

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Please complete all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. ADDITION, complete the supplemental sheet for nonproject actions (part D). For nonproject actions.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: *Okanogan County Comprehensive Plan Update*

2. Name of applicant: *Okanogan County*

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Okanogan County Planning & Development Department

c/o Perry Huston, Director

123 5th Ave North, Ste 130

Okanogan, WA 98840

509-422-7218

phuston@co.okanogan.wa.us

4. Date checklist prepared: 5/9/2014

5. Agency requesting checklist: *Okanogan County*

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
Comprehensive Plan adoption—July 2014

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

Based on the final Comprehensive Plan, a Shoreline Master Program update, Zoning Ordinance update and Critical Area Ordinance update will all be processed.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal. *See expanded checklist materials attached as Attachment 1.*

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain. *No.*

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
SEPA completion
Ordinance of adoption by the Okanogan County Board of County Commissioners.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The Okanogan County Comprehensive Plan 2014 is adopted pursuant to Chapter 35.63 RCW and provides a guideline for property use and development County wide as provided in that chapter.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The Okanogan County Comprehensive Plan is the blueprint for development regulations throughout Okanogan County. Its application may be limited on Federal lands and lands subject to Treaty rights approved by the United States government.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous,
other: *all of the above*

Okanogan County is 5,267 sq. miles located on the Canadian border from east of the Cascade Crest to east of the Columbia River. The county has varied terrain from mountainous to river valleys and steppe prairies. See Natural Resource Conservation Service Soils Data (2013) for detailed soils and topographic information.

The remainder of the section is project-specific and not applicable to a County-wide program. Project-specific reviews as required per Chapter 43.21C RCW deal with project-specific concerns and issues.

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?
- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.
- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.
- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.
- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

2. Air

There are no nonattainment areas in Okanogan County and the expected population growth for the County for the next 30 years is projected to be about 150 persons (75 permanent households per year through 2040). While that population increase together with recreational and tourist travel is anticipated to increase at a similar rate, no significant air quality issues are anticipated and no change in either population or tourist travel is anticipated between the prior Comprehensive Plan program and the current update.

The remainder of the section is project specific and not applicable to a County-wide program. Project-specific reviews as required per Chapter 43.21C RCW deal with project-specific concerns and issues.

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.
- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

3: Water

a. Surface Water:

Okanogan County has three major river systems, the Columbia River and its two major tributaries, Methow and Okanogan river systems, together with a number of lakes. Those waters of the state governed by the Shoreline Management Act are governed by this Comprehensive Plan and the State's Shoreline Master Program. The balance of the waters of the state is governed by the Comprehensive Plan and County development regulations.

The Methow system is State WRIA 48 (Chapter 173-548 WAC) and the Okanogan system is WRIA 49, WRIA Chapter 173-549 WAC. Rivers and lakes provide a major source of irrigation water for the County's agriculture industry and recreation opportunities tied to boating, swimming, fishing and, where appropriate, recreational gold mining.

The Comprehensive Plan does not anticipate any material changes in the surface water use and protection not already available under the prior comprehensive plan. The possible impact of any changes to shoreline regulations will be addressed specifically in the Shoreline Master Program update.

The remainder of the section is project specific and not applicable to a County-wide program. Project-specific reviews as required per Chapter 43.21C RCW deal with project-specific concerns and issues.

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

b. Ground Water:

Much of the new development in the unincorporated portions of the County will be served by existing water systems and exempt wells. The current Comprehensive Plan update recognizes limitations imposed on exempt wells since the adoption of the prior Comprehensive Plan,

including Ecology v. Campbell & Gwinn, L.L.C., 146 Wn.2d 1, 11, 43 P.3d 4, 10 (2002); Five Corners Family Farmers v. State, 173 Wn.2d 296, 313, 268 P.3d 892 (2011); Knight v. City of Yelm, 173 Wn.2d 325, 345, 267 P.3d 973, 984 (2011); and Kittitas County v. Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Bd., 172 Wn.2d 144, 256 P.3d 1193 (2011). New development under the revised Comprehensive Plan will be more restrictive than historically as a result of the legal precedents set by those cases. The availability of water for withdrawal and specific limitations, if any, on the availability of water, including closed basins, are set forth in Chapter 173-548 WAC for the Methow and Chapter 173-549 WAC for the Okanogan.

Septic tanks are governed by the County Health Department regulations and the Comprehensive Plan amendment does not change those regulations.

The current Comprehensive Plan does not anticipate any material change in the pace and pattern of development over the old plan and no material impacts are anticipated as a result of the updates.

The remainder of the section is project specific and not applicable to a County-wide program. Project-specific reviews as required per Chapter 43.21C RCW deal with project-specific concerns and issues.

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

- ___deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- ___evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- ___shrubs
- ___grass
- ___pasture
- ___crop or grain
- ___ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other

- _____water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- _____other types of vegetation

All of the above.

The updated Comprehensive Plan provides additional details on agricultural and resource lands and the Critical Area Ordinances to follow provide additional protections over priority habitats and species. No material environmental impact to the listed vegetation types is anticipated as a result of the update.

The remainder of the section is project specific and not applicable to a County-wide program. Project-specific reviews as required per Chapter 43.21C RCW deal with project-specific concerns and issues.

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?
- c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.
- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

5. Animals

- a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

All of the above, excluding shellfish.

The updated Comprehensive Plan provides additional details on habitat protection and the Critical Area Ordinances to follow provide additional protections over priority habitats and species. No material environmental impact to the listed animal types is anticipated as a result of the changes in the update.

Threatened and endangered species and critical areas will be more specifically addressed in the County Critical Area Ordinance and Shoreline Master Program update. The Comprehensive Plan update under review provides additional goals and policies protective of threatened and endangered species and habitats.

The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.
- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

6. Energy and natural resources

Okanogan County is served by electric and particularly hydroelectric energy, natural gas, wood and solar energy sources. The current update recognizes alternative fuel use and climate change-related issues that were not addressed in the prior draft. No material environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the increased attention paid in this draft to alternative fuels.

The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.
- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.
- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

7. Environmental health

The updated Comprehensive Plan does not alter environmental health exposures when compared with the current Comprehensive Plan. No material impacts are identified as a result of the change.

The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.
 - 1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.
 - 2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

b. Noise

The updated Comprehensive Plan does not alter noise exposures when compared with the current Comprehensive Plan. No material impacts are identified as a result of the change.

The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?
- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

8. Land and shoreline use

The updated Comprehensive Plan does not alter shoreline use when compared with the current Comprehensive Plan. The updated Shoreline Master Program, to be considered after the adoption of this comprehensive plan, will provide additional regulatory details consistent with RCW 36.70A.480 and Chapter 365-190 WAC and Chapters 173-26/27 WAC. Land-related changes are addressed in the supplement attached as Attachment 1. The Moderate Growth Projections for the County are identified in the census and profile materials attached (Attachment 2). No material impacts are identified as a result of the change.

The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?
- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.
- c. Describe any structures on the site.
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? [
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
- L. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

9. Housing

The updated Comprehensive Plan does not alter the number of housing units anticipated when compared with the current Comprehensive Plan. Land-related changes are addressed in the supplement attached as Attachment 1. No material impacts are identified as a result of the change.

The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

10. Aesthetics

No change is anticipated from the current program by reason of the update. This section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

11. Light and glare

No change is anticipated from the current program by reason of the update. This section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?
- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

12. Recreation

No change is anticipated from the current program by reason of the update. This section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

13. Historic and cultural preservation

No change is anticipated from the current program by reason of the update. This section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs. The revised plan has been updated to reflect current regulations and new statutory controls.

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.
- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

14. Transportation

The County Transportation Plan does not materially change as a result of this update, although there is now more emphasis on supporting transit where feasible.

The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.
- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?
- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?
- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).
- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.
- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

15. Public services

No change is anticipated from the current program by reason of the update. The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,
other _____

All of the above in various locations (sewers tied to cities and major developments).

No change is anticipated from the current program by reason of the update. The remainder of this section is project specific and not applicable to County-wide programs.

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: Perry D Huston

Name of signee Perry D Huston

Position and Agency/Organization Director of Planning Okanogan County

Date Submitted: 5-9-14

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(IT IS NOT NECESSARY to use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment in .

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

The Comprehensive Plan does not per se suggest an increase in any of the referenced items. Zoning codes, water quality standards, shoreline and hazardous waste regulations are present to evaluate project-specific impacts and identify the need for an appropriate mitigation where need exists to address each of the referenced items.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Existing development regulations and updated regulations as they are developed.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The Comprehensive Plan per se will have no specific effect. Development in accordance with regulations adopted under the plan may impact plant life and possibly fish in a developing area if not properly conditioned or regulated. The updated Comprehensive Plan maintains the current pattern of development intensity around existing developed areas. In addition, shoreline master programs are to contain no net loss provisions and the critical areas ordinance is designed to protect wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat to provide necessary protections.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

Adoption and enforcement of appropriate development regulations to guide development in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The revised plan has specific provision to protect resource lands, including agricultural, forest and mineral lands of long-term commercial significance. No depletion of either energy or natural resources is anticipated. The plan does not alter the historic growth patterns of the County and utilities have based

their growth needs on historic trends, so no additional impact is anticipated as a result of this plan amendment.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

Building codes with updated insulation requirements and the adoption of critical area and resource protection codes, following the adoption of this ordinance.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

The plan does not directly affect environmentally sensitive areas and other designated areas, and in fact calls for the adoption of additional protections in the form of critical area regulations, protection of historic or cultural sites and resource lands, including prime farm lands.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

Adoption and enforcement of the referenced regulations.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

There is existing development on the shorelines that is not modified by this plan. A shoreline master program update is under review, which will provide additional shoreline protections as provided by RCW 36.70A.480 and Chapters 173-26/27 WAC.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

Adoption of the amended updated shoreline master program under the guidelines referenced.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Okanogan County has a slow growth trajectory, they have adopted the OFM mid growth scenario (see chart attached). Capital facility planning is used to match growth with physical facility needs.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

Continue capital facility planning to match growth of infrastructure with population growth.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

No conflict has been identified.

**Environmental Checklist
Attachment 1**

**SUPPLEMENTAL SUMMARY OF CHANGES AND CONDITIONS
OKANOGAN COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 1964/2014**

Okanogan County is undertaking its first Comprehensive Plan amendment in fifty years. While the scope and range of regulations have expanded, many of the underlying themes from the existing plan remain intact. What has changed is a greater emphasis on the method and manner of regulation and a commitment to periodic updates.

The purpose of this Checklist supplement is to provide a comparison of the proposed revision with the current plan to enable the reader to better understand both the nature of the changes made and the possible impact or lack thereof. As with the current Comprehensive Plan the present plan is a blueprint for future development, but with very limited regulatory authority.

Implementation of the plan is through the development of land use, subdivision, shoreline master program, critical area and natural resource regulations to be adopted in amendments to the County Development Code, which will follow adoption of the plan. Capital facility plans and transportation plans are adopted periodically to identify the timing and capital available to move forward with programs within the framework of this plan. Under state law capital facility and transportation plans, shoreline master programs and development regulations are to be consistent with comprehensive plans. This is to be the regulatory limit. Project developments will be judged under the provisions of the applicable development regulations that are chosen to implement this plan.

I. The 1964 Plan

A. Goals

The 1964 plan was developed by a joint planning office under the provisions of Chapter 35.63 RCW (the Planning Commission Act). The goals of the Comprehensive Plan were taken directly from the provisions of the Act, RCW 35.63.090, and then specifying

- Prevent incompatible uses
- Reserve land for future development (residential, commercial, industrial)
- Assure adequate roads
- Encourage logical expansion of urban growth
- Preserve quality of intensive agricultural lands
- Limit density on shorelines to that which can be supported without sewers where they are not available

- Conserve and develop natural resources
- Encourage recreational development
- Assure public access to rivers and lakes

B. Implementation

Land Use Plan, pp. 13-28 and Maps plates I-XIII.

The goals are more specifically addressed in the context of each of the plans, identifying land use facility and transportation categories in more detail.

Specific sections included:

- Intensive agricultural areas
- Suburban residential areas
- Recreational residential areas
- Commercial areas
- Tourist commercial areas
- Industrial areas

Implementation was identified as:

- Zoning rules
- Subdivision rules

Public Facilities Plan, pp. 28-47

- Parks and recreation/open space
- Schools
- Sewer and water
- Courthouse parking
- Other public facilities
 - Road District shops
 - Airports

- Garbage dumps

Implementation through periodic capital facility plans.

Roads, pp. 48-59.

- Major arterials
- Secondary arterials
- Collector arterials
- Access roads

Classifying definitions and specifications for each.

Urbanizing Area Plans (areas abutting incorporated cities), pp. 60-74.

Addressed in connection with each city.

II. Comparison with the Revised Version

In a section-by-section analysis the revised plan covers much of the same issues covered by the existing plan. New sections were added as required by law (Shorelines, Resource Lands and Critical Areas as provided in Chapter 36.70A RCW), or to clarify actions taken, and regulatory controls (street sections, etc.) were removed as more properly part of the County official controls or development regulations.

A. Goals

In 2014 the goals cover the same elements as the 1964 plan and are found in the planning objectives and private property and water rights sections of the revised plan. There are no omissions from the 1964 goals. The new plan is more specific about goals for both water and limits on development authority imposed by state law and constitutional restrictions. The limitations are applied to the 1964 plan by operation of law and no material change or environmental consequence is anticipated as result of the changes.

B. Implementation

Implementation of the vision set forth in the plan is through a series of maps and the use of zoning, subdivision, Shoreline Master Program and GMA-mandated critical area and natural resource protections.

New provisions not found in the previous plan include:

Resource Lands, pp. 16-23, addressing agricultural, forestry and mineral resource lands of long-term commercial significance. The plan restates the identification criteria from the applicable

regulation. WAC 365-190-090 thru -120. Implementation will be through designation on the Comprehensive Plan maps for location and zoning standards for use and development.

The designation and conservation of resource lands is required by Chapter 36.70A RCW and merely provides additional reinforcement to the 1964 plan goal of protecting important agricultural lands and other resource industries. No material environmental consequence is anticipated as a result of the change.

Land Use of Rural Lands, pp. 25-27.

In the current plan the County identifies criteria for identifying density and compatible uses and is more specific about what types of uses are permitted under the zoning code and those that require a conditional use.

Unincorporated Towns, Neighborhood Commercial Centers Land Use, pp. 27-28.

This section addresses the need for additional services and considerations surrounding the unincorporated cities that are developed at urban densities but fall under the County development authority. The topic is generally addressed in the current plan and the revision provides additional details about how such areas are to be addressed in the zoning codes. Designation criteria for the identified centers and plans for new neighborhood commercial centers to serve rural portions of the County are more specifically identified. Development regulations and the adopted maps will more specifically determine how and where such increased activity centers will be developed. The revisions to the Comprehensive Plan provide no additional basis for environmental impact from the present plan.

Land Use of City Expansion Areas, pp. 29-32.

This section replicates the City expansion areas in the current plan and merely provides greater detail on the criteria to be used in identifying the areas subject to consideration under the provisions stated. There is no additional environmental impact by reason of the increased detail provided.

Amendment: This is a new section—often found in regulations rather than the plan—and simply provides guidance on how and when the plan may be amended. It includes provisions for a five-year review and criteria for zoning and project review. This is a procedural section and does not in itself create any additional environmental impacts.

More Completely Planned Areas, pp. 32-33.

Since the original plan was approved in 1964 the County has used subarea plans or “more completely planned areas” to address the need for specific regulations in one portion of the County that may not be appropriate or necessary in another. The Methow Valley More Complete Planned Area is an example. This section identifies how such programs are to be reviewed and simply adds another planning tool in aid of achieving the plan goals in the community.

Circulation Element, pp. 34 -38.

This section is a significant update to the roads section in the 1964 plan, reflecting the more complex road planning processes in place in the State and County, including institutionalization of six-year road plans, and participation in regional transportation planning organizations. The plan links transportation and land use planning and restates the functional classification system containing the same items as the current plan, but adding identification criteria. The County's existing circulation system according to the plan is illustrated on adopted maps. Appx A-1 and 2. The circulation element adds nothing new to the Comprehensive Plan that would create an environmental impact. Adoption of capital facility plans (consistent with this Comprehensive Plan) and specific transportation projects above minimum threshold are all required to have a SEPA review and site-specific environmental impacts and required mitigation are to be identified at that time.

Essential Public Facilities, pp. 39.

This section replicates the capital facilities section of the prior plan. The section provides additional insights and needs that are to be considered as capital facility plans are developed and development regulations are planned for areas surrounding capital facilities. Included sections are:

Airports—and the need to assure compatible surrounding uses.

Capital facilities—to be planned over a 20-year planning window with annual updates.

The section creates no new environmental impacts as environmental review at the time of the development of capital facility plans and official controls will look at programmatic-related issues. Project-specific issues will be addressed at the time of permit application to assure compliance with adopted regulations and mitigation or other appropriate action as a result of identified environmental impacts.

Coordination, p. 40.

This section replicates provisions in the current plan and merely adds additional definition and specification as to the agencies involved and the goals to be achieved. All of the provisions are required by law and as such the section adds no new environmental concerns by reason of the section addition.

The Methow Valley More Completely Planned Area, pp. 42-96, is merely a re-adoption of the present plan to clarify that for the region covered it is the operative subarea plan. There are no changes to the Methow Valley Planning Area Sub Unit A and as such no additional environmental considerations by reason of its inclusion in the plan.

Comparative Land Uses

Table 1

County Zoning	2013	2014 (proposed)
17.05 Minimum Requirement District (MD)	2,263,263	672,854
17.08 Agricultural-Residential District (A-R)	491	491
17.09 Suburban Residential District (SR)	296	296
17.10 Commercial District (C)	230	230
17.11 Industrial District (I)	7	7
17.12 Airport Development District (AP)	176	176
17.14 Methow Review District (MRD)	1,094,521	1,094,521
17.14A Rural Residential District (RRD)	25,159	25,159
17.14B Low Density Residential District (LDRD)	4,605	1,042,999
17.15 Urban Residential District (UR)	32	32
17.16 Neighborhood Use District (NU)	27	27
17.17 Special Review Commercial	36	36
17.19 Planned Development (PD)	995	995
17.20 Planned Destination Resort (PDR)	73	73
17.06A Rural 1	0	267,265
17.06B Rural 5	0	473,238
17.06C Rural 20	0	906,113

With the adoption of the County Comprehensive Plan, the County will adopt an interim zoning ordinance eliminating the Minimum Requirements District except within the boundaries of the CCT Reservation and replacing it with interim agricultural and rural zones. The zones retain as permitted uses all uses in Minimum Requirement District but zoning all such lands within 1 mile of a County arterial R 1-5; between 1 and 2 miles R 5 and more than 2 miles from a County arterial R 1-20 with few exceptions. This interim zone will remain in place until the County adopts its final zoning ordinance and map. The zoning in the Methow Review District will remain the same except in those areas where the Resource Designation has been applied and upland 20 has been expanded. These changes have the effect of reducing the potential density upon adoption of the new plan by a factor of between 5 and 10 fold depending on the final rezone. Any specific changes made at that time would be subject to independent SEPA review.

Any discussion of potential densities brought about by adoption of the revised County Comprehensive Plan and interim zone code must consider the conveyance of private land to

public ownership or placed under conservation easements. Since 1967 approximately 187,000 acres has been acquired by various public agencies or placed under conservation easements.

Summary of Changes and Impacts

In adopting the Comprehensive Plan, a number of the current zone categories will remain the same unless and until changed during a more site-specific review during the rezone process to follow. Those are shown on the chart above. Any change from current zoning would require independent environmental analysis of the change at the time of the zoning ordinance and map revision process.

The major change concerns the elimination of the Minimum Requirements District (which permitted densities at one unit per acre) and its replacement by rural and agricultural zones, which will have a range of densities from one unit per five acres to one unit per 20 acres as determined through the site-specific zoning. This is a significant reduction in potential density throughout the more rural areas of the County and recognizes that agriculture is a significant component of the County economy.

County production varies by the year and crop demand, but the overall inventory required to support the County agricultural industry remains about the same. The top crops by acre are:

Forage—Hay, silage and greenchop	32,510
Apples	16,151
Wheat and grains	11,621
Pears	4,061
Cherries sweet	3,828
Total	95,000 acres

<u>Livestock inventory (private lands)</u>	<u>Number</u>
Cattle and calves	44,000
Horses and ponies	6,289
Layers	3,258
Bee colonies	2,406

A key question from the Census of Agriculture (see copy attached as part of Attachment 2) is the extent that farms are “commercially significant,” which can be defined by the County. For example, more than 1,000 farms have gross sales between \$1,000 per year and \$20,000 per year. While these activities certainly support the farm industry infrastructure, from feed to machinery to professional services, they also tend to be episodic, very much tied to a given owner and may open and close periodically depending on the owners and the markets.

The County has about 500 farms with income over \$20,000 per year. While the number is somewhat arbitrary, that level of income tends to suggest longer term professional operations that form the heart of the County commercial agricultural activity.

More than 200 farms listed in the Census are less than 10 acres and nearly 600 are less than 40 acres. In this County parcels less than 40 acres do not need to be conserved by ag-only zoning. Given the amount of undeveloped land in the County, the ability of the smaller farms to open and close, change crops and to relocate is presently undisturbed by the limited development activity in the County. The needs of the industry here are protected by protecting the farm activity, particularly for those activities that are not tied to the quality of the soils, including fowl and livestock, or are productive even on small acreages (cherries and pears).

The need to conserve lands based on soils is principally tied to forage (about 40,000 acres), hay and grain production (about 12,000 acres) and larger-scale fruit production (about 25,000 acres).

Okanogan County has 8,000 acres in large-scale agricultural conservation easements, which provides more than 60% of the prime farm lands necessary to service commercial alfalfa and grains. Hay and grains are also grown on numerous lands less than 40 acres in size, which vary from year to year, and on many larger farms in support of livestock operations, but the lands used for these purposes varies from year to year and location to location. The availability of water and cost-effective energy are the key components of successful crop-based agriculture. No additional conservation designations are required to conserve a critical mass necessary to support the industry.

Tree fruits such as apples, cherries and pears can be grown on most well-drained soils in the valley where water is present and available. Cherries and pears can be cost-effectively grown on smaller farms, 2-20 acres. Most commercial apple production requires at least 20 acres for success. Orchards can be affected by a variety of changes, but there is well over 100,000 acres in the County suitable for some form of fruit production—sufficient to cover the present use (about 25,000 acres) several times over and enough to serve the needs of the industry without placing additional restrictions beyond those in the agriculture district. Livestock, layers and other minor operations are not soils dependent and may be located on lands where the activity is protected. In addition, livestock needs access to grazing lands, which have historically included public lands which encompass more than 1 million acres in Okanogan County.

A view of the map shows that much of the County is already segregated into parcels, but the extreme slow rate of growth, combined with the new agricultural zoning assuring an abundant supply of 5, 10 and 20 acre parcels, provides the critical mass necessary to sustain the commercial agricultural activity tied to crops.

While the forest resource and agricultural resource activities on public lands overlap, the agencies revise permits annually to avoid conflict and together provide far in excess of the 500,000 acres commonly needed to service the livestock industry. In addition, grazing is frequently found on a variety of private lands, which may open one year and close the next depending on the needs of the owner of the land and the livestock. Here again, with the size of the County, the availability of public lands and the number of large properties, combined with

the slow pace of development, ample acreage is available for livestock without the need for additional designation.

Any agricultural lands requiring the greater degrees of protection required by Chapter 365-190 WAC will be evaluated during the zoning process.

The County cannot provide agricultural or forest resource zoning under the long-term commercially significant designations as the limitations imposed by cases such as *Lewis County*¹ and the *Soccer fields* case² would violate other mandates for the management of public lands by WDNR and WDFW, the major state public land holders in the County. But because the joint use of these lands provides an ample inventory of lands available for use for forestry and agriculture, the need to specify additional lands for livestock production in the County under the unique factors here is substantially reduced.

Fowl and duck operations are not soil dependent and can be managed on relatively small acreages. The vast lands available in the agriculture zone are sufficient to support the needs of that activity for the foreseeable future and no additional lands need to be set aside.

Attachments:

Comprehensive Plan map

Proposed Comprehensive Plan map—to guide future activities

Interim Zone Map

Circulation element/essential facilities map

City Expansion Areas

Current, see maps attached

Proposed, no change

Small Towns (Unincorporated areas)

Current, see maps attached

Proposed, no change


The Reservation: The past plan considered the Colville Indian Reservation a Minimum Requirements District for purposes of any non-Indian-related development. Until the County reviews its zoning ordinance, that designation shall be retained for all non-Indian projects.

Mineral Resource: The mineral resource overlay is designed to serve areas with existing mines approved with either Federal or State mining permits. Compliance with the terms of operating permits (all subject to SEPA or NEPA review) shall be a minimum requirement for resource activities in the district. Agricultural and forest resource activities are permitted uses in the mineral resource overlay, but residential units are prohibited except as to serve the mineral resource activity.

¹ *Lewis County v. Western Washington Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd.*, 157 Wn.2d 488, 139 P.3d 1096 (2006).

² *King County v. CPSGMHB*, 142 Wn.2d 543, 14 P.3d 133 (2000) (*Soccer fields*).

OKANOGAN



Population - 2011	Amount	Rank
Unincorporated	41,200	25
Incorporated	24,806	21
Land Area in Sq. MI.	16,396	24
Density Pop./Sq. MI.	6,267.88	34
Assessed Value - 2010	\$3,944,270	25
Total \$ In Thousands	\$95,921	25
Per Capita \$/Person	\$1,303,172	22
Personal Income - 2009	\$32,136	23
Per Capita \$/Person		
*See Table L101		

County Seat - Okanogan	Population*	City/Town	Population*
2010 to 2011	2,385	Oroville	1,680
Estimated Births	220	Palatka	685
Estimated Deaths	910	Riverside	280
Natural Increase	240	Tenasikat	1,025
Net Migration	235	Twisp	925
Total Population Change	2,685	Winthrop	410
	4,845		

POPULATION AS OF APRIL 1, 2011

Marriages in 2010	285
Divorces in 2008	6.9
Per 1,000 Pop.	107
Per 1,000 Pop.	2.6

FEDERAL CENSUS 2010 POPULATION BY NON-HISPANIC RACE CATEGORIES

Total	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Other	Race	Multi-Race
41,120	30,399	159	237	31	4,163	1,456	
Non-Hispanic	33,883	28,082	131	4,301	223	27	42
Hispanic	7,227	2,907	28	284	4	4,121	469

AIAN: American Indian and Alaska Native; NHPI: Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.

STATE COLLECTED REVENUES DISTRIBUTED TO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS*

State Fiscal Year	2008	2010	2011
Criminal Justice	\$724,556	\$712,680	\$694,116
Federal Revenues	2,072,932	1,680,271	1,496,213
Forest Excise & Reclassified	126,673	63,373	71,469
Hotel/Motel Tax	362,690	308,149	374,843
Liquor Excise Tax	40,801	43,508	46,486
Liquor Profits	71,914	73,636	88,667
Local Sales & Use Tax/Interest	2,540,391	2,478,043	2,814,789
Miscellaneous	1,148,368	937,060	553,601
Motor Vehicle Fund	3,762,413	3,638,148	3,711,446
Natural Resources Transfers	21	24	114,762
PUD Privilege Tax	483,566	356,392	438,686
Total Revenues Distributed	\$11,354,296	\$10,478,633	\$10,723,849

REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX COLLECTIONS - % OF SALES

State Fiscal Year	2008	2010	2011
State Fiscal Year 2008	\$3,069,941.01		\$1,667,941.84
State Fiscal Year 2009	\$2,122,041.58		\$1,582,125.05

COUNTY REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES-CALENDAR YEAR 2010*

Revenue	Expenditure
Property Taxes	General Govt. Services
Retail Sales & Use	Security of Persons & Prop.
All Other Taxes	Physical Environment
Licenses & Permits	Transportation
Intergovernmental Revenue	Economic Environment
Charges for Services	Mental & Physical Health
Fines & Forfeits	Culture & Recreation
Miscellaneous Revenues	Debt Service
Other Financing Resources	Capital Outlays
Total Revenues	Total Expenditures

*See footnotes page. Footnote symbol meanings differ by section.

OKANOGAN

AVERAGE MONTHLY EMPLOYMENT AND TOTAL WAGES IN COVERED EMPLOYMENT-CY 2010

Industry	Employees	Av. # of Employees	Percent of Total	Wages Paid	Percent of Total
Agric., Forestry, Fishing & Hunting	331	5,660	32.1	\$62,342,786	18.7
Mining	6	160	1.0	11,667,732	2.7
Utilities	11	41	0.2	1,762,978	0.4
Construction	204	454	2.6	12,619,674	2.9
Manufacturing	39	348	2.0	8,927,984	2.0
Wholesale/Retail Trade	212	1,994	11.5	46,791,128	10.7
Transp. & Warehousing	27	89	0.5	3,053,287	0.7
Information	21	135	0.8	4,120,634	0.9
Fin., Ins., & Real Estate	79	332	1.9	8,369,742	1.9
Professional & Tech. Services	166	166	1.1	5,979,652	1.4
Mgmt of Companies & Enterprises	3	34	0.2	1,501,985	0.3
Administrative & Waste Services	99	170	1.0	3,761,945	0.9
Educational Services	13	37	0.2	539,936	0.1
Health Care & Social Assistance	91	1,173	6.8	35,539,927	8.1
Arts, Entertainment & Recreation	26	106	0.6	1,713,767	0.4
Accommodation & Food Services	127	1,063	6.3	16,748,338	3.8
Other Svcs. except Public Admin.	645	658	3.8	9,015,669	2.1
Government	100	4,738	27.3	185,663,097	42.3
Not Elsewhere Classified	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1,966	17,329	100.0	\$439,501,413	100.0

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN STATE FISCAL YEAR 2010

Program	Total Grants	Monthly Average	% of County Population	Rank by % of Pop
CEAP	5789	5	0.01	5
Disability Lifetime	1,198,614	330	0.80	5
Diversions	6,955	5	0.01	36
Food Assistance	12,621,611	9,694	21.14	5
Medical Assistance	4,189	12	0.03	3
Refugee Assistance	-	-	-	-
State Supplemental SSI	161,719	262	0.64	5
TANF	\$2,202,985	886	2.40	18

PUBLIC K-12 SCHOOLS

Number of Districts	8	School Apportionment
Avg. Ann. FTE Enroll 2009-10:	6,115.40	State fiscal year 2010
Avg. Ann. FTE Enroll 2010-01:	7,100.55	State fiscal year 2011

Major Sources of Operating Rev.-FY 2009-10

Source	Amount	Self. Expend. For Instructional Prog.-FY 2009-10
State	\$43,470,418	\$28,670,428
Federal	15,598,795	6,613,729
Local Prop. Tax	6,236,094	2,414,731
Other Local	1,247,561	2,532,492
Payments from Other Dist.	285,949	-
Total	\$66,838,897	\$40,231,378

TRANSPORTATION: REGISTRATIONS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2010

Total Licensed Drivers:	32,515
Licensed Vehicles:	24,145
Passenger Trucks	17,053
Recreational Trailers	6,911
Total	7,421
Vanity	365

STATE POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX-APRIL 1, 2011

Age	Total	Male	Female
0-4	2,782	1,430	1,351
5-9	2,568	1,263	1,224
10-14	2,586	1,374	1,223
15-19	2,618	1,344	1,272
20-24	2,008	1,052	956
25-29	2,130	1,090	1,040
30-34	2,174	1,119	1,055
35-39	2,198	1,091	1,095
40-44	2,317	1,174	1,143
45-49	2,661	1,301	1,360
Total	41,200	20,803	20,397
Median Age	43.45	42.63	44.29

Note: Data may not add due to rounding. *See footnotes page. Footnote symbol meanings differ by section.

Decennial Census Counts of Population for Counties
Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

County Name	Population, 1890	Population, 1900	Population, 1910	Population, 1920	Population, 1930	Population, 1940	Population, 1950	Population, 1960	Population, 1970	Population, 1980	Population, 1990
State of Washington	357,232	518,103	1,141,990	1,356,621	1,563,396	1,736,191	2,378,963	2,853,214	3,413,250	4,132,353	4,866,663
Adams		4,840	10,920	9,623	7,719	6,209	6,584	9,929	12,014	13,267	13,603
Asotin		3,366	5,831	6,539	8,136	8,365	10,878	12,909	13,799	16,823	17,605
Benton			7,937	10,903	10,952	12,053	51,370	62,070	67,540	109,444	112,560
Chelan		3,931	15,104	20,906	31,634	34,412	39,301	40,744	41,103 \$	45,061	52,250
Chillam		5,603	6,755	11,368	20,449	21,848	26,396	30,022	34,770	51,648	56,204
Clark		13,419	26,115	32,805	40,316	49,852	85,307	93,809	128,454	192,227	238,053
Columbia		7,128	7,042	6,093	5,325	5,549	4,860	4,569	4,439	4,057	4,024
Cowlitz		7,877	12,561	11,791	31,906	40,155	53,369	57,801	68,616	79,548	82,119
Douglas		4,926	9,227	9,392	7,561	8,651	10,817	14,890	16,787	22,144	26,205
Ferry		4,562	4,800	5,143	4,292	4,701	4,096	3,889	3,655	5,811	6,295
Franklin		486	5,153	5,877	6,137	6,307	13,563	23,342	25,816	35,025	37,473
Garfield		3,918	4,199	3,875	3,662	3,383	3,204	2,976	2,911	2,468	2,248
Grant			8,698	7,771	5,666	14,668	24,346	46,477	41,881	48,522	54,798
Grays Harbor		15,124	35,590	44,745	59,982	53,166	53,644	54,465	59,553	66,314	64,175
Island		1,870	4,704	5,489	6,098	6,098	11,079	19,638	27,011	44,048	60,195
Jefferson		5,712	8,337	6,557	8,918	8,918	11,618	9,639	10,661	15,965	20,406
King		110,053	284,638	389,273	463,517	504,980	732,992	935,014	1,159,375 \$	1,269,898 \$	1,507,305
Kitsap		6,767	17,647	33,162	30,776	44,387	75,724	84,176	101,732	147,152 \$	189,731
Kittitas		9,704	18,561	17,737	18,154	20,230	22,235	20,467	25,039	24,877	26,725
Klickitat		6,407	10,180	9,268	9,825	11,357	12,049	13,455	12,138	15,822	16,616
Lewis		15,157	32,127	36,840	40,034	41,393	43,755	41,858	45,467	56,025 \$	59,358
Lincoln		11,959	17,539	15,141	11,876	11,361	10,970	10,919	9,572	9,604	8,864
Mason		3,810	5,156	4,919	10,060	11,603	15,022	16,251	20,918	31,184	38,341
Okanogan		4,689	12,887	17,094	18,519	24,546	29,131	25,520	25,867	30,663 \$	33,350
Pacific		5,983	12,532	14,891	14,970	15,928	16,558	14,674	15,796	17,237	18,882
Pend Oreille				6,363	7,155	7,156	7,413	6,914	6,025	8,580	8,915
Pierce		55,515	120,812	144,127	163,842	182,081	275,876	321,590	412,344 \$	485,667 \$	586,203
San Juan		2,928	3,603	3,605	3,097	3,157	3,245	2,872	3,856	7,838	10,035
Skagit		14,272	29,241	33,373	35,142	37,650	43,273	51,350	52,381	64,138	79,545
Skamania		1,688	2,887	2,357	2,891	4,633	4,788	5,207	5,845	7,919	8,289
Snohomish		23,950	59,209	67,690	78,861	88,754	111,580	172,199	265,236	337,720 \$	465,628
Spokane		57,542	139,404	141,289	150,477	164,652	221,561	278,333	287,487	341,835	361,333
Stevens		10,543	25,297	21,605	18,550	19,275	18,580	17,884	17,405	28,979	30,948
Thurston		9,927	17,581	22,366	31,351	37,285	44,884	55,049	76,894	124,264	161,238
Wahkiakum		2,819	3,285	3,472	3,862	4,286	3,835	3,426	3,592	3,832	3,327
Walla Walla		18,680	31,931	27,539	28,441	30,547	40,135	42,195	42,176	47,435	48,439
Whatcom		24,116	49,511	50,600	59,128	60,355	66,733	70,317	81,983 \$	106,701	127,780
Whitman		25,360	33,280	31,323	28,014	27,221	32,469	31,263	37,900	40,103	38,775
Yakima		13,462	41,709	63,710	77,402	99,019	135,723	145,112	145,212 \$	172,508	188,823

Decennial Census Cou
Washington State Offi

County Name	Population, 2000	Population, 2010
State of Washington	\$ 5,894,143	\$ 6,724,540
Adams	16,428	18,728
Asotin	20,551	21,823
Benton	142,475	175,177
Chelan	66,616	72,453
Chittam	\$ 64,179	\$ 71,404
Clark	345,238	425,363
Columbia	4,064	4,078
Cowlitz	92,948	102,410
Douglas	32,603	38,431
Ferry	7,260	7,551
Franklin	49,347	78,163
Garfield	2,397	2,266
Grant	\$ 74,698	89,120
Grays Harbor	67,194	72,787
Island	71,558	78,506
Jefferson	\$ 26,299	\$ 29,872
King	\$ 1,737,046	\$ 1,931,249
Kitsap	231,989	251,133
Kittitas	33,362	40,915
Klickitat	19,161	20,318
Lewis	68,600	75,455
Lincoln	10,184	10,570
Masson	49,405	60,888
Okanogan	39,584	41,120
Pacific	20,984	20,820
Pend Oreille	11,732	13,001
Pierce	700,618	795,225
San Juan	14,077	15,769
Skagit	\$ 102,979	116,901
Skamania	9,872	11,066
Snohomish	\$ 606,024	713,335
Spokane	\$ 417,939	471,221
Stevens	40,066	43,931
Thurston	207,355	262,264
Wahkiakum	3,824	3,978
Walla Walla	55,160	58,781
Whatcom	168,826	201,140
Whitman	40,740	44,776
Yakima	222,561	243,231

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Present
 Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Line	Filter	County	Jurisdiction	1960 Census Count of Total Population	1961 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1962 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1963 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1964 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1965 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1966 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1967 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population
226	4	Lincoln	Harrington								
227	4	Lincoln	Odessa								
228	4	Lincoln	Reardan								
229	4	Lincoln	Sorapue								
230	4	Lincoln	Wilbur								
231											
232	1	Mason	Mason County	16,251	16,500	17,100	17,200	17,400	17,800	18,400	19,100
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County								
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County								
235	4	Mason	Shelton								
236											
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	25,520	25,500	25,400	25,000	25,000	25,100	25,000	25,200
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County								
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County								
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster								
241	4	Okanogan	Conconully								
242	4	Okanogan	Coulee Dam (part)								
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City								
244	4	Okanogan	Nespelem								
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan								
246	4	Okanogan	Omak								
247	4	Okanogan	Oroville								
248	4	Okanogan	Pateros								
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside								
250	4	Okanogan	Tonasket								
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp								
252	4	Okanogan	Winthrop								
253											
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	14,674	14,500	14,700	14,900	14,700	14,700	15,000	14,500
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County								
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County								
257	4	Pacific	Ilsaco								
258	4	Pacific	Long Beach								
259	4	Pacific	Raymond								
260	4	Pacific	South Bend								
261											
262	1	Oreille	Pend Oreille County	6,914	6,700	6,800	6,500	6,300	6,100	6,200	6,100
263	2	Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County								
264	3	Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County								
265	4	Oreille	Cusick								
266	4	Oreille	Idene								
267	4	Oreille	Metlatine								
268	4	Oreille	Metlatine Falls								
269	4	Oreille	Newport								
270											

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Present
Washington State Office of Financial Management, Fore

Line	Filter	County	Jurisdiction	1968 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1969 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1970 Census Count of Total Population	1971 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1972 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1973 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1974 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population
227	4	Lincoln	Hartington	500	500	489	480	485	490	480
228	4	Lincoln	Odessa	1,100	1,100	1,074	1,074	1,080	1,130	1,130
229	4	Lincoln	Reardan	355	359	368	401	432	425	461
230	4	Lincoln	Sprague	601	520	550	550	538	538	538
231	4	Lincoln	Wilbur	1,370	1,007	1,074	1,084	1,140	1,140	1,140
232	1	Mason	Mason County	19,600	20,200	20,916	21,100	21,200	21,500	21,500
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County	13,300	13,750	14,403	14,500	14,480	14,600	14,600
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County	6,300	6,450	6,515	6,600	6,720	6,900	6,900
235	4	Mason	Shelton	6,300	6,450	6,515	6,600	6,720	6,900	6,900
236										
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	25,600	25,100	25,867	26,200	26,400	26,500	26,400
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County	11,226	10,738	12,326	12,120	12,081	12,047	12,051
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County	14,374	14,362	13,541	14,080	14,319	14,453	14,349
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster	1,300	1,157	1,059	1,176	1,150	1,143	1,143
241	4	Okanogan	Concomly	125	125	122	125	125	135	135
242	4	Okanogan	Coules Dam (cont)	1,472	1,565	1,201	1,420	1,417	1,351	1,272
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City	341	340	324	340	388	399	383
244	4	Okanogan	Nespelem	330	330	323	330	330	335	335
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan	2,075	2,085	2,015	2,068	2,170	2,225	2,207
246	4	Okanogan	Omak	4,200	4,220	4,164	4,250	4,300	4,400	4,425
247	4	Okanogan	Oroville	1,565	1,585	1,555	1,555	1,555	1,555	1,555
248	4	Okanogan	Palatka	546	510	472	486	520	530	530
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside	258	258	258	248	255	255	255
250	4	Okanogan	Tonasket	1,000	1,050	951	965	955	970	965
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp	766	767	756	777	777	777	750
252	4	Okanogan	Whitcomb	376	360	371	340	376	378	384
253										
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	14,800	15,300	15,786	15,800	15,800	15,800	15,800
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County	8,660	9,145	9,401	9,392	9,407	9,233	9,226
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County	6,140	6,155	6,385	6,408	6,393	6,567	6,574
257	4	Pacific	Ilwaco	550	555	506	510	510	543	550
258	4	Pacific	Long Beach	710	710	688	688	688	1,059	1,059
259	4	Pacific	Raymond	3,190	3,200	3,126	3,130	3,115	3,115	3,115
260	4	Pacific	South Bend	1,680	1,680	1,795	1,800	1,800	1,850	1,850
261										
262	1	Pend Oreille	Pend Oreille County	6,000	6,000	6,025	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
263	2	Pend Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County	2,969	2,958	3,271	3,255	3,223	3,174	3,134
264	3	Pend Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County	3,011	3,042	2,754	2,745	2,777	2,826	2,866
265	4	Pend Oreille	Cusick	650	248	257	250	250	250	271
266	4	Pend Oreille	Iona	650	650	529	529	530	530	530
267	4	Pend Oreille	Metlatina	210	210	197	214	208	220	220
268	4	Pend Oreille	Metlatina Falls	550	500	307	300	315	315	320
269	4	Pend Oreille	Newport	1,351	1,434	1,464	1,452	1,474	1,511	1,525
270										

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Pres
Washington State Office of Financial Management, Fore

Line	Filer	County	Jurisdiction	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1980
				Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	Census Count of Total Population					
226	4	Lincoln	Harrington	480	505	505	510	520	530	507
227	4	Lincoln	Odeessa	1,100	1,104	1,105	1,115	1,100	1,110	1,009
228	4	Lincoln	Reardan	461	508	510	510	510	515	498
229	4	Lincoln	Sprague	538	545	555	555	550	550	473
230	4	Lincoln	Wilbur	1,140	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,110	1,110	1,122
231										
232	1	Mason	Mason County	22,200	24,300	24,900	26,000	27,500	29,100	31,184
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County	15,722	17,820	17,950	19,150	20,480	21,970	23,555
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County	6,478	6,480	6,650	6,850	7,020	7,130	7,629
235	4	Mason	Shelton	6,478	6,480	6,650	6,850	7,020	7,130	7,629
236										
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	26,500	26,900	27,800	29,000	30,500	31,200	30,863
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County	12,118	12,342	13,231	14,206	15,623	16,100	16,456
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County	14,382	14,558	14,569	14,794	14,977	15,100	14,208
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster	1,120	1,343	1,471	1,495	1,400	1,430	1,337
241	4	Okanogan	Conconully	140	172	172	170	170	175	157
242	4	Okanogan	Coulee Dam (part)	1,241	1,216	1,233	1,194	1,186	1,195	1,185
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City	373	342	350	340	350	350	312
244	4	Okanogan	Naselleam	335	340	340	335	330	335	284
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan	2,225	2,242	2,250	2,400	2,470	2,490	2,326
246	4	Okanogan	Ormak	4,440	4,400	4,126	4,180	4,270	4,280	4,007
247	4	Okanogan	Oroville	1,555	1,590	1,565	1,570	1,590	1,600	1,483
248	4	Okanogan	Parsons	545	540	589	610	615	620	555
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside	265	265	260	260	270	270	243
250	4	Okanogan	Tomasket	985	985	985	1,010	1,010	1,025	985
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp	750	745	818	820	884	890	911
252	4	Okanogan	Winthrop	408	408	410	410	435	440	413
253										
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	15,900	15,800	16,000	16,200	16,400	16,600	17,237
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County	9,441	9,338	9,431	9,623	9,730	9,723	10,713
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County	6,459	6,462	6,569	6,577	6,670	6,877	6,524
257	4	Pacific	Ilwaco	550	550	577	577	575	604	604
258	4	Pacific	Lons Beach	1,059	1,059	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,243	1,243
259	4	Pacific	Rainmond	3,050	3,050	3,087	3,095	3,175	3,210	2,991
260	4	Pacific	South Bend	1,800	1,803	1,805	1,805	1,820	1,820	1,686
261										
262	1	Pend Oreille	Pend Oreille County	6,500	6,900	8,000	8,400	8,500	8,800	8,580
263	2	Pend Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County	3,562	3,940	5,055	5,475	5,520	5,800	5,589
264	3	Pend Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County	2,908	2,960	2,945	2,925	2,980	3,000	2,991
265	4	Pend Oreille	Cusick	271	271	265	265	255	260	246
266	4	Pend Oreille	Ima	530	560	560	575	575	565	594
267	4	Pend Oreille	Metlatine	225	225	225	200	205	200	180
268	4	Pend Oreille	Metlatine Falls	350	370	360	305	305	305	296
269	4	Pend Oreille	Newport	1,532	1,534	1,535	1,580	1,640	1,670	1,665
270										

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Present
 Washington State Office of Financial Management, Fore

Line	Filter	County	Jurisdiction	1981 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1982 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1983 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1984 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1985 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1986 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population
226	4	Lincoln	Harrington	520	510	512	510	514	510
227	4	Lincoln	Odezza	1,031	1,040	1,020	1,094	1,098	1,090
228	4	Lincoln	Reardan	500	495	485	485	480	480
229	4	Lincoln	Srageau	480	495	470	476	488	508
230	4	Lincoln	Wilbur	1,140	1,100	1,135	1,120	1,100	1,070
231									
232	1	Mason	Mason County	31,900	32,700	33,600	34,800	34,800	35,400
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County	24,300	24,960	26,000	27,200	27,260	27,860
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County	7,600	7,740	7,600	7,600	7,550	7,550
235	4	Mason	Shelton	7,600	7,740	7,600	7,600	7,550	7,550
236									
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	30,800	31,000	31,500	31,900	31,700	31,600
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County	16,686	17,074	17,466	17,867	17,700	17,625
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County	14,214	13,926	14,034	14,033	14,000	13,975
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster	1,350	1,320	1,360	1,360	1,360	1,497
241	4	Okanogan	Concomity	160	155	168	162	162	158
242	4	Okanogan	Coulee Dam (part)	1,130	1,046	1,058	1,018	982	976
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City	320	305	305	323	295	290
244	4	Okanogan	Nespelem	290	290	295	280	270	270
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan	2,359	2,360	2,350	2,340	2,340	2,325
246	4	Okanogan	Omak	4,000	3,940	3,910	3,910	3,910	3,890
247	4	Okanogan	Oroville	1,500	1,490	1,480	1,500	1,505	1,505
248	4	Okanogan	Patros	560	560	525	530	540	550
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside	235	230	240	265	264	265
250	4	Okanogan	Tonasket	980	950	1,060	1,060	1,065	1,030
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp	900	870	868	860	912	849
252	4	Okanogan	Winthrop	430	420	415	420	395	370
253									
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	17,600	17,700	17,600	17,700	17,500	17,200
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County	11,200	11,100	11,147	11,142	10,870	10,612
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County	6,600	6,600	6,453	6,558	6,630	6,588
257	4	Pacific	Ilwaco	600	590	593	588	595	698
258	4	Pacific	Long Beach	1,300	1,350	1,300	1,335	1,330	1,320
259	4	Pacific	Rainmond	3,000	2,970	2,920	3,000	2,970	2,960
260	4	Pacific	South Bend	1,700	1,690	1,640	1,635	1,635	1,610
261									
262	1	Oreille	Pend Oreille County	8,800	8,800	8,900	9,100	9,100	9,000
263	2	Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County	5,795	5,921	6,025	6,201	6,250	6,130
264	3	Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County	3,005	2,879	2,875	2,899	2,850	2,870
265	4	Oreille	Cusick	250	250	240	269	245	235
266	4	Oreille	Iona	590	590	585	590	565	575
267	4	Oreille	Metaine	190	203	195	200	190	194
268	4	Oreille	Metaine Falls	295	290	285	290	290	296
269	4	Oreille	Newport	1,680	1,566	1,570	1,570	1,560	1,570
270									

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Pres
Washington State Office of Financial Management, Fore

Line	Filter	County	Jurisdiction	1967 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1968 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1969 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1960 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1960 Census Count of Total Population	1991 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1982 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population
225	4	Lincoln	Harrington	492 #	470	480	472 +	449	474 +	461
227	4	Lincoln	Odessa	1,090	972 *	940 *	943 *	943 *	928 *	919
228	4	Lincoln	Reardan	525 +	512	450	486 *	486 *	485	510
230	4	Lincoln	Sprague	1,070	1,080	875	860	863	860	825
231			Wilbur							
232	1	Mason	Mason County	36,000	36,800	37,500	38,300	38,341	39,900	41,200
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County	28,470	29,270	29,880	30,680	31,100	32,580	33,870
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County	7,530	7,530	7,620	7,620	7,241	7,310	7,330
235	4	Mason	Shelton	7,530	7,530	7,620	7,620	7,241	7,310	7,330
236										
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	31,600	31,700	31,700	32,100	33,350	34,000	34,400
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County	17,676	17,663	17,663	18,027	19,294	19,838	20,168
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County	13,924	14,037	14,037	14,073	14,056	14,162	14,232
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster	1,510	1,500	1,588 *	1,595	1,633	1,635	1,645
241	4	Okanogan	Concanully	160 +	178 *	173 *	174 *	174 *	165 *	160
242	4	Okanogan	Coulee Dam (part)	940 *	891 *	882 *	906 *	906 *	917 *	875
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City	264 *	273 #	254 #	287 *	297 *	284 *	312
244	4	Okanogan	Nespelem	270	270	270	225	187	206 *	210
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan	2,320	2,390	2,395	2,390	2,370	2,375	2,395
246	4	Okanogan	Omak	3,920	3,910	3,870	3,870	4,117	4,120	4,130
247	4	Okanogan	Oroville	545	1,500	1,495	1,495	1,505	1,505	1,505
248	4	Okanogan	Paleros	260	560	560	570	570	570	570
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside	225	225	235	241 +	223	240	250
250	4	Okanogan	Tonasket	1,010	1,055	1,045	1,050	900 \$	933 \$	960
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp	850	885	885	895	872	880	890
252	4	Okanogan	Winthrop	375	400	385	395	302	322 *	330
253										
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	17,300	17,600	17,700	18,100	18,882	19,200	19,400
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County	10,723	11,075	11,083	11,487	12,366	12,679	12,875
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County	6,577	6,525	6,617	6,633	6,526	6,521	6,525
257	4	Pacific	Ilwaco	762 *	750	812 +	838 *	838 *	856 #	880
258	4	Pacific	Lond Beach	1,295	1,300	1,310	1,305	1,236	1,230	1,250
259	4	Pacific	Raymond	2,900	2,870	2,870	2,870	2,901	2,890	2,850
260	4	Pacific	South Bend	1,620	1,605	1,625	1,620	1,551	1,545	1,545
261										
262	1	Pend Oreille	Pend Oreille County	8,900	8,800	8,900	9,000	8,915	9,200	9,400
263	2	Pend Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County	6,090	6,062	6,107	6,191	6,114	6,375	6,545
264	3	Pend Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County	2,810	2,738	2,793	2,808	2,801	2,825	2,855
265	4	Pend Oreille	Cusick	217 +	202 +	236 +	202 +	196	200	236
266	4	Pend Oreille	Ilona	570	520 *	520	530	510	510	480
267	4	Pend Oreille	Metalline	176 #	179 #	182 #	192 #	198	185	177
268	4	Pend Oreille	Metalline Falls	282 #	272 +	265	265	210	210	215
269	4	Pend Oreille	Newport	1,565	1,565	1,590	1,620	1,691	1,720	1,745
270										

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Present
 Washington State Office of Financial Management, Fore

Line	Filter	County	Jurisdiction	1993 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1994 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1995 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1996 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1997 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	1998 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population
226	4	Lincoln	Hartington	494 +	482 #	484 +	493 +	495 +	479 +
227	4	Lincoln	Odeassa	956 *	957 #	968 *	960 *	985 *	975 *
228	4	Lincoln	Reardan	497	497	505	495	495	601 #
229	4	Lincoln	Sprague	445	465	471 +	482 +	453 +	455
230	4	Lincoln	Wilbur	875	875	885	895	895	895
231									
232	1	Mason	Mason County	42,900	44,300	45,300	46,700	47,900	48,300
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County	35,504	36,860	37,745	38,995	40,130	40,510
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County	7,396	7,440	7,555	7,705	7,770	7,790
235	4	Mason	Shelton	7,396	7,440	7,555	7,705	7,770	7,790
236									
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	35,400	35,900	36,900	37,500	38,400	38,400
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County	21,052	21,435	21,764	22,128	22,908	22,984
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County	14,348	14,465	15,136	15,372	15,492	15,436
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster	1,645	1,645	2,023 *	2,040	2,055	2,050
241	4	Okanogan	Concomity	172 #	180	183 #	190	177 +	205
242	4	Okanogan	Coulee Dam (cont)	886 #	866 #	885 #	895	890	890
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City	310	310	310	310	310	305
244	4	Okanogan	Neapoleim	225	225	215	232 +	235 +	241 #
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan	2,390	2,400	2,410	2,415	2,415	2,415
246	4	Okanogan	Omak	4,150	4,220	4,365	4,460	4,495	4,435
247	4	Okanogan	Oroville	1,515	1,520	1,550	1,560	1,615	1,595
248	4	Okanogan	Pateros	580	585	585	595	595	595
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside	255	250	270	285	305	365
250	4	Okanogan	Tonasket	985	1,020	1,025	1,025	1,025	995
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp	900	910	955	980	1,000	990
252	4	Okanogan	Winthrop	335	345	350	365	375	365
253									
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	19,800	20,300	20,800	21,100	21,300	21,500
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County	13,180	13,600	14,035	14,216	14,375	14,633
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County	6,620	6,700	6,765	6,884	6,925	6,967
257	4	Pacific	Ilwaco	890	870	875	864	874 +	876 +
258	4	Pacific	Long Beach	1,290	1,360	1,365	1,400	1,410	1,420
259	4	Pacific	Ramond	2,870	2,865	2,905	2,960	2,971	2,987
260	4	Pacific	South Bend	1,570	1,585	1,620	1,660	1,670	1,674
261									
262	1	Pend Oreille	Pend Oreille County	10,100	10,500	10,700	11,100	11,200	11,200
263	2	Pend Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County	7,185	7,543	7,700	8,048	8,117	8,115
264	3	Pend Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County	2,915	2,957	3,000	3,052	3,083	3,085
265	4	Pend Oreille	Cusick	247 +	256 +	244 +	244 +	229 +	223 +
266	4	Pend Oreille	Ione	490	501 +	506 +	502 +	506 +	497 +
267	4	Pend Oreille	Metallina	188 +	193 +	185	171	178	180
268	4	Pend Oreille	Metallina Falls	235	227	226	225	230	230
269	4	Pend Oreille	Newport	1,755	1,780	1,840	1,910	1,940	1,955
270									

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Present
Washington State Office of Financial Management, Fore

Line	Filler	County	Jurisdiction	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
				Postcensal Estimate of Total Population					
226	4	Lincoln	Harrington	482 +	431 *	425	429	434	430
227	4	Lincoln	Osteasa	975	967	960	950	930	950
228	4	Lincoln	Reardan	610	601	608	605	595	610
229	4	Lincoln	Szaque	455	458	505	480	490	490
230	4	Lincoln	Wilbur	895	895	920	905	880	895
231									
232	1	Mason	Mason County	48,600	49,300	49,600	49,800	50,200	50,800
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County	40,790	41,435	41,130	41,305	41,655	42,105
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County	7,810	7,865	8,470	8,495	8,545	8,685
235	4	Mason	Shelton	7,810	7,865	8,470	8,495	8,545	8,685
236									
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	38,400	38,500	39,700	39,800	39,600	39,600
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County	22,805	22,812	23,745	23,938	23,810	23,830
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County	15,595	15,688	15,955	15,862	15,790	15,770
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster	2,065	2,130 *	2,205	2,200	2,200	2,195
241	4	Okanogan	Concomully	200	205	190	193 *	190	190
242	4	Okanogan	Coulee Dam (part)	880	880	915	854 *	840	850
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City	310	305	270	265	265	265
244	4	Okanogan	Nespelem	266	266	210	210	210	210
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan	2,395	2,390	2,480	2,455	2,450	2,435
246	4	Okanogan	Omak	4,545	4,556	4,721	4,740	4,705	4,700
247	4	Okanogan	Oreville	1,585	1,590	1,670	1,665	1,675	1,670
248	4	Okanogan	Pateros	630	636	640	640	615	610
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside	350	345	330	325	320	320
250	4	Okanogan	Tonasket	1,010	1,013 #	1,010	1,020	1,005	1,005
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp	980	990	955	945	955	960
252	4	Okanogan	Winthrop	380	385	350	350	360	360
253									
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	21,500	21,300	21,000	21,000	20,900	21,000
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County	14,800	14,481	13,885	13,940	13,880	13,955
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County	6,900	6,819	7,115	7,060	7,020	7,045
257	4	Pacific	Ilwaco	860 +	819 +	950	945	940	955
258	4	Pacific	Long Beach	1,440	1,435	1,385	1,340	1,345	1,360
259	4	Pacific	Raymond	2,950	2,920	2,975	2,960	2,960	2,970
260	4	Pacific	South Bend	1,650	1,645	1,805	1,790	1,775	1,760
261									
262	1	Pend Oreille	Pend Oreille County	11,100	11,200	11,800	11,800	11,800	11,800
263	2	Pend Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County	8,020	8,111	8,710	8,735	8,810	8,920
264	3	Pend Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County	3,060	3,089	3,090	3,065	2,990	2,980
265	4	Pend Oreille	Cusick	246 +	205 +	210	210	205	210
266	4	Pend Oreille	Ime	452 +	466 +	475	465	440	425
267	4	Pend Oreille	Metairie	172	175	160	160	160	160
268	4	Pend Oreille	Metallina Falls	230	235	225	225	220	220
269	4	Pend Oreille	Newport	1,980	2,015	2,020	2,005	1,965	1,965
270									

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Present
 Washington State Office of Financial Management, Fore

Line	Filter	County	Jurisdiction	2005 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	2006 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	2007 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	2008 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	2009 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	2010 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population
226	4	Lincoln	Harrington	420	420	420	420	425	425
227	4	Lincoln	Odessa	950	950	955	960	960	960
228	4	Lincoln	Reardan	610	620	630	630	630	630
229	4	Lincoln	Sprague	495	495	495	490	495	495
230	4	Lincoln	Wilbur	895	895	900	900	895	890
231									
232	1	Mason	Mason County	51,900	53,100	54,600	56,300	56,800	57,100
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County	43,165	44,295	45,705	47,320	47,835	48,125
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County	8,735	8,805	8,895	8,980	8,965	8,975
235	4	Mason	Shelton	8,735	8,805	8,895	8,980	8,965	8,975
236									
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	39,600	39,800	39,800	40,100	40,500	40,900
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County	23,870	23,949	23,939	24,145	24,385	24,705
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County	15,730	15,851	15,861	15,955	16,115	16,195
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster	2,180	2,200	2,195	2,195	2,205	2,230
241	4	Okanogan	Concouly	190	190	190	200	210	215
242	4	Okanogan	Coulee Dam (part)	850	850	850	850	850	855
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City	265	241	241	240	240	245
244	4	Okanogan	Nesotelm	205	210	205	205	205	205
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan	2,435	2,495	2,445	2,470	2,495	2,500
246	4	Okanogan	Omak	4,885	4,705	4,735	4,750	4,780	4,780
247	4	Okanogan	Oroville	1,660	1,665	1,710	1,715	1,750	1,765
248	4	Okanogan	Pateros	610	625	620	620	630	635
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside	320	320	320	325	330	330
250	4	Okanogan	Tonasket	1,000	1,000	990	1,000	1,010	1,010
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp	965	990	980	985	985	985
252	4	Okanogan	Winthrop	355	370	380	400	425	440
253									
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	21,300	21,500	21,600	21,800	21,800	22,100
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County	14,200	14,255	14,325	14,445	14,415	14,645
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County	7,100	7,245	7,275	7,355	7,385	7,455
257	4	Pacific	Ilwaco	975	1,015	1,040	1,070	1,070	1,115
258	4	Pacific	Long Beach	1,395	1,455	1,460	1,510	1,535	1,535
259	4	Pacific	Rainmond	2,975	3,005	3,005	3,005	3,010	3,065
260	4	Pacific	South Bend	1,755	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,740
261									
262	1	Pend Oreille	Pend Oreille County	12,200	12,300	12,600	12,800	12,900	13,100
263	2	Pend Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County	9,210	9,300	9,529	9,700	9,805	9,980
264	3	Pend Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County	2,980	3,000	3,071	3,100	3,095	3,110
265	4	Pend Oreille	Cusick	210	205	210	205	195	190
266	4	Pend Oreille	Iona	420	420	420	425	440	440
267	4	Pend Oreille	Metalline	160	165	165	170	165	160
268	4	Pend Oreille	Metalline Falls	220	225	286	285	275	275
269	4	Pend Oreille	Newport	1,975	1,985	1,980	2,015	2,020	2,045
270									

Postcensal Estimates of April 1 Population, 1960 to Pres
Washington State Office of Financial Management, Fore

Line	Filter	County	Jurisdiction	2010 Census Count of Total Population	2011 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	2012 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population	2013 Postcensal Estimate of Total Population
226	4	Lincoln	Harrington	424	420	420	420
227	4	Lincoln	Odeasa	910	910	915	905
228	4	Lincoln	Reardan	571	575	575	575
229	4	Lincoln	Srageue	446	445	445	445
230	4	Lincoln	Wilbur	884	885	885	880
231							
232	1	Mason	Mason County	60,699	61,100	61,450	61,800
233	2	Mason	Unincorporated Mason County	50,865	51,245	51,580	51,825
234	3	Mason	Incorporated Mason County	9,834	9,855	9,870	9,975
235	4	Mason	Shelton	9,834	9,855	9,870	9,975
236							
237	1	Okanogan	Okanogan County	41,120	41,200	41,425	41,500
238	2	Okanogan	Unincorporated Okanogan County	24,780	24,805	25,085	25,110
239	3	Okanogan	Incorporated Okanogan County	16,340	16,395	16,340	16,390
240	4	Okanogan	Brewster	2,370	2,365	2,355	2,370
241	4	Okanogan	Conconully	210	220	215	220
242	4	Okanogan	Coulee Dam (part)	911	910	915	915
243	4	Okanogan	Elmer City	238	240	235	235
244	4	Okanogan	Nespelem	236	235	235	235
245	4	Okanogan	Okanogan	2,552	2,585	2,535	2,560
246	4	Okanogan	Omak	4,845	4,845	4,835	4,830
247	4	Okanogan	Oroville	1,686	1,690	1,715	1,715
248	4	Okanogan	Paleros	687	685	685	665
249	4	Okanogan	Riverside	280	280	280	280
250	4	Okanogan	Tonasstet	1,032	1,025	1,020	1,020
251	4	Okanogan	Twisp	919	925	930	940
252	4	Okanogan	Winthrop	394	410	405	405
253							
254	1	Pacific	Pacific County	20,920	20,900	20,970	21,000
255	2	Pacific	Unincorporated Pacific County	14,073	14,070	14,115	14,125
256	3	Pacific	Incorporated Pacific County	6,847	6,830	6,855	6,875
257	4	Pacific	Ilwaco	936	935	940	940
258	4	Pacific	Lemo Beach	1,392	1,390	1,400	1,410
259	4	Pacific	Raymond	2,882	2,870	2,880	2,895
260	4	Pacific	South Bend	1,637	1,635	1,625	1,630
261							
262	1	Pend Oreille	Pend Oreille County	13,001	13,000	13,100	13,150
263	2	Pend Oreille	Unincorporated Pend Oreille County	9,810	9,790	9,890	9,945
264	3	Pend Oreille	Incorporated Pend Oreille County	3,191	3,210	3,210	3,205
265	4	Pend Oreille	Cusick	207	210	210	205
266	4	Pend Oreille	Iona	447	445	445	445
267	4	Pend Oreille	Metairie	173	175	175	175
268	4	Pend Oreille	Metairie Falls	238	240	240	240
269	4	Pend Oreille	Newport	2,126	2,140	2,140	2,140
270							

**PROJECTIONS OF THE TOTAL RESIDENT POPULATION FOR THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT
MEDIUM SERIES: 2010 TO 2040 BY FIVE YEAR INTERVALS**

	Census		Projections				
	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Washington	6,724,540	7,022,200	7,411,977	7,793,173	8,154,193	8,483,628	8,790,981
Adams	18,728	20,257	21,840	22,984	24,289	25,690	27,205
Asotin	21,623	21,818	22,033	22,198	22,313	22,358	22,356
Benton	175,177	184,882	197,806	210,803	223,689	236,007	247,856
Chelan	72,453	75,180	78,586	81,885	84,778	87,168	89,246
Clallam	71,404	71,868	73,616	75,022	76,112	76,786	77,224
Clark	425,363	447,201	477,884	508,124	536,717	562,207	585,137
Columbia	4,078	4,047	4,013	3,968	3,895	3,800	3,700
Cowlitz	102,410	105,130	108,588	111,706	114,158	115,798	116,897
Douglas	38,431	40,603	43,619	46,662	49,583	52,256	54,762
Ferry	7,551	7,619	7,706	7,751	7,754	7,740	7,692
Franklin	78,163	87,755	100,926	115,142	130,284	146,103	162,900
Garfield	2,266	2,238	2,220	2,210	2,202	2,175	2,143
Grant	89,120	95,822	104,078	112,525	121,204	129,779	138,337
Grays Harbor	72,797	73,575	74,408	75,529	76,428	76,905	77,070
Island	78,506	80,337	82,735	85,073	87,621	90,239	93,205
Jefferson	29,872	30,469	32,017	33,678	35,657	37,914	40,093
King	1,931,249	2,012,782	2,108,814	2,196,202	2,277,160	2,350,576	2,418,850
Kitsap	251,133	262,032	275,546	289,265	301,642	311,737	320,475
Kittitas	40,915	42,592	45,255	47,949	50,567	53,032	55,436
Klickitat	20,318	20,606	20,943	21,225	21,430	21,492	21,439
Lewis	75,455	77,621	80,385	82,924	85,165	87,092	88,967
Lincoln	10,570	10,616	10,707	10,800	10,865	10,862	10,817
Mason	60,699	63,203	67,545	71,929	76,401	80,784	84,919
Okanogan	41,120	42,230	43,163	43,978	44,619	45,127	45,707
Pacific	20,920	20,860	20,990	21,261	21,495	21,736	22,042
Pend Oreille	13,001	13,289	13,692	13,977	14,129	14,149	14,116
Pierce	795,225	831,944	876,565	923,912	967,601	1,006,614	1,042,341
San Juan	15,769	15,907	16,256	16,606	16,939	17,216	17,443
Skagit	116,901	121,624	128,249	136,410	144,953	153,632	162,738
Skamania	11,066	11,282	11,548	12,014	12,447	12,816	13,082
Snohomish	713,335	750,358	806,015	857,939	908,807	955,281	997,634
Spokane	471,221	489,491	513,910	537,428	558,614	576,763	592,969
Stevens	43,531	44,262	45,212	46,447	47,834	49,340	50,929
Thurston	252,264	266,224	288,265	307,930	326,426	343,019	358,031
Wahkiakum	3,978	3,931	3,877	3,830	3,772	3,716	3,669
Walla Walla	58,781	60,015	61,685	63,368	64,978	66,378	67,655
Whatcom	201,140	210,050	225,307	241,138	256,643	271,142	284,901
Whitman	44,776	46,139	47,826	49,346	50,577	51,563	52,504
Yakima	243,231	256,341	269,347	282,057	294,445	306,636	318,494

Note: Differences in 2010 figures compared to other tables due to census corrections.
Data may not add due to rounding; unrounded figures are not meant to imply precision.

2007 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

County Profile

Okanogan County – Washington

Ranked items among the 39 state counties and 3,079 U.S. counties, 2007

Item	Quantity	State Rank	Universe ¹	U.S. Rank	Universe ¹
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD (\$1,000)					
Total value of agricultural products sold	208,758	11	39	299	3,076
Value of crops including nursery and greenhouse	184,192	10	39	98	3,072
Value of livestock, poultry, and their products	24,565	17	39	1,360	3,069
VALUE OF SALES BY COMMODITY GROUP (\$1,000)					
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas	3,807	16	36	1,583	2,933
Tobacco	-	-	-	-	437
Cotton and cottonseed	-	-	-	-	626
Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes	607	24	37	986	2,796
Fruits, tree nuts, and berries	174,040	5	39	26	2,659
Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod	1,233	19	38	1,006	2,703
Cut Christmas trees and short rotation woody crops	23	22	33	854	1,710
Other crops and hay	4,482	11	39	367	3,054
Poultry and eggs	140	19	39	1,342	3,020
Cattle and calves	20,560	8	39	657	3,054
Milk and other dairy products from cows	99	29	34	2,010	2,493
Hogs and pigs	34	24	37	1,735	2,922
Sheep, goats, and their products	252	10	39	511	2,998
Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys	786	12	39	284	3,024
Aquaculture	2,512	12	34	100	1,498
Other animals and other animal products	183	16	39	729	2,875
TOP CROP ITEMS (acres)					
Forage - land used for all hay and haylage, grass silage, and greenchop	32,510	9	39	624	3,060
Apples	18,151	3	38	4	2,144
Wheat for grain, all	11,621	15	30	656	2,481
Pears, all	4,016	3	37	6	1,663
Cherries, sweet	3,828	5	34	8	918
TOP LIVESTOCK INVENTORY ITEMS (number)					
Cattle and calves	44,551	5	39	693	3,060
Horses and ponies	6,229	3	39	38	3,066
Layers	3,258	16	39	918	3,024
Ducks	(0)	1	36	58	2,733
Colonies of bees	2,406	12	38	260	2,640

Other County Highlights

Economic Characteristics	Quantity	Operator Characteristics	Quantity
Farms by value of sales:			
Less than \$1,000	575	Principal operators by primary occupation:	
\$1,000 to \$2,499	163	Farming	743
\$2,500 to \$4,999	145	Other	919
\$5,000 to \$9,999	148	Principal operators by sex:	
\$10,000 to \$19,999	129	Male	1,348
\$20,000 to \$24,999	41	Female	314
\$25,000 to \$39,999	97	Average age of principal operator (years)	57.1
\$40,000 to \$49,999	39	All operators by race ² :	
\$50,000 to \$99,999	71	American Indian or Alaska Native	103
\$100,000 to \$249,999	104	Asian	14
\$250,000 to \$499,999	77	Black or African American	-
\$500,000 or more	73	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1
Total farm production expenses (\$1,000)	132,606	White	2,467
Average per farm (\$)	79,787	More than one race	22
Net cash farm income of operation (\$1,000)	83,294	All operators of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino Origin ²	168
Average per farm (\$)	50,117		

See "Census of Agriculture, Volume 1, Geographic Area Series" for complete footnotes, explanations, definitions, and methodology.


(D) Cannot be disclosed. (Z) Less than half of the unit shown.

¹ Universe is number of counties in state or U.S. with item. ² Data were collected for a maximum of three operators per farm.



2007 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

County Profile

Okanogan County Washington



	2007	2002	% change
Number of Farms	1,662	1,486	+ 12
Land in Farms	1,205,229 acres	1,241,316 acres	- 3
Average Size of Farm	725 acres	835 acres	- 13
Market Value of Products Sold	\$208,758,000	\$137,418,000	+ 52
Crop Sales \$184,192,000 (88 percent)			
Livestock Sales \$24,565,000 (12 percent)			
Average Per Farm	\$125,606	\$92,475	+ 36
Government Payments	\$1,065,000	\$2,746,000	- 61
Average Per Farm Receiving Payments	\$14,195	\$9,704	+ 46



United States Department of Agriculture
National Agricultural Statistics Service

www.agcensus.usda.gov