of increases in service areas, reductions in persons per household, and policies which encourage separate metering of structures, the number of residential customers has grown at a faster rate than population.

PTI Communications. PTI has begun a future demand analysis. Table 5, *below*, shows the increase in the number of phone lines over the last seven years from 1989 to 1995. It is expected that the number of lines will increase at a faster rate than population as a result of technological innovations such as fax machines which increase the number of lines per person.

Table 5. Change in the Number of Telephone Lines, 1989-1995.

Telephone Exchange Area	Total Telephone Lines at Year's End							Net Increase	Ave. Annual Growth Rate (%)
	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995		
Lopez[1]	1,363	1,473	1,557	1,616	2,136	2,255	2,103	740	6.3
FH[2]	3,579	3,979	4,268	4,549	5,153	5,677	5,970	2,391	7.6
Eastsound[3]	2,276	2,524	2,711	2,896	3,429	3,638	3,803	1,527	7.6
Blakely[4]	188	203	211	225	269	264	288	100	6.2
Total	7,406	8,179	8,747	9,286	10,987	11,834	12,164	4,758	7.3
County Population	9,700	10,035	10,700	11,300	11,900	12,100	12,300	2,600	3.4
Population w/ telephone lines (%)	76	81	82	82	92	98	99		

Notes:

1. Lopez = Lopez, Shaw, Crane, Canoe and Charles islands
2. FH = San Juan, Henry, Brown, and Pearl islands
3. Eastsound = Orcas, Bell, Fawn, Big Double, Little Double, and Obstruction islands
4. Blakely = Blakely, Decatur, Center and Armitage islands

Academic and Financial Institutions. Various academic and financial institutions including Northwest Policy Center, University of Washington, Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Evergreen State College, and U.S. Bank, have at different times prepared population studies; however, these have generally focused on a broader geographic area such as central Puget Sound.

F. Population Projections for Planning Purposes.

The above text discusses the various methodologies used to prepare population projections and compares the various projections that have been done for San Juan County. Based on the OFM "medium series" projections the County would have a 2.24 percent annual growth rate for the twenty-year planning period from 1995 to 2015. The County chose a slightly higher annual growth rate of 2.5 percent for planning

purposes which takes into account the average annual growth rate in the 1980's and 90's, and the Town of Friday Harbor's projected growth rate of 2.78 percent. Table 6, below, identifies the distribution by island of the projected San Juan County population based on an annual growth rate of 2.5 percent for the county including the Town of Friday Harbor. The table assumes that the population will continue to be distributed among the islands as it was in the 1990 Census, only those islands which had a permanent population in 1990 are included. It is important to note that these are projections of the permanent population only and do not reflect seasonal or part-time residents.

Table 6. Projected Population to 2015 Based on a 2.5% Average Annual Growth Rate.

Island	1990 Population[1]	Population per Island (%)	Projected Population[2] 1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
San Juan Unincorp.	3,449	34.37	4,246	4,800	5,451	6,191	7,026
Town of Fri. Hbr.	1,492	14.87	1,810	2,077	2,359	2,678	3,039
Orcas	3,194	31.82	3,915	4,445	5,048	5,733	6,506
Lopez	1,483	14.78	1,818	2,064	2,344	2,662	3,021
Shaw	163	1.62	200	227	258	293	332
Blakely	29	0.29	36	40	46	52	59
Brown	14	0.14	17	20	22	25	29
Center	14	0.14	17	20	22	25	29
Crane	11	0.11	13	15	17	20	22
Decatur	54	0.54	66	75	85	97	110
Stuart	40	0.40	49	56	63	72	81
Waldron	70	0.70	86	97	111	126	143
Other Islands	22	0.22	27	31	35	39	45
TOTALS	**10,035**	**100.00**	**12,300**	**13,967**	**15,861**	**18,013**	**20,442**

Notes:

1. Data are from the 1990 census.
2. Projections are from Washington State Office of Financial Management.

2. PEAK SEASON POPULATION ESTIMATES

The following tables estimate peak season population by assuming that during the peak of the Summer season all available accommodations are occupied, that ten percent of the residents have one houseguest staying with them, and that, in addition, the four ferry-served islands have day visitors.

Table 7. Estimated Population and Dwelling Units, 1990–1995.[1]

Location	1990 Population per Island[2]	1990 Pop. per Island (%)	1990 Dwell. Units per Island[3]	1990 Dwell. Units per Island (%)	1995 Population[4]	Est. 1995 Dwell. Units per Island[5]	1995 Dwell. Units per Island (%)
San Juan							
Unincorp.	3,449	40.37	1,882	35.81	4,246	2,318	33.00
Town of Friday Harbor[6]	1,492	N.A.[7]	819	N.A.[7]	1,810	1,047	N.A.[7]
Orcas	3,194	37.39	1,901	36.17	3,914	2,347	33.41
Lopez	1,483	17.36	1,074	20.43	1,818	1,317	18.75
Shaw	163	1.91	170	3.23	200	188	2.70
Blakely	29	0.34	31	0.59	36	121	1.72
Brown	14	0.16	39	0.74	17	45	0.64
Cactus	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	2	0.03
Canoe	0	0.00	2	0.04	0	2	0.03
Center	14	0.16	7	0.13	17	84	1.19
Crane	11	0.13	31	0.59	13	42	0.60
Decatur	54	0.63	20	0.38	66	148	2.10
Dinner	2	0.02	1	0.02	2	2	0.03
Double	4	0.05	2	0.04	5	3	0.04
Fawn	2	0.02	2	0.04	2	2	0.03
Frost	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	2	0.03
Henry	0	0.00	2	0.04	0	74	1.05
Johns	1	0.01	1	0.02	0	43	0.61
McConnell	0	0.00	1	0.02	0	2	0.03
Obstruction	2	0.02	9	0.17	2	17	0.24
Pearl	5	0.06	2	0.04	1	29	0.41
South Finger	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	2	0.03
Stuart	40	0.47	16	0.30	49	104	1.48
Waldron	70	0.82	56	1.07	86	116	1.65
All Other Islands	6	0.02	7	0.13	16	13	0.18
TOTALS	**10,035**	**100.00**	**6,075**	**100.00**	**12,300**	**7,023**	**100.00**

Notes:

1. The 1990 Census count of dwelling units for the islands appears to be accurate and was combined with Dwelling Units Added in 1991 through 1995 to develop the "Estimated 1995 Dwelling Units per Island."
2. The distribution of the permanent residential population amongst the islands based on the 1990 Census.
3. The distribution of dwelling units amongst the islands based on the 1990 Census.
4. The estimated distribution of the Office of Financial Management's (OFM) 1995 population by island is based on the distribution pattern of the 1990 Census.

5. The estimated 1995 dwelling units are based on building permit data for the years 1991–1995.
6. The data are from the 1990 Census and the Town of Friday Harbor Building Department.
7. N.A. = Not Applicable. *See* Note 6.

Tables 8–12: Peak Population Estimates by Island for 1995. These tables identify all of the possible accommodations available to residents and visitors, and estimate the population resulting from 100 percent occupancy at 2.25 persons per household for dwelling units and two persons per unit for most other accommodations. Data regarding available accommodations was obtained from several sources, in particular the 1996 *Springtide*. With the exception of Friday Harbor and Eastsound, one percent of the vacant parcels are assumed to have two people camping on them during a peak August weekend and ten percent of the permanent residents are estimated to have one houseguest.

Table 8. San Juan Island Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
TOWN of FRIDAY HARBOR	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	1,047	2.25	2,356
	Visitor Accommodations			
	Hotel/Motel and Resorts			
	Inn at Friday Harbor	72	2	144
	Islands Lodge	28	2	56
	Friday Harbor House	20	2	40
	Inn at FH Suites	62	2	124
	Sandpiper	7	2	14
	Bed & Breakfast			
	Argyle House	3	2	5
	Blair House	8	2	16
	Friday's Historical Inn	9	2	18
	Harrison House Suites	3	2	5
	Hillside House	7	2	14
	Mariella Inn	17	2	34
	San Juan Inn	10	2	20
	Tucker House	5	2	10
	Wharfside	2	2	4
	Marina			
	Port of FH	130	2	260
	Campgrounds & RV Hookup			
	Town and Country	25	2	50
	Friends/Family	173	1	173
	Subtotal—Friday Harbor	**1,628**		**3,343**

Table 8. San Juan Island Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
SAN JUAN ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	2,318	2.25	5,215
(unincorp.)	**Marine Labs**	200	1	200
	Visitor Accommodations			
	Hotel/Motel and Resorts			
	Lonesome Cove Resort	6	2	12
	Mar Vista Resort	8	2	16
	Roche Harbor Resort	58	2	116
	Snug Harbor	9	2	18
	Bed & Breakfast			
	Duffy House	5	2	10
	Jensen Bay Pines	1	2	2
	The Meadows	2	2	4
	Old English Roses Manor	4	2	8
	Olympic Lights	5	2	10
	Orcinus Inn	5	2	10
	Panacea	4	2	8
	States Inn	9	2	18
	Three Lakes	2	2	4
	Tower House	2	2	4
	Trumpeter Inn	5	2	10
	Westwinds	2	2	4
	Marina			
	Roche Harbor	208	2	416
	Snug Harbor	45	2	90
	Lonesome Cove	5	2	10
	Campgrounds & RV Hookup			
	San Juan County Park	18	2	36
	Lakedale	125	2	250
	Pedal Inn	25	2	50
	Snug Harbor	20	2	40
	Vacant Land	19	2	38
	Friends/Family	411	1	411
	Subtotal—San Juan Island (unincorp.)	**3,521**		**7,010**
SAN JUAN ISLAND TOTALS		**5,149**		**10,353**

Table 9. Orcas Island Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
ORCAS ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	2,347	2.25	5,281
	Visitor Accommodations			
	Hotel/Motel and Resorts			
	Bartwood Lodge	16	2	32
	Beach Haven Resort	12	2	24
	Deer Harbor Resort	25	2	50
	Doe Bay Village	19	2	38
	Lieber Haven Marina	11	2	22
	North Beach Inn	11	2	22
	Rosario Resort	131	2	262
	Smugglers Villa	40	2	80
	West Beach Resort	15	2	30
	Deer Harbor Inn	8	2	16
	Landmark Inn	15	2	30
	Orcas Hotel	12	2	24
	Outlook Inn	41	2	82
	Glenwood Inn	4	2	8
	Bed & Breakfast			
	Blue Heron	3	2	6
	Buck Bay Farm	4	2	8
	Chestnut Hill Inn	4	2	8
	Deep Meadow Farm	2	2	4
	Hazelwood	4	2	4
	Joy's Inn	2	2	4
	Kangaroo House	5	2	10
	L'Aerie	4	2	4
	Liberty Call	2	2	4
	Old Trout Inn	5	2	10
	Palmer's Chart House	2	2	4
	Sand Dollar Inn	4	2	8
	Spring Bay Inn	4	2	8
	Turtleback Farm Inn	7	2	14
	West Sound Cottage	3	2	6
	WindSong	4	2	8

Table 9. Orcas Island Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
Orcas Island (cont.)	**Visitor Accommodations** (cont.)			
	Marina			
	Deer Harbor Resort	32	2	64
	Rosario Resort	32	2	64
	West Beach	58	2	116
	West Sound	6	2	12
	Campgrounds and RV Hookup			
	Moran State Park	151	2	302
	Environmental Learning Cntr.	120	1	120
	Obstruction Pass Park	9	2	18
	West Beach Resort	52	2	104
	Doe Bay Village	30	2	60
	Indralaya Camp (beds)	100	1	100
	Four Winds Camp (beds)	300	1	300
	Camp Orkila (beds)	500	1	500
	Moorage			0
	Vacant Land	18	2	36
	Friends/Family	380	1	380
ORCAS TOTALS		**4,554**		**8,287**

Table 10. Lopez Island Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
LOPEZ ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	1,319	2.25	2,963
	Visitor Accommodations			
	Hotel/Motel			
	Blue Fjord Cabins	2	2	4
	Lopez Lodge	3	2	6
	Islander Lopez	28	2	56
	Bed & Breakfast			
	Aleck Bay Inn	4	2	8
	Edenwilde Inn	8	2	16
	Inn at Swifts Bay	5	2	10
	MacKaye Harbor Inn	6	2	12

Table 10. Lopez Island Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
	Village Guest House	1	2	2
LOPEZ ISLAND (cont.)	**Visitor Accommodations** (cont.)			
	Marina			
	Islands Marine Center	96	2	192
	Islander Lopez	28	2	56
	Campgrounds			
	Spencer Spit	45	2	90
	Odlin County Park	30	2	60
	Hummel Haven	12	2	24
	Moorage			
	Spencer Spit	16	2	32
	Vacant Land	15	2	30
	Friends/Family	177	1	177
LOPEZ ISLAND TOTALS		**1,795**		**3,738**

Table 11. Shaw Island Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
SHAW ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	200	2.25	450
	Visitor Accommodations			
	Our Lady of the Rock	12	1	12
	County Park	12	2	24
	Vacant Land	2	2	4
	Friends/Family	19	1	19
SHAW ISLAND TOTALS		**245**		**509**

Table 12. Non-Ferry Served Islands Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
BLAKELY ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	121	2.25	272
	Visitor Accommodations			
	Blakely Island Marina	50	2	100
	Vacant Land	1	2	2
	Friends/Family	4	1	4

Table 12. Non-Ferry Served Islands Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
BLIND ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park Campsites	4	2	8
	State Park Buoys	4	2	8
CANOE ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	2	2.25	5
	Visitor Accommodations			
	French Camp	35	1	35
CLARK ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park Campsites	8	2	16
	State Park Buoys	9	2	18
DOE ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park	5	2	10
	State Park Dock	1	2	2
JAMES ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park Campsites	13	2	26
	State Park Dock and Buoys	5	2	10
JONES ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park Campsites	21	2	42
	State Park Dock and Buoys	10	2	20
MATIA ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			0
	State Park Campsites	6	2	12
	State Park Dock and Buoys	4	2	8
PATOS ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park Campsites	7	2	14
	State Park Buoys	2	2	4
POSEY ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			0
	State Park Campsites	1	2	2

Table 12. Non-Ferry Served Islands Peak Population Estimate, 1995.

Location	Facility Type	Dwelling Units	Persons Per Unit	Peak Season Population
SPIEDEN ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	1	2.25	2
	Visitor Accommodations			
	Lodge and Cabins	6	2	12
STUART ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	104	2.25	234
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park Campsites	10	2	20
	State Park Docks and Buoys	44	2	88
	Vacant Land	2	2	4
	Friends/Family	5	1	5
SUCIA ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park Campsites	55	2	110
	State Park Dock and Buoys	48	2	96
TURN ISLAND	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	0	2.25	0
	Visitor Accommodations			
	State Park Campsites	10	2	20
	State Park Buoys	3	2	6
ALL OTHER ISLANDS	**Total Units for Residents** (1995)	613	2.25	1379
NON-FERRY-SERVED ISLANDS TOTALS		**1,214**		**2,594**

Table 13—Estimated Number of Day Visitors in Peak Season (August), 1993. In 1993 the Washington Department of Transportation Planning Division conducted a study of ferry ridership. Table 13, *below*, estimates the total number of day visitors to the four ferry-served islands using 1993 data about the ferry system and private tour boats. The percentage of ferry riders making a round trip visit to the islands in a single day was estimated using data produced for the 1993 *Washington State Ferries Origin-Destination Survey* (March 1994). The survey was performed in two phases: May (Sunday, May 16th and Tuesday, May 18th) and August (Sunday, August 15th and Tuesday, August 17th). Only the August survey data (excluding the International run) was used for the purpose of estimating peak day visitor population.

Of the total 2,494 usable responses, 1,073 of the respondents indicated they were going to be completing their round-trip in one day. Of these respondents, 500 indicated that they had originated in Anacortes and were going to be returning there as part of a one day trip. This suggests that day visitors represent approximately 20 percent of total riders. According to Washington State Ferries (WSF), average daily ridership in August of 1993 (excluding the inter-island and International routes) was 7,953 riders. Extrapolating from this, the average daily number of day visitors arriving in the islands by ferry in August of 1993 was an estimated 796 people.

Based on origin-destination data, distribution of the 500 surveyed day visitors among the ferry-served islands was estimated as follows: Orcas 36.4 percent (182 respondents), Shaw 2.6 percent (13 respondents), San Juan 36.6 percent (183 respondents), Lopez 22.0 percent (110 respondents), and

unknown 2.4 percent (12 respondents). Table 13 shows the distribution among the ferry-served islands of the estimated 796 day visitors.

In addition to day visitors arriving by ferry, this table also estimates the number of day visitors arriving in Friday Harbor by private cruise/tour boat. The Port of Friday Harbor provided a list of ten cruise/tour boat operators who regularly visit the Port. A telephone survey of these operators provided information about their activities in San Juan County in August of 1993 including: how frequently they visit the County, where they go and for how long, the capacity of their vessels and percent of capacity typically used in August.

Table 13. Estimated Number of Day Visitors in Peak Season (August), 1993.

Location	Day Visitors Arriving by Ferry (%)	Estimated Number of Day Visitors Arriving by Ferry	Estimated Number of Day Visitors Arriving by Cruise/Tour Boat	Total Estimated Day Visitors
San Juan Island (Unincorp. + FH)	36.4	290	297	587
Orcas Island	36.6	291	0	291
Lopez Island	22.0	175	0	175
Shaw Island	2.6	21	0	21
Unknown	2.4	19	0	19
TOTAL	**100.0**	**796**	**297**	**1,093**

Table 14—Summary of Peak Season Population, 1995. This table summarizes data from the previous six tables. The number of overnight visitors is estimated by subtracting the 1995 resident population (from Table 1, Column 4) from the total peak season overnight population (from Tables 8–12). The total estimated visitor population equals the overnight visitor population plus estimated 1995 day visitors (20 percent of daily ferry riders in August). Total peak population equals total visitor population plus resident population. The last column in the table shows the percent of the total peak population represented by the total visitor population. In 1995, countywide during the height of the peak season, visitors may represent slightly more than one-half of the County's peak population.

Table 14. Summary of Peak Season Population, 1995.

Location	Estimated Overnight Population			Est. Day Visitors	Total Visitor Pop.	Total Peak Season Pop.	Visitor Population (% of Total)
	Total Overnight	Resident Pop.	Visitor Pop.				
San Juan Island (Un-incorp. +FH)	10,353	6,056	4,297	806	5,103	11,154	46
Orcas Island	8,287	3,915	4,372	570	4,942	8,857	56
Lopez Island	3,738	1,818	1,920	264	2,184	4,002	55
Shaw Island	509	200	309	22	331	531	62
Non-Ferry-Served Islands	2,594	311	2,283	0	2,283	2,594	88
TOTAL	**25,481**	**12,300**	**13,181**	**1,662**	**14,843**	**27,138**	**55**

Table 15—Comparison to Other Sources. The percentage of peak population represented by visitors identified by the above methodology is relatively close to estimates prepared for the County by the Beckwith Consulting Group and the Madrona Group and for the Town of Friday Harbor by Butler and Associates.

Table 15. Comparison of Other Sources.

Source (year estimated)	Peak Season (August) Population	Permanent Resident Population	Visitor Population	Percent Visitor Population
Countywide				
Beckwith Consulting				
(1980)[1]	18,955	7,838	11,117	59
(1990)	26,470	10,035	16,435	62
Madrona Group (1992)[2]	21,320	11,300	10,020	47
County Staff (1993)	24,822	11,899	12,923	52
San Juan Island (Census Div.)				
Butler and Associates (1990)[3]	9,365	5,003	4,362	47
County Staff (1995)	11,154	6,056	5,103	46

Notes:

1. *Narrative Report Facilities Master Plan, San Juan County Washington*, 1991, Beckwith Consulting Group.
2. *San Juan County Tourism Plan*, December 1993, Madrona Group and follow up conversation with Jim Fox of the Madrona Group.
3. *Draft Town of Friday Harbor Community Profile*, 1994, Butler and Associates.

3. BUILDOUT ANALYSIS

A. Buildout Methodology.

The buildout estimate that follows differ from the population forecasts of the previous section in that it is not based on historic trends. It simply tries to answer the question: what growth is possible given existing parcels, uses, and the potential for creation of new parcels under the existing *Comprehensive Plan* designations and densities? In the summary tables that follow, buildout is estimated for the entire county. The buildout estimates included in this section do **not** reflect the densities associated with the Shoreline Master Program nor do they reflect the inability of some parcels to be developed as a result of site limitations.

While the buildout calculations that follow are more refined than simply dividing the number of acres in each designation by its allowable density, they are still only rough estimates. Below are listed some of the key issues which affect the accuracy of the data:

- The buildout calculations do not include shoreline residential densities pursuant to the Shoreline Master Program.
- The acreage data is of variable accuracy. Many of the acreage figures were scaled or estimated by planning staff, particularly for platted parcels, and acreage data for some common areas in plats was unavailable.
- The number of existing legal parcels per tax parcel number is an approximation.

- The Assessor's Use Code numbers are used as a basis for analysis and may not reflect all of the uses on a property.
- The density calculations don't include accessory units such as guest houses.
- With the exception of Eastsound Service Industrial land use designation, the scenarios assume that all new development will be residential and will occur at the specified densities, persons per household, and occupancy rates.
- The number of persons per household and vacancy rates are by census division and may not necessarily accurately reflect the actual rate on any given island.
- It is assumed that the occupancy rate and the number of persons per household will remain the same as the 1990 Census; however, trends suggest that the occupancy rate is increasing and the number of persons per household is decreasing.
- There is no distinction between parcels which are buildable and those which may be unbuildable due to site limitations.
- Portions of potential parcels were included in the totals (*e.g.* 1.6 potential new parcels).

The buildout calculations were generated based on data that was originally downloaded from the Assessor's database in the System 36 Computer and then modified by Planning staff. Planning staff loaded the data into database software and added both fields and data. Table 16, *below*, summarizes the data fields in the database:

Table 16. Summary of Data Fields in Upland Buildout Database.

Field	Data Source	Description
Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	System 36	This 9-digit number is assigned by the Assessor's office. Assign-ment of an APN creates a tax parcel: it does not necessarily mean that the parcel is a legal lot of record. A single legal lot may have multiple parcel numbers and, conversely, multiple legal parcels may share a single parcel number.
Assessor's Use Code	System 36	This four digit code is assigned by the Assessor's office. There are 87 different use codes. Each tax parcel is assigned one use code based on its primary use as determined by the appraiser in the field.
Land Acreage	System 36 and Planning Staff	This field identifies the estimated acreage of tax parcels. The System 36 download did not include acreage for the following: tax parcels in designated forest lands (DFL), or most platted parcels. Planning staff entered the acreage for DFL parcels from the Assessor's maps and used these maps to scale the acreages for platted parcels. In addition, the Assessor's office provided acreages for those smaller islands for which the GIS parcel maps were completed.
Open Space Acreage	System 36	This field identifies the estimated acreage of those lands in the open space taxation program.
Island	Planning Staff	This field identifies the island of each tax parcel number. In some cases, small islands are grouped together under one parcel number or are included with one of the larger islands.

Table 16. Summary of Data Fields in Upland Buildout Database.

Field	Data Source	Description
Comprehensive Plan (a)	Planning Staff	This field identifies whether a parcel is Rural, Rural-Timber/Agriculture, Conservancy, Suburban, Urban, Natural, Tidelands, or Oysterlands. Parcels with multiple designations are shown as multiple entries.
Comprehensive Plan (b)	Planning Staff	This field identifies the density associated with the designation.
Eastsound Subarea Plan	Planning Staff	This field shows the subarea plan designation for those parcels within the Eastsound Subarea Plan. Parcels which are partially within the subarea are shown as multiple entries.
Plat	Planning Staff	This field identifies the plat name for all long plats.
Existing Parcels	Planning Staff	This field identifies the number of separate parcels associated with a tax parcel. For the purposes of this project it is assumed to be one, unless there is data to the contrary. For example, if multiple platted parcels are under a single tax parcel number or if a tax parcel was identified as being created for tax purposes only this field was changed to reflect the actual number of parcels.
Total Acreage	Calculated	(Land Acreage + Open Space Acreage) Table 35 shows the approximate accuracy of the acreage estimates.
Use	Planning Staff	This field summarizes the 87 use codes into 17 general categories (*See* Table 36).
Gross Potential Parcels	Calculated	(Total Acreage/Comprehensive Plan (b)); or, for areas within the Eastsound Subarea (Total Acreage/Eastsound density)
Adjusted Potential Parcels	Calculated	This field is the same as Gross Potential Parcels unless Gross Potential Parcels is exceeded by Existing Parcels whereupon it is changed to Existing Parcels.
Net New Parcels	Calculated	(Adjusted Potential Parcels minus Existing Parcels)

Table 17, *below*, identifies some of the residential densities that were used for the buildout calculations. These may not correspond exactly to the official densities associated with the designations; however, some assumptions were necessary in order to perform the calculations. For example, Urban has a *Comprehensive Plan* density of 7,000 square feet per unit which equates to approximately 0.16 acres. For those *Plan* designations where a range of densities were possible, the highest density was used. For those Eastsound Planning Area designations where a range of densities were possible, an average density was used.

Table 17. Selected Upland Designations and Densities Used to Calculate Buildout.

Plan	Designation	Average Residential Density (Acres/Unit)
Comprehensive Plan	Rural-Timber/Ag-15 & Rural-10	Estimate assumes 10 acres per unit
	Suburban	0.5 acres per unit
	Urban	0.16 acres per unit
	Natural	one unit per existing lot
Eastsound Subarea Plan	Village Commercial	0.1 acres per unit
	Village Residential	0.13 acres per unit
	Service Industrial	Buildout estimates assume no new residential development
	Village Suburban	0.5 acres per unit
	Marina	0.14 acres per unit
	Natural	one unit per existing lot

B. Estimated Potential Upland Parcels.

The baseline buildout analysis is represented by the allowable upland densities of the current *Comprehensive Plan*. Table 18, *below*, identifies the approximate acreage, existing parcels, and potential parcels for all lands within the county by upland designation. As this table suggests there is still considerable subdivision potential within the county with existing upland parcels representing only 41 percent of potential parcels.

Table 18. Estimated Acreage, Existing Upland Parcels and Potential Parcels by *Comprehensive Plan* Designation (All Unincorporated Lands).

Designation	Est. Acreage	Existing Parcels	Potential Parcels	Existing Parcels as a Percentage of Potential Parcels
Urban	142	127	903	14
Suburban	3,988	1,881	8,191	23
Rural-2	8,136	2,332	5,027	46
Rural-3	83	59	59	100
Rural-5	46,653	6,728	12,389	54
Rural-10	22,868	1,848	3,140	59
Rural-15	60	10	10	100
Rural-20	2,484	106	159	67
Rural-40	1,105	25	33	76
Rural-10/R-T/A-15	4,503	349	568	61
Rural Timber/Ag-10	1,178	18	119	15
Rural Timber/Ag-15	2,429	213	272	78
Rural Timber/Ag-40	1,495	42	57	74

Table 18. Estimated Acreage, Existing Upland Parcels and Potential Parcels by *Comprehensive Plan* Designation (All Unincorporated Lands).

Designation	Est. Acreage	Existing Parcels	Potential Parcels	Existing Parcels as a Percentage of Potential Parcels
Conservancy-2	356	41	182	23
Conservancy-5	8,096	160	1,691	9
Conservancy-10	1,000	63	125	50
Conservancy-15	85	1	6	17
Conservancy-20	410	3	20	15
Natural	2,650	97	97	100
Natural-5	77	1	15	7
Eastsound Subarea Plan	586	551	2,519	22
SUBTOTALS				
Unincorp. County	108,384	14,655	35,582	41
Friday Harbor	555	846	2,506	34
TOTAL	**108,939**	**15,501**	**38,088**	**41**

Table 18, *above*, identifies the maximum subdivision potential of San Juan County uplands given existing allowable Comprehensive Plan densities. However, not all lands are equally likely to be further subdivided. Some lands are unlikely to be developed because of their existing use, unsuitability for development, or property owner desire. For these lands, a change in designation may be more of a paper exercise than an actual change the future use of the property. For example, Conservancy-5 (with existing parcels representing only seven percent of potential parcels) is the least subdivided of the designations; however, because most of the State and Federal parks are included in this designation it is unlikely that it would ever be fully subdivided. While an exact percentage is difficult to estimate, those parcels currently used for things like parks, schools, commercial businesses, private roads, or common area in plats are unlikely to be further divided (Assessor's Use Codes 2100-7900, 9600, and 9700; *see* Table 36). These lands represent approximately 16 percent of the total acreage, seven percent of the existing parcels, and 16 percent of the potential parcels.

Other "reduction factors" can be applied to potential parcels to determine the number of likely subdividable parcels as well. Not all parcels that can be subdivided will be, simply because the owners choose not to. Over a 20-year planning period, in rural residential environments, 10-12 percent of all parcels are not subdivided due to market and other socioeconomic factors. Table 19 summarizes the total acreage, the number of existing parcels, and the potential parcels by district, adjusted not to include those lands which are unlikely to be developed.

Table 19. Estimated Acreage, Existing Upland Parcels and Potential Parcels by District (Likely to be Developed)[1].

Designation	Est. Acreage	Existing Parcels	Potential Parcels	Existing Parcels as a Percentage of Potential Parcels
District 1 (unincorp.)	29,467	5,151	12,295	42
District 2	28,976	4,158	10,749	39
District 3	23,974	3,777	6,609	57
TOTAL (unincorp.)	82,417	13,086	29,653	44

Note:

1. Excludes lands unlikely to be developed due to their existing uses and other socio-economic factors.

C. Relationship between Parcels and Population.

The potential number of homes which could eventually be constructed in the county (including Friday Harbor) will affect the ultimate (buildout) population. In order to translate parcels into a buildout population, it is necessary to multiply the number of parcels by the occupancy rate and the number of persons per household. The 1990 Census identified occupancy rates as follows: Lopez Division 59.1 percent; Orcas Division 70.8 percent; and, San Juan Division 79.6 percent. The 1990 Census also established a countywide rate of 2.25 persons per household. Table 20, below, identifies the potential buildout population based on the potential upland parcels established in Table 19.

Table 20. Potential Buildout Population[1] and Time Frame.

Description	Total Buildout Population	Buildout[2] Time frame in years	Buildout Date*
Existing (No further subdivision)			
District 1	9,225	(19)	2014
District 2	6,624	(20)	2015
District 3	5,022	(34)	2029
TOTAL	**20,871**	**24**	**2014**
Baseline (Full subdivision of "Uplands likely to be Developed")			
District 1	22,020	(52)	2047
District 2	17,123	(58)	2053
District 3	8,788	(57)	2052
TOTAL	**47,931**	**55**	**2050**

Notes:

1. Based on the potential upland parcels established in Table 19.
2. Based on a 1995 Population of 6125 for District 1, 4024 for District 2, 2157 for District 3 and 12,300 county-wide, and a 2.5% annual growth rate.

4. SHORELINE DENSITY ANALYSIS

Table 21, *below*, estimates the amount of waterfront footage in each SMP designation by island and district. The residential densities of the designations are described below. All shorelines seaward of the line of ordinary high tide are designated "Aquatic" unless otherwise stated. Where double designations are shown, the seaward designation applies to the area seaward of ordinary high tide only.

As Table 21 shows, the most widely used shoreline designation in the unincorporated county is Conservancy with a total of 801,637 feet representing 42 percent of all of the county's shorelines, followed by Rural with 491,861 feet (26 percent), Suburban with 301,236 feet (16 percent), Natural with 293,963 feet (15 percent), and Urban with 21,888 feet (one percent).

Table 21. Estimated Shoreline Footage by Designation[1].

Island	Urban	0.5 acre/ dwelling unit S	C/S[2]	N/S[2]	1.0 acre/d. unit C	N/C[2]	2.0 acres/d. unit R	N/R[2]	Natural
Barren	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	900
Battleship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400
Brown	0	7,265	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cactus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,450
Cemetery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630
Dinner	0	0	0	0	1,573	0	0	0	1,087
Flattop	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,670
Gossip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	825
Henry	0	0	0	0	45,662	4,987	0	0	4,490
Johns	0	0	0	0	14,205	0	4,060	0	820
O'Neal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,605
Pearl	0	6,120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
Posey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,050
Ripple	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,700
San Juan	10,209	97,968	33,587	3,922	104,264	11,141	44,407	10,270	30,065
Satellite	0	0	0	0	12,875	0	0	0	0
Sentinel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,075
Spieden	0	0	0	0	19,583	0	19,583	0	0
Stuart	0	0	0	0	55,660	0	12,999	0	4,780
Turn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,097
DIST. 1 SUBTOTAL	**10,209**	**111,353**	**33,587**	**3,922**	**253,822**	**16,128**	**81,049**	**10,270**	**70,244**

Table 21. Estimated Shoreline Footage by Designation[1].

Island	Urban	0.5 acre/ dwelling unit S	C/S^2	N/S^2	1.0 acre/d. unit C	N/C^2	2.0 acres/d. unit R	N/R^2	Natural
Anderson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	760
Bare	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,300
Barnes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,425
Bell	0	0	0	0	1,479	0	0	0	0
Big Double	0	0	0	0	3,739	0	0	0	0
Bird	0	0	0	0	1,570	0	0	0	0
Clark	0	0	0	0	11,292	0	0	0	0
Cliff	0	0	0	0	3,565	0	0	0	0
Crane	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,220	0	0
Doe	0	0	0	0	2,300	0	0	0	0
Ewing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,195
Fawn	0	0	0	0	1,284	0	0	0	0
Freeman	0	0	0	0	1,100	0	0	0	0
Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,865
Jones	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,460
Knob	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Little Double	0	0	0	0	1,576	0	0	0	0
Low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Matia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,200
McConnell	0	0	0	0	5,350	0	0	0	0
North Finger	0	0	0	0	6,375	0	0	0	0
Obstruction	0	0	0	0	15,390	0	0	0	0
Orcas	6,011	79,050	0	0	108,953	0	183,698	0	10,022
Patos	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,840
Picnic	0	0	0	0	940	0	0	0	0
Puffin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,300
Reef	0	0	0	0	3,405	0	0	0	0
Sisters	0	0	0	0	3,400	0	0	0	0
Skipjack	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,500
Skull	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,600
South Finger	0	0	0	0	9,494	0	0	0	0
Sucia	0	0	0	0	41,265	0	0	0	22,463
Twin Rocks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,100

Table 21. Estimated Shoreline Footage by Designation[1].

Island	Urban	0.5 acre/ dwelling unit S	C/S[2]	N/S[2]	1.0 acre/d. unit C	N/C[2]	2.0 acres/d. unit R	N/R[2]	Natural
Victim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,505
Waldron	0	0	0	0	0	8,029	7,595	0	38,673
Wilkins	0	0	0	0	1,015	0	0	0	0
Yellow	0	0	0	0	2,870	0	0	0	0
DIST. 2 SUBTOTAL	**6,011**	**79,050**	**0**	**0**	**226,362**	**8,029**	**205,513**	**0**	**143,668**
Aleck	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,570
Armitage	0	0	0	0	2,175	0	0	0	0
Blakely	0	23,244	0	0	45,215	0	9,600	0	6,210
Blind	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,320
Boulder	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,570
Buck	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	750
Canoe	0	0	0	0	5,585	0	0	0	0
Castle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,370
Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,175	0	0
Charles	0	0	0	0	6,320	0	0	0	0
Colville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,045
Crab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	610
Deadman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,450
Decatur	365	0	0	0	49,789	0	8,342	0	0
Flower	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,595
Fortress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,145
Frost	0	0	0	0	7,360	0	0	0	0
Goose	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,436
Hall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,290
Iceberg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,380
James	0	0	0	0	11,970	0	0	0	0
Long	0	0	0	0	2,625	0	0	0	6,245
Lopez	5,303	47,537	1,735	0	150,870	0	80,183	0	14,440
Ram	0	0	0	0	3,794	0	0	0	0
Richardson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840
Rim/Rum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,430
Secar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	880

Table 21. Estimated Shoreline Footage by Designation[1].

Island	Urban	0.5 acre/ dwelling unit S	C/S[2]	N/S[2]	1.0 acre/d. unit C	N/C[2]	2.0 acres/d. unit R	N/R[2]	Natural
Shaw	0	808	0	0	9,543	2,050	86,729	0	21,915
Swirl	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,250
Trump	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,230
Whale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	685
Willow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,395
DIST. 3 SUBTOTAL	**5,668**	**71,589**	**1,735**	**0**	**295,246**	**2,050**	**195,029**	**0**	**80,051**
UNINCORP. COUNTY TOTALS	**21,888**	**261,992**	**35,322**	**3,922**	**775,430**	**26,207**	**481,591**	**10,270**	**293,963**

Notes:

1. Key to Shoreline designations and densities:

Designation		Density
U	(Urban)	7,000 square feet/unit (6 units/acre)
S	(Suburban)	0.5 acre/unit
C/S	(Conservancy/Suburban)	0.5 acre/unit with Conservancy seaward
N/S	(Natural/Suburban)	0.5 acre/unit with Natural seaward
C	(Conservancy)	1.0 acre/unit
N/C	(Natural/Conservancy)	1.0 acre/unit with Natural seaward
R	(Rural)	2.0 acre/unit
N/R	(Natural/Rural)	2.0 acre/unit with Natural seaward
N	(Natural)	One dwelling unit per existing lot.

2. Where double designations are shown, the seaward designation applies to the area seaward of ordinary high tide only.

Table 22 identifies the total number of parcels by island in the county and the number and percentage of those parcels which are within the shoreline jurisdiction, both now and at buildout. As this table shows, shoreline parcels currently represent approximately 33 percent of total existing parcels; however, it appears that should buildout occur, shoreline parcels would represent only 19 percent of the total. This suggests that there are disproportionately more subdividable parcels remaining in the upland than on the shoreline. It also suggests that reducing the allowable densities on the shoreline would likely have less net affect than similar changes to the upland.

These data have some shortcomings, which should be kept in mind when reviewing Table 22. The estimates in Table 22 double-count those lands that are within the SMP jurisdiction. The Comp Plan buildout estimates were based on the total acreage of the parcel divided by the allowable density. The SMP estimates separately calculated both the SMP and upland density of each shoreline parcel. Unfortunately, linking the two databases is made complicated by the fact that there are multiple entries for those parcels with multiple designations. However, the impact of the double-counting can be estimated. Table 23, below, estimates that double-counting occurred on nearly 7,000 acres. If one assumes an average upland density of one unit per five acres, the estimated impact of the double-counting is 1,400 units countywide.

Table 22. Percentage of Parcels (Existing and Potential) within the Shoreline Jurisdiction.[1, 2]

Island	Estimated Existing Parcels	No. of Existing Parcels within SMP[3]	Parcels within SMP (%)	Adjusted Potential Parcels (CP[4] and SMP)	Potential Parcels based on SMP	SMP as Percent of Total Potential Parcels
Barren	1	1	100	1	1	100
Battleship	1	1	100	1	1	100
Brown	57	59	104	98	61	62
Cactus	2	2	100	2	2	100
Cemetery	1	1	100	1	1	100
Dinner	2	3	150	7	7	100
Flattop	1	1	100	2	1	50
Gossip	1	1	100	1	1	100
Henry	207	179	86	521	234	45
Johns	65	55	85	185	101	55
O'Neal	1	1	100	1	1	100
Pearl	44	44	100	45	44	98
Pole	1	1	100	1	1	100
Posey	1	1	100	1	1	100
Ripple	1	1	100	1	1	100
San Juan	4,340	1,254	29	13,132	1979	15
Satellite	1	1	100	63	59	94
Sentinel	2	2	100	2	2	100
Spieden	1	1	100	165	135	82
Stuart	336	169	50	791	297	38
Turn	2	2	100	3	2	67
DIST. 1 SUBTOTAL	**5,068**	**1,780**	**35**	**15,024**	**2,932**	**20**
Anderson	1	2	200	2	2	100
Bare	1	1	100	1	1	100
Barnes	1	1	100	2	1	50
Bell	1	1	100	3	3	100
Big Double	1	1	100	16	16	100
Bird	1	1	100	3	3	100
Clark	1	1	100	53	52	98

Table 22. Percentage of Parcels (Existing and Potential) within the Shoreline Jurisdiction.[1, 2]

Island	Estimated Existing Parcels	No. of Existing Parcels within SMP[3]	Parcels within SMP (%)	Adjusted Potential Parcels (CP[4] and SMP)	Potential Parcels based on SMP	SMP as Percent of Total Potential Parcels
Cliff	1	1	100	13	13	100
Crane	82	60	73	162	59	36
Doe	1	1	100	6	6	100
Ewing	1	2	200	2	2	100
Fawn	1	1	100	2	2	100
Freeman	1	1	100	1	1	100
Indian	1	1	100	1	1	100
Jones	1	1	100	1	1	100
Knob	1	1	100	1	1	100
Little Double	1	1	100	4	4	100
Low	1	1	100	1	1	100
Matia	1	1	100	1	1	100
McConnell	3	5	167	22	22	100
North Finger	1	1	100	31	30	97
Obstruction	49	49	100	72	54	75
Orcas	4,577	1,085	24	15,859	1765	11
Patos	1	1	100	35	1	3
Picnic	1	1	100	1	1	100
Puffin	1	1	100	2	1	50
Reef	1	1	100	14	14	100
Sisters	1	1	100	5	5	100
Skipjack	1	1	100	1	1	100
Skull	1	1	100	1	1	100
South Finger	9	8	89	23	23	100
Sucia	6	7	117	197	193	98
Twin Rocks	1	1	100	2	2	100
Victim	1	1	100	1	1	100
Waldron	248	127	51	557	129	23
White Rock	1	1	100	1	1	100
Wilkins	2	2	100	2	2	100
Yellow	2	2	100	9	9	100

Table 22. Percentage of Parcels (Existing and Potential) within the Shoreline Jurisdiction.[1, 2]

Island	Estimated Existing Parcels	No. of Existing Parcels within SMP[3]	Parcels within SMP (%)	Adjusted Potential Parcels (CP[4] and SMP)	Potential Parcels based on SMP	SMP as Percent of Total Potential Parcels
DIST. 2 SUBTOTAL	**5,007**	**1,376**	**27**	**17,110**	**2,425**	**14**
Aleck	1	1	100	1	1	100
Armitage	1	1	100	7	7	100
Blakely	274	138	50	1,459	412	28
Blind	1	1	100	1	1	100
Boulder	1	1	100	1	1	100
Buck	1	1	100	1	1	100
Canoe	3	3	100	27	23	85
Castle	1	1	100	1	1	100
Center	195	70	36	293	74	25
Charles	2	2	100	25	25	100
Colville	1	1	100	2	1	50
Crab	1	1	100	1	1	100
Deadman	1	1	100	1	1	100
Decatur	394	107	27	939	249	27
Flower	1	1	100	1	1	100
Fortress	1	1	100	1	1	100
Frost	14	17	121	41	29	71
Goose	1	1	100	1	1	100
Hall	1	1	100	1	1	100
Iceberg	1	1	100	1	1	100
James	2	2	100	56	54	96
Long	1	1	100	16	13	81
Lopez	3,242	1,041	32	6,902	1628	24
Ram	2	2	100	8	8	100
Richardson	1	1	100	1	1	100
Rim/Rum	1	1	100	2	2	100
Secar	1	1	100	1	1	100
Shaw	440	249	57	1,448	291	20

Table 22. Percentage of Parcels (Existing and Potential) within the Shoreline Jurisdiction.[1, 2]

Island	Estimated Existing Parcels	No. of Existing Parcels within SMP[3]	Parcels within SMP (%)	Adjusted Potential Parcels (CP[4] and SMP)	Potential Parcels based on SMP	SMP as Percent of Total Potential Parcels
Swirl	1	1	100	1	1	100
Trump	1	1	100	3	1	33
Whale	2	1	50	1	1	100
Willow	1	1	100	1	1	100
DIST. 3 SUBTOTAL	**4,591**	**1,653**	**36**	**11,247**	**2,834**	**25**
UNINCORP. COUNTY TOTALS	**14,666**	**4,809**	**33**	**43,381**	**8,191**	**19**

Notes:

1. "Total existing parcels" is based on the 1992 download (*see* notes from Land Use Section). The shoreline data were developed in 1993, and are more recent and more detailed.
2. On those islands where 100 percent of the parcels are shoreline, the shoreline data were used. For the remaining islands (with the exception of a few small islands where the difference was likely the result of the estimation technique), the adjusted potential number of parcels allowed by the Comprehensive Plan densities (from the buildout analysis) was added to the number of parcels allowed by the SMP designations.
3. SMP = San Juan County Shoreline Master Program.
4. CP = San Juan County Comprehensive Plan.

Table 23. Estimated Affect of Double-Counting.

Island	Lineal Feet within SMP	Estimated Acres within SMP	Effect of Double-Counting (in Dwelling Units)
Henry	55,139	253	51
Johns	19,085	88	18
San Juan	345,833	1,588	318
Stuart	73,439	337	67
Crane	14,220	65	13
Orcas	387,734	1,780	356
Waldron	54,297	249	50
Blakely	84,269	387	77
Center	10,175	47	9
Decatur	58,496	269	54
Lopez	300,068	1,378	276
Shaw	121,045	556	111
TOTAL	**1,523,800**	**6,997**	**1,400**

5. LAND USE INVENTORY

The Land Use Inventory tables simply total the number of Existing Parcels and Total Acreage by existing use. Acreage data, land use designations and *Comprehensive Plan* densities and existing use data were entered for each tax parcel. The existing number of legal parcels per tax parcel number was estimated. The existing use and much of the acreage data was obtained in the fall of 1991 from a download of Assessor's data from the System 36 computer. The 84 Assessor's use code numbers were summarized into 16 general use categories (*see* Table 36). Table 16 in Section 3, Buildout, contains a complete description of the data fields.

The land use inventory that follows is only a rough estimate based on available data and has not been field verified. Below are listed some of the key issues which affect the accuracy of the data.

- The use categories are based on the 84 Assessor's Use Code numbers and may not reflect all of the uses on a property.
- The acreage data is of variable accuracy. Many of the acreage figures were scaled or estimated by planning staff, particularly for platted parcels, and acreage data for some common areas in plats was unavailable.
- The number of existing legal parcels per tax parcel number is an approximation.

Table 24. San Juan Island Land Use Inventory (not including Friday Harbor).

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Common Area	94	341
Gov't Services	12	551
Manufacturing	8	17
Mobile Home Park	3	27
Multi-Family	31	268
Open Space	9	402
Recreation	25	246
Resource Lands	281	11,400
Retail/Service	27	897
Single-Family	1,886	7,139
Transient Accom.	44	34
Transportation	24	233
Vacant	1,871	10,060
Water	0	18
Parks	25	1,929
TOTAL	**4,340**	**33,562**

Table 25. Orcas Island Land Use Inventory (not including Eastsound Planning Area).

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Common Area	71	259
Gov't Services	11	91
Manufacturing	4	33
Mobile Home Park	1	50
Multi-Family	58	530
Open Space	1	165
Recreation	62	857
Resource Lands	235	9,440
Retail/Service	31	95
Single-Family	1,640	6,565
Small Islands	1	77
Transient Accom.	44	18
Transportation	28	94
Vacant	1,791	11,599
Parks	35	5,652
TOTAL	**4,013**	**35,525**

Table 26. Eastsound Planning Area Land Use Inventory.

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Manufacturing	3	8
Multi-Family	11	16
Common Area	1	1
Recreation	20	62
Retail/Service	63	61
Single-Family	187	169
Transient Accom.	37	5
Transportation	8	51
Vacant	229	221
Parks	1	17
TOTAL	**558**	**611**

Table 27. Lopez Island Land Use Inventory.

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Common Area	47	56
Gov't Services	66	172
Manufacturing	4	19
Multi-Family	12	143
Open Space	3	65
Recreation	18	105
Resource Lands	229	6,008
Retail/Service	44	714
Single-Family	1,265	4,653
Transient Accom.	23	15
Transportation	25	68
Vacant	1,459	5,882
Parks	45	390
TOTAL	**3,240**	**18,290**

Table 28. Shaw Island Land Use Inventory.

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Common Area	4	12
Gov't Services	4	2
Manufacturing	1	10
Multi-Family	4	134
Open Space	9	328
Recreation	3	2
Resource Lands	28	1,038
Retail/Service	24	752
Single-Family	155	1,062
Transportation	3	1
Vacant	203	1,561
Parks	2	59
TOTAL	441	5,031

Table 29. Blakely Island Land Use Inventory.

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Common Area	5	215
Manufacturing	1	1
Multi-Family	1	16
Recreation	1	8
Resource Lands	47	3,392
Retail/Service	5	119
Single-Family	115	153
Transportation	2	2
Vacant	95	332
Parks	2	118
TOTAL	274	4,355

Table 30. Decatur Island Land Use Inventory.

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Common Area	13	570
Gov't Services	2	2
Open Space	1	8
Recreation	4	81
Resource Lands	3	76
Retail/Service	1	5
Single-Family	121	234
Transportation	5	16
Vacant	242	1,229
Parks	1	1
TOTAL	393	2,221

Table 31. Stuart Island Land Use Inventory.

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Common Area	7	38
Multi-Family	2	2
Recreation	2	16
Resource Lands	12	458
Retail/Service	2	3
Single-Family	88	382
Transportation	39	22
Vacant	182	675
Parks	2	159
TOTAL	336	1,756

Table 32. Waldron Island Land Use Inventory.

Uses	Existing Parcels	Total Acreage
Multi-Family	1	43
Open Space	1	20
Resource Lands	35	727
Retail/Service	2	3
Single-Family	107	786
Transportation	1	21
Vacant	101	1,322
TOTAL	248	2,921

Table 33. Land Use Inventory for Other Non-Ferry Served Islands.

Island	Desig-nation	Uses	Existing Parcels	Acreage
Armitage	C	Recreation	1	7.35
Barnes	C	Single-Family	1	36.10
Bell	C	Single-Family	1	3.50
Big Double	R-5	Multi-Family	1	16.83
Brown	S	Common Area	1	13.08
		Multi-Family	5	3.37
		Single-Family	32	29.78
		Vacant	19	15.75
Cactus	C	Single-Family	2	31.40

Table 33. Land Use Inventory for Other Non-Ferry Served Islands.

Island	Desig-nation	Uses	Existing Parcels	Acreage
Canoe	C	Retail/Service	1	28.68
		Vacant	2	16.03
Center	R-2	Common Area	7	32.13
		Multi-Family	1	0.49
		Single-Family	73	57.01
		Vacant	112	72.92
Charles	C	Multi-Family	1	22.95
		Vacant	1	9.45
Cliff	C	Single-Family	1	13.74
Coon	C	Single-Family	1	3.01
Crane	R-2	Common Area	3	3.08
		Single-Family	37	85.39
		Vacant	32	54.01
	N	Common Area	3	45.10
		Vacant	6	30.34
Dinner	C	Single-Family	2	9.10
Fawn	C	Single-Family	1	2.24
Frost	C-2	Common Area	1	14.11
		Single-Family	2	10.44
		Vacant	11	45.11
Henry	R-5	Multi-Family	1	8.16
		Parks	1	62.14
		Recreation	23	32.82
		Resource Lands	2	49.40
Henry (cont.)		Single-Family	64	239.64
		Vacant	116	590.39
Johns	R-5	Common Area	1	0.50
		Resource Lands	2	57.81
		Single-Family	37	42.91
		Vacant	24	83.61
Little Double	C	Single-Family	1	4.34
Long	C	Recreation	1	58.05
McConnell	C	Single-Family	2	16.76
		Vacant	1	11.71

Table 33. Land Use Inventory for Other Non-Ferry Served Islands.

Island	Desig-nation	Uses	Existing Parcels	Acreage
North Finger	C	Transportation	1	35.38
O'Neal	C	Single-Family	1	4.50
Obstruction	R-2	Common Area	2	72.19
		Single-Family	13	36.79
		Vacant	34	108.38
Pearl	S	Multi-Family	1	0.70
		Single-Family	26	19.64
		Vacant	17	11.44
Picnic (Sheep)	C	Single-Family	1	1.51
Ram	C	Open Space	1	7.75
		Vacant	1	1.05
Reef	C	Vacant	1	17.25
Satellite	C-10	Recreation	1	106.15
South Finger	C	Common Area	3	4.89
		Single-Family	2	9.60
		Vacant	3	10.73
	N	Vacant	1	1.93
Spieden	R-10	Recreation	1	480.45
Trump	C	Vacant	1	29.19
Whale	C	Vacant	2	0.93
Wilkins	C	Single-Family	1	0.64
		Vacant	1	0.95
TOTAL			**752**	**2,933.00**

Table 34 Small Islands Under Government or Nature Conservancy Ownership.

Island	Designation	Ownership	Total Acres
Aleck	N	United States Government	3.25
Anderson	N	State Of Washington	0.26
Bare	N	United States Government	1.65
Barren	N	United States Government	1.37
Battleship	N	United States Government	3.20
Blind	N	United States Government	2.25
Boulder	N	United States Government	6.90

Table 34 Small Islands Under Government or Nature Conservancy Ownership.

Island	Designation	Ownership	Total Acres
Buck	N	United States Government	0.95
Castle	N	United States Government	9.33
Cemetery	N	State Of Washington	0.96
Clark	N	State Of Washington	55.05
Colville	N	United States Government	11.48
Crab	N	United States Government	0.50
Deadman	C	The Nature Conservancy	1.98
Doe	N	State Of Washington	6.11
Ewing	N	State Of Washington	2.64
Flattop	N	United States Government	49.30
Flower	N	United States Government	4.60
Fortress	N	United States Government	2.41
Freeman	N	United States Government	0.35
Goose	C	The Nature Conservancy	2.72
Gossip	N	State Of Washington	2.12
Hall	N	United States Government	1.85
Iceberg	N	State Of Washington	3.50
Indian	N	United States Government	2.29
James	N	State Of Washington	116.55
Jones	N	United States Government	188.09
Knob	N	United States Government	0.80
Low	N	United States Government	0.80
Matia	N	United States Government	145.00
Patos	R	United States Government	244.50
Pole	N	United States Government	0.36
Posey	N	United States Government	1.03
Puffin	N	United States Government	25.11
Richardson	N	United States Government	1.02
Rim/Rum	N	United States Government	1.46
Ripple	N	United States Government	3.80
Secar	N	United States Government	0.89
Sentinel	C	The Nature Conservancy	14.65
Sisters	N	United States Government	4.27

Table 34 Small Islands Under Government or Nature Conservancy Ownership.

Island	Designation	Ownership	Total Acres
Skipjack	N	United States Government	19.28
Skull	N	United States Government	3.56
Sucia	N	State Of Washington	226.59
Swirl	N	United States Government	1.65
Turn	N	United States Government	35.15
Twin Rocks	N	United States Government	1.14
Victim	N	United States Government	3.92
White Rock	N	United States Government	1.45
Willow	N	United States Government	9.25
Yellow	C	The Nature Conservancy	10.29
TOTAL			**1237.63**

Table 35. Accuracy of Acreage Estimates.

Island	Total Acreage from Database	Acreage based on Univ. of WA Publication	Percent Difference
San Juan	34,066	35,448.14	4
Orcas	36,068	36,431.91	1
Lopez	18,290	18,847.21	3
Shaw	5,031	4,936.89	2
Blakely	4,355	4,435.75	2
Waldron	2,905	2,936.08	1
Decatur	2,221	2,294.20	3

The first column of Table 36, *below*, identifies the Use Codes which are assigned to each parcel by the Assessor's Office. The second column is a short description of the Use Code. The third column, entitled "Use" was assigned to each Use Code by Planning Staff in order to simplify the evaluation of the data.

Table 36. Relationship between Assessor's Use Codes and Use Designations.

Use Code	Assessor's Description	Use
0	Unclassified	Unclassified
90	Mobile Home on Real Prop—Lease	Mobile Home
1100	Household, Single-Family Units	Single-Family
1120	Single-Family w/Cons. Esmt	Single-Family
1190	Mobile as Residence	Single-Family

Table 36. Relationship between Assessor's Use Codes and Use Designations.

Use Code	Assessor's Description	Use
1200	Household, 2-4 units	Multi-Family
1220	Residential 2-4 w/Cons. Easmt.	Multi-Family
1300	Household, Multi-Units	Multi-Family
1400	Residential Hotels/Condos/B&B	Transient Accom.
1500	Mobile Home Parks or Courts	Mobile Home Park
1600	Hotels/Motels	Transient Accom.
1700	Institutional Lodging	Multi-Family
1800	Other Residential Units	Vacant
1820	Other Res. w/Cons. Easmnt.	Vacant
1900	Vacation & Cabin	Single-Family
1920	Vacation & Cabin w/Cons. Easmt.	Single-Family
2100	Food and Kindred Products	Manufacturing
2200	Textile Mill Products	Manufacturing
2300	Apparel & Other Finished Prod.	Manufacturing
2400	Lumber and Wood Products	Manufacturing
2500	Furniture & Fixtures	Manufacturing
2600	Paper & Allied Products	Manufacturing
2700	Printing and Publishing	Manufacturing
2800	Chemicals	Manufacturing
2900	Petroleum Refining and Related	Manufacturing
3100	Rubber & Misc. Plastic Products	Manufacturing
3200	Stone, Clay & Glass Products	Manufacturing
3300	Primary Metal Industries	Manufacturing
3400	Fabricated Metal Products	Manufacturing
3500	Prof. & Scientific Instruments	Manufacturing
3900	Miscellaneous Manufacturing	Manufacturing
4100	Railroad/Transit Trans.	Transportation
4200	Motor Vehicle Transportation	Transportation
4300	Aircraft Transportation	Transportation
4400	Marine Transportation	Transportation
4500	Highway Right-of-Way	Transportation
4600	Automobile Parking	Transportation
4700	Communication	Transportation
4800	Utilities	Transportation
4900	Other Transportation	Transportation
5100	Wholesale Trade	Retail/Service
5200	Retail—Building & Hrdwr. & Farm	Retail/Service
5300	Retail—General Merchandise	Retail/Service
5400	Retail—Food	Retail/Service

Table 36. Relationship between Assessor's Use Codes and Use Designations.

Use Code	Assessor's Description	Use
5500	Retail—Auto, Marine & Aircraft	Retail/Service
5600	Retail—Apparel	Retail/Service
5700	Retail—Furniture & Home Furn.	Retail/Service
5800	Retail—Eating and Drinking	Retail/Service
5900	Other Retail	Retail/Service
6100	Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate	Retail/Service
6200	Personal Services	Retail/Service
6300	Business Services	Retail/Service
6400	Repair Services	Retail/Service
6500	Professional Services	Retail/Service
6600	Contract Construction Services	Retail/Service
6700	Governmental Services	Gov't Services
6800	Educational Services	Retail/Service
6900	Miscellaneous Services	Retail/Service
7100	Cultural Activities	Recreation
7200	Public Assembly	Recreation
7300	Amusements	Recreation
7400	Recreational Activities	Recreation
7500	Resorts and Group Camps	Recreation
7600	Parks	Recreation
7700	Comm. Unimproved Land	Vacant
7900	Other Recreational	Recreation
8100	Agriculture	Resource Lands
8200	Agricultural Related	Resource Lands
8300	Open Space—Farm & Agric.	Resource Lands
8320	O/S Agricultural w/Cons. Easmnt.	Resource Lands
8400	Fishing & Related Services	Resource Lands
8500	Mining Activities	Resource Lands
8600	Reforestation	Resource Lands
8700	Classified Forest Land	Resource Lands
8800	Designated Forest Land	Resource Lands
8820	DFL w/Cons. Easmnt.	Resource Lands
8900	Other Resource Production	Resource Lands
9100	Undeveloped Land	Vacant
9120	Undeveloped w/Cons. Easmnt.	Vacant
9200	Noncommercial Forest	Resource Lands
9300	Water Areas	Water
9400	Open Space—Recreational	Open Space

Table 36. Relationship between Assessor's Use Codes and Use Designations.

Use Code	Assessor's Description	Use
9420	O/S Rec. w/Cons. Easement	Open Space
9500	Open Space—Timber	Resource Lands
9600	Small Islands—US Gov't.	Small Islands
9700	Jointly Held Area in Subdivisions	Common Area
9900	Other Undeveloped Land	Vacant