## WASHINGTON COUNTY Joint Comprehensive Plan 2005-2025



Prepared by the Central Savannah River Area Regional Development Center for Washington County, Georgia and the cities of Davisboro, Deepstep, Harrison, Oconee, Riddleville, Sandersville, and Tennille, Georgia.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Chapter 1: Introduction	Page 1
Introduction	Page 1
Why Plan?	Page 1
What is a Comprehensive Plan?	Page 1
Planning Development Process	Page 2
Chapter 2: Population	Page 3
Introduction	Page 3
Historical Background	Page 4
Households	Page 7
Age	Page 8
Race	Page 11
Education	Page 16
Income	Page 21
Findings	Page 24
Chapter 3: Economic Development	Page 25
Introduction	Page 25
Economic Base Inventory	Page 26
Labor Force Analysis	Page 34
Economic Development Resources	Page 46
Goals, Objectives and Policies	Page 47
Chapter 4: Housing	Page 49
Introduction	Page 49
Housing Supply	Page 49
Assessment	Page 60
Special Needs Housing	Page 65
Goals and Policies	Page 67
Chapter 5: Natural and Cultural Resources	Page 68
Introduction	Page 68
Public Water Supply Resources	Page 68
Protected Mountains	Page 70
Protected River	Page 71
Flood Plains	Page 71
Prime Agricultural and Forestry Land	Page 74
Plant and Animal Habitats	Page 75
Major Parks, Recreation and Conservation Areas	Page 75
Historic Resources	Page 76
Goals and Objectives	Page 86



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 6: Community Facilities	Page 88
Introduction	Page 88
Transportation Network	Page 88
Sewerage System and Wastewater	Page 96
General Government	Page 98
Public Safety	Page 99
Recreational Facilities	Page 105
Hospitals and other Public Health Facilities	Page 107
Educational Facilities	Page 108
Libraries and other Cultural Facilities	<b>Page 109</b>
Goals and Policies	Page 111
Chapter 8: Intergovernmental Coordination	Page 117
Introduction	Page 117
Adjacent Local Governments	Page 117
Independent Special Districts	Page 117
Goals	Page 122
Chapter 9: Land Use	Page 123
Introduction	Page 123
Existing Land Use	Page 123
Future Land Use	Page 127
Other Issues	Page 132
Goals and Policies	Page 134
Appendix A Short Term Work Programs	Page 135



## LIST OF MAPS

Washington County Watersheds	Page 148
Washington County Future Land Use	Page 149
Washington County Current Land Use	Page 150
Washington County Soil Association Boundaries	Page 151
Washington County Ground Water Recharge Areas	Page 152
Washington County Ground Water Recharge Areas	Page 153
Washington County Ground Water Pollution Susceptibility	Page 154
Washington County Flood Zones	Page 155
Washington County EPA 305B Rivers	Page 156
Washington County Community Facilities	Page 157
Washington County Airports	Page 158
Washington County Wetland Areas	Page 159



The county seat of Washington County is located in Sandersville, the largest municipality in the County. Sandersville was incorporated as a town on November 27, 1812. The city's original name was "Saundersville", named for Mr. M. Saunders a local storeowner. The city dates back to 1796 when it was an intersection of Indian trails and later the site of Saunder's general store.

## **Plan Setting**

Washington County, the 10th county formed in Georgia, was created in 1783. One of Georgia's original counties, it was the first in the nation to be named for President George Washington. Its first settlers were Revolutionary War veterans, who were given land grants for their service to the country.

Washington County is the "Kaolin Capital of the World." One of Georgia's most important minerals, kaolin is a white, alumina-silicate clay used in hundreds of products ranging from paper to cosmetics to the nose cones of rockets.

The Official State of Georgia Historical Plates, depicting events and people from the state's history, were designed by Sandersville native Louise Irwin in 1933. The plates are made in England by Wedgewood and are available for sale at the Sandersville Public Library.

About two-dozen historical markers are placed throughout the county, most relating to the Civil War. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places are the Francis Plantation, Washington County Courthouse, the Old City Cemetery, North Harris Street Historic District, and Charles Edward Choate Historic District.

Hamburg State Park offers a 225-acre lake with tent and trailer sites, a museum, gristmill fishing, boats and canoes.

## Why Plan?

Successful communities do not just happen; they must be continually shaped and guided. A community must actively manage its land use, infrastructure and resources, and respond to changing circumstances if it is to continue to meet the needs of its residents. Washington County residents value the character and diversity of their jurisdictions; both incorporated and unincorporated the strong sense of community, and the breadth of cultural and recreational opportunities available to them. Concern about economic development and jobs, public services, and education are issues that the city and county have been working on for years. Comprehensive planning, based on good data and public consultation, can help the community address each of these concerns.

## WHAT IS THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN?

The comprehensive plan is the official guiding document for the future of Washington County. It is designed to formulate a coordinated, long-term planning program for the city and county. It lays out a desired future, and guides how that future is to be achieved.



It serves as a guide to both the public and private sector by providing a picture of how land will develop, how housing will be made available, how jobs will be attracted and retained, how open space and the environment will be protected, how public services and facilities will be provided, and how transportation facilities will be improved. Further, the Plan guides elected and appointed officials as they deliberate community development issues; and conveys policy and intended programs of action to residents. In short, the comprehensive plan is a unified document providing consistent policy direction.

The Plan is structured to be a dynamic document, subject to amendment when conditions within the city or county change significantly. Periodic updates are needed to

ensure that the Plan continues to meet the needs of Washington County. The previous Washington County Comprehensive Plan was prepared in 1994. Many of the items recommended for implementation were completed or became irrelevant as years passed. This new plan addresses changes in the community since the last comprehensive plan.



## How to Use the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan is not, in itself, an implementation tool, but rather a guide to action. It is intended to serve as a

reference point for potential users. For example, the Planning Commission or City Council may use the Plan's policies to decide whether to approve a proposed rezoning of land. The Board of Education may use the plan to determine future student enrollment and corresponding facilities expansion. The Tax Assessors' Office may use the plan to estimate future digests.

A variety of planning documents such as land use regulation ordinances, scenic byway plans or any other documents intended to guide development in Washington County, should be used in conjunction with this Comprehensive Plan.

Unlike the above-mentioned sector or single issue planning documents, which only generally refer to issues such as transportation, economic development, parks and recreation, annexation, and community services, this Plan addresses and integrates these issues into one comprehensive document.

## **Planning Development Process**

The comprehensive plan is in the product of extensive local government and citizen involvement through structured workshops and unstructured discussion sessions (**Fig. I-2**).

## **Advisory Committee**

Preparations for the comprehensive plan began with the creation of an Advisory Committee. The primary purpose of the committee was to oversee and assist in the process of drafting the comprehensive plan. The committee was composed of elected and appointed officials and residents from Washington County and the City of Lincolnton. The committee's roles included communicating the concerns of interested groups regarding the development of the city and county, providing a forum for discussion of



differing views; developing statements of the community's vision and goals, and recommending goals, policies and implementation measures.

During the fall and winter of 2004, staff from the CSRA RDC collected background information about the planning area through historical research, site visits, and information gathered from local officials. The Advisory Committee then provided direction and guidance when discussing the various issues raised at public hearings and workshops. Specific plan chapters were then prepared for the various functional elements of the Plan.

## **Public Consultation**

The plan's development was subject to a comprehensive public involvement process. Public involvement serves to educate community leaders about planning issues and build constituency support, both necessary ingredients for any successful comprehensive plan. Each person at the table represents many others and offers insight on something overlooked by planners. By involving the public as a partner throughout the planning process, the message sent is that people's ideas matter. And if a known and quantifiable effect on the plan is seen and people feel the plan is theirs, not just something imposed by a regional planning agency, they are likely to become advocates for its implementation.

# Issues/Problems Identified/Analyzed Alternative Solutions Developed/Evaluated Solution(s) Selected and Adopted as Policy Policy Implemented

To kick off the public consultation process, the CSRA RDC sent notices to community groups inviting area residents to a planning advisory group meeting. During the meeting, participants used the background information gathered by CSRA RDC staff in addition to their personal knowledge and experience of existing conditions to outline areas of concern and future goals for Washington County. Approximately fifteen (15) participants spent the afternoon, and several more, examining issues relating to population, economic development, community facilities, housing, cultural and natural resources, land use, and intergovernmental coordination.

The people of Washington County are proud of their community and its rich heritage. Known as a friendly community, many are welcomed to share the way of life. The vision of this plan is to promote a community that maintains its small town values while managing growth to ensure an enriched quality of life for its citizens.

It is with this vision in mind, that this Comprehensive Plan Update has been developed.



Taking a broad look at a community's population growth from the past, to the present, and into the future is essential to any comprehensive planning process. This section provides a basis for the Economic Development, Transportation, Community Facilities, Housing and Land Use elements of Washington County's 10-year Comprehensive Plan update. The dynamics of Washington County's past population trends, present population conditions, and future estimates of population growth will lay the groundwork for the community's initiatives for growth in the next ten years. Future population forecasts supply a vital picture for the planning of infrastructure improvements and land development patterns that are consistent with the goals and policies established in the other elements of this plan.

A combination of data resources, including the United States 2000 Census Bureau, Woods and Poole economics, Inc., Georgia Department of Labor, and Georgia Department of Education are utilized to create the most accurate portrait of Washington County's population dynamics.

The methodology used in population projections greatly affects their outcome. The most simple and least time-consuming method is trend analysis of population change. This method utilized past tendencies to make projections about the future. Cohort component analysis makes estimates based on three (3) main factors affecting population change: birth rate, death rate, and migration. Neither method considers more comprehensive factors affecting population changes.

The Woods & Poole economics, Inc. method is based on a large computer aggregation that contains historic census data models population growth on natural increase and migration based on job creation. The model balances projections across the state and the nation so that changes in one region are reflected in another. The planning process requires that one population projection method be consistently used to determine plan requirements. Woods & Poole Economics (2002) projections will be used throughout the comprehensive plan. Where municipal population projections are unavailable, the county growth or decline rate will be used to determine trends.

## **Plan Setting**

Washington County is a rural county covering 684 square miles in eastern Georgia and is located fifty-three (53) miles west of Augusta and one hundred thirty nine (139) miles east of Atlanta. Washington County in one of fourteen (14) counties that comprise the Central Savannah River Area (CSRA). The county is a member of the Central Savannah River Area Regional Development Center (RDC) located in Augusta. There are seven (7) incorporated cities in Washington County: Davisboro, Deerstep, Harrison, Oconee, Riddleville, Sandersville, and Tennille.

## HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

## Population Growth, 1800s to 1980

Washington County was created on February 25<sup>th</sup>, 1784 by an act of the General Assembly. The new county included all the territory from the Cherokee Corner, north,



extending from the Ogeechee to the Oconee, south to Liberty County. In 1786 a portion of it was added to Greene; in 1793 a part to Hancock; in 1807 a part to Baldwin; in 1811, a part to Laurens; and in 1812 and 1826, more to Baldwin. Between 1800 and 1850 Washington County's population increased from 10,300 to 11,766 or 14.23%. Unlike other communities, Washington County's population growth continued even after the Civil War.

## **Population since 1980**

The 1980s was a period of heavy migration to Georgia from other states. Between 1980 and 2000, Georgia's population grew by 50%, an increase of 2,728,887 new residents. Washington County and municipalities enjoyed some of the unprecedented state growth. Between 1980 and 1990, population if Washington County increased by 1.16% (**Table P-1**).

Since 1990, the county has seen a mild increase in population, increasing by about two percent every five years. The period of 1990 to 1995 saw Georgia's peak population growth at 11.16%. Likewise, the national population grew by 6.25% during that era.

Table P-	Table P-1: Washington County and Cities Population Change, 1980-2025													
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025				
Washington County	18,862	19,079	19,159	20,364	21,190	21,882	22,461	23,384	24,120	25,113				
Davisboro	433	432	432	988	1,544	1,594	1,636	1,693	1,746	1,818				
Deepstep	120	124	128	125	121	125	128	132	136	142				
Harrison	456	433	411	460	509	526	540	559	577	601				
Oconee	306	283	260	270	280	289	366	379	391	407				
Riddleville	154	117	80	102	124	128	131	136	140	146				
Sandersville	6,137	6,214	6,290	6,217	6,144	6,345	6,513	6,738	6,950	7,236				
Tennille	1,709	1,624	1,538	1,521	1,505	1,554	1,595	1,650	1,702	1,772				
Source: Woods & Poole E	conomics	, Inc.												

Tennille's population has declined continually in the last two decades, decreasing from 1,709 in 1980 to 1,505 in 2000 (**Table P-1**). Deepstep's population has remained relatively the same as its 1980 level, increasing only one person over the twenty year period. Both Oconee's and Riddleville's populations have decreased from their 1980 levels at 9.2% and 24.19% respectively. Harrison's population has increased 11.62% from its 1980 level, along with Sandersville (1.14%). Davisboro is the only municipality in the county that has experienced continual growth in the twenty year period, increasing from 433 in 1980 to 1,544 in 2000 (**Table P-1**).

Total population in Washington County and the municipalities is projected to increase 18.51% through 2025 (Table P-2), slightly higher than the rural CSRA growth rate of 10.5% but significantly lower than the state (+35.9%) and national (+27%) averages.

## **Population Assessment**

Washington County has undergone a gradual population increase since 1980, increasing by 12.34%. This is in-line with a trend of significant population growth for the CSRA region, the state and the nation. Between 1980 and 2000, the CSRA population



increased by 21.5% while the non-urbanized portions of the CSRA (exclude Richmond and Columbia Counties) increased by 7.2%. The state and national population increased by 50% and 25.1% respectively during that same time period.

Table P-2	Table P-2: Washington County and Cities' Population Change (%), 1985-2025												
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025			
Washington County	NA	1.15%	0.42%	6.29%	4.06%	3.27%	2.65%	3.46%	3.15%	4.12%			
Davisboro	NA	0.23%	0.00%	28.70%	56.28%	3.27%	2.65%	3.46%	3.15%	4.12%			
Deepstep	NA	3.33%	3.23%	2.40%	3.31%	3.27%	2.65%	3.46%	3.15%	4.12%			
Harrison	NA	5.31%	5.35%	11.92%	10.65%	3.27%	2.65%	3.46%	3.15%	4.12%			
Oconee	NA	-8.13%	-8.85%	3.85%	3.70%	3.27%	2.65%	3.46%	3.15%	4.12%			
Riddleville	NA	-31.62%	-46.25%	27.50%	21.57%	3.27%	2.65%	3.46%	3.15%	4.12%			
Sandersville	NA	1.25%	1.22%	-1.17%	-1.12%	3.27%	2.65%	3.46%	3.15%	4.12%			
Tennille	NA	-5.23%	-5.59%	-1.11%	-1.06%	3.27%	2.65%	3.46%	3.15%	4.12%			
Source: Woods & Poole E	conomic	s, Inc.											

Population increases often mirror a general increase in total employment. In Washington County, the local economy strengthened during the period of population increases. Between 1990 and 2000, total population increased 10.60% while total employment increased 14.68%. Statewide employment increased 34.3% during that same period.

Total population in Washington County and the municipalities is projected to increase by 18.51% through 2025, slightly above the CSRA rural area growth rate of 10.5% but significantly lower than the state (35.9%) and national (27%) averages. A significant portion of that growth will come from the 45-54 and 55-64 age brackets, 36.88% and 102.18% respectively. This trend may be indicative of an aging population.

The fastest growing sectors of the economy are Transportation, Communications, Public Utilities (79.82%) and Services (61.81%). Should these projections hold true they could provide incentive for new college graduates to relocate to the Washington County area.

Negative or small population growth rates in Washington County and the municipalities since 1980 reflect the challenges that many rural areas face. Statewide population growth rates disproportionately reflect Georgia's large metro areas. In the absence of bordering one of the state's large metro areas to serve as a bedroom community, rural counties such as Washington cannot keep up with the statewide population growth rates. This holds true for future population growth rates as well. Job opportunities, services, and convenience offered by large metro areas will continue to attract new residents and

be reflected in statewide figures.

## **Daytime Population**

There has been an increase in daytime population in the county over the ten-year period from 1990 to 2000. The number of people

Table P-3: Washington County: Daytime Population										
Category 1990 2000										
Daytime population inside county	19,237	23,402								
Number of people leaving the county during the day to work	1,241	1,552								
Number of people coming into the county during the day to work	1,366	3,778								
Total number of workers during the day	8,023	9,810								
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census (SF1)										



coming into the county to work has increased 177 percent since 1990, rising to 3,778 persons coming into the county in 2000. The number of people leaving the county for work also increased over the same ten-year period, but this number only increased 25 percent.

## Assessment

The large number of people coming into the county during the day to work represents 39 percent of the total number of workers during the day in 2000, as compared to only 17 percent in 1990. This percentage illustrates a strong economic base in Washington County, but could illustrate a shortage of available housing in the county as well. Communities generally want to provide jobs to their residents, but if they do not have the residents, it is important to attract people to live in the community where they work.

The number of people leaving leaving the county during the day to work represents 15 percent of the total number of workers during the day in 1990, and nearly the same percentage, 16 percent in 2000. This number should remain steady as it has in the past.

## HOUSEHOLDS

Household growth change varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction in Washington County. The total number of households in Washington County has increased by 1,328 from 6,076 in 1980 to 7,435 in 2000, which is an increase of 22 percent. The total number of households is projected to increase by an additional 1,699 through 2025, or 23 percent. The number of households will actually decline in Davisboro and Riddleville by 2025. In Davisboro, total households will decrease by 19 percent, or 26 households, while the population is expected to increase by 14 percent. The result will be an increase in average household size. In Riddleville, the total households are expected to decrease by 46 percent, or 16 households, while the population increases by 14 percent. In the other jurisdictions, the total households will rise at a rate somewhat higher than the population, resulting in smaller average household sizes.

Average household size in Washington County has declined from 3.07 in 1980 to 2.65 in 2000, and is projected to decline to 2.13 by 2025 (**Table P-5**). Average household size is expected to continue to decline in all of the jurisdictions, except Davisboro and Riddleville, where average household size will actually increase.

	Table P-4: Total Households, 1980-2025														
	1980         1985         1990         1995         2000         2005         2010         2015         2020         202														
Washington County	6,076	6,408	6,739	7,087	7,435	7,775	8,115	8,454	8,794	9,134					
Davisboro	166	157	148	144	140	134	127	121	114	108					
Deepstep	45	44	43	49	54	56	59	61	63	65					
Harrison	154	153	151	164	176	182	187	193	198	204					
Oconee	89	82	74	84	94	95	97	98	99	100					
Riddleville	55	43	30	35	39	35	31	27	23	19					
Sandersville	2,069	2,157	2,244	2,303	2,362	2,435	2,509	2,582	2,655	2,728					
Tennille	624	624	624	612	599	593	587	580	574	568					
Source: U.S. Bureau of th	he Census	(SF1)		Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census (SF1)											



	Table P-5: Average Household Size, 1980-2025													
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025				
Washington County	3.07	2.93	2.79	2.72	2.65	2.55	2.44	2.34	2.23	2.13				
Davisboro	2.61	2.68	2.75	2.87	2.99	3.09	3.18	3.28	3.37	3.47				
Deepstep	2.67	2.63	2.58	2.51	2.44	2.38	2.33	2.27	2.21	2.15				
Harrison	2.96	2.85	2.74	2.82	2.89	2.87	2.86	2.84	2.82	2.80				
Oconee	2.83	2.67	2.50	2.48	2.45	2.36	2.26	2.17	2.07	1.98				
Riddleville	2.80	2.72	2.63	2.91	3.18	3.28	3.37	3.47	3.56	3.66				
Sandersville	2.89	2.80	2.71	2.62	2.52	2.43	2.34	2.24	2.15	2.06				
Tennille	2.74	2.60	2.46	2.48	2.49	2.43	2.37	2.30	2.24	2.18				
Source: U.S. Bureau of the	Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census (SF1)													

## **Households Assessment**

The number of households in Washington County and the municipalities has increased an average of 21% since 1980. This rate is above at the CSRA rate of 9.9% but well below the household growth rates for the state (60.2%) and the nation (30.9%). Through 2025, the number of households in Washington County and the municipalities will increase by 11.72%, a relatively low growth rate compared to the state (35.9%) and national (27.3%) averages.

Household growth in Washington County and the municipalities has increased at substantially lower rates that the total population. Growth in total households necessitates a corresponding increase in the housing supply to ensure housing meets the community's needs. Between 1980 and 2000, the housing supply in Washington County increased 26.07%. Housing growth has thus outpaced growth in total households, ensuring a sufficient supply of housing.

The increase of total households relative to a slow-growing population in Washington County and the municipalities can be viewed through the lens of declining average household size. In the county, average household size has declined by 13.7 percent between 1980 and 2000, highlighting an increasing trend towards smaller family sizes. Most municipalities have seen a similar decrease in household size, but not by such a large decrease as the county, which can be attributed to the higher population growth in the county. By contrast the state and national average household size declined by 18 percent and 15 percent respectively. In 2000, the average household size was 2.65 in Georgia, and 2.59 in the United States. These numbers are very comparable to household sizes in Washington County and the municipalities. There are some jurisdictions that actually have a smaller average household size than the nation, these jurisdictions are Deepstep, Oconee, Sandersville and Tennille. These cities plus the county even have smaller average household sizes than the state average of 2.65. This trend should continue on into the planning period.

## AGE

**Table P-6** presents historical trends and projections in the age distribution of Washington County and municipality residents. Overall, there are no significant



differences in the distribution ages between the county and the cities. Across jurisdictions, there has been a decline of residents in different age groupings from 0 to 34 years old (-8.6%). A decline in the 25-34 years old group is almost always correlated with a decline in lower age groups since they account for most of the children residents.

Table P-	6: Washingt	on Coun	ty and N	/unicipa	lities Ag	ge Distri	bution,	1980-20	25				
			Washii	ngton Co	ounty								
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025			
Total	18,842	19,079	19,112	20,364	21,176	21,882	22,461	23,384	24,120	25,113			
Age 0 to 4	1,538	1,538	1,538	1,443	1,348	1,192	1,130	1,144	1,059	946			
Age 5-13	2,865	2,900	2,935	3,014	3,093	2,732	2,364	2,564	2,550	2,475			
Age 14-17	1,727	1,459	1,191	1,220	1,248	1,273	1,238	1,354	1,046	1,185			
Age 18-20	1,051	994	736	836	898	910	1,027	1,147	1,042	972			
Age 21-24	1,225	1,108	991	977	963	1,128	1,050	1,307	1,032	896			
Age 25-34	2,742	2,922	3,102	2,908	2,715	2,559	2,668	3,086	2,969	2,606			
Age 35-44	1,852	2,241	2,629	3,296	3,762	3,555	3,924	3,847	3,417	3,644			
Age 45-54	1,702	1,807	1,911	2,272	2,633	3,121	3,362	3,378	2,861	3,604			
Age 55-64	1,725	1,596	1,467	1,751	1,834	2,152	2,832	3,267	3,718	3,708			
65 Years and over	2,415	2,514	2,612	2,647	2,682	2,782	3,128	3,465	4,226	2,082			
Davisboro													
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025			
Total	433	432	432	988	1544	1,594	1,636	1,693	1,746	1,818			
Age 0 to 4	27	35	43	41	38	34	35	36	36	37			
Age 5-13	54	72	90	69	48	43	42	43	44	45			
Age 14-17	45	35	24	28	31	32	34	33	33	31			
Age 18-20	21	14	6	42	78	81	81	91	104	105			
Age 21-24	33	22	10	78	146	148	156	149	158	159			
Age 25-34	50	73	97	269	441	454	500	539	597	646			
Age 35-44	49	55	62	288	514	494	471	507	467	503			
Age 45-54	36	27	18	81	161	192	194	190	155	134			
Age 55-64	43	35	27	36	46	55	56	62	75	66			
65 Years and over	75	64	55	56	58	61	68	61	80	95			
				eepstep									
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025			
Total	120	124	128	125	121	125	128	132	132	142			
Age 0 to 4	8	11	14	10	5	5	5	6	6	7			
Age 5-13	12	12	13	8	2	2	1	2	2	2			
Age 14-17	9	7	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	7			
Age 18-20	5	5	5	6	8	8	9	9	9	10			
Age 21-24	4	9	14	11	9	11	11	11	9	9			
Age 25-34	21	21	21	16	11	11	11	12	12	11			
Age 35-44	7	13	17	14	11	11	13	13	12	12			
Age 45-54	11	17	23	25	26	31	34	33	29	28			
Age 55-64	13	10	8	13	18	22	27	32	36	35			
65 Years and over	30	19	8	17	26	27	30	35	42	52			



Table P-6: Washington County and Municipalities Age Distribution, 1980-2025 Continued												
	-		Н	arrison	•		-		•			
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025		
Total	456	433	411	456	509	526	540	559	577	601		
Age 0 to 4	40	40	40	31	21	19	18	18	18	19		
Age 5-13	74	67	59	65	71	69	75	76	78	79		
Age 14-17	37	29	22	29	35	36	38	37	36	38		
Age 18-20	15	18	21	24	27	28	30	30	29	30		
Age 21-24	20	21	22	21	21	25	26	27	23	23		
Age 25-34	73	64	55	55	55	52	56	62	62	57		
Age 35-44	49	56	63	82	100	96	109	103	94	85		
Age 45-54	34	35	35	56	77	92	82	79	69	66		
Age 55-64	34	39	45	45	45	53	64	77	68	66		
65 Years and over	80	64	49	48	48	50	56	65	78	96		
			Т	ennille								
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025		
Total	1,709	1,624	1,538	1,521	1,505	1,554	1,595	1,650	1,702	1,772		
Age 0 to 4	138	112	86	91	96	80	76	73	73	67		
Age 5-13	225	222	220	225	231	201	176	175	180	177		
Age 14-17	128	101	74	95	116	106	91	85	83	81		
Age 18-20	91	76	61	87	112	129	129	123	120	119		
Age 21-24	88	78	67	70	74	65	59	63	47	39		
Age 25-34	248	232	217	140	128	117	120	129	127	109		
Age 35-44	139	164	190	199	208	195	214	198	178	191		
Age 45-54	127	135	142	146	150	174	186	175	150	125		
Age 55-64	221	172	124	134	145	167	195	233	262	247		
65 Years and over	304	332	357	334	311	320	349	400	482	588		
Source: Woods & Poole	e Economics, U.	S. Bureau	ı of Cens	us, and C	SRA Regi	ional Dev	elopment	Center				

## Age Assessment

Throughout Washington County and the municipalities, middle age and senior population groups accounted for most of the population growth since 1980, in line with the CSRA, state, and national trends. In other parts of the CSRA, the state and the nation, younger age groups are growing in proportion to senior age groups, ensuring population growth across all age groups.

Through 2025, 0 to 34 year old age groups will decrease by 13.05% while the 35 to 65+ age groups will account for 19.49% of the growth. The 35-54 age groups, the backbone of the Washington County economy, will decrease by 2.35%. While the workforce population will become younger, local governments will have to support an aging population that will increasingly be dependent on non-wage sources of income. From a housing and community facilities perspective, future projects and planning will need to consider these demographic shifts.



## RACE

In 2000, the population of Washington County was comprised of 45.57% white, 53.19% black, 0.63% Hispanic, and 0.65%% other ethnic backgrounds (Table P-7). Between 1980 and 2000, the proportional population of all racial groups has remained relatively constant. Through 2025 the black population is expected to increase by almost one-third of the 1980 level.

In Sandersville, the black population has increased from 56.28% in 1980 to 59.03% in 2000. The city's white population has decreased from 43.57% in 1980 to 39.76% in 2000. While no race projections are available for Sandersville, this trend is expected to continue through 2025.

The percentage of non-white residents in Tennille increased from 40.26% in 1980 to 58.01% in 2000. In Harrison, the black population has increased by almost one-third comprising 66.89% in 1980 to currently occupying 79.37% of the city's population. Population trends for Davisboro, Deepstep, Oconee, and Riddleville all follow similar trends.

Table P-7: Washi	ngton Co	ounty a	nd Mun	icipalit	ies Rac	ial Com	position	n, 1980	-2000					
	Washington County													
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%				
<b>Total Population</b>	18,842	100%	19,079	100%	19,112	100%	20,364	100%	21,176	100%				
White	9,149	49%	9,361	49%	9,558	50%	9,709	48%	9,683	46%				
Black	9,646	51%	9,596	50%	9,554	50%	10,498	52%	11,265	53%				
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	18	0%	36	0%				
Asian or Pacific Islander	23	0%	13	0%	3	0%	31	0%	59	0%				
Other	22	0%	13	0%	4	0%	23	0%	43	0%				
Hispanic	134	1%	85	0%	35	0%	85	0%	134	1%				
	Davisboro													
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%				
<b>Total Population</b>	433	100%	432	100%	432	100%	988	100%	1,544	100%				
White	189	44%	186	43%	184	43%	376	38%	568	37%				
Black	244	56%	246	57%	248	57%	597	60%	947	61%				
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	1%	7	0%				
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0%	3	0%				
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%				
Hispanic	5	1%	0	0%	0	0%	8	1%	17	1%				
			Dee	pstep										
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%				
Total Population	120	100%	124	100%	128	100%	125	100%	121	100%				
White	120	100%	124	100%	128	100%	125	100%	121	100%				
Black	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%				



Table P-7: Washington	County	and M	unicipal	ities Ra	ncial Co	mposit	ion, 198	0-2000	Contin	ued
American Indian,	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Eskimo, or Aleut	0	070	0	0/0	0	070	0	070	v	070
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			Hai	rrison						
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
<b>Total Population</b>	456	100%	433	100%	411	100%	456	100%	509	100%
White	151	33%	160	37%	169	41%	133	29%	97	19%
Black	305	67%	274	63%	242	59%	323	71%	404	<b>79</b> %
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0	0%	1	0%
			Oc	onee				•		
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
Total Population	306	100%	283	100%	260	100%	270	100%	280	100%
White	201	66%	194	69%	187	72%	180	67%	173	62%
Black	104	34%	87	31%	70	27%	87	32%	102	36%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0%	2	1%	3	1%	3	1%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			Rido	lleville						
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
<b>Total Population</b>	154	100%	117	100%	80	100%	102	100%	124	100%
White	133	86%	100	85%	67	84%	78	76%	88	71%
Black	20	13%	17	15%	13	16%	24	24%	36	29%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		•	Sand	ersville		•		•		
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
Total Population	6,137	100%	6,214	100%	6,290	100%	6,217	100%	6,144	100%
White	2,674	44%	2,601	42%	2,528	40%	2,485	40%	2,443	40%
Black	3,454	56%	3,568	57%	3,762	60%	3,695	59%	3,627	<b>59</b> %
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	0%	7	0%



Table P-7: Washington	County	and M	unicipal	ities Ra	icial Co	mposit	ion, 198	0-2000	Contin	ued
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	0%	2	0%	0	0%	20	0%	40	1%
Other	5	0%	3	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%
Hispanic	49	1%	40	1%	30	0%	12	0%	15	0%
Tennille										
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
Total Population	1,709	100%	1,624	100%	1,538	100%	1,521	100%	1,505	100%
White	1,021	60%	925	57%	841	55%	736	48%	632	42%
Black	685	40%	689	42%	693	45%	775	51%	856	57%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	2	0%	4	0%	5	0%	6	0%
Hispanic	13	1%	8	0%	3	0%	5	0%	23	2%
Percentages may not total 10 Source: U.S. Bureau of Censu				elopmer	nt Center	ŗ			·	-

Ta	Table P-7: Washington County and Municipalities Racial Composition, 1980-2000										
				Was	shington	County					
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%	
<b>Total Population</b>	18,842	100%	19,079	100%	19,112	100%	20,364	100%	21,176	100%	
White	9,149	48.56%	9,361	49.06%	9,558	50.01%	9,709	47.68%	9,683	45.73%	
Black	9,646	51.19%	9,596	50.30%	9,554	49.99%	10,498	51.54%	11,265	53.20%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18	0.00%	36	0.17%	
Asian or Pacific Islander	23	0.12%	13	0.00%	3	0.00%	31	0.15%	59	0.28%	
Other	22	0.12%	13	0.00%	4	0.00%	23	0.11%	43	0.20%	
Hispanic	134	0.71%	85	0.45%	35	0.18%	85	0.42%	134	0.63%	
				Davisbo	ro						
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%	
<b>Total Population</b>	433	100%	432	100%	432	100%	988	100%	1,544	100%	
White	189	43.65%	186	43.05%	184	42.59%	376	38.06%	568	36.79%	
Black	244	56.35%	246	56.94%	248	57.41%	597	60.43%	947	61.33%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	0.51%	7	0.45%	
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.20%	3	0.19%	
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.00%	
Hispanic	5	1.15%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8	0.81%	17	1.10%	



Table P-	7: Washing	ton County	and Mur	nicipalities	Racial C	ompositio	on, 1980	-2000 Co	ntinued	
	8	<u> </u>		Deepste		-				
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
<b>Total Population</b>	120	100.00%	124	100.00%	128	100.00 %	125	100.00 %	121	100.00 %
White	120	100.00%	124	100.00%	128	100.00 %	125	100.00 %	121	100.00 %
Black	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
				Harriso						
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
Total Population	456	100.00%	433	100.00%	411	100.00 %	456	100.00 %	509	100.00 %
White	151	33.11%	160	36.95%	169	41.12%	133	29.17%	97	19.06%
Black	305	66.89%	274	63.28%	242	58.89%	323	70.83%	404	79.37%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	0.79%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.20%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.20%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	1	0.23%	2	0.49%	0	0.00%	1	0.20%
				Oconee	•					
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
Total Population	306	100.00%	283	100.00%	260	100.00 %	270	100.00 %	280	100.00 %
White	201	65.69%	194	68.55%	187	71.92%	180	66.67%	173	61.79%
Black	104	33.99%	87	30.74%	70	26.92%	87	32.22%	102	36.43%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0.33%	2	0.71%	3	1.15%	3	1.11%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
				Riddlevi		1				
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%
Total Population	154	100.00%	117	100.00%	80	100.00 %	102	100.00 %	124	100.00 %
White	133	86.36%	100	85.47%	67	83.75%	78	76.47%	88	70.97%
Black	20	12.99%	17	14.53%	13	16.25%	24	23.53%	36	29.03%
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%



	7: Washing	ton County	and Mur	-	Racial C	-	on, 1980	-2000 Co	ntinued		
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0.60%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Hispanic	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Sandersville											
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%	
Total Population	6,137	100.00%	6,214	100.00%	6,290	100.00 %	6,217	100.00 %	6,144	100.00 %	
White	2,674	43.57%	2,601	41.86%	2,528	40.19%	2,485	39.97%	2,443	39.76%	
Black	3,454	56.28%	3,568	57.42%	3,762	59.81%	3,695	59.43%	3,627	59.03%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	0.06%	7	0.11%	
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	0.06%	2	0.03%	0	0.00%	20	0.32%	40	0.65%	
Other	5	0.08%	3	0.04%	0	0.00%	1	0.01%	2	0.03%	
Hispanic	49	0.80%	40	0.64%	30	0.48%	12	0.19%	15	0.24%	
				Tennill	e						
	1980	%	1985	%	1990	%	1995	%	2000	%	
Total Population	1,709	100.00%	1,624	100.00%	1,538	100.00 %	1,521	100.00 %	1,505	100.00 %	
White	1,021	59.74%	925	56.96%	841	54.68%	736	48.39%	632	41.99%	
Black	685	40.08%	689	42.43%	693	45.06%	775	50.95%	856	56.88%	
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1	0.05%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	0.20%	
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	0.12%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Other	0	0.00%	2	0.12%	4	0.26%	5	0.33%	6	0.40%	
	13	0.76%	8	0.49%	3	0.20%	5	0.33%	23	1.53%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, and CSRA Regional Development Center

## **Race Assessment**

In Washington County, Deepstep, Oconee, and Sandersville, the percentage of residents by race has remained relatively constant since 1980. In Davisboro, Harrison, Riddleville, and Tennille, however, the black population has increased while the white population has decreased by an equivalent rate. In absolute numbers, only Davisboro is growing while Harrison, Riddleville, and Tennille have populations that remain relatively static. In municipalities that do not experience relative growth, white residents are leaving at a faster rate than other races. The exodus of younger age groups is more pronounced among the white population and has shifted the cities' racial balance. Over the next twenty years, however, the black population is expected to grow at a faster rate than all other racial groups.

Past, current, and future race demographics in Washington County and the municipalities run contrary to state and national trends, which project, as a share of total population, a declining white population, an unchanged black population, and a growing Hispanic population.



## **EDUCATION**

The educational level of a community is often the determinant of economic development. The skill levels of residents in an area can be inferred from the level of education prevalent in the citizenry. Companies requiring skilled workers may look for areas with high rates of high school graduates wile industries requiring highly-skilled workers may seek counties with large numbers of college graduates. The reverse is also true, with the county seeking to attract companies that are a good fit for the educational level of its citizens.

Educational level is also important when evaluating a school system's quality. If the number of high school dropouts is particularly high for a certain area, the school system could be in need of improvement. School system quality can also be a factor in determining quality of life for the citizens of an area. The better the school system, the better perceived quality of life.

## **Educational Attainment**

Educational attainment in Washington County has continually improved since the 1980s. In 1980, 62% of Washington County residents had not completed high school (Table P-8). By 2000, this percentage had dropped to 32%. The number of citizens aged 25 or older completing high school or some college has risen from 29.12% in 1980 to 54.09% in 2000. The percentage of residents completing four or more years of college reached 10.52% in 2000. The level of education in the county, however, is still far below the state average, with nearly 25% of Georgians over the age of 25 completing four or more years of college in 2000.

The figures for the cities in Washington County are comparable to county figures (Table P-8). All the incorporated cities in Washington County show a higher percentage of population not completing high school than the state average (21%). Likewise the percentage of population completing four or more years of college is lower in the municipalities than the state average.



Т	able P-8: Washir	ngton County	and Munic	ipalities Edu	ucational	Attainment, 1	1980-2000				
				1980	)						
	Washington County	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille			
Less than 9th grade	36.48%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
9th to 12th grade (no diploma)	25.55%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
High School graduate	23.60%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Some college	5.52%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Associate degree	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Bachelor's degree	8.72%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Graduate or Professional degree	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
	1990										
	Washington Co.	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille			
Less than 9th grade	20.97%	15.44%	6.49%	27.53%	45.71%	16.95%	19.87%	27.28%			
9th to 12th grade (no diploma)	20.89%	25.48%	6.49%	18.62%	13.33%	13.56%	20.38%	20.58%			
High School graduate	36.52%	42.47%	45.45%	37.65%	30.48%	44.07%	31.10%	33.98%			
Some college	9.61%	10.04%	18.18%	8.91%	4.76%	20.34%	11.00%	7.96%			
Associate degree	2.18%	1.54%	2.60%	3.64%	0.00%	1.69%	3.68%	1.46%			
Bachelor's degree	6.49%	4.25%	11.69%	2.83%	4.29%	3.39%	8.89%	5.73%			
Graduate or Professional degree	3.34%	0.78%	9.10%	0.82%	1.43%	0.00%	5.08%	3.01%			
			20	000				1			
	Washington Co.	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille			
Less than 9th grade	11.82%	7.70%	4.35%	16.61%	16.00%	12.00%	11.97%	20.91%			
9th to 12th grade (no diploma)	19.90%	21.23%	19.57%	30.15%	30.67%	13.00%	18.18%	20.81%			
High School graduate	38.82%	35.90%	31.52%	40.62%	32.89%	51.00%	35.67%	29.62%			
Some college	15.27%	28.77%	8.70%	9.54%	6.67%	6.00%	14.82%	9.34%			
Associate degree	3.67%	2.62%	8.70%	0.61%	4.00%	1.00%	3.89%	2.12%			
Bachelor's degree	7.05%	2.54%	15.22%	1.85%	2.22%	17.00%	10.35%	12.95%			
Graduate or Professional degree	3.47%	1.24%	11.94%	0.62%	7.55%	0.00%	5.12%	4.25%			



The educational level of the Washington County population is more comparable to that of other rural counties in the CSRA than it is with statewide figure (Table P-9). At 11.8% Washington County is below the CSRA average of 13.6% of residents who possess an educational level that is less than a 9<sup>th</sup> grade level. This percentage is significantly lower than the state average of 7.6%. For the population percentage with a high school degree or higher, Washington County is at 68.3%, slightly higher than the CSRA average of 66.49%, and lower than the Georgia state average of 78.6%. The percentage of population with a Bachelor's degree or more in Washington County is 10.5%, while the CSRA average is 11.98%, and the state average is 24.3%.

Table I	Table P-9: Educational Attainment by Surrounding Counties: 2000									
Category	Glascock	Hancock	Jefferson	Johnson	Wilkinson	Washington	Georgia			
Less than 9th Grade	15.87%	14.52%	16.74%	15.88%	9.55%	11.80%	7.54%			
9th to 12th Grade (No Diploma)	18.03%	23.35%	24.78%	21.83%	19.70%	19.80%	13.86%			
High School Graduate (Includes Equivalency)	40.31%	34.60%	34.01%	39.37%	41.71%	39.02%	28.71%			
Some College (No Degree)	16.50%	15.61%	11.74%	11.83%	16.02%	15.24%	20.40%			
Associate Degree	2.83%	2.35%	3.61%	3.35%	3.34%	3.64%	5.19%			
Bachelor's Degree	3.68%	6.01%	6.26%	4.80%	6.54%	7.01%	16.01%			
Graduate or Professional Degree	2.78%	3.56%	2.87%	2.93%	3.14%	3.49%	8.30%			
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Cens	sus (SF3)									

## **Educational Attainment Assessment**

Education attainment in Washington County and the municipalities has continually improved in the past twenty years but lags behind the state average. In 2000, 31.72% of Washington County residents did not graduate from high school, higher than Davisboro (28.93), Deepstep (23.92%), Riddleville (25.00%), and Sandersville (30.15%) but lower than Harrison (46.76%), Oconee (46.67%), and Tennille (41.72%). The state average for residents without a high school diploma is 21.4%. This significant education attainment differential is also seen in post-secondary education. In 2000, less than 15% of Washington County residents obtained a college degree or higher. By contrast, over 29.5% statewide residents obtained a college degree.

The County and municipalities have gained ground over the last twenty years. The number of students not completing high school has declined an average of 15.17% every ten year period since 1980. While Washington County's current high school completion rate is lower than the state average, it is increasing at a faster rate. Should historic trends continue into the future, the high school completion rate in Washington County should approach the state average by 2025.

A similar pattern is seen in post secondary education. Since 1980, the number of Washington County residents with some college or more has more than doubled to 29.46%. While Washington County's college or more rate is less than the state average of 49.9%, the gap is narrowing.



That Washington County and the municipalities are catching up to the state average I n educational attainment is no surprise and reflects gains in education attainment made region wide. State education policy, in an attempt to increase statewide test scores and improve its national rating, has increased school resources and facilitated teacher development. As a result, Washington County schools have had, since 1980, unprecedented resources devoted to improving educational attainment. On the local level, there is an acknowledgement in the community that today's economy requires education and training. Even in a mining and lower-skill service dominated economy, a high school diploma has become indispensable.

While Washington County's economy is still primarily a mining and lower skill service economy, the CSRA economy is more diverse and requires more educated graduates. Currently 31.72% of Washington County's students do not complete high school. A substantial number of residents will therefore not be able to participate in the regional economy.

Table P-10: Higł	Table P-10: High School Grads Attending Post-Secondary Education									
		Georgia Public Colleges								
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001			
Washington County	15.20%	29.10%	30.20%	27.90%	27.60%	NA	NA			
Georgia	35.00%	30.00%	30.20%	38.80%	37.50%	37.30%	36.1			
		G	eorgia Pu	ıblic Tecl	n Schools	5				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001			
Washington County	2.70%	21.80%	34.60%	13.30%	9.70%	16.00%	NA			
Georgia	5.40%	6.20%	7.10%	6.50%	6.40%	7.40%	8.80%			
Source: Georgia Depar	rtment of <b>E</b>	Education				-				

Based on these local education attainment levels, the community will need to attract two different types of employment sectors. On the one hand, service sector jobs and mining, will allow residents with a high school diploma or less to participate in the local economy. On the other hand, projected employment growth in transportation, communications, & public utilities and finance and insurance will provide employment opportunities for residents with a college education. Current education attainment levels suggest the need to aggressively pursue these sectors.

## **High School Graduation Test Scores**

_		
0	school	
	on test	
scores o	decreased	Was
0 7	from	Cour
	o 2001,	Geor
	g trends	Sourc
elsewher	re in the	

Table P-11: High School Graduation Test Scores(All Components) 1995-2001									
1995         1996         1997         1998         1999         2000         2001									
Washington County	65%	53%	51%	48%	54%	56%	56%		
Georgia	82%	76%	67%	<b>68</b> %	66%	68%	65%		
Source: Georgia Department of Education									

state (**Table P-11**). Overall, test scores have stayed between 10-15% lower in Washington County that the state average. In 2001, the test scores were only 9% behind the state average.



## **High School Dropout Rate**

The high school dropout rate in Washington County declined from 1995 to 2001. This trend was seen in Georgia as a whole, as well as in Glascock County and Jefferson County. Hancock County's dropout rate has fluctuated between two (2) and eight (8) percent from 1995 to 2001. Washington County's dropout rate is higher than both Hancock County and Glascock County. The overall average of the dropout rates from 1995 to 2001 for Washington County was 10.89%, significantly higher than the state average of 7.29%. The overall dropout rate for the CSRA from 1995 to 2001 was 7.01%.



## Test Scores, Dropout Rate and Post-secondary Education Assessment

Achievement test scores have declined 9% in Washington County between 1995 and 2001. This mirrors declines in neighboring counties and the state average. Test scores in neighboring Glascock and Jefferson Counties have declined 22% and 40% respectively in that same period. State test scores have declined 17%. Current scores in Washington County are similar to other rural areas in the CSRA but are nine percentage points below the state average. If historic and local trends area an indication, test scores in Washington County will reach the state average by 2010.

School drop out rates in Washington County have declined from 16.7% to 7.7% between 1995 and 2001. This places Washington County slightly behind the state average of 6.4%.

Public college attendance in Washington County is cyclical and has varied from year to year, from a high of 30.2% in 1997 to a low of 15.25 in 1995. A similar is seen at the state level since 1995, although statewide rates hover in the 30% range. Public tech school attendance has gradually 2.7% in 1995 to 16.0% in 2000. The statewide trend has been a gradual decline during that same time period.



The local school system is enhancing Washington County's economic development potential. The school dropout rate has consistently declined and is hovering around the state average, translating into higher educational attainment across all education levels. For economic development purposes, the important school system issue is adequate education through high school. Education attainment improvement, as we have seen since 1980, makes Washington County's school system an asset.

## INCOME

## Per Capita and Median Household

The per capita income has risen in Washington County since 1980, from \$4,832 to \$15,565 in 2000 (current dollars) (**Table P-12**). Although it per capita income has risen over 200%, the 2000 per capita income is still over \$5,000 lower than the state per capita income. Over the past decade though, the county per capita income rose slightly more than the state, at a 57 percent increase as compared to 55 percent.

Table P-12: Pe	r Capita	a Incom	e				
Jurisdiction	1980	1990	2000				
Washington County	4,832	9,917	15,565				
Davisboro	4,490	6,034	7,090				
Deepstep	6,488	15,041	20,182				
Harrison	3,671	8,657	11,429				
Oconee	4,131	10,329	13,262				
Riddleville	5,414	9,528	15,012				
Sandersville	5,375	10,476	18,226				
Tennille	1,836	9,323	12,987				
<b>Georgia</b> NA 13,631 21,154							
Source: US Bureau of the C	ensus						

Table P-13: Average Household Income							
Jurisdiction	1990	2000					
Washington County	27,993	41,843					
Davisboro	17,626	37,361					
Deepstep	44,713	46,183					
Harrison	22,131	27,507					
Oconee	34,356	40,341					
Riddleville	27,279	61,951					
Sandersville	28,937	46,978					
Tennille	22,876	33,704					
Georgia	36,810	80,077					
Source: U S Bureau of the Cen	sus						

The same trend does not hold true with the mean household income, although both the county and state mean household incomes rose from 1990 to 2000, the state mean rose much more rapidly than the County mean. The state average household income rose 117 percent over the same ten year period that the Washington County average household income rose only 49 percent. In 1990, the Washington County mean household income was \$27,993 (current dollars), and the Georgia mean household income was \$36,810, almost \$9,000 higher. In 2000, the average household income in Washington County was \$41,843 as compared with the State average household income of \$80,077, which is over \$38,000 more, or almost double the Washington income.



## Distribution of Income by Households

Table **P-14** shows the distribution of household incomes by income class for the county, the cities, and the state. The income distributions in the middle-income households are not significantly different from the state averages, but Washington County and its cities have higher percentages of incomes in the lower groups than the state, and fewer in the very high-income categories.

Table P-14: Household Income Distribution (%)								
	Washi Cou	ington Inty	Georgia					
Category	1990	2000	1990	2000				
less than \$9999	28.3	18.8	16.8	10.1				
\$10,000 - \$14,999	9.2	9.8	8.6	5.9				
\$15,000 - \$19,999	9.1	7.0	8.9	5.9				
\$20,000 - \$29,999	19.7	14.5	17.1	12.7				
\$30,000 - \$34,999	6.5	6.6	7.9	6.2				
\$35,000 - \$39,999	5.5	4.4	6.8	5.9				
\$40,000 - \$49,999	8.2	9.2	11.0	10.9				
\$50,000 - \$59,999	5.2	8.9	7.6	9.2				
\$60,000 - \$74,999	3.7	7.9	6.8	10.5				
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2.6	6.8	4.6	10.4				
\$100,000 - \$124,999	0.9	3.6	1.7	5.2				
\$125,000 - \$149,999	0.4	1.2	0.7	2.5				
\$150,000 and above	0.8	1.3	1.4	4.6				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0				



In 2000, 28.59% of Washington County families fell below the poverty level, these are alarming figures considering that statewide, only 9.9% of families fell below the poverty level. The percentage of people in poverty has decreased overall for Washington County, down from 61.675 in 1980 to its current level of 28.6%.



			Т	able P-	l5: Hou	sehold	Income	e Distril	bution (	(%)				
	Davis	sboro	Deep	ostep	Harı	rison	Oco	nee	Ridd	leville	Sande	rsville	Ten	nille
Category	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
less than \$9999	42.2	27.7	4.2	6.5	32.6	25.9	16.9	14.0	30.0	0.0	27.9	21.1	36.7	28.1
\$10,000 - \$14,999	19.0	10.6	4.2	0.0	9.2	15.9	15.7	7.0	6.7	0.0	10.1	9.6	10.1	10.4
\$15,000 - \$19,999	2.7	5.7	0.0	13.0	6.4	11.8	12.4	13.0	6.7	0.0	9.9	7.1	10.3	8.6
\$20,000 - \$29,999	18.4	14.2	18.8	4.3	17.7	14.1	15.7	8.0	13.3	15.2	20.4	17.6	15.1	10.7
\$30,000 - \$34,999	2.0	9.2	16.7	10.9	7.8	6.5	5.6	6.0	6.7	23.9	6.0	5.7	5.8	9.1
\$35,000 - \$39,999	4.8	5.0	4.2	4.3	7.8	1.8	10.1	2.0	0.0	13.0	3.1	3.8	4.3	5.1
\$40,000 - \$49,999	4.1	5.7	22.9	13.0	8.5	10.0	10.1	18.0	23.3	15.2	8.3	7.6	4.2	8.6
\$50,000 - \$59,999	3.4	8.5	18.8	17.4	5.7	1.8	6.7	21.0	6.7	10.9	4.8	6.4	6.6	6.2
\$60,000 - \$74,999	3.4	5.7	10.4	10.9	3.5	5.3	2.2	5.0	6.7	8.7	3.2	5.7	2.4	6.9
\$75,000 - \$99,999	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.3	3.9	6.5	4.0	2.7
\$100,000 - \$124,999	0.0	2.1	0.0	15.2	0.7	1.8	4.5	3.0	0.0	4.3	1.0	5.4	0.0	2.3
\$125,000 - \$149,999	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.2	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.3	0.5	0.5
\$150,000 and above	0.0	1.4	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	1.0	2.3	0.0	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Source: US Bu	ireau of	the Cens	us											

## **Income Assessment**

Per capita incomes have consistently risen over the past twenty years, but have risen significantly higher in some jurisdictions than others. For instance, per capita income has risen only 17 percent from 1990 to 2000 in Davisboro, and 39 percent in Tennille and 74 percent in Sandersville over the same time period. Georgia had a 55 percent increase in per capita income over the same time period. Although Sandersville does not have the highest per capita income of all of the jurisdictions in Washington County, this number is more indicative of per capita income than is the highest per capita income as shown in Deepstep. Deepstep per capita income could be misleading since there is such a small population and one high income can disproportionately skew the per capita income than all of the other jurisdictions, except Deepstep, which is only \$972 less than that of the state.



Since 1980, Washington County per capita income has risen over 200 percent, and 57 percent over the past ten years. Current per capita income is \$5,589 higher in Georgia than Washington County.

A large discrepancy is found in mean household income when comparing the county household income to the state. The state average household income is nearly twice that of Washington County, and is more than twice the average household incomes of three cities. The highest average household income in Washington County is found in Riddleville, at \$61,951 which is still over \$18,000 lower than the state average. Harrison has the lowest average household income at \$27,507, which is over \$14,000 less than the County and over \$52,500 less than the state.

The greatest growth in average household income occurred in Riddleville which actually outpaced the state growth at 127 percent. State growth was 117 percent. Close behind Riddleville, was Davisboro at 112 percent growth. Sandersville, the highest populated jurisdiction, saw a growth of 75 percent in average household income over the same ten year period. Washington County and Tennille saw similar growth at 49 percent and 47 percent respectively.

Income differentials are generally explained by the lower cost of living in Washington County. The average weekly wage paid in Washington County is \$575, compared to the statewide average of \$629. Furthermore, median property values and rent in Washington are significantly lower than the state average. Given the local cost of living, it is unlikely that income will approach the state average by 2025.

## FINDINGS

## Education

- Adult literacy program was instituted 10 years ago
- Sandersville Technical College was founded 5 years ago; will impact educational attainment level in future; trains displaced workforce in skilled trades and computers
- There is no local demand for skilled trades/education; therefore, educational attainment levels are low

## Income

• Poverty is widespread throughout County; found in developed AND undeveloped areas



## Vision Statement

Washington County and the municipalities will strive to create a stable and diversified economy, continuing to create a positive business climate for business to locate and grow.

## INTRODUCTION

The economic development chapter provides an inventory and assessment of the economic engine driving Washington County and the cities contained there within. This section takes a close look at the economic base, occupational trends, labor force, and local and regional opportunities of the county and cities. In combination with the information from other chapters in this Comprehensive Plan, this examination will provide a base for economic development planning and policymaking within Washington County and the municipalities.

The County and municipalities would like to expand their tax base by creating opportunities for economic development, including targeting clean industry and tourism. Collectively, they are striving for an appropriate balance between maintaining their rural character and the need to provide employment opportunities and necessary services.

## Local Context

In today's economy, the ability to transport people, goods, and services in an efficient manner is a critical. An effective multimodal transportation network that connects areas of the county to one another, areas of the region to one another, and the region to the rest of the world is a window of opportunity for Washington County. The County lies strategically between Augusta and Macon and is hoping to benefit from the growth of both regional centers. The county is in close proximity I-20 and I-16 and will benefit from the development of the Fall Line Freeway, a major widening project that will result in 4-lane access from Columbus to Augusta. Communities along the Freeway are expecting growth as a result of the widening project.

Washington County contains seven municipalities: Davisboro, Deepstep, Harrison, Oconee, Riddleville, Sandersville, and Tennille. The current population of Washington County is 21,176 but is only projected to increase by 15.5% through 2025. Household size is projected to decline, representing smaller family size and a growing single population.

The educational system is an important resource in Washington County. The dropout rate (7.7%) is slightly higher than the state average of 6.4%. Washington County also has a lower dropout rate than some of its surrounding counties and education attainment rates continue to rise, allowing the county to remain competitive in recruiting industry.

## **Regional Context**

As with all local economies, Washington County must be viewed within a larger regional context. During the past several decades, the Augusta and Macon metropolitan regions experienced a boom in population and job growth. An excellent transportation system, a



positive housing market, and continued corporate relocation and immigration will continue to fuel both the region's growth through 2025. Washington County's close proximity to both of these rapidly growing areas provides ample opportunities to benefit from regional growth.

The CSRA region has a diverse and expanding industry base that keeps the regional economy growing. Services, manufacturing, and retail trade are the leading employers in the area. The area is one of the world's largest suppliers of kaolin for ceramics and fillers, forestry companies produce wood products ranging from paper and pulpwood to fine furniture and flooring. The County's high level of kaolin production has earned it the nickname of "the kaolin capital of the world". Textile firms across the region manufacture apparel of all types. Medical companies produce pharmaceuticals, medical supplies, and diagnostic equipment. Firms in emerging technologies, such as telecommunications and environmental remediation, are offered support through the CSRA's Southeast Technology Center.

## ECONOMIC BASE INVENTORY

The 2002 Woods and Poole Georgia State Profile lists the following industries in Washington County:

- Agricultural services, forestry, fishing, and hunting
- Mining
- Utilities
- Construction
- Manufacturing
- Wholesale Trade
- Retail Trade
- Transportation and Warehousing
- Information
- Finance and Insurance
- Real Estate and Rental Leasing
- Professional, Scientific and Technical Services
- Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services
- Educational Services
- Health Care and Social Assistance
- Accommodation and Food Services
- Other Services (except Public Administration)
- Auxiliaries (Except Corporate, Subsidiary and Regional Management)

## **Employment by Sector**

Employment encompasses the total number of people employed by local businesses and industries, sole proprietors and the self-employed. This includes people living in surrounding areas coming to Washington County to work, but does not include residents of Washington County who commute to jobs outside the County limits.

**Table E-1** examines historic sector employment trends in Washington County. Overall, total employment grew by 1,442 or 14.7% between 1990 and 2000. Services and mining,



the two largest employment sectors, grew by 42.2% and 2% respectively in that same period. Manufacturing posted the only significant decline, dropping 42.7% between 1990 and 2000. Total employment is projected to increase by 3,107 or 27.5% through 2025. Transportation, communications & public utilities (80%) and manufacturing (61.8%) will account for most of the job growth.

**Table E-2** highlights the relative growth of each sector. The three largest sectors, services, mining, retail trade currently account for 45.7% of all sector employment. Historically, no one sector dominated the local economy. With the exception of transportation, communications & public utilities and services (+10%) the relative share of sector employment is projected to remain relatively constant.

Table E-1: Wash	ington (	County	Employ	ment by	Sector,	1980-20	)25			
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Farm	855	705	557	515	530	521	500	481	465	451
Agricultural Services, Other	314	83	63	85	105	114	122	129	136	143
Mining	1,243	1,274	1,701	1,655	1,736	1,770	1,820	1,884	1,954	2,025
Construction	322	168	570	456	542	588	602	612	622	633
Manufacturing	1,492	1,420	1,373	1,225	786	700	641	603	582	577
Trans., Comm., & Public Utilities	427	630	746	898	1,244	1,430	1,621	1,821	2,027	2,237
Wholesale Trade	218	184	209	203	225	218	214	212	210	208
Retail Trade	967	1,353	1,322	1,577	1,422	1,491	1,520	1,555	1,600	1,653
Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate	233	200	219	245	300	326	346	366	388	413
Services	1,210	1,208	1,405	1,651	1,998	2,258	2,495	2,727	2,970	3,233
Federal Civilian Government	53	49	57	46	48	45	44	44	44	45
Federal Military Government	78	93	85	82	76	77	78	79	79	79
State & Local Government	1,371	1,379	1,518	2,029	2,255	2,369	2,459	2,538	2,610	2,677
Total	8,783	8,746	9,825	10,667	11,267	11,907	12,462	13,051	13,687	14,374
Source: Woods & Poole Economics (2003)	ource: Woods & Poole Economics (2003)									

Table E-2: \	Vashingt	on Coun	ty Percen	t of Sect	or Emplo	yment, 1	980-2025	5		
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Farm	9.73%	8.06%	5.67%	4.83%	4.70%	4.38%	4.01%	3.69%	3.40%	3.14%
Agricultural Services, Other	3.58%	0.95%	0.64%	0.80%	0.93%	0.96%	0.98%	0.99%	0.99%	0.99%
Mining	14.15%	14.57%	17.31%	15.52%	15.41%	14.87%	14.60%	14.44%	14.28%	14.09%
Construction	3.67%	1.92%	5.80%	4.27%	4.81%	4.94%	4.83%	4.69%	4.54%	4.40%
Manufacturing	16.99%	16.24%	13.97%	11.48%	6.98%	5.88%	5.14%	4.62%	4.25%	4.01%
Trans, Comm, & Pub. Utilities	4.86%	7.20%	7.59%	8.42%	11.04%	12.01%	13.01%	13.95%	14.81%	15.56%
Wholesale Trade	2.48%	2.10%	2.13%	1.90%	2.00%	1.83%	1.72%	1.62%	1.53%	1.45%
Retail Trade	11.01%	15.47%	13.46%	14.78%	12.62%	12.52%	12.20%	11.91%	11.69%	11.50%
Finance, Insur., & Real Estate	2.65%	2.29%	2.23%	2.30%	2.67%	2.74%	2.78%	2.80%	2.83%	2.87%
Services	13.78%	13.81%	14.30%	15.48%	17.73%	18.96%	20.02%	20.89%	21.70%	22.49%
Federal Civilian Government	0.60%	0.56%	0.58%	0.43%	0.43%	0.38%	0.35%	0.34%	0.32%	0.31%
Federal Military Government	0.89%	1.06%	0.87%	0.77%	0.67%	0.65%	0.63%	0.61%	0.58%	0.55%
State & Local Government	15.61%	15.77%	15.45%	19.02%	20.01%	19.88%	19.73%	19.45%	19.08%	18.64%
Source: Woods & Poole Economics (2003)										



<b>Table E-3</b> provides statewide sector employment rates. Approximately 58% of the
statewide economy is in services, retail trade and manufacturing, significantly higher
than the 45.7% for those same sectors in Washington County. Mining, a major industry
in Washington County, accounts for less than .2% in the statewide.

Table	E-3: Geo	r <mark>gia Per</mark> c	ent of Se	ctor Emp	oloyment	, 1980-20	)25	2010         2015         2020           1.11%         1.00%         0.90%           1.16%         1.17%         1.17%           0.17%         0.17%         0.16%           5.94%         5.80%         5.66%           1.56%         11.03%         10.50%           6.19%         6.16%         6.09%           5.73%         5.71%         5.69%           7.32%         17.51%         17.65%           3.98%         6.91%         6.83%           0.10%         31.07%         32.16%         3           1.63%         1.53%         1.43%         1.71%				
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025		
Farm	3.51%	2.55%	2.01%	1.63%	1.39%	1.24%	1.11%	1.00%	0.90%	0.82%		
Agricultural Services, Other	0.60%	0.78%	0.85%	1.06%	1.13%	1.15%	1.16%	1.17%	1.17%	1.16%		
Mining	0.32%	0.32%	0.29%	0.22%	0.20%	0.19%	0.17%	0.17%	0.16%	0.15%		
Construction	5.07%	6.11%	5.75%	5.58%	6.10%	6.05%	5.94%	5.80%	5.66%	5.52%		
Manufacturing	19.25%	17.53%	15.51%	14.27%	12.63%	12.07%	11.56%	11.03%	10.50%	9.97%		
Trans, Comm, & Pub. Utilities	5.55%	5.51%	5.86%	5.72%	6.10%	6.17%	6.19%	6.16%	6.09%	5.97%		
Wholesale Trade	6.34%	6.65%	6.18%	5.73%	5.69%	5.74%	5.73%	5.71%	5.69%	5.66%		
Retail Trade	14.84%	16.13%	16.44%	17.14%	16.80%	17.08%	17.32%	17.51%	17.65%	17.76%		
Finance, Insur., & Real Estate	7.28%	6.98%	6.64%	6.36%	7.12%	7.05%	6.98%	6.91%	6.83%	6.76%		
Services	18.30%	20.61%	23.75%	26.61%	28.63%	29.27%	30.10%	31.07%	32.16%	33.35%		
Federal Civilian Government	3.08%	2.87%	2.79%	2.33%	1.90%	1.76%	1.63%	1.53%	1.43%	1.35%		
Federal Military Government	3.36%	3.05%	2.46%	2.24%	1.93%	1.82%	1.71%	1.61%	1.51%	1.43%		
State & Local Government	12.50%	10.91%	11.47%	11.11%	10.38%	10.41%	10.40%	10.33%	10.25%	10.10%		
Source: Woods & Poole Economics (2003)												

## Sector Earnings

Sector earnings represent total wages, salaries and other earned paid to persons working for businesses and industries in Washington County.

Since 1990, total earnings in Washington County have risen 39.9%. Not surprisingly, mining accounts for the largest share of sector earnings, with residents earning 35.78% or \$120.8 million of total earnings (**Table E-4**). This represents a \$30 million increase over the 1990 level and is projected to reach \$147.8 million by 2025. State and local government is second with \$63.6 million, a rate expected to grow by 38.2% to \$87.9 million in 2025. Though farm employment is expected to decline through 2025, sector earnings are projected to increase by 53% over that same time period. A similar trend can be seen in transportation, communications, and public utilities, where earnings account for a higher percentage than the sector's share of total employment. This reflects traditionally higher salaries paid in these sectors and suggests a slowdown in transportation, communications, public utilities and mining would result in a disproportionate decline in earnings.

**Table E-5** provides percentage figures for sector earnings, allowing a comparison of the relative growth of each sector. The relative share of manufacturing, wholesale trade, and federal civilian government has continually declined while mining and transportation, communication, and public utilities have continued to rise steadily. The relative share of farming, transportation, communication, public utilities, services, and state and local government earnings are projected to increase through 2025.



## E C O N O M I C D E V E L O P M E N T

		Tab	ole E-4: Wasl	hington Coun	ty Earnings	by Sector, 19	80-2025			
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Farm	1779000	3199000	2339000	3434000	4295000	4774000	5159000	5578000	6041000	6558000
Agricultural Serv.	7422000	1378000	731000	1316000	1634000	1872000	2102000	2331000	2572000	2830000
Mining	50492000	56308000	79114000	94127000	120786000	124301000	128890000	134605000	141060000	147845000
Construction	7125000	1569000	11457000	9838000	11271000	12560000	13194000	13746000	14308000	14898000
Manufacturing	31215000	31238000	32826000	33829000	23693000	22435000	21802000	21685000	22066000	22975000
Trans., Comm, & Utilities	13075000	21017000	23925000	30512000	40522000	48075000	56246000	65214000	74960000	85405000
Wholesale Trade	4488000	4519000	4639000	5380000	5741000	5694000	5741000	58100	5887000	5971000
Retail Trade	15040000	21295000	16885000	20015000	20291000	21836000	22839000	23967000	25276000	28769000
Fin., Insur., & Real Estate	4092000	2597000	4252000	4520000	5685000	6561000	7345000	8194000	9134000	10174000
Services	18855000	17778000	21247000	26279000	36786000	44236000	51857000	60020000	69066000	79325000
Fed Civilian Govt.	2114000	1944000	2131000	2007000	2307000	2262000	2297000	2376000	2479000	2594000
Fed Military Govt.	545000	1097000	930000	920000	987000	1048000	1109000	1169000	1229000	1286000
State & Local Govt.	27817000	32607000	40676000	51450000	63597000	68909000	73772000	78488000	83160000	87889000
Total	184059000	198546000	241152000	283627000	337595000	364563000	392353000	423183000	457238000	494519000

		Tab	ole E-4: Wasl	nington Coun	ity Earnings l	by Sector, 198	80-2025			
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Farm	1779000	3199000	2339000	3434000	4295000	4774000	5159000	5578000	6041000	6558000
Agricultural Serv.	7422000	1378000	731000	1316000	1634000	1872000	2102000	2331000	2572000	2830000
Mining	50492000	56308000	79114000	94127000	120786000	124301000	128890000	134605000	141060000	147845000
Construction	7125000	1569000	11457000	9838000	11271000	12560000	13194000	13746000	14308000	14898000
Manufacturing	31215000	31238000	32826000	33829000	23693000	22435000	21802000	21685000	22066000	22975000
Trans., Comm, & Utilities	13075000	21017000	23925000	30512000	40522000	48075000	56246000	65214000	74960000	85405000
Wholesale Trade	4488000	4519000	4639000	5380000	5741000	5694000	5741000	58100	5887000	5971000
Retail Trade	15040000	21295000	16885000	20015000	20291000	21836000	22839000	23967000	25276000	28769000
Fin., Insur., & Real Estate	4092000	2597000	4252000	4520000	5685000	6561000	7345000	8194000	9134000	10174000
Services	18855000	17778000	21247000	26279000	36786000	44236000	51857000	60020000	69066000	79325000
Fed Civilian Govt.	2114000	1944000	2131000	2007000	2307000	2262000	2297000	2376000	2479000	2594000
Fed Military Govt.	545000	1097000	930000	920000	987000	1048000	1109000	1169000	1229000	1286000
State & Local Govt.	27817000	32607000	40676000	51450000	63597000	68909000	73772000	78488000	83160000	87889000
Total	184059000	198546000	241152000	283627000	337595000	364563000	392353000	423183000	457238000	494519000
Source: Woods & Poole	Economics (2	003)			•		•			



Table E	5: Washi	ington Co	ounty Ear	nings by	Sector (S	%), 1980-	2025			
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Farm	0.97%	1.61%	0.97%	1.21%	1.27%	1.31%	1.31%	1.32%	1.32%	1.33%
Agricultural Services	4.03%	0.69%	0.30%	0.46%	0.48%	0.51%	0.54%	0.55%	0.56%	0.57%
Mining	27.43%	28.36%	32.81%	33.19%	35.78%	34.10%	32.85%	31.81%	30.85%	29.90%
Construction	3.87%	1.80%	4.75%	3.47%	3.34%	3.45%	3.36%	3.25%	3.13%	3.01%
Manufacturing	16.96%	15.73%	13.61%	11.93%	7.02%	6.15%	5.56%	5.12%	4.83%	4.65%
Trans., Comm., & Public Utilities	7.10%	10.59%	9.92%	10.76%	12.00%	13.19%	14.34%	15.41%	16.39%	17.27%
Wholesale Trade	2.44%	2.28%	1.92%	1.90%	1.70%	1.56%	1.46%	1.37%	1.29%	1.21%
Retail Trade	8.17%	10.73%	7.00%	7.06%	6.01%	5.99%	5.82%	5.66%	5.52%	5.41%
Finance, Insurance, & Real Estate	2.22%	1.31%	1.76%	1.59%	1.68%	1.80%	1.87%	1.94%	2.00%	2.06%
Services	10.24%	8.95%	8.81%	9.27%	10.90%	12.13%	13.22%	14.18%	15.11%	16.04%
Federal Civilian Government	1.15%	0.98%	0.88%	0.71%	0.68%	0.62%	0.59%	0.56%	0.54%	0.52%
Federal Military Government	0.30%	0.55%	0.39%	0.32%	0.29%	0.29%	0.28%	0.28%	0.27%	0.26%
State & Local Government	15.12%	16.42%	16.88%	18.13%	18.85%	18.90%	18.80%	18.55%	18.19%	17.77%
Source: Woods & Poole Economics (2003)										

**Table E-6** highlights current statewide sector earnings. Similar to sector employment rates, the Georgia economy is comparable to that of Washington County. The widest gap is found in state and local government, where sector earnings account for 10.06% more in Washington County than the state average. The service sector, on the other hand, contributes a higher percentage of earnings on the state level.

Ta	ble E-6:	Georgia I	Earnings	by Sector	r (1996\$)	%, 1980	-2025			
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Farm	0.16%	1.27%	1.36%	1.40%	0.98%	0.93%	0.89%	0.85%	0.82%	0.79%
Agricultural Serv.	0.37%	0.41%	0.46%	0.53%	0.59%	0.60%	0.61%	0.62%	0.62%	0.62%
Mining	0.65%	0.48%	0.36%	0.29%	0.27%	0.25%	0.22%	0.21%	0.19%	0.18%
Construction	5.66%	6.57%	5.82%	5.39%	6.00%	5.86%	5.67%	5.46%	5.26%	5.06%
Manufacturing	22.54%	20.03%	17.51%	16.84%	14.86%	14.45%	14.05%	13.59%	13.08%	12.53%
Trans., Comm., & Utilities	9.33%	8.85%	8.75%	9.43%	9.89%	9.99%	10.01%	9.96%	9.84%	9.53%
Wholesale Trade	8.87%	9.04%	8.86%	8.17%	8.44%	8.36%	8.21%	8.05%	7.88%	7.71%
Retail Trade	10.33%	17.36%	21.95%	24.33%	26.77%	27.78%	29.02%	30.44%	32.02%	33.73%
Fin., Insur., & Real Estate	5.44%	5.59%	6.43%	6.86%	0.0757	7.66%	7.73%	7.78%	7.81%	7.82%
Services	15.63%	17.36%	21.95%	24.33%	26.77%	27.78%	29.02%	30.44%	32.02%	33.73%
Fed Civilian Govt.	5.64%	5.11%	4.66%	4.17%	3.39%	3.11%	2.87%	2.67%	2.49%	2.33%
Fed Military Govt.	3.72%	3.68%	2.69%	2.49%	2.06%	1.94%	1.83%	1.72%	1.62%	1.53%
State & Local Government	11.66%	10.97%	11.97%	11.01%	10.18%	10.10%	9.95%	9.78%	9.58%	9.37%
Source: Woods & Poole Economics	(2003)									

## Wages

In 1999, the average weekly wage paid in Washington County was \$575. Between 1990 and 1999, average weekly wages have increased 48.58%. Current average weekly wages paid by sector range from a low of \$346 in construction to a high of \$1094 in mining (**Table E-7**). Historically, these sectors have always been at higher and lower ends of the wage scale. The



highest wage growth rates between 1990 and 1999 were in manufacturing (148%), mining (58.32%), and services (55.28%).

The overall 1990 to 1999 wage increases in Washington County were below the state average (**Table E-7**) and local wages remain significantly lower than elsewhere in Georgia. The only sector comparable in actual wages was mining and manufacturing where county wages exceeded the state average. The largest local-statewide gaps are found in TCP and FIRE.

Table E-7: Washington Co	unty and 1980-		ia Avera	ge Wee	kly Wag	jes,
	Washi	ington (	County	Stat	e of Geo	orgia
	1990	1995	1999	1990	1995	1999
Agri, Forestry, Fishing	\$182	\$182	NA	\$276	\$322	\$390
Mining	691	953	1094	276	734	866
Construction	290	363	346	589	508	623
Manufacturing	282	448	700	434	555	684
Trans., Comm., & Utilities	462	535	528	450	737	895
Wholesale Trade	339	433	462	603	729	932
Retail Trade	182	212	287	603	275	335
Fin., Insur., Real Estate	372	444	486	236	693	900
Services	246	300	382	544	501	611
Federal Govt.	NA	NA	NA	414	666	808
State Govt.	428	NA	483	543	493	579
Local Govt.	272	323	360	451	440	523
All Industries	\$387	\$481	\$575	\$424	\$509	\$629
Source: Georgia Department of Lal	oor					

## **Sources of Personal Income**

Sources of personal income indicate how communities receive income. The Georgia Department of Community Affairs, with the assistance of Woods & Poole Economics, Inc., has developed categories of personal income which include:

- 1. **Wage and Salary**-Total income earned as compensation for working or rendering services;
- 2. **Other Labor Income**-Total employer contributions to private pension or worker's compensation funds;
- 3. **Proprietor's Income** Proprietor's income measured as total profits earned from partnership and sole proprietorships;
- 4. **Dividends-Investment-Rent and Interest Payments, Interest Income**-Total income from investments and rental property; and
- 5. **Transfer Payments** Total income from payments by government under many different programs, such as Social Security, unemployment insurance, food stamps, and veteran's benefits.

Between 1990 and 2000, overall personal income in Washington County rose by \$1.3 million or 39.46% (**Table E-8, E-9**). This is far below the state average increase of 55.2%. Wages and salaries account for the largest source of personal income at \$282 million or 61.15%, followed by dividends, interest, and rent at \$92.33 million (19.97%),



and transfer payments at \$94.19 million (18.29%). On the lower end of the scale, social insurance contributions and other labor income account for \$19.2 million (4.15%) and \$30.6 million (6.62%) respectively.

The most dramatic difference between Washington County and the state average is in transfer payments (**Table E-10**). Washington County residents are more dependent on transfer payments than the state as a whole, reflecting the county's aging population.

On average, all sources of personal income are projected to rise, with some outpacing others. Between 2000 and 2025, overall personal income will increase by 50.3%, significantly lower than the state average of 78.5%. At 76.57% and 50.11% respectively, social insurance contributions and dividends, interest, and rent payments will account for the largest increase in Washington County sources of income through 2025.

Associated with these figures is a Residence Adjustment Category, which measures the net amount of Washington County residents' personal income, earned outside the county. When the number is positive, as in Washington County (**Table E-8**), the amount of income earned outside the county by Washington residents is greater than the amount of income earned in the county by nonresidents. Washington County's residence adjustment has increased steadily since 1990 and that trend is expected to continue through 2025. Washington County residents increasing level of personal income earned inside the economy highlights a strong local economy.

Table E-8: Washington	County S	ources (	of Perso	nal Inco	me (199	6) (in mi	llions \$),	1980-20	)25	
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Total	241.5	273	331.51	391.14	462.33	501.38	542.78	588.61	639.22	694.89
Wages & Salaries	154.07	162.81	199.18	233.44	282.7	306.03	330.05	356.69	386.14	418.38
Other Labor Income	17.08	20.62	28.68	34.63	30.61	32.61	34.61	36.8	39.2	41.8
Proprietor's Income	12.91	15.11	13.29	15.56	24.29	25.92	27.7	29.69	31.91	34.34
Dividends, Interest, & Rent	37.79	45.31	64.6	71.17	92.32	100.72	109.58	118.86	128.54	138.58
Transfer Payments to Persons	39.95	46.38	58.51	78.41	84.55	94.19	105.2	117.74	132.04	148.35
Less: Social Ins. Contributions	8.69	10.82	14.1	16.83	19.2	21.66	24.34	27.28	30.47	33.91
Residence Adjustment	6.85	6.41	18.66	25.23	32.93	36.43	40.01	43.9	48.12	52.66
Source: Woods & Poole Economics (2003)	-			-		-	-	<u></u>	-	

Table E	Table E-9: Washington County Sources of Personal Income by Type %												
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025			
Wages & Salaries	63.86%	59.64%	60.08%	59.68%	61.15%	61.04%	60.81%	60.60%	60.41%	60.21%			
Other Labor Income	7.08%	7.55%	8.65%	8.85%	6.62%	6.50%	6.38%	6.25%	6.13%	6.01%			
Proprietors Income	5.35%	5.54%	4.01%	3.98%	5.25%	5.17%	5.10%	5.04%	4.99%	4.94%			
Dividends, Interest, & Rent	13.59%	16.60%	19.49%	18.20%	19.97%	20.09%	20.19%	20.19%	20.11%	19.94%			
<b>Transfer Payments to Persons</b>	16.56%	16.99%	17.65%	20.05%	18.29%	18.79%	19.38%	20.00%	20.66%	21.35%			
Less Social Ins. Contribution	3.60%	3.96%	4.25%	4.30%	4.15%	4.32%	4.48%	4.63%	4.77%	4.88%			
Residence Adjustment	-2.84%	-2.35%	-5.63%	-6.45%	-7.12%	-7.27%	-7.37%	-7.46%	-7.53%	-7.58%			
Source: Woods & Poole Economics (2003)													


Ta	ble E-10:	Georgia	Sources o	of Person	al Incon	ne by Typ	<b>e</b> %			
	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
Wages & Salaries	62.10%	62.15%	60.36%	59.07%	61.18%	61.09%	61.00%	60.94%	60.92%	60.92%
Other Labor Income	8.41%	8.72%	8.68%	8.63%	6.84%	3.71%	6.60%	6.48%	6.38%	6.28%
Proprietors Income	6.18%	6.97%	7.11%	7.92%	5.65%	8.52%	8.43%	8.34%	8.26%	8.19%
Dividends, Interest, & Rent	10.05%	10.33%	10.34%	10.31%	10.71%	10.76%	16.70%	16.61%	16.49%	16.34%
<b>Transfer Payments to Persons</b>	9.72%	7.73%	9.18%	10.62%	11.13%	11.25%	11.43%	11.66%	11.93%	12.25%
Less Social Ins. Contributions	3.54%	4.10%	4.33%	4345%	4.49%	4.67%	4.86%	5.04%	5.19%	5.33%
Residence Adjustments     -0.25%     -0.25%     -0.10%     -0.15%     -0.11%     0.33%     0.70%     1.00%     1.21%     1.35%										
Source: Woods & Poole Economics (2003)										

# **Major Community-Level Economic Activities**

Washington County has seen an increase in economic activity since 1980. The county's transportation infrastructure and proximity to Interstate I-16 and I-20 and large metro areas provides economic development opportunities.

The county has been proactive in the areas of planning and providing the necessary infrastructure to attract industry.

The Washington County Chamber of Commerce is the primary vehicles to attract and provide available location opportunities for industrial development. The Chamber of Commerce is actively involved in promoting tourism, business, and industrial development, and improving the quality of life for Washington County residents. The Chamber markets the county in several statewide publications and participates in regional development efforts. To encourage business development in the County, the Chamber works closely with Georgia Power, the Georgia Electric Membership Corporation, the Georgia Department of Economic Development, and the CSRA Regional Development Center.

## Services

Service employment in Washington County increased steadily from 1990 to 2000. In 1990 service employment accounted for 1,405 jobs, or 14.30% of total employment. By 2000, the number of service jobs had increased to 1,998 or 17.73% of total employment. The service sector is projected to show increased growth through 2025.

# Major Development Trends and Unique Economic Opportunities

Understanding that tourism can stimulate the local economy, Washington County is in the process of pursuing various strategies aimed at promoting tourism, including marketing of its historic character and participating in historic trail projects. The purpose of both of these programs is to capitalize on unique historical and scenic qualities that offer Washington County regional, state, and national exposure.

Numerous historical and recreation qualities provide good tourism opportunities. Sandersville has applied for numerous state and federal grants aimed at enhancing potential tourist areas such as the Sandersville downtown historic district.



## LABOR FORCE ANALYSIS

This section examines Washington County's labor force characteristics, including occupation, levels of participation, and unemployment.

# **Employment by Occupation**

Professional and technical specialists, and machine operators, assemblers & inspectors specialties account for the highest share of occupational groupings in Washington County (27.19%) and the municipalities (21.14% in Davisboro, 40.00% in Deepstep, 25.66% in Harrison, 31.65% in Oconee, 30.77% in Riddleville, 32.05% in Sandersville, 23.28% in Tennille) and increased substantially between 1990 and 2000 (**Table E-11**). These occupational groupings account for less than 15.6% statewide and 14.6% nationwide occupations (**Table E-12**). By contrast, executive and managerial occupations, which account for 12.26% statewide and 13.45% nationwide, account for 8.09% in Washington County, 6.42% in Davisboro, 5.45% in Deepstep, 1.97% in Harrison, 1.98% in Oconee, 15.38% in Riddleville, 8.48% in Sandersville, and 8.38% in Tennille. These occupation trends highlight the more labor-intensive nature of the local economy in contrast to the state's more knowledge-based orientation.

	Ta	ble E-11: Emp	oloyment by	Occupation	<b>, 1990-20</b>	00		
				199	0			
	Washington County	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille
Exec, Admin and Managerial	579	6	0	7	7	2	248	41
Professional and Technical	766	15	11	9	12	4	280	65
Technicians and related support	387	0	2	2	4	3	148	23
Sales	667	16	4	21	0	2	193	59
Clerical and Admin Support	871	8	18	12	10	7	317	82
Private Household Services	88	0	0	2	0	0	35	0
Protective Services	111	2	0	2	0	0	41	7
Service Occupations	865	12	5	12	17	4	353	95
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	308	8	0	4	0	0	74	6
Precision Prod, Craft, and Repair	1070	25	11	29	20	5	229	72
Machine Ops, Ass., & Inspectors	1310	32	10	49	9	2	401	92
Transportation & Material Moving	546	8	9	4	9	1	122	46
Handlers, Helpers, & Laborers	485	14	3	12	0	3	155	55
Total	8053	146	73	165	88	33	2596	643
		•		200	0	•	•	•
	Washington County	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille
Exec, Admin and Managerial	631	11	3	3	2	12	203	45



Professional and Technical	1147	14	6	10	17	9	495	60	
Technicians and related support	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Sales	643	16	9	5	4	3	191	81	
Clerical and Admin Support	869	10	10	8	10	4	223	60	
Private Household Services	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Protective Services	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Service Occupations	908	26	3	15	2	4	249	95	
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	117	6	0	6	0	15	14	4	
Precision Prod, Craft, and Repair	947	27	0	22	16	3	269	65	
Machine Ops, Ass., & Inspectors	1043	16	11	29	15	15	272	71	
Transportation & Material Moving	836	16	4	41	22	11	165	62	
Handlers, Helpers, & Laborers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Total	7804	140	55	152	101	78	2393	537	
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census									

		1	Table E-12: E	Employment	by Occupa	tion, 2000				
	Washington	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille	Georgia	U.S.A.
Exec. Admin., and Managerial	8.09%	6.42%	5.45%	1.97%	1.98%	15.38%	8.48%	8.38%	12.26%	13.45%
Prof. and Tech. Services	14.70%	10.00%	10.90%	6.58%	16.83%	11.54%	20.69%	11.17%	12.39%	20.20%
Technicians and Support	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sales	8.24%	11.43%	16.36%	3.29%	3.96%	3.85%	7.98%	15.08%	11.64%	11.25%
Clerical and Admin support	11.13%	7.14%	18.18%	5.26%	9.90%	5.13%	9.32%	11.17%	15.14%	15.44%
Private Household Services	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Protective Services	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Service Occupations	11.64%	18.57%	5.45%	9.86%	1.98%	5.13%	10.41%	17.69%	11.57%	12.01%
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	1.50%	4.29%	0.00%	3.95%	0.00%	19.23%	0.58%	0.74%	0.64%	0.73%
Precision Prod., Craft, and Repair	12.13%	19.29%	0.00%	14.47%	15.84%	3.85%	11.24%	12.10%	9.02%	8.49%
Machine Ops, Ass. & Inspectors	13.36%	11.43%	20.00%	19.08%	14.85%	19.23%	11.37%	13.22%	10.83%	9.45%
Transportation & Material Moving	10.71%	11.43%	7.27%	26.97%	21.78%	14.10%	6.90%	11.54%	6.63%	6.14%
Handlers, Helpers & Laborers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Source: U.S. Bureau of t	Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census									

# Labor Force Participation and Employment Status

Companies locating within Washington County have an ample workforce to choose from. With an average commute time of less than 30 minutes, people are willing to travel to a good job. The civilian workforce of the Augusta Metro area is 204,041. It is estimated that an additional 69,951 persons from the non-traditional labor force (students, post-



secondary, military dependents, military retirees, and civilian retirees) are available for employment.

**Table E-13** identifies labor force participation rates for Washington County and the municipalities. In 2000, total labor force participation in Washington County was 53.67%, slightly higher than Harrison and Tennille but lower than Deepstep, Riddleville, and Sandersville (**Table E-13**). Between 1990 and 2000, the total number of residents in the labor force declined by 1.03% in Washington County and 21.67% in Deepstep, while increasing in both Davisboro and Oconee (**Table E-13**). On average, the county's labor force participation rates are lower than the state and national averages (**Table E-14**).

	Ta	ble E-13: Lab	or Force Pa	rticipation,	1990-200	0						
				199	0							
	Washington Co.	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille				
Total in Labor Force	8,715	167	73	172	93	38	2,790	688				
<b>Civilian Labor Force</b>	8,703	167	73	168	93	38	2,784	686				
Military Labor Force	12	0	0	4	0	0	6	2				
Males In Labor Force	4,655	4,655 88 44 81 52 22 1,373 358										
Females In Labor Force	4,060	79	29	91	41	16	1,411	330				
				200	0							
	Washington Co.	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille				
Total in Labor Force	8,626	185	60	173	153	80	2,695	604				
Civilian Labor Force	8,626	185	60	173	153	80	2,695	604				
Military Labor Force	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Males In Labor Force	4,405	80	35	111	77	53	1,304	283				
Females In Labor Force	4,221	105	25	62	76	27	1,391	321				
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census												

	_		Table E-14:	Labor Force	e Participa	tion, 2000				
	Washington County	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille	Georgia	U.S.A.
Total in Labor Force	53.67%	12.67%	54.55%	44.93%	61.94%	61.54%	57.98%	50.67%	66.10%	63.90%
Civilian Labor Force	53.67%	12.67%	54.55%	44.93%	61.94%	61.54%	57.98%	50.67%	65.00%	63.30%
Military Labor Force	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.10%	0.50%
Males in Labor Force	51.06%	43.24%	61.40%	62.36%	70.00%	69.74%	64.91%	56.60%	73.00%	70.70%
Females in Labor Force	48.93%	56.76%	47.17%	29.95%	55.47%	50.00%	52.71%	46.39%	59.40%	57.50%
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census										



# Unemployment

Table E-15 highlights unemployment rates in Washington County, the state and the nation. Despite a 4% improvement from 1997, unemployment in Washington County remains at 5.00% through 2000. This rate is slightly higher than the state and national averages.

Tabl	e E-15: Unempl	loyment Ra	ates					
	Washington County	Georgia	U.S.A.					
1990	5.90%	5.50%	5.60%					
1991	5.10%	5.00%	6.80%					
<b>1992</b> 5.60% 7.00% 7.50%								
1993	4.50%	5.80%	6.90%					
1994	3.80%	5.20%	6.10%					
1995	5.50%	4.90%	5.60%					
1996	6.00%	4.60%	5.40%					
1997	9.00%	4.50%	4.90%					
1998	8.40%	4.20%	4.50%					
1999	7.50%	4.00%	4.20%					
<b>2000</b> 5.00% 3.70% 4.00%								
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census								

# Local Economic Development Agencies and Resources

Effective economic development programs are a group effort, involving not only local government and staff but also the cooperation of and resources available from other potential partners.

## • The CSRA Unified Development Council

The CSRA UDC is a voluntary organization of concerned local and regional economic development groups, community service associations, and educational institutions whose purpose is to continuously improve the area's economic development and quality of life. The mission of the CSRA UDC is to provide planning, management and information services to its members, and to serve as a forum for addressing economic development issues. The CSRA UDC provides its members with such services as city/county/regional planning, state and federal grant support, historic preservation, small business loans, data services and strategic planning. The CSRA UDC also sponsors education seminars, industrial prospect tours, and strategic planning meetings.

#### • Washington County Chamber of Commerce

The Washington County Chamber of Commerce is the primary vehicles to attract and provide available location opportunities for industrial bonds on behalf of the county. The Chamber of Commerce is actively involved in promoting tourism, business and industrial development, and improving the quality of life for Washington County residents. The Chamber markets the county in several statewide publications and participates in regional development efforts. To



encourage business development in the County, the Chamber works closely with Georgia Power, the Georgia Electric Membership Corporation, the Georgia Development of Economic Development, and the CSRA Regional Development Center.

#### • Classic Main Street Program

Sandersville participates in the Classic Main Street Program, a self-help community development program designed to improve the downtown's quality of life. Sandersville receives technical assistance and resources, which assist the local community their efforts to build a stronger local economy through revitalization of the downtown area.

## • Education and Training Opportunities

Augusta Technical College has opened the area's first high-tech "incubator," a facility that offers engineers, scientists, researchers and others free or low-cost technical support as well as office and research space. The Center for Advanced Technology (CADTEC) is the Consortium for Manufacturing Competitiveness demonstration site for the state of Georgia. The facility houses the Quick Start Program which works through the Sandersville Regional Technical Institute. The Quick Start program provides high-quality training services at no cost to new or expanding businesses in Georgia. The program's goal is to eliminate the need for weeks or months of on-thejob training by producing graduates who can support their employer's programs from day one.

In addition to Sandersville Regional Technical Institute, Augusta Tech, and Swainsboro Tech provide technical training and support. Skill specific training is offered through the CSRA Employment and Training Consortium, a public-private partnership.

Washington County also has access to Vocational and Technical training programs in McDuffie, Warren, and Richmond Counties. Sandersville Technical Institute also provides dual enrollment programs such as Certified Nurses Aid as well as other programs.

Washington County has an attractive labor force. The Washington County school system graduates 89% of enrolled students and dropout rates are among some of the lowest in Georgia. Washington County residents have access to several institutions that provide advanced vocational and academic diplomas such as Sandersville Technical Institute, Augusta Tech. Paine College, Augusta State University, the Medical College of Georgia, and Georgia College and State University.

#### • Georgia Power Company, Economic Development Division

Georgia Power is the oldest economic developer in Georgia and includes an Economic Development Division whose primary role is to attract businesses to the state. Georgia Power's primary local contact for economic development issues is generally with the Chamber of Commerce. Georgia Power's main emphasis is heavy marketing of Georgia in general and responding to client's site needs by maintaining a current site inventory database. Georgia Power will provide communities with technical support to make changes necessary to attract and various funding sources available to help meet the cost of such improvements. Georgia Power's Community



Development Department also serves as a clearinghouse for communities to identify matching grants and other programs to plant trees, add fire hydrants or upgrade water and sewer infrastructure.

#### • Georgia Department of Economic Development (GDEcD)

The Georgia Department of Economic Development (GDEcD) is a state-funded agency mandated to serve as an economic development agent for the state's local jurisdictions. The GDEcD's primary purpose is to assist potential businesses considering locating in Georgia by identifying an optimal location for their operational needs. GDEcD also assists the movie industry in locating appropriate movie locations throughout the state. The identification of international markets for the export of Georgia goods and services is another duty of the GDEcD. In the event that a potential business is interested in the Washington County area, GDEcD's policy is to work with the Chamber of Commerce. GDEcD has a working relationship with utility companies, rail operators, banks, universities, and other agencies with resources to facilitate economic development. GDEcD maintains a substantial computer-based inventory of commercial and industrial sites throughout Georgia.

## **Resources-Programs and Tools**

#### • Georgia Business Expansion Support Act

In 1994, the State passed legislation for tax credits against state income taxes to encourage economic development in Georgia. Some of the programs are targeted to specific industry groups (Industry, tourism, and resources & development) while others apply to all employers. Below is a summary of various available programs.

- ➢ Job Tax Credit. Applies to business or headquarters of a business engaged in manufacturing, warehousing and distribution, processing, tourism, and research and development industries. Does not include retail businesses.
- Investment Tax Credit. Allows a corporation, which has operated an existing manufacturing facility in the state for the previous three years, to obtain a credit against income liability.
- *Retraining Tax Credit.* Any employer in Washington County that provides retraining for employees is eligible for a tax credit equal to 25% of the costs of retraining per full-time student up to \$500.
- Child Care Credit. Any employer in Washington County that provides or sponsors childcare for employees is eligible for a tax credit of up to 50% of the direct cost of operation to the employer. The credit cannot exceed more than 50% of the taxpayer's total state income tax liability for that taxable year.
- Manufacturing Machinery Sales Tax Exemption. Provides for exemption from sales and use tax for manufacturing equipment.
- Primary Material Handling Sales Tax Exemption. Provides for exemption from sales and use tax on purchases of primary material handling equipment



which is used directly for the handling and movement of tangible personal property in a new or expanding warehouse or distribution facility or expansion is worth \$10 million or more.

Electricity Exemption. Electricity purchased for the direct use in manufacturing a product is exempt from sales taxes when the total cost of the electricity accounts for over 50% or more of all the materials used in marketing the product. It allows full exemption on the sales tax and is available for new and existing firms.

## • Financing Mechanisms

*Community Improvement Districts:* The Georgia Constitution provides for a special tax district called Community Improvement Districts (CID). This type of district can be created only upon the petition of property owners, and is managed by a board that includes representatives of the property owners and the County. Under CID, only nonresidential property is subject to the special tax and the funds must be used only for certain public facilities, such as roads and water and sewer utilities. Funds may be used for both capital and operating expenditures and the special nature of the Act allows the basis of taxation to be the development density or impact of a property as well as its assessed value. The Act also allows debt financing without referendum since a majority of the property owners (who must own at least 75% of the properties by value) must request the CID designation. CIDs enjoy a lower interest rate due to their quasi-governmental status and their debts do not affect a city's debt limit.

*Enterprise Community:* Under an Urban Enterprise Zone, specific areas are delineated where deteriorating physical or market conditions have resulted in little or no investment in property improvements or development. Within an Urban Enterprise Zone, if a property owner renovates or develops a site, the City's property taxes can be frozen at the pre-improvement level for a specified time period, then rise in annual steps to full value taxation at the end of the period. This approach is useful in encouraging investment that would otherwise continue to decline through depreciation.

*Tax Incremental Financing:* TIF allows property taxes to rise as sites are developed or improved, but directs all or some of the increase over and above the preimprovement tax level to public facilities that have been built to support the area's revitalization. In effect, government assumes the risk through provision of public improvements up front and then pays itself back through higher tax collection increment while assuring that the pre-improvement tax collections continue to go into the general fund. This approach can be very useful in a carefully controlled revitalization effort for a deteriorating area, where future renovations and development can be reasonably anticipated but are dependent on a general improvement to the area.

*Development Impact Fees:* Fair and reasonable development impact fees can be a useful tool in encouraging economic development when the development community recognizes that adequate public facilities are important in attracting buyers and tenants to their developments. This maintains the long-range health of the community and the continued ability for development to be profitable.



## Assessment

## **Current and Historic Employment**

Total employment in Washington County has increased by almost 15% in the past decade. The local economy is driven by services, mining, and state and local government employment which account for over 44% of total employment. Since 1990, the manufacturing sector declined from 13.97% of total employment to 6.98%, while the service sector increased from 14.3% to 17.73%. The decline in the relative importance of manufacturing and corresponding increase in services mirrors a statewide trend underway since 1990. Over 28.6% of the Georgia population is employed in the service sector, up from 23.7% in 1990, and less than 13% of the statewide economy is manufacturing based.

In addition to manufacturing, farm employment in Washington County has continually declined in the past decade with the loss of over 55 of those sector jobs. Employment growth since 1990 includes agricultural services (66.67%), transportation, communications, & public utilities (66.76%), retail trade (7.66%), and finance, insurance, & real estate (36.99%). However, not all sector growth is equally important. Despite high percentage growth rates, combined to account for less than 45 of total employment.

Statewide, total employment increased by over 31.6% since 1990. All sectors recorded growth with the exception of farm (-9.3%), mining (-10.1%), and federal government (-10.4%) employment. The fastest growth rates were in retail trade (34.6%), FIRE (41.2%), and services (58.7%). Together, these sectors combined for 70.6% of the state's 1,169,360 new jobs since 1990. Statewide sector employment figures clearly highlight a shift to a more knowledge based economy.

To understand why some sectors of the Washington County economy are growing wile others are declining, we need to examine broader trends in the local, regional, and state economy. For a sector like retail trade, there is a direct one-to-one relationship. In the absence of tourism or significant through traffic, the sector is solely dependent on the resident population. The retail trade sector has increased according to both local and statewide population growth.

The decline of manufacturing sector employment in Washington County is subject to broader dynamics and mirrors the decline of manufacturing in the region. Since 1990, the CSRA region lost over 5,000 jobs, a decline of over 17.6%. Overseas outsourcing, plant consolidation, and competition from other states aggressively pursuing manufacturing explains the trend. Traditionally, the manufacturing sector in Washington County and the CSRA was lower-skilled. The jobs are more easily consolidated or outsourced than the more skilled manufacturing jobs the region lacks. Similarly, the Washington County farm sector has declined in proportion to statewide figures. The cyclical nature of the sector and unwillingness of younger residents to farm has resulted in lower interest in the employment sector.

# **Projected Employment**



Trends highlighted in past employment trends are projected through 2025. Washington County will experience most of its job growth in services and TCP. Together, these sectors will account for 2,232 of the 3,107 net new jobs through 2025. This is in line with significant statewide growth rates across those sectors. The continuing projected decline in manufacturing (from 6.98% in 2000 to 4.01% in 2025) and an increase in services (from 17.73% in 2000 to 22.49% in 2025) in Washington County highlight a convergence with the statewide economy.

# Earnings

Sector earnings paint a different picture of the Washington County economy. Unlike sector employment, earnings of most sectors have increased since 1990 even though total employment numbers have dropped in those sectors, in some cases significantly. In 2000, mining accounted for 35.78% of total earnings, more than double than the sector's share of total employment. Services, on the other hand, accounted for 10.9%, 6.83% below its share of total employment.

Current statewide averages, by contrast, show earnings that are more in line with employment rates. Mining, for example, accounted for .27% of earnings and .20% of total employment. Similarly, services accounted for 26.7% and 28.6% of total employment.

The earnings-employment imbalance occurring in Washington County suggests that the job losses in some sectors are not adequately balanced by jobs created in others. That is, the county is loosing higher paying mining jobs while gaining lower-paying service jobs. Given that the service sector is projected to grow faster than all other sectors, total employment growth rates are masking a potential downslide in Washington County's overall economic health.

# Wages

In 1999, the average weekly wage paid in Washington County was \$575, higher than neighboring Jefferson (\$452) and Glascock (\$460) Counties but lower than the state average of \$629. Since 1990, wages in Washington County have increased 48.58%, faster than neighboring Jefferson (40.37%) and Hancock (44.79%), and the statewide average (48.3%). Within sectors, wages are rising at different paces within Washington County and state economies. In Washington County, mining wages have increased by 58.32% since 1990 while statewide the increase was triple that of its 1990 level. In retail trade, Washington County wages rose 57.69% while the statewide wages increased a more modest 12.3%.

Assuming that projected wage earnings mirror per capita and average household income projections, wages will continue to remain significantly below the state average. The lower cost of living in Washington County and the municipalities is always a factor. Current median property values and rents are substantially less in Washington County and the municipalities than the statewide average. Since 1990, housing median property values have outpaced wage increases, rendering concerns over housing affordability.



Various types of training are required for higher paying positions. State government employment, associated almost exclusively with the Washington County school system, requires college education. All teaching and most administrative staff require an appropriate degree prior to commencing employment and continuing education to meet state licensing requirements. Augusta State University and Georgia College and State University are the primary avenues for this type of training. Certain government jobs, as well as some manufacturing positions, require vocational or technical school training, available from technical colleges located within Washington County as well as in neighboring counties.

# **Personal Income**

Approximately 20% of personal income in Washington County is transfer payments, a rate nearly double the state average. Since 1990, transfer payments have increased only slightly in Washington County. The area of income that has outpaced all other sources of income has been dividends, interest, & rent (244.30%), which is also almost double the state average. In 2000, wages accounted for 61.15% of all income, which is on-par with the state average.

Dependence on transfer payments will increase by 89.20% through 2025 and over 20% of Washington County's residents will be dependent on transfer payments. A relatively high rate of transfer payments means that many residents are on fixed-incomes and affected disproportionately by increases in housing.

Furthermore, household size is projected to decrease while the total population is expected to increase, indicating a new demand for housing. The next section will examine housing more closely but unless new housing unit increases keep pace with these demographic shifts, residents dependent on transfer payments will be more vulnerable should the demand for housing increase.

# Major Economic Activities

The Washington County are has seen an increase in economic activity since 1970. The county's transportation infrastructure and proximity to Interstate 20 and large metro areas provides economic development opportunities. The county has been proactive in the areas of planning and providing the necessary infrastructure to attract industry.

Washington County and the municipalities recognize the need to diversify the local economy but also understand the need to match employment opportunities with the skill level of the population. Skills and education data highlight two extremes found in Washington County. On the one hand, over 31% of Washington County residents have not completed high school. On the other hand, county residents attend Georgia public technical colleges at a rate higher than that of the state average. Future economic development policy will therefore



need to adhere to a 2-prong strategy: continue to recruit and expand the local economy's manufacturing base while nurturing sectors that are higher wage and higher skilled.

Manufacturing benefits two distinct groups of workers: low-skilled workers (manual labor) and high skilled technology workers, whose ranks within the sector continue to rise statewide. This highlights the important role manufacturing can play in the local economy. It can at once provide relatively high wage employment opportunities for low skilled residents that are otherwise unemployable or employable only in the low wage service sector, while simultaneously providing opportunities for higher skilled and paid technology graduates. For this reason, Washington County should continue to expand its manufacturing base.

Diversifying the economic base will require focusing on sectors that are growing and the ability to match required skills with the local population. TCP and FIRE are projected to increase in employment growth through 2025. There are primarily two reasons why these sectors should be encouraged to grow. First, the disproportionately high wages and sector earnings they provide the local TCP, for example, accounts for 6.10% of total employment but community. accounts for 12% of total earnings. Second, the skill level of the population matches the sector. As noted, Washington County high school graduates attend Georgia public and technical colleges at a rate that is comparable to the state The supply of graduates is therefore available for these jobs. average. Washington County should nourish these sectors by working with the existing businesses to expand to the base and promoting Washington County as a viable location for TCP and FIRE.

# **Special and Unique Opportunities**

Throughout Georgia, tourism is the second most important industry and a viable economic development strategy for many rural communities. Washington County and the municipalities are in the process of pursuing various strategies aimed at promoting tourism and stimulating to the local economy. These efforts include working with other community in establishing a Civil War Heritage Trail and participating in the Georgia Scenic Byways program. The purpose of both of these programs is to capitalize on unique historical and scenic qualities that offer Washington County regional, state, and national exposure. Participation in such programs should continue and more opportunities should be sought.

Aggressive marketing campaigns have succeeded in small communities throughout the state. Washington County and the municipalities are well positioned to capitalize on tourism. Numerous historical and recreation qualities provide good tourism opportunities. Sandersville has applied for numerous state and federal grants aimed at enhancing potential tourist areas such as the Sandersville downtown historic district.



# LABOR FORCE ASSESSMENT

# **Employment by Occupation**

Employment occupation in Washington County highlights variations with the state and historical economy. The state and national economies are similar in their distribution of occupations and diverse. Occupational groupings in Washington County demonstrate the dominant role of mining in the local economy. Over 25% of county occupations are in precision production, craft & repair (PPR) and machine operators, assistants & inspectors (MAIO), a percentage that is over 40% higher than the state and national average. Statewide and nationally these occupations make up 19.85% and 17.94% respectively. By contrast, occupational groups associated with the knowledge-based economy such as executive, administrative, professional and technical (EAPT), make up over a third of state and national employment but less than 25% in Washington County and the municipalities.

PPR and transportation & material moving (TMM) remain very important to the Washington County economy. By contrast, the state and national economy has shifted to less labor-intensive occupations. Statewide, EAPT occupations increased 8% since 1990 while nationally these same occupations increased 7%. As noted, the Washington County economy is slowly converging with the state and national economies. Between 1990 and 2000, the number of Washington County jobs in EAPT increased by 8.98%. Should these occupations keep growing at this pace locally, Washington County and the municipalities should approximate the state and national occupational percentages by 2025.

There are two education attainment statistics that are important in determining whether occupation requirements can be met: overall education attainment and higher education rates. The overall education attainment in Washington County has continually improved in the past two decades. In 1980, 62.03% of residents did not have a high school diploma. By 2000, this rate dropped to 31.72% but will need to continue to decline for residents to access these occupations. Current higher education attainment rates appear sufficient to accommodate the increase in higher skilled occupation groups. Over 30% of Washington County high school graduates attend Georgia public colleges and technical schools. Historically, this supply was far greater than the demand for high skilled occupations. As noted in the population element, the lack of appropriate opportunities is directly related to exodus of younger age groups. Should higher skilled occupations continue to increase at historic paces, the supply of skilled employees will be sufficient to meet the needs of higher skilled occupations.

In the past two decades, there has been a trend among higher paying occupations to require certification and continuing education. Currently, Washington County residents in these occupations need to attend Augusta State University, Georgia College & State University, and the University of Georgia to meet these needs. This includes workers ranging from teachers to public administrators. Traditionally, local governments and private employers in these occupation groups have provided flexible work schedules to accommodate certification and continuing education. Given the small pool of such workers, this training is sufficient to meet local needs.



# **Employment Status**

Labor force participation in Washington County and the municipalities is below the state average. In 2000, labor force participation in the county was 53.67%, slightly higher than Harrison (44.93%) and Tennille (50.67%); considerably higher than Davisboro (12.67%); and below Deepstep (54.55%), Oconee (61.94%), Riddleville (61.54%), and Sandersville (57.98%). By contrast, state and national labor force participation rates are 66.1% and 63.9% respectively. Since 1990, the total number of residents in the labor force declined by 1.035 in Washington County, 21.67% in Deepstep, 3.53% in Sandersville, and 13.91% in Tennille. By contrast, the labor force participation increased by 10.78% Davisboro, 64.52% in Oconee, and 210.53% in Riddleville. State and national rates declined by less than 25 in that same period. On average, the county's various labor force participation indicators are ten percentage points below that of neighboring counties and the state and national averages.

# **Unemployment Rates**

Unemployment rates in Washington County have been competitive with neighboring counties and the state average. 5% of county residents are unemployed, compared to 9.2% in Jefferson County, 9.5% in Hancock County, and 4% statewide. The unemployment rate has improved by historic standards. As recently as 1997, 9% of Washington County residents were unemployed.

# ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES

## **Economic Development Agencies**

The Washington County Chamber of Commerce promote the county and municipalities for economic development purposes. Coordination with Georgia Power, Georgia Department of Economic Development, and the CSRA Regional Development Center ensures that multiple agencies are assisting in those efforts. Existing support programs and tools are sufficient for the county's continued economic development. However, the county will need to pursue marketing and development efforts more aggressively. In particular, the county should supplement existing agencies assistance with its own programs. The regional agencies are responsible for multiple jurisdictions. As such, they are incapable of meeting all of Washington County's development needs. More resources need to be made available to the Chamber.

Washington County residents have unprecedented access to education, job training and workforce development opportunities. In a rapidly changing economy where the opening or closing of a single plant can drastically change the community's economic base, local officials will need to monitor these programs more closely and coordinate extensively with area schools and technical colleges, as well as appropriate workforce development authorities.

# **Economic Development Programs and Tools**

Economic Development programs and tools are used to recruit industries, strengthen businesses and stimulate the economy among others. For Washington County and the municipalities, some programs are more effective than others. Job tax and investment



credits and manufacturing machinery sales tax exemptions are clearly effective as they relate directly to the types of industries in the community and provide incentives for existing industries to continue and expand their operations. These programs have been used effectively in the past and will continue to be used. The electricity exemption is less important as there are few industries in Washington County where electricity accounts for 50% or more of all materials used in manufacturing products.

Incentives provided to industrial recruits through the Georgia Business Expansion Act provide good incentives for development but these incentives are offered statewide. As such, Washington County and the municipalities enjoy no competitive advantage. Washington County is already at a disadvantage as other, wealthier jurisdictions already have the sites, water and sewage infrastructure needed to attract prospects in place. The various One Georgia programs provide funding for site development and infrastructure, and are vital resources needed by the county to remain competitive in recruiting industry.

Community improvement districts, enterprise communities, tax increment financing, and development impact fees are all important and useful economic growth tools that cities in Washington County can use to develop or redevelop downtowns or city sectors. However, not all of these tools are effective. Development impact fees, for example, are useful when demand for development is high and local governments have the luxury negotiating. In Washington County and the municipalities, the current economic realities are not conducive to development impact fees. Similarly, community improvement districts are useful when businesses absorb the extra cost. The struggling downtowns throughout the cities in Washington County would not benefit from this tool. To date, the majority of municipalities in Washington County have relied on state and federal funds, and the efforts of private citizens and civic groups associated with the Main Street and National Register for Historic Preservation programs to revitalize downtown areas. This approach has been highly successful and should continue.

Entrepreneurship is actively encouraged by the Chamber of Commerce, which provide training and support. Chamber members receive periodic training from a variety of sources, including the Georgia Entrepreneur and Small Business Coordinating Network, an alliance of representatives from state agencies and academic outreach unite involved in entrepreneurship.

# **Educational and Training Opportunities**

Education and training opportunities appear throughout the assessment (i.e. major economic activities, employment by occupation, etc.) as the assessment of those sections requires inclusion of educational and training opportunities as part of the analysis.

# GOALS, OBJECTIVES and POLICIES

**Goal 1:** Increase education level and training of labor force.

Policy 1-1: Coordinate education efforts with Sandersville Technical College and schools in the surrounding counties.



**Goal 2:** Attract commercial and industrial development county-wide, especially in municipalities dependant upon Sandersville for employment.

Policy 2-2: Partner with the Washington County Chamber of Commerce



## INTRODUCTION

The housing element is an important part of the overall comprehensive plan as housing accounts for a significant share of land use in Washington County, and is vital to economic development efforts.

The purpose of the housing section is to inventory and assess the existing housing stock and to formulate a set of goals, objectives and policies to ensure adequate housing for future populations. The private sector has and will continue to play the primary role in providing housing. However, Washington County and the municipalities can facilitate the process through their statutory and regulatory power.

The Governor's Office has formulated a set of statewide planning goals that include Quality Community Goals to coordinate local government planning through the statewide under each of the comprehensive plan elements. One of the goals directly relates to housing: "To ensure that residents of the state have access to adequate and affordable housing." In accordance with the overall goal, the state has developed a Quality Community Objective to help direct local governments in formulating local goals, policies and objectives. The statewide objective is: "Quality housing and a range of housing size, cost, and density should be provided in each community, to make it possible for all who work in the community to also live in the community."

Washington County and the municipalities will work within the framework of the state initiative to support goals, objectives, and policies governing the future development of housing that meets the needs identified in the inventory and assessment components of this plan section.

# **Housing Supply**

**Table H-1** identifies the existing local housing stock and includes historical data for comparison with state averages. Since 1980, the total number of housing units increased 26.07%, less than half the state average of 63%. Approximately 62.74% of the current housing stock is stick built single-family units, with mobile homes or trailers accounting for 29.48%. The percentage of single-family units declined significantly in the past two decades. In 1980, single-family units accounted for 79.42% of the total housing stock, over 15% more than in 2000. The number of multi-family units increased from 585 to 648 in that same period.

The percentage of single-family units statewide has declined 8.7% since 1980. Multi-family unit levels in Washington County have historically been low compared to the state average but since 1980 have increased 10.8%.

The number of mobile home units in Washington County has increased steadily in the past two decades, from 11.72% of total housing stock in 1980 to 29.48% in 2000. By contrast, the number of mobile home units statewide has increased by less than 5% in that same period. In the past decade, some neighboring jurisdictions have adopted strict mobile home ordinances that led many mobile home owners to locate in Washington County. Because the county has not adopted any regulations limiting the size, age, type, and location of mobile homes, this trend is projected to continue in the future.



Table H-1: Wa	shingto	n County ai	nd Muni	icipalities T	ypes of	Housing						
	1	980	1	1990	2	2000						
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%						
		١	Washing	gton County	y							
Single-Family	5246	79.42%	5130	69.17%	5224	62.74%						
Multi-Family	585	8.86%	636	8.58%	648	7.78%						
Mobile Home	774	11.72%	1650	22.25%	2455	29.48%						
Total	6605	100.00%	7416	100.00%	8327	100.00%						
			Dav	visboro								
Single-Family	179	84.83%	160	84.21%	88	55.70%						
Multi-Family	14	6.64%	2	1.05%	1	0.63%						
Mobile Home	18	8.53%	28	14.74%	69	43.67%						
Total	211	100.00%	190	100.00%	158	100.00%						
		Deepstep										
Single-Family	47	83.93%	37	69.81%	39	68.42%						
Multi-Family	1	1.78%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%						
Mobile Home	8	14.29%	16	30.19%	18	31.58%						
Total	56	100.00%	53	100.00%	57	100.00%						
		Harrison										
Single-Family	136	80.00%	142	79.33%	157	75.85%						
Multi-Family	5	2.94%	6	3.35%	5	2.42%						
Mobile Home	29	17.06%	31	17.32%	45	21.73%						
Total	170	100.00%	179	100.00%	207	100.00%						
			0	conee	,							
Single-Family	86	88.66%	76	84.44%	67	72.04%						
Multi-Family	2	2.06%	0	0.00%	8	8.60%						
Mobile Home	9	9.28%	14	15.56%	18	19.36%						
Total	97	100.00%	90	100.00%	93	100.00%						
		•	Rid	dleville								
Single-Family	57	89.06%	35	81.40%	35	72.92%						
Multi-Family	0	0.00%	2	4.65%	2	4.17%						
Mobile Home	7	10.94%	6	13.95%	11	22.91%						
Total	64	100.00%	43	100.00%	48	100.00%						
			Sanc	lersville								
Single-Family	1640	76.56%	1678	69.89%	1931	71.57%						
Multi-Family	379	17.69%	449	18.70%	476	17.64%						
Mobile Home	123	5.75%	274	11.41%	291	10.79%						
Total	2142	100.00%	2401	100.00%	2698	100.00%						
	Tinnille											
Single-Family	545	82.58%	505	76.40%	531	71.37%						
Multi-Family	56	8.48%	80	12.10%	81	10.89%						
Mobile Home	59	8.94%	76	11.50%	132	17.74%						
Total	660	100.00%	661	100.00%	744	100.00%						



Table H-1 Continued											
Georgia Housing Stock, 1980-2000											
1980 1990 2000											
	Total	Total%Total%									
Single-family	1,525,070	75.80%	1,712,259	64.90%	2,201,467	67.10%					
Multi-family	334,622	16.60%	598,271	22.70%	681,019	20.80%					
Mobile Home	152,948	7.60%	327,888	12.40%	399,251	12.10%					
Total     2,012,640     100.00%     2,638,418     100.00%     3,281,737     100.00%											
Source: U.S. Bureau of Census											

All the cities in Washington County have experienced similar housing trends since 1980. In all cases, the number and percentage of single-family units declined while the share of mobile home units increased. The most dramatic change occurred in Davisboro where the percentage of single-family units dropped from 84.83% to 55.70%. Throughout, the number of multi-family units has increased as a result of affordable and public housing initiatives undertaken in the 1980s.

# Age and Condition of Housing Supply

**Table H-2** provides data on the age of the housing stock within Washington County and the municipalities. With the exception of homes built prior to 1939, the age of the housing stock in Washington County and the municipalities is on par with the CSRA and state averages. Approximately 7.5% of CSRA homes and 5.9% of Georgia homes were built prior to 1939, compared to 15.24% in Washington County, 28.94% in Davisboro, 35.85% in Deepstep, 20.12% in Harrison, 24.45% in Oconee, 41.86% in Riddleville, 14.67% in Sandersville, and 23.45% in Tennille.

Over 75% of Washington County's housing supply was constructed prior to 1980. The largest decade of housing construction occurred in the 1970s when over 25% of housing units were built. Nearly 15% of Sandersville's housing stock was constructed prior to 1940. Sandersville experienced a slow but steady increase in housing through 1979, after which only 199 new units were constructed. In Riddleville, 100% of the housing stock was constructed prior to 1990. It is important to remember that the data in this portion of the assessment is dated prior to 1995.



			Table	e H-2: Housi	ing Stock by	Туре			
	Year	1989 to 1990	1985 to 1988	1980 to 1984	1970 to 1979	1960 to 1969	1959 to 1960	1940 to 1949	1939 or earlier
				Wash	ington Cou	nty	1	•	Į
Total	7416	241	805	786	1940	1210	743	561	1130
%	100.00%	3.25%	10.85%	10.60%	26.16%	16.32%	10.02%	7.56%	15.24%
				Ι	Davisboro	• •	• •	• •	
Total	190	4	14	16	31	22	37	11	55
%	100.00%	2.11%	7.37%	8.42%	16.32%	11.58%	19.47%	5.79%	28.94%
				]	Deepstep				
Total	53	2	4	7	17	2	2	0	19
%	100.00%	3.77%	7.55%	13.21%	32.08%	3.77%	3.77%	0.00%	35.85%
				]	Harrison				
Total	179	4	6	16	59	34	20	4	36
%	100.00%	2.23%	3.36%	8.94%	32.96%	18.99%	11.17%	2.23%	20.12%
					Oconee	•	•	•	
Total	90	3	2	3	22	11	14	13	22
%	100.00%	3.33%	2.22%	3.33%	24.44%	12.22%	15.56%	14.45%	24.45%
				R	ddleville	•	•	•	
Total	43	0	3	0	10	10	2	0	18
%	100.00%	0.00%	6.98%	0.00%	23.26%	23.26%	4.65%	0.00%	41.86%
				Sa	ndersville				
Total	2401	60	215	199	614	454	280	227	352
%	100.00%	2.50%	8.95%	8.29%	25.57%	18.91%	11.66%	9.45%	14.67%
					Tennille	•	•	•	
Total	661	12	49	85	104	92	100	64	155
%	100.00%	1.82%	7.41%	12.86%	15.73%	13.92%	15.13%	9.68%	23.45%
				Central Sa	vannah Riv	er Area			
Total	178,556	4,612	16,778	18,484	37,533	36,810	24,345	26,654	13,350
%	100.00%	2.60%	9.40%	10.30%	21.00%	20.60%	13.60%	14.90%	7.50%
				Stat	e of Georgia	a			
Total	3,006,369	108,607	387,634	348,008	669,953	558,943	376,827	384,397	172,014
Source:	U.S. Bureau of	the Census							

The availability of plumbing facilities and percentage of homes built prior to 1939 are often used as indicators of substandard housing. Overall, the housing conditions throughout Washington County and the municipalities is adequate and comparable to state levels (**Table H-3**). This represents a significant improvement, particularly for the county, which managed to cut the number of housing units without complete plumbing facilities from 18.00% in 1980 to 2.59% in 2000.



Table H-3: Housing Conditions										
	Lac	k Plumbi	ing	Com	plete Plun	nbing				
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000				
Washington County	1193	366	210	5434	7050	8117				
Davisboro	52	28	4	131	162	154				
Deepstep	1	4	0	53	49	57				
Harrison	28	12	7	141	167	200				
Oconee	17	0	3	80	90	90				
Riddleville	7	4	2	55	39	46				
Sandersville	242	33	36	1932	2368	2662				
Tennille	62	19	11	599	642	733				
	Lack	Plumbin	ıg, %	Comp	lete Plum	bing, %				
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000				
Washington County	18.00%	4.94%	2.59%	82.00%	95.06%	97.41%				
Davisboro	28.42%	14.74%	2.53%	71.58%	85.26%	97.47%				
Deepstep	1.85%	7.58%	0.00%	98.15%	92.42%	100.00%				
Harrison	16.57%	6.70%	3.38%	83.43%	93.30%	96.62%				
Oconee	17.53%	0.00%	3.33%	82.47%	100.00%	96.67%				
Riddleville	11.29%	9.32%	4.35%	88.71%	90.68%	95.65%				
Sandersville	11.13%	1.37%	1.33%	88.87%	98.63%	98.67%				
Tennille	9.38%	2.87%	1.48%	90.62%	97.13%	98.52%				
CSRA	NA	2.10%	1.50%	NA	97.90%	98.50%				
Georgia	NA	1.10%	0.90%	NA	98.90%	99.10%				
Source: U.S. Bureau of the C	Census									

## **Occupancy and Tenure**

Housing occupancy and tenure characteristics are important variables in determining the adequacy of the existing housing stock. Owner-occupied housing in Washington County and the municipalities is higher than the CSRA and state averages (**Table H-4**), reflecting traditionally higher rates of ownership is rural areas. The percentage of owner-occupied housing traditionally has remained relatively stable in Washington County and Sandersville. The relative decline of owner-occupied units in Riddleville highlights the substantial growth in multi-family and affordable housing units.

Vacant homes and apartments units are necessary to provide a choice of location and price for housing consumers. A healthy vacancy rate is approximately 5% and fluctuates according to the housing market. Too few vacant units drive up prices and limit housing choices, while too many reduces the demand for new units. With the exception of Deestep, Oconee, and Riddleville, vacancy rates throughout Washington County are above the CSRA and state averages. In 2000, the vacancy rate in Washington County was 12% and ranges from 0% to 18.8% in the municipalities. In the past decade, vacancy rates declined in Davisboro, Deepstep, Oconee, and Riddleville but increased countywide, Harrison, Sandersville, and Tennille. The CSRA and state averages dropped slightly in that same period.



## HOUSING

The owner vacancy rate throughout Washington County and the municipalities is below 6%, with the exception of Harrison (16.42%), in line with CSRA (7.9%) and state (8.4%) averages. Since a 5% vacancy rate is often cited as necessary for a healthy rental market, this suggests that supply for rental units is satisfied.

	Table H-	4: Occupan	cy and Tenu	re of Ho	ousing, 19	80-2000			
	0	ccupied Un	Va	acancy Ra	ites	Owner-Occupied			
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000
Washington County	6076	6739	7435	NA	10.05%	12.00%	68.93%	72.04%	74.05%
Davisboro	166	157	133	NA	21.02%	18.80%	62.05%	61.15%	88.72%
Deepstep	45	46	53	NA	15.22%	7.55%	82.22%	73.91%	90.57%
Harrison	154	155	175	NA	15.48%	18.29%	78.57%	83.22%	64.00%
Oconee	89	75	91	NA	20.00%	2.20%	87.64%	89.33%	96.70%
Riddleville	55	33	48	NA	30.30%	0.00%	70.91%	78.79%	58.33%
Sandersville	2069	2244	2356	NA	7.00%	14.52%	64.52%	65.95%	62.86%
Tennille	624	617	630	NA	7.13%	18.10%	58.97%	57.21%	62.22%
CSRA	117,685	139,071	158,840	NA	13.10%	12.40%	65.10%	65.70%	68.40%
Georgia	1,871,700	2,366,600	3,006,400	7.00%	10.30%	8.40%	60.40%	58.20%	67.50%

Table H-4: Occupancy and Tenure of Housing, 1980-2000 Continued										
	Owner Vacancy %	<b>Renter-Occupied</b>			Renter Vacancy %	Owner-Renter Ratio				
	2000	1980	1990	2000	2000	1980	1990	2000		
Washington County	2.69%	31.07%	27.96%	25.94%	8.62%	NA	NA	2.69		
Davisboro	5.60%	37.95%	38.85%	11.28%	0.00%	NA	NA	NA		
Deepstep	0.00%	17.78%	26.09%	9.43%	0.00%	NA	NA	NA		
Harrison	16.42%	21.43%	16.77%	36.00%	5.97%	NA	NA	5.5		
CSRA	2.10%	34.90%	34.30%	31.60%	7.90%	1.89	1.91	2.17		
Georgia	2.20%	32.00%	31.50%	32.50%	8.40%	1.85	1.85	2		

## **Seasonal Units**

As can be seen in the Seasonal Housing Units table, there is not a significant seasonal housing population to even elicit a discussion.

## **Cost of Housing**

The cost of housing in Washington County and the municipalities has increased slightly but remains significantly below CSRA and state median values (**Table H-6**). The median property value of a Washington County home in 2000 was \$55,900, slightly lower than Deepstep, Riddleville, Sandersville, and Tennille but higher

Table H-5: Seasonal Housing									
	1990	2000							
Washington County	44	155							
Davisboro	1	1							
Deepstep	3	1							
Harrison	0	0							
Oconee	0	2							
Riddleville	0	1							
Sandersville	1	11							
Tennille	1	4							
TOTAL	50	175							
Source: U.S. Bureau of the	e Census (	SF1)							



## HOUSING

than Davisboro, Harrison, and Oconee. By contrast the median home value in the CSRA was \$73,500 and \$100,600 statewide. Between 1980 and 2000, the median value of a home in Washington County increased by 259.8% and more than tripled in Riddleville. No municipality within Washington County saw median home values decrease. Median property values in the CSRA and throughout the statewide average have increased fourfold since 1980.

Median monthly rent throughout Washington County and the municipalities averages just over \$200, below the CSRA and state averages. This could be primarily to a lack of high-end apartment units for rent in the county and the high number of multi-family public housing units. The least expensive rent is located within Tennille.

Table H-6: Cost of Housing, 1980-2000										
	Media	n Propert	y Value	Owner	Owner	Owner				
	1980	1990	2000	% Change '80-'90	% Change '90-'00	% Change '80-'00				
Washington County	\$21,600	\$39,700	\$55,900	45.59%	28.98%	61.35%				
Davisboro	\$14,000	\$32,600	\$43,700	57.05%	25.40%	67.96%				
Deepstep	\$32,500	\$62,800	\$70,000	48.24%	10.28%	53.57%				
Harrison	\$14,100	\$24,300	\$33,000	41.97%	29.00%	57.27				
Oconee	\$13,300	\$27,500	\$28,900	51.63%	4.84%	53.97				
Riddleville	\$26,300	\$46,700	\$88,000	43.68%	46.93%	70.11%				
Sandersville	\$25,200	\$40,900	\$63,900	38.38%	35.99%	60.56%				
Tennille	\$18,600	\$34,700	\$57,400	46.39%	39.54%	67.59%				
CSRA	NA	\$59,999	\$73,500	N/A	18.36%	N/A				
Georgia	\$23,100	\$71,278	\$100,600	67.59%	29.15%	77.03%				
	Median Rent			Renter	Renter	Renter				
	1980	1990	2000	% Change '80-'90	% Change 90-'00	% Change '80-'00				
Washington County			<b>2000</b> \$240	Change	Change	Change				
Washington County Davisboro	1980	1990		Change '80-'90	Change 90-'00	Change '80-'00				
	<b>1980</b> \$54	<b>1990</b> \$237	\$240	Change '80-'90 77.22%	Change 90-'00 0.13%	<b>Change</b> <b>'80-'00</b> 77.50%				
Davisboro	<b>1980</b> \$54 \$49	<b>1990</b> \$237 \$152	\$240 \$225	Change       '80-'90       77.22%       67.76%	Change       90-'00       0.13%       32.44%	Change '80-'00 77.50% 78.22%				
Davisboro Deepstep	<b>1980</b> \$54 \$49 \$105	<b>1990</b> \$237 \$152 \$385	\$240 \$225 NA	Change       '80-'90       77.22%       67.76%       72.72%	Change       90-'00       0.13%       32.44%       N/A	Change '80-'00 77.50% 78.22% N/A				
Davisboro Deepstep Harrison	<b>1980</b> \$54 \$49 \$105 \$49	<b>1990</b> \$237 \$152 \$385 \$175	\$240 \$225 NA \$222	Change       '80-'90       77.22%       67.76%       72.72%       72.00%	Change       90-'00       0.13%       32.44%       N/A       21.17%	Change       '80-'00       77.50%       78.22%       N/A       77.93%				
Davisboro Deepstep Harrison Oconee	<b>1980</b> \$54 \$49 \$105 \$49 \$50	<b>1990</b> \$237 \$152 \$385 \$175 \$175	\$240 \$225 NA \$222 \$275	Change       '80-'90       77.22%       67.76%       72.72%       72.00%       71.42%	Change       90-'00       0.13%       32.44%       N/A       21.17%       36.36%	Change       '80-'00       77.50%       78.22%       N/A       77.93%       81.81%				
Davisboro Deepstep Harrison Oconee Riddleville	<b>1980</b> \$54 \$49 \$105 \$49 \$50 \$70	<b>1990</b> \$237 \$152 \$385 \$175 \$175 \$308	\$240 \$225 NA \$222 \$275 \$221	Change       '80-'90       77.22%       67.76%       72.72%       72.00%       71.42%       77.27%	Change 90-'00 0.13% 32.44% N/A 21.17% 36.36% -39.36%	Change '80-'00 77.50% 78.22% N/A 77.93% 81.81% 68.32%				
Davisboro Deepstep Harrison Oconee Riddleville Sandersville	1980       \$54       \$49       \$105       \$49       \$50       \$70       \$61	<b>1990</b> \$237 \$152 \$385 \$175 \$175 \$308 \$257	\$240 \$225 NA \$222 \$275 \$221 \$256	Change       '80-'90       77.22%       67.76%       72.72%       72.00%       71.42%       77.27%       76.26%	Change       90-'00       0.13%       32.44%       N/A       21.17%       36.36%       -39.36%       -0.39%	Change       '80-'00       77.50%       78.22%       N/A       77.93%       81.81%       68.32%       76.17%				
Davisboro Deepstep Harrison Oconee Riddleville Sandersville Tennille	1980       \$54       \$49       \$105       \$49       \$50       \$70       \$61       \$58	<b>1990</b> \$237 \$152 \$385 \$175 \$175 \$308 \$257 \$219	\$240 \$225 NA \$222 \$275 \$221 \$256 \$183	Change       '80-'90       77.22%       67.76%       72.72%       72.00%       71.42%       77.27%       76.26%       73.51%	Change       90-'00       0.13%       32.44%       N/A       21.17%       36.36%       -39.36%       -0.39%       -19.67%	Change       '80-'00       77.50%       78.22%       N/A       77.93%       81.81%       68.32%       76.17%       68.30%				



Ashington County 1081 1253	<b>Davisboro</b> 37	<b>Deepstep</b> 7	Harrison 62	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille
	37	7	62	20			
1253			02	39	1	360	128
1200	20	15	19	19	7	542	134
408	7	3	0	2	5	148	21
311	0	0	0	0	2	132	8
119	0	0	0	0	0	48	9
18	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
aı	311 119 18 0	311 0   119 0   18 0	311 0 0   119 0 0   18 0 0   0 0 0	311     0     0     0       119     0     0     0       18     0     0     0       0     0     0     0	311     0     0     0     0       119     0     0     0     0       18     0     0     0     0       0     0     0     0     0	311     0     0     0     0     2       119     0     0     0     0     0       18     0     0     0     0     0       0     0     0     0     0     0	311     0     0     0     0     2     132       119     0     0     0     0     0     48       18     0     0     0     0     0     6       0     0     0     0     0     0     6

# Housing Affordability

The term affordable housing is one of the most difficult to define because of the negative stigma attached to it. Affordable housing relates to the supply of housing available for the residents of a jurisdiction, whether they are highly educated professionals, minimum wage retail employees, or a special needs population. Assessing affordability is a measure of the housing cost burden that is placed on households. More specifically, federal standards consider a household to be cost-burdened if it pays more than 30% of its gross income on housing. A household is considered severely cost-burdened if it spends more than 50% of its gross income on housing.

**Table H-8** illustrates the percentages of households that are considered cost burdened (classified in the 30-49% category) and severely cost-burdened (classified in the 50%+ category) according to their household expense for both owner and renter-occupied units. Severely cost-burdened data is not available from the 1990 Census; therefore the percentage of cost-burdened households refers to those that spent greater than 30% of their gross income on housing costs. To better understand these tables, the following definitions are included:

**Rent 0-30%** - These are units with a current gross rent (rent and utilities) that are affordable to households with incomes at or below 30% of HUD Area Median Family Income. Affordable is defined as gross rent less than or equal to 30% of a household's gross income.

**Rent 30-50%** - These are units with a current gross rent that are affordable to households with incomes greater than 30% and less than or equal to 50% of HUD Area Median Family Income.

**Rent 50-80%** - These are units with a current gross rent that are affordable to households with incomes greater than 50% and less than or equal to 80% of HUD Area Median Family Income.

**Rent** > 80% - These are units with a current gross rent that are affordable to



#### HOUSING

households with incomes above 80% of HUD Area Median Family Income.

**Value 0-50%** - These are homes with values affordable to households with incomes at or below 50% of HUD Area Median Family Income. Affordable is defined as annual owner costs less than or equal to 30% of annual gross income. Annual owner costs are estimated assuming the cost of purchasing a home at the time of the Census based on the reported value of the home. Assuming a 7.9% interest rate and and national averages for annual utility costs, taxes, and hazard and mortgage insurance, multiplying income times 2.9 represents the value of a home a person could afford to purchase. For example, a household with an annual gross income of \$30,000 is estimated to be able to afford an \$87,000 home without having total costs exceed 30% of their annual household income.

**Value 50-80%** - These are units with a current value that are affordable to households with incomes greater than 50% and less than or equal to 80% of HUD Area Median Family Income.

**Value** > **80%** - These are units with a current value that are affordable to households with incomes above 80% of HUD Area Median Family Income.

		Table H-	8: Cost Bure	dened – Rer	ntal Units							
	Washington County	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille				
	<b>1. Rent</b> ≤ 30%											
# occupied units	782	24	4	24	4	10	243	124				
% occupants ≤ 30%	40.9	50	0	33.3	0	0	53.5	56.5				
% built before 1970	47.8	16.7	0	33.3	0	40	43.2	64.5				
% some problem	32.6	50	0	33.3	0	0	37	32.3				
# vacant for rent	120	0	0	4	0	0	59	20				
			<b>2. Rent</b> :	> <b>30% to</b> ≤ 5	0%							
# occupied units	763	8	4	30	0	8	383	94				
% occupants ≤ 50%	51.8	100	100	86.7	N/A	0	48	61.7				
% built before 1970	38	50	100	66.7	N/A	0	46.7	48.9				
% some problem	47.2	100	100	66.7	N/A	50	56.1	57.4				
# vacant for rent	60	0	0	0	0	0	50	10				
			3. Rent :	>50% to ≤ 8	0%							
# occupied units	334	4	0	12	0	0	194	20				



# HOUSING

	Table H-8 Continued											
			3. Rent :	>50% to ≤ 8	0%							
% occupants ≤ 80%	61.4	100	N/A	100	N/A	N/A	58.8	20				
% built before 1970	34.1	0	N/A	100	N/A	N/A	32.5	110				
% some problem	53.9	100	N/A	116.7	N/A	N/A	61.9	20				
# vacant for rent	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
4. Rent > 80%												
# occupied units	39	0	0	0	0	0	35	0				
# vacant for rent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	Cost Burdened – Owned Units											
	Washington County	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille				
1. Value ≤ 30%												
# occupied units	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
% occupants <=30%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
% built before 1970	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
% some problem	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
# vacant for sale	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
		r	2. Va	alue ≤ 50%		r	r					
# occupied units	2,830	79	26	93	80	12	647	201				
% occupants <=50%	33	44.3	0	43	30	0	28.7	34.3				
% built before 1970	34	43	46.2	64.5	45	66.7	53.2	58.2				
% some problem	9.7	10.1	0	8.6	0	0	6.8	6				
# vacant for sale	110	4	0	10	4	0	45	19				
			3. Value	> 50% to ≤ 8	80%							
# occupied units	1,203	30	20	34	12	12	322	121				
% occupants <=80%	29.2	26.7	20	35.3	0	0	31.4	38				
% built before 1970	42.6	53.3	80	47.1	100	100	56.5	70.2				



	Table H-8 Continued											
% some problem	6.2	0	0	11.8	0	0	7.5	3.3				
# vacant for sale	29	0	0	4	0	0	20	4				
			<b>4.</b> V	alue >80%								
# occupied units	1,443	24	28	0	4	18	445	80				
# vacant for sale	16	0	0	4	0	0	0	0				
Source: HUD S	SOCDS CHAS I	Data: Afforda	ability Mism	atch Output	t for All H	ouseholds						

Overall the county and cities is below state averages in terms of cost-burdened households, reflecting the low median owner-occupied housing values and low median contract rents. However, the county and cities exceed state averages for severely cost-burdened owner-occupied housing and both cities exceed the state average for severely cost-burdened renter-occupied housing. This can be partially explained by the relative prevalence of poverty in the population in comparison with state averages. **Table H-9** illustrates the poverty status statistics for each of the jurisdictions and compares with state rates.

		Table	H-9: Poverty S	status		
Jurisdiction	Families All Income Levels	Families in Poverty	% Families in Poverty	Individuals All Income Levels	Individuals in Poverty	% Individuals in Poverty
Washington County	5,400	1,008	18.7	19,839	4,543	22.9
Davisboro	102	33	32.4	476	228	47.9
Deepstep	41	2	4.9	121	4	3.3
Harrison	134	43	32.1	500	162	32.4
Oconee	87	15	17.2	286	95	33.2
Riddleville	44	0	0.0	172	5	2.9
Sandersville	1,573	382	24.3	6,159	1,691	27.5
Tennille	432	119	27.5	1,571	460	29.3
Georgia	2,126,360	210,138	9.9	7,959,649	1,033,793	13.0
Source: U.S. Burea	u of the census; 2000	)				

When compared with state statistics the county poverty rates appear high. As discussed in Chapter 3, Economic Development, the county does not have an abundance of highpaying professional jobs that are more predominant in larger metropolitan areas, which contributes to lower overall wages and may contribute to increasing poverty levels. However, the lower costs of living in the county should offset the lack of higher wage employment.



## ASSESSMENT

# **Housing Stock**

In the past two decades, the total number of housing units in Washington County and the municipalities has increased over 25%. While the housing growth rate was less than half the state average of 63%, both the statewide population increased as well as the population of Washington County.

Approximately 63% of the current housing supply is stick built single-family units, with mobile homes or trailers accounting for 29.48%. Single-family units that were the dominant form of housing units in the 1980s, have continually declined both in absolute numbers and in their percentage of the total housing supply. In 1980, nearly 80% of the housing stock was single-family stick built units. By 2000, the rate had dropped to less than 65%. A similar shift away from single-family units occurred in the municipalities. The most dramatic decline was in Davisboro where the percentage of single-family units declined from 84.8% to 55.7%.

Overall, the total number of single-family units contracted by 22 in Washington County and the municipalities from 1980 to 2000. While the number of multi-family units increased throughout Washington County, most notably in Sandersville where multifamily units account for nearly 20% of the total housing supply.

The growth of mobile home units has been explosive. Since 1980, over 1680 new units were added to the county's total housing supply and currently account for over 29% of the total housing stock. Even in Sandersville, where available infrastructure is conducive to stick-built housing developments, over 1 in 10 housing units are mobile homes.

A number of causes explain these housing trends. First, the decline in single-family units mirrors a statewide trend during the past two decades. Second, the increase in mobile home units is directly related to housing affordability. While the median value of a home in Washington County is \$55,900, mobile homes rarely exceed \$33,000. Countywide income levels highlight the increasing popularity of mobile housing. Close to a quarter of the countywide population falls below the poverty line and per capita and average household income levels are below the state averages. In short, mobile home units are partly a response to housing affordability issues.

Related to population and income indicators are local government ordinances and regulations. Only Sandersville and Tennille have adopted land use ordinances and instituted zoning. Sandersville is also the only jurisdiction that employees a full-time building inspector and code enforcement officer. Because the county has not adopted land use regulations limiting the size, age, type and location of mobile homes, and income levels are not projected to increase substantially over the next twenty years, the number of mobile home units is projected to increase through 2025.

For the local community, there are primarily two issues related to mobile home ownership. First, mobile homes do not provide sufficient revenue to offset the cost of infrastructure provided. Second, it is widely accepted that stick-built units encourage community stability because it limits mobility and increases a homeowner's financial stake in the community.



The range of housing types is not sufficiently diversified. There is still a dominant housing type like as in the 1980s when single-family units accounted for nearly 80% of the housing supply. This still holds true. Multi-family housing and condominiums provide more diversity in housing choices and are generally more affordable. The number of mobile homes accounts for a greater percentage of housing types than does multi-family housing in all jurisdictions except two; Sandersville and Tennille. In Sandersville, 18 percent of housing type is multi-family and only 6 percent of housing type, mobile homes. In Tennille, the ratios are equivalent with each housing type, mobile home and multi-family, accounting for approximately 8 percent, respectively, of the total stock. Both of these jurisdictions are the only cities that have comprehensive land use regulations, which regulate mobile homes and do not allow them within the city limits.

The existing supply of housing units in Washington County and the municipalities meets the community's current needs, but there is a predominance of substandard homes that needs to be addressed. The City of Sandersville is aggressively addressing this inadequacy by performing a comprehensive housing assessment, and aggressively enforcing city ordinances and building codes. Aside from the condition of the homes, it seems there should be an adequate supply of housing for the estimated population growth, but the jurisdictions would like to see a higher standard of living. Both the number of households and the number of total units has increased at a higher rate than the population. Between 1980 and 2000, the total population of Washington County grew 12.39%, while the housing units built increased by over 26%.

## Age and Condition of Housing

In general, the housing stock in Washington County and the municipalities is slightly older than the CSRA and state averages. However, less than 5.9% of Georgia's homes were built prior to 1939, Washington County (15.2%), Davisboro (28.9%), Deepstep (35.9%), Harrison (20.1%), Oconee (20.5%), Riddleville (41.9%), Sandersville (14.7%), and Tennille (23.45%).

Over 75% of Washington housing supply was constructed prior to 1980, relatively higher than the 56.6% for the CSRA and 49.9% for the state. The largest decade of housing construction took place in the 1970s, with over 20% of the housing units built then.

The high numbers and percentages of aged and aging housing units in Washington County and the municipalities is cause for great concern. These homes are in greater need of maintenance and just cannot last more than 60 years without encountering numerous problems. The vast majority of old houses do not have standard plumbing, electrical, and roofing that has been updated along with building codes and the normal advancement of society. A great majority of these older homes are in need of some kind of renovation, rehabilitation, or demolition as they are not providing safe and sanitary housing for the population. There are some houses that have been maintained over the years and add to the historic features and environment of the county and cities. These structures have been identified in the Cultural Resources section of this plan. With the poor population in Washington County, it can be concluded that most of the older homes in the county have not been maintained over the years and will need some type of rehabilitation. These types of structures are being identified with a comprehensive housing assessment in Sandersville to rid the city of dilapidated, older structures not



#### HOUSING

serving as standard homes for the population. Other cities and the county will follow suit one the housing action plan for Sandersville is completed and implemented.

Overall, the condition of the housing stock is adequate throughout the county and municipalities and very comparable to regional and state levels, which is not to say that is good. The following statistics do not take into affect the actual structural and aesthetic values of the homes. Comprehensive housing assessments are the only way to truly evaluate housing, and the City of Sandersville has identified substandard housing as an issue and is pursuing a housing assessment to determine the best method of raising awareness of this issue and battling the problem.

As of 1990, over 20% of the county's homes were built in the preceding twenty years. The lack of complete plumbing facilities in the county has declined from 18% in 1980 to 2.59% in 2000, and is comparable to the CSRA (1.5%) and statewide (0.9%) averages. Rates in the municipalities are similar to the county average. Although housing conditions have improved drastically since 1980, primarily because of the phasing out of older units and increased care by homeowners, there are still numerous that are of very poor condition.

#### Income and Housing Adequacy

The data for the housing supply in Washington County is difficult to compare with the CSRA and state averages due to the unavailability of current housing information, specifically with regard to the age of housing structures. The data that has been employed for this section of the assessment is the data that existed in 1990, so some significant changes may have been made since this information was assembled.

Concern with housing affordability lies within low income groups. Nearly 23 percent of Washington County's residents fall below the poverty line. The number of households earning less than \$29,999 per year in household income exceeds those earning mid-range income levels. The presence of multi-family, subsidized housing units throughout Washington County currently house a large share of low-income residents. Low incomes are consequently offset by the lower cost of living.

The community's non-resident workforce's housing needs are more complicated to quantify because of the assumption that they wish to reside in Washington County. The idea behind the statewide objective of "to make it possible for all who work in the community to also live in the community" relates primarily to communities in which the non-resident workforce commutes to areas where the cost of housing is unaffordable, not to rural jurisdictions where housing cost differentials are minimal from one county to another.

#### **Occupied Units**

Homeownership trends vary throughout the region. In the CSRA, homeownership has increased gradually since 1980, from 65.1% to 68.4% in 2000. This mirrors a statewide trend towards increased homeownership. Statewide, homeownership increased from 60.4% to 67.5% in the past two decades. In Washington County, the homeownership rate has increased from 68.9% in 1980 to 74% in 2000. The vast majority of municipalities experienced growth in homeownership rates with the exception of Riddleville, Sandersville, and Tennille between 1980 and 2000.



Homeownership trends are reflected in the owner to renter ratio. In the CSRA, there are 2.17 owners for every renter, up from 1.91 since 1980. Statewide, the ratio has increased from 1.89 to 2.17 in the past two decades. Due to lack of availability of information, the owner to renter ratio of Washington County can not be compared with past data, however the current level is 2.69, substantially higher than that of both the CSRA and state.

With the exception of Deepstep, the vacancy rates for the county and municipalities are above the state average suggesting a surplus in housing units.

The owner vacancy rate in Washington County is slightly above 2.5%, in line with CSRA and state averages. Renter vacancy rates in jurisdictions that have available rental units range from 5.9% in Harrison to 11.4% in Sandersville. The renter vacancy rate is comparable to the CSRA (7.9%) and state (8.4%) averages. Since 5% is desirable for rental unit availability, this suggests a surplus of units in Washington County.

#### **Seasonal Units**

Although the seasonal units as shown in the seasonal housing units table have more than tripled over the ten-year period since 1990, the reason for seasonal housing is not apparent. Needs for seasonal housing could be for hunting season or even a second home for northerners fleeing the cold weather. Reasoning for seasonal housing would need to be determined to properly plan for future changes in seasonal housing needs

#### Housing Costs

The median property value in Washington County is \$55,900, slightly lower than the \$88,000 in Riddleville, \$70,000 in Deepstep, \$63,900 in Sandersville, and \$57,400 in Tennille but higher than the \$43,700 in Davisboro, \$33,000 in Harrison, and \$28,900 in Oconee. Median property in the county as a whole, are below the CSRA average of \$73,500 and the state average of \$100,600. Since 1980, the median value of a home in Washington County increased by 258.9% with most of the municipalities following suit. By contrast, the property values in the CSRA and statewide have increased fourfold in that same period.

With owner vacancy rates near the state average, coupled with and increasing number of new households, median property value increases have been relatively small. This is primarily due to little demand in residing in Washington County. The county will enjoy very limited population growth and the commuting population, primarily located in neighboring counties, is willing to commute reasonable distances to work.

Median monthly rents in Washington County are \$240, in line with the municipalities, but well below median rents found in the CSRA (\$364) and statewide (\$505). In the past decade, median rents increased by only 1.27%, primarily due to the lack of high-end apartments and a relatively high number of public and affordable housing units.

The supply of affordable housing for the resident and nonresident commuting populations is readily available. Property values and rents are affordable even to the lowest paid workers, and vacancy rates are high enough to ensure an adequate supply.



## **Housing Affordability**

**Table H-6** examines the cost of housing throughout the county and illustrates the trends that have occurred since 1980. The cost of living in Washington County has continually increased over the past twenty years, however the median cost of purchasing a home is well below the state average. This is a reflection of Washington County's location in a rural environment outside of the high growth areas. The median contract rent has also increased but is below the state average due to the lack of high-end condominium style rental properties.

To determine whether or not the housing stock is affordable to the population increases in income levels must be analyzed. Increases in housing costs must correlate to increases in income to ensure that there are affordable housing options available to the entire population. Median housing costs increased throughout the county in 2000. Using a generally accepted lending standard that a household can qualify to purchase a home estimates that approximately 30 percent of income should be used to pay for housing. This does not take into account the cost of insurance, taxes, and interest on the loan. These estimates are very conservative because it also does not take into account credit rating and other debts and utilities households must pay. There are other lending institution standards that estimate affordable housing cost to be 2.5 times annual income. This estimate is used to determine the maximum amount a buyer could pay for a house. In this analysis though, 30 percent of income is used to determine housing affordability. **Table H-10** illustrates the correlation between median housing values and median incomes. **Table H-11** further illustrates the distribution of incomes over various income ranges.

Since the required income to purchase a median value home in Washington County is just over \$20,000, then 35 percent of households there could not afford a median value house. In Sandersville, almost 38 percent of households could not afford a median value house.

Table H-10: Income Required to Afford Median Value Homes											
	Med	ian Hous	ing Value	Μ	ledian Inc	ome	<b>Required Income</b>				
Jurisdiction	1990	2000	% Change '90 - '00	1990	2000	% Change '90 - '00	1990	2000			
Washington County	39,600	66,900	68.94%	21,460	29,910	39.38%	11,880	20,070			
Davisboro	32,100	46,900	46.11%	17,257	25,536	47.97%	9,630	14,070			
Deepstep	51,700	76,700	48.36%	43,125	44,583	3.38%	15,510	23,010			
Harrison	25,800	32,200	24.81%	21,667	18,125	-16.35%	7,740	9,660			
Oconee	27,100	31,000	14.39%	26,875	41,250	53.49%	8,130	9,300			
Riddleville	40,000	88,800	122.00%	21,667	39,167	80.77%	12,000	26,640			
Sandersville	41,900	69,000	64.68%	20,770	27,201	30.96%	12,570	20,700			
Tennille	36,100	61,200	69.53%	20,297	22,065	8.71%	10,830	18,360			
Source: US Bureau o	f the Census	s; 1990, 20	00								



## HOUSING

		Tal	ble H-11: Ho	ousehold I	ncome Distril	oution (%) 200	0		
Category	Davisboro	Deepstep	Harrison	Oconee	Riddleville	Sandersville	Tennille	Washington County	Georgia
less than \$9,999	27.70%	6.50%	25.90%	14.00%	0.00%	21.10%	28.10%	18.80%	10.13%
\$10,000 - \$14,999	10.60%	0.00%	15.90%	7.00%	0.00%	9.60%	10.40%	9.80%	5.85%
\$15,000 - \$19,999	5.70%	13.00%	11.80%	13.00%	0.00%	7.10%	8.60%	7.00%	5.90%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	14.20%	4.30%	14.10%	8.00%	15.20%	17.60%	10.70%	14.50%	12.74%
\$30,000 - \$34,999	9.20%	10.90%	6.50%	6.00%	23.90%	5.70%	9.10%	6.60%	6.22%
\$35,000 - 39,999	5.00%	4.30%	1.80%	2.00%	13.00%	3.80%	5.10%	4.40%	5.87%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	5.70%	13.00%	10.00%	18.00%	15.20%	7.60%	8.60%	9.20%	10.85%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	8.50%	17.40%	1.80%	21.00%	10.90%	6.40%	6.20%	8.90%	9.24%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	5.70%	10.90%	5.30%	5.00%	8.70%	5.70%	6.90%	7.90%	10.48%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2.10%	0.00%	1.80%	3.00%	4.30%	6.50%	2.70%	6.80%	10.36%
\$100,000 - \$124,999	2.10%	15.20%	1.80%	3.00%	4.30%	5.40%	2.30%	3.60%	5.25%
\$125,000 - \$149,999	2.10%	2.20%	3.50%	0.00%	0.00%	1.30%	0.50%	1.20%	2.53%
\$150,000 & above	1.40%	2.20%	0.00%	0.00%	4.30%	2.30%	0.80%	1.30%	4.55%
TOTAL	100%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

# **Special Needs Housing**

The only significant special needs population identified in Washington County is the elderly aged 65 and older. As noted in **Table H-12** in the Population chapter, the elderly population represents a significant demographic group in the county and accounted for nearly 15 percent of the total population.

Currently Washington County has three skilled nursing facilities with a total of 170 beds and one personal care home with 31 beds, to meet the needs of Washington County's elderly population. These facilities consistently operate at or near capacity and as the county population ages additional housing options may be needed to ensure an adequate supply of special needs housing. At the anticipated growth, 25 additional beds will be needed at skilled nursing homes and almost 5 additional beds will be needed for assisted living. These numbers are based on current availability. If additional senior housing, whether it be nursing homes or personal care homes were available, the facilities may still be used to capacity. There is no way to tell if seniors are moving to other locations to find adequate nursing homes or personal care homes. Washington County should



consider providing adequate senior housing to allow for seniors to stay in the county to live.

Table H-12: Elderly Population - Current and Projected										
	20	000	20	25						
	Number of people Age 65+	% of Population	Number of people Age 65+	% of Population						
Washington County	2682	13%	2082	8%						
Davisboro	58	4%	95	5%						
Deepstep	26	21%	52	37%						
Harrison	48	9%	96	16%						
Oconee	64	23%	118	29%						
Riddleville	19	15%	25	17%						
Sandersville	954	16%	1815	25%						
Tennille	311	21%	588	33%						
TOTAL	4162		4871							
Source: US Bureau of the	Census									

# Housing Compatibility with Local Employment

Overall, the housing chapter illustrates that the cost of living in Washington County, and its municipalities, is lower than state averages because of the rural nature of the county and the absence of large-scale suburban development. The Economic Development chapter discusses wages and earnings of the county population, and as indicated in the section on "Average Weekly Wages," average wages have increased in the county. While these wages do not compare with state averages they do appear sufficient to provide employed residents adequate income to afford available housing.

The commuting workforce in Washington County is much smaller than surrounding suburbanized counties. As discussed in Chapter 3, "Commuting Patterns," the loss of local commuters is not a major issue. While the county is seeking to retain a larger percentage of its workers, overall the county has a high percentage of employed residents working in Washington County. This indicates that the existing supply of housing and employment opportunities are adequate, allowing local workers the opportunity to live near their place of work.

## Vision Statement

Washington County and the municipalities recognize that housing is the cornerstone of healthy economy and community development. The county and cities will promote the provision of adequate and affordable housing for all residents and support the preservation of historic homes and neighborhoods through sound management and regulatory practices.



#### **GOALS and POLICIES**

**Goal 1:** Focus residential development in areas supported by necessary infrastructure.

**Policy 1.1:** Coordinate future residential development with the availability of supportive infrastructure.

**Policy 1.2:** Encourage infill redevelopment, where appropriate, in suitable areas supported by necessary infrastructure.

**Policy 1.3:** Mitigate negative environmental impacts associated with increased residential development.

**Policy 1.4:** Preserve, conserve and enhance historic structures and sites wherever possible.

Goal 2: Ensure adequate supply of standard and affordable housing.

**Policy 2.1:** Encourage the renovation of substandard or vacant units for use as affordable housing units for low-to-moderate income households.

**Policy 2.2:** Encourage the development of affordable senior housing and special needs housing.

**Policy 2.3:** Develop more nursing homes, assisted living facilities and affordable condominiums

**Policy 2.4:** Increase the number of well-managed rental units county-wide.

Goal 3: Reduce supply of substandard housing.

**Policy 3.1:** Seek outside funding sources for housing rehabilitation and special needs housing assistance.

**Policy 3.2:** Institute aggressive rehabilitation program.

**Policy 3.3:** Enforce city's abandoned structure ordinance.

Policy 3.4: Tear down dilapidated, vacant housing.

**Policy 3.5:** Participate in the U.S. National Guard's demolition program.

Policy 3.6: Continue enforcement of Southern Building Code.



#### **Vision Statement**

Washington County and the municipalities recognize the importance of natural and cultural resources and will protect these resources through sound land development practices.

# INTRODUCTION

The natural resources of Washington County provide certain opportunities and constraints on the manner in which land is developed or used. It is important to identify these resources and determine how they can be preserved, protected or utilized in a responsible manner. Hunting and fishing opportunities in the County abound, a direct result of the relatively undisturbed quality of the natural environment. It is imperative to preserve these resources while encouraging economic development and growth.

#### PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY RESOURCES

#### Inventory

Source water is untreated water from streams, rivers, lakes, or underground aquifers used to supply private wells and public drinking water. Water supply watersheds are the primary and only source supplying drinking water to the residents of the county and all municipalities. Protection of the water supply watersheds is of utmost importance. There are three water supply watersheds located in Washington County that should be protected – the Upper Ogeechee, the Lower Ogeechee, and the Ohoopee Watersheds.

#### Assessment

Protecting water resources requires managing the land over which the water flows – the watershed. Healthy, functioning watersheds naturally filter pollutants and moderate water quantity by slowing surface runoff and increasing the infiltration of water into the soil. The result is less flooding and soil erosion, cleaner water downstream and greater groundwater reserves.

Watershed management is a multi-faceted discipline that involves conservation and restoration, land use monitoring, proactive landuse regulations, on-site field inspections, education, planning, emergency spill response, and incentives. Although all of these components are essential to improving water resources, only the protection of land prevents contamination by non-point source pollutants and costly clean-up of drinking water.

Land can and should be protected with both regulatory and voluntary tools. Yet in the past, many communities have relied too heavily on regulatory strategies; although they are critical to any land management plan, as a singular approach, they can place excessive burdens on landowners in the source area. In addition, they may be difficult or even impossible to implement for communities that do not have the authority to regulate land uses within the source area they need to protect.


#### WATER SUPPLY WATERSHED

#### Inventory

Water supply watersheds are defined by the Department of Natural Resources as the areas of land upstream of a governmentally owned public drinking water intake. Many different factors determine the volume of water in a stream or other body of water. These factors include amount of precipitation, land cover, slope, soil type, and absorption rate. Any water that is: not absorbed by the soil, detained on the surface by lakes or ponds, or used by vegetation, runs off the lands overflow, or surface run-off. Water that is later released by the soil adds to this overflow to produce what is known as total run-off. As the run-off flows into areas of lower elevation, it collects in drainage areas, the boundaries of which form watersheds. Run-off from these watersheds flows into streams, which serve as outlets for water in the watersheds.

#### Assessment

Washington County does not lie within a water supply watershed according to criteria established by the Department of Natural Resources. The County is in excess of 7 miles from the closest water supply reservoir, Lake Sinclair. Residents of Washington County retrieve their water from deep wells.

## **GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AREAS**

#### Inventory

Groundwater recharge areas, otherwise known as Aquifer recharge areas is the process by which precipitation infiltrates soil and rock to add to the volume of water stored in pores and other openings within them. Aquifers are soils or rocks that yield water to wells. Infiltration and recharge takes place in virtually all soils to some degree. The rate or amount of recharge varies however depending on geologic conditions of the area.

Virtually all of Washington County lies above the Cretaceous-Tertiary aquifer. This system is primarily a system of sand and gravel that supplies the majority of the east central Georgia's groundwater.

#### Assessment

Development in these areas should be limited to low impact development in which limited area is covered with impervious surfaces such as roads, parking lots and building pads. The sub-surface integrity of these areas should also be maintained by avoiding development that may contaminate water supplies (i.e. landfills). For a detailed listing of these development criteria, please refer to the Rules of Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division, Chapter 391-316, Section 391-3-16-.02 entitled "Criteria for Protection of Groundwater Recharge Areas".



## WETLANDS

## Inventory

Federal law defines freshwater wetlands as those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Some examples of wetlands include marshes, swamps, bogs and similar areas. Under natural conditions, wetlands help to maintain and enhance water quality by filtering out sediments and other non-point source pollutants from adjacent land uses. In addition to this, they store water and provide habitat for a variety of plant and animal species.

Numerous wetlands, both small and large, dot the landscape of Washington County. These wetlands serve as important fish and wildlife habitats and are an integral part of food chain production. Numerous plant and animal species have adapted to the special conditions of freshwater wetlands and cannot survive elsewhere. Wetlands act as cleansing water filters and play an important role in water quality. They serve as storage areas for storm and flood waters as well as natural recharge areas where ground and surface water are interconnected. In addition, wetlands are aesthetically pleasing and can be used for recreation by man.

## Assessment

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 will adequately exercise wetland protection through the planning period. It is not likely that this resource will be negatively impacted by development or other incompatible uses throughout the planning period. The best method for achieving wetland protection in Washington County is through proper enforcement of the Section 404 permitting process. The County feels that current measures are sufficient for wetland protection.

## **PROTECTED MOUNTAINS**

## Inventory

Washington County is located in the coastal plain area of Georgia and only has gently sloping hills.

## Assessment

Therefore, there are no significant mountain ranges and/or mountains located within the borders of Washington County.



#### **PROTECTED RIVERS**

#### Inventory

The justification for protecting rivers is far reaching. Rivers provide a source of drinking water, provide habitat for wildlife, and a place for recreation. Rivers also help control erosion and absorb flooding. The Georgia Department of Natural Resources has identified those rivers in the state that should be protected. By definition, river corridors are strips of land that flank major rivers in Georgia. In Washington County, these areas have been identified around the Ogeechee, Ohoopee and the Ocenee Rivers.

#### Assessment

All of the Oconee River within the County is protected, but only a section of the Ogeechee River is protected. State law requires compliance with the Mountain and River Corridor Protection Act or else the County will lose its status as a "qualified local government." Loss of this status would make the County ineligible for certain State loans and grants. Washington County should adopt these criteria in order to ensure protection of its rivers in the future.

## **FLOOD PLAINS**

## Inventory

Flooding is defined as the temporary covering of soil with water from overflowing streams and by run-off from adjacent slopes. Water left standing after a rainfall, however, is not considered flooding, nor is water in swamps. Flooding is characterized in terms that describe the frequency and duration of the flood and the time of year that the flood occurs.

Floodplains serve three major purposes: Natural water storage and conveyance, water quality maintenance, and groundwater recharge. These three purposes are greatly inhibited when floodplains are misused or abused through improper and unsuitable land development.

Development within floodplain areas is discouraged with the exception of very low impact such as recreational facilities (i.e. trails, open fields, etc.). With this type of land use, the floodplains are utilized without disturbing the natural cycles of the floodplain. For example, if floodplains are filled in order to construct a building, then valuable water storage areas and recharge areas are lost thus causing unnecessary flooding in previously dry areas.

## Assessment

Floodplain management is an important task for local governments to undertake. The floodplain areas of the County are generally adjacent to the County's major river systems. Unincorporated Washington County does not participate in the National Flood Insurance Act or the Flood Disaster Protection Act, which provide insurance and relief for flood damage. If a community does participate, it must meet minimum federal



floodplain management standards. When a community applies for federal flood insurance, the entire 100-year floodplain in the community must be accurately mapped. Because Washington County does not participate, only a general map based on assumptions was feasible to include in this document.

Flooding is defined as the temporary covering of soil with water from overflowing streams and by run-off from adjacent slopes. Water left standing after a rainfall, however, is not considered flooding, nor is water in swamps. Flooding is characterized in terms that describe the frequency and duration of the flood and the time of year that the flood occurs.

## SOIL TYPES

## Inventory

The soils in Washington County can be grouped into twelve general units. A general soil unit is a unique natural landscape consisting of one or more major soils and some minor soils, with the unit being named for the major soils. The soil making up one unit can occur in other units but in a different pattern.

The following list describes the general soil units, which are grouped into categories according to type and location. Following the soil unit list is a table, which describes the developmental suitability and limitations of the soil units.

# Poorly drained to well-drained soils on flood plains.

Chewalca-Chastain-Congaree: These soils are nearly level, poorly drained to well drained soils that have a loamy surface layer and a loamy or clayey subsoil or loamy underlying layers. This soil unit is made up of nearly level soils on flood plains of the Oconee and Ogeechee Rivers and their tributaries. The soils in low lying positions are commonly poorly drained, and the soils in higher lying positions are better drained. These soils are generally flooded in winter and early spring. Slopes are characterized as being less than 2%.

Bibb-Kinston: These are nearly level, poorly drained soils that have a loamy or sandy surface layer and loamy or sandy underlying layers. This soil unit is made up of nearly level soils on flood plains of streams and smaller tributaries throughout most of Washington County. These soils are in low lying positions and the probability of being flooded is high late in winter and early in spring. Slopes are less than 2%.

# Somewhat poorly drained soils on low lying uplands, and moderately well drained soils on stream terraces.

Ardilla-Persanti-Ocill: These are nearly level and somewhat poorly drained and moderately well drained soils that have a sandy or loamy surface layer and loamy or clayey subsoil. This soil unit is made up of nearly level soils on broad, low lying uplands and on stream terraces. These soils are mainly north of the Oconee River and adjacent to the Ogeechee River near Archer's Pond. Slopes range from 0% to 2%.



# Predominantly well-drained soils on ridge-tops and hillsides of the Southern Coastal Plain.

Orangeburg-Faceville-Greenville: These are nearly level to sloping, well-drained soils that have a sandy or loamy surface layer and a loamy or clayey subsoil. This soil unit is made up of nearly level and very gently sloping soils commonly on broad, smooth ridge tops and gently sloping soils on convex hillsides that are eroded. These soils are throughout the County. Slopes range from 0% to 10%.

Fuquav-Lakeland-Dothan: These are nearly level to sloping, well-drained and excessively drained soils that have a sandy surface layer and a loamy subsoil or sandy underlying layers. This soil unit is made up of nearly level and very gently sloping soils commonly on smooth ridge tops, gently sloping commonly on smooth ridge tops and hillsides, and sloping soils on narrow ridge tops and short hillsides. These soils are mainly south of Deepstep. Slopes range from 0% to 12%.

Dothan-Tifton-Faceville: These are nearly level to gently sloping, well drained soils that have a sandy or loamy surface layer and a loamy or clayey subsoil that is 5 % or more plinthite (red-mottled highly weathered mixture of clay, quartz and other diluents). These soil units are made up of very gently sloping soils commonly on smooth ridgetops and gently sloping soils on convex hillsides. These soils are mainly near Riddleville, Tennille and small areas north of Warthen. Slopes range from 0% to 10%.

Cowarts-Nankin-Dothan: These are nearly level, well drained soils that have a sandy or loamy surface layer and a loamy or clayey subsoil. The soil unit is made up of nearly level soils on smooth ridgetops, very gently sloping soils mainly on undulating and convex ridgetops, and gently sloping and sloping soils on short, irregularly shaped hillsides. These soils are mainly in the southeastern part of the County. Slopes range from 0% to 12%.

# Excessively drained and somewhat excessively drained soils on ridgetops and hillsides on uplands of the Southern Coastal Plain.

Lakeland-Eustis: These are nearly level to sloping, excessively drained and somewhat excessively drained soils that are sandy throughout. This soil unit is made up of nearly level and gently sloping soils on broad, smooth and convex ridgetops and gently sloping to sloping soils on narrow ridgetops and short, irregularly shaped hillsides. These soils are mainly in the southwestern part of Washington County. Slopes range from 0% to 12%.

# Disturbed soil material and pits on ridgetops and hillsides on uplands of the Southern Coastal Plain.

Udorthents-Pits: These soils are gently sloping to moderately steep disturbed soil material and pits in areas that were mined for kaolin. The soil is in high mounds or is leveled and smoothed. These soil units are located near Deepstep and along Ga. 24 near Baldwin County. Slopes range from *5%* to 17%.

# Predominantly well drained soils on ridgetops and hillsides of the Sand Hills.



Vaucluse-Ailev-Cowarts: These are very gently sloping to moderately steep, well drained soils that have a sandy or loamy surface layer and a loamy subsoil. This soil unit is made up of very gently sloping and sloping soils on smooth to undulating convex ridgetops and sloping to moderately steep soils commonly on short, irregularly shaped hillsides. These soils are mainly on the northern and northwestern parts of the County. Slopes range from 2% to 17%.

Lakeland-Lucy-Orangeburg: These are nearly level to moderately steep, excessively drained and well drained soils that have a sandy or loamy surface layer and a loamy subsoil or sandy underlying layers. This soil unit is made up of nearly level and very gently sloping soils commonly on smooth and convex ridgetops and gently sloping to moderately steep soils on narrow ridgetops and short hillsides. These soils are mainly on the northern part of the County. Slopes range from 0% to 17%.

## Well-drained soils on hillsides and uplands of the Southern Coastal Plain.

Orangeburg: These are sloping and moderately steep, well-drained soils that have a sandy or loamy surface layer and a loamy subsoil. This soil unit is made up of sloping to moderately steep soils on hillsides mainly near the major drainage systems of Buffalo and Keg Creeks. The slopes are irregularly shaped and short and are generally parallel to the well-defined drainage systems. Slopes range from 8% to 17%.

## STEEP SLOPES

## Inventory

Slopes in Washington County range from nearly level to *25 %*. The steepest slopes are along streambeds in the hilly area, which runs south to north through the western side of the County. Development along these steep slopes is limited by soil suitability, but if it *is* undertaken, responsible measures must be used to avoid soil instability and erosion. Current protection measures under the Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Act of 1975 are sufficient to protect steep slopes.

## Assessment

Most of the slopes in Washington County should not hinder any development. Some areas along the creek are not developable because of the flood plains.

# PRIME AGRICULTURAL and FORESTRY LAND

## Inventory

Prime farmland is defined as available land that is best suited for producing food and fiber. It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply necessary to produce sustained yields of crops. One of the most attractive aspects of Washington County is the abundance of farmland and tree stands. Concentrated in the southeastern part of the County, agricultural crops include corn, soybeans, peanuts, cotton, sorghum and hay. A number of cattle and dairy farms are also present. It should be an immediate goal of the County to protect, preserve and encourage farms and the farming way of life.



#### Assessment

No intensive measures should be necessary to preserve the county's prime forestlands during the planning period because development pressure is not menacing and not significantly encroaching upon the farmland. Private landowners make up much of the farmland in Washington County.

## PLANT and ANIMAL HABITATS

## Inventory

Under its Natural Heritage Inventory Program, the Georgia DNR has complied a computerized and mapped inventory of plants, animals and natural habitats in the state, which are rare enough to warrant state and federal protection. Washington County is home to several endangered animal species. An endangered species is a resident species that exhibits special or unique features and because of these features, deserves special consideration in its continued survival in the state. Below is a list of the federally recognized endangered and threatened species in the Washington County region. There are no federally listed endangered plant species in Washington County.

- Bald Eagle: The Bald Eagle has recently made a comeback but it remains an endangered species. The Bald Eagle lives and nests around inland waterways, estuaries, lakeshores and other wetlands. Protection of lakeshore forests is recommended, especially where there are few signs of human activity and where Bald Eagles have been spotted.
- Red Cockaded Woodpecker: The Red Cockaded Woodpecker is endangered because it nests only in pine trees over sixty years old which are infected with red heart disease fungus. In order to protect this species, preservation of stands of older growth pines, which are rapidly decreasing, must be a priority.
- Other endangered and threatened species include: The Florida Panther, rarely seen, but considered endangered in the entire state and Bacliman's Warbler which is endangered in the entire state.

#### Assessment

Washington County has no plans for local protection of sensitive plants and animals.

# **MAJOR PARKS, RECREATION and CONSERVATION AREAS**

#### Inventory

There is a 5-acre park and recreation area. The park consists of a softball field, basketball courts tennis courts, walking and biking trails and children play lot. Washington County also owns several acres of land containing beautiful woodland areas and ponds.



#### Assessment

It is not necessary by state recommendations to create any park and recreation areas; however, the county could improve the quality of life by providing more recreational activities, especially in the smaller cities.

#### **SCENIC VIEWS and SITES**

#### Inventory

No officially designated scenic views and sites exist within the County, but many are present and well preserved. Pastoral settings and bluffs, which overlook the Oconee River, represent the rural charm of Washington County.

#### Assessment

Washington County residents stress the importance of promoting their natural and historical landscape. Having more signage and information about these sites may attract more interest in the area, as long as the signage is in accordance with local sign ordinances and conform to the areas around them.

## **HISTORIC RESOURCES**

#### Introduction

Historic resources include landmark buildings, historic structures and sites, historic rural resources, archaeological and cultural sites, and the historic environments in which they exist. They serve as visual reminders of a community's past, provide a link to its cultural heritage and a better understanding of the people and events which shaped the patterns of development.

Preservation of these important resources makes it possible for them to continue to play a vital and an integral role in the community. Because historic resources are irreplaceable, they should be protected from deterioration and the intrusion of incompatible land uses. Preservation can also provide local governments with substantial savings in the cost of infrastructure through the re-use of existing streets and utilities and the revitalization of older neighborhoods and downtowns.

## History of Washington County--Early History

Washington County is bisected by the Fall Line which is responsible for vast changes in terrain and vegetation. The Fall Line is a term derived from the fact that waterfalls often occur where streams move from the hard igneous and metamorphic rocks of the Piedmont to the soft sediments of the Coastal Plain. Large deposits of kaolin, which have made the County famous, lie along the Fall Line. This natural resource has had an immeasurable impact on the history and the economy of the County.

The Creek Indians are the first known inhabitants of Washington County. Numerous Indian tools have been found throughout the County along streams and near springs. These indicate occupation of this area as early as 6,000-8.000 B.C. Indian pottery has



been found dating back 3,000 years. The Lower Creek Path (also known as Old Horse Path) was a famous early Indian trading route that led from Augusta to Rock Landing on the Oconee River. It was the oldest, Longest, and most important trail that came from Augusta. This thoroughfare passed through the northeastern part of the County, almost parallel with the County line. Indian artifacts can still be found in the area. The influence of the Creeks is found in the names of many of the rivers within the County - Oconee, Ogeechee, Ohoopee.

An act of the Georgia Legislature formed and defined Washington County in 1784. It was the ninth County formed in Georgia and is said to be the first County in the nation to be named for George Washington. Originally designed to provide homes for patriots of the Revolutionary War, WaslThigton County consisted of some 3,000,000 acres. Later, Greene, Hancock, Montgomery and Johnson, plus parts of six other counties, were formed from this area. Grants of 250 acres, tax free, were issued to all soldiers. Early settlers, many of them of Scotch origin, came from the Carolinas, Virginia, and other parts of Georgia. The bulk of the early settlers were poor. Some were slave holders and some were free slaves who settled in the County as well. Sandersville, the County seat for Washington County, was created in 1796 and is the largest community within the County.

## Economy

Historically, the economy of Washington County has evolved from agriculture to industry and manufacturing. Cotton played a major role in the economic development of the County through the antebellum and postbellum periods and extended into the early-1900's. Cotton determined the cultural and social standards for the people of Washington County. It dominated the economy and set the standards of living. In 1911 Washington County had more than 28,000 people with three-quarters of them living in rural locations. The boll weevil destroyed the cotton economy during the l920's and changed the direction of the County's economy forever. The County diversified its economy to lumber and other agricultural crops, as well as livestock and kaolin.

Kaolin has replaced cotton as the engine of Washington County's growth. Washington County is called the "Kaolin Capital of the World" for its fine kaolin deposits. The general economy has boomed and diversified with kaolin leading the way after World War II until the present day.

# Transportation

# **Early Transportation**

Early means of transportation were by horseback, horse or ox-drawn carriages, carts and wagons or by riverboats. Barges could come up navigable rivers as far as the Fall Line, thus opening the County to markets down river. Some streams, such as Buffalo Creek (wider and deeper than now) were used to float logs down to the coast. By 1816, the state had given the right for a stagecoach company to run between Savannah and Milledgeville. These stagecoaches passed through Sandersville thereby offering opportunities for opening inns and taverns in the area.



## **Rail Transportation**

The first railroad entered the County in 1841. Around 1838 the people of Savannah sought an outlet for their imports and a factor in the development of their export trade. The Central Railway Company was organized, chartered, and surveys were made from Savannah westward towards Macon. The railroad was intended to run by Sandersville but the citizens resented the intrusion so, in 1842, Station 13, known as Franklin's depot, but now known as Tennille, was created. The railroad provided transportation for cotton, lumber, naval stores and other products to Savannah, Augusta and to more distant markets. In 1876, Sandersville formed the Sandersville & Tennille Railroad Company. The economic progress of Sandersville made a visible jump after this achievement. In 1884 the lumber and naval stores development in the southern part of the County demanded improved facilities, so The Wrightsville & Tennille Railroad was organized. In 1904, the City of Sandersville began the Sandersville Railroad, under the management of the Honorable Louis Cohen. Today, this line is still operated by the Tarbutton family of Washington County.

## **Community Histories**

#### Davisboro

Davisboro was founded in 1827 and enjoyed relative prosperity due to the coming of the railroad in 1840. It is the third oldest community in the County. The first settlement was along the Ogeechee River in 1785. The first business was that of a blacksmith, named Davis, in 1827. The settlement became known as Davisboro in his honor. Train Station Number 12 was located in Davisboro, with daily stops. This brought prosperity to the town. The Hardwick Inn was built in 1842 to accommodate the crowds; a cyclone in 1883 destroyed the *Inn.* On November 27, 1864 the 20th Corps and the 14th Corps of Sherman's army met in Davisboro and left the town in ruins. It was rebuilt after Sherman's Army destroyed it and was incorporated in 1894. Another hotel was commissioned by Mrs. S. J. Taylor, Sr. in 1906. It was built by Frank Sheppard who lived outside of Davisboro. The hotel was in operation for over 30 years and served the many passengers of the railroad, as well as other visitors to the community. It is still standing and is now a private residence.

## Deepstep

Deepstep was once a famous Methodist camp meeting ground, serving people from Washington, Baldwin and surrounding counties. It is located ten miles west of Sandersville. Deepstep sits on a creek named by Indian natives for its steep banks and deep waters. Most of today's residents are descendants of the original settlers who chartered the community in 1920.

## Harrison

Harrison was named in 1883 for a wealthy farmer, Mr. Green B. Harrison, who gave up the right-of-way on his land for the coming of the Wrightsville and Tennille Railroad. The main source of income of the community was agriculture and timber. The town



continued to prosper until it was devastated by the boll weevil. Today, the population is around 500 with most people finding employment in surrounding areas.

#### Oconee

Oconee is located in the southwest corner of Washington County. Governor Jared Irwin built Fort Irwin and his home "Union Hill" near here in 1786. Oconee was created in 1840 when the railroad station was located where the river road from Milledgeville to Dublin crossed the railroad about one-half mile east of the river swamp. The community developed around this intersection. Oconee was a natural trading center for the farmers of the area to buy and sell products transported by the railroad. During the Civil War in 1864, the Union's 17th Corps came into Oconee to bum the railroad. Oconee was chartered in 1876, although it stayed inactive until it was granted a new charter of incorporation in 1963. In 1921, a tornado claimed 29 lives and caused \$100,000 worth of damages. This was a major disaster for Oconee although the citizens rebuilt the town. In 1931, the County's first kaolin processing plant located here, and a major kaolin refinery still exists here today.

## Riddleville

Riddleville was the third settlement in the County and was incorporated in 1859. Most of the early settlers were from North Carolina. Riddleville became a thriving farm community, boasted several gins and stores, including a Jewish establishment and fine houses. Two of the old houses still survive: the William G. Bryan house built in the 1830's, and the Greek Revival cottage built around 1850 by a man named Wescoloski from Savannah. This house is listed in the book, Architecture of Middle Georgia, and is the pastorium for the Baptist church. A boarding school once stood near the center of town across from the Mount Vernon Institute, a college chartered by the State in 1859. This college remained active until the 1890's.

## Sandersville

The seat of the County, Sandersville, was created in 1796 and became incorporated on November 27, 1812, at which time the first County courthouse was built. Once known as "White Ponds", the town was the crossroads of Creek Indian trails and included a trading post owned by Mark Saunders after whom the town was later named. During the pioneer days the town was slow to grow, and by 1864 it had a population of only 450-500. In the 1840's the Central of Georgia requested to develop a rail station in Sandersville. The proposal was furiously opposed, forcing the railroad to locate in Tennille, which grew rapidly as a result. However, in 1893-94 Sandersville got an economic shot in the arm when the Sandersville Railroad was built to connect Sandersville to the City of Tennille and to Kaolin, Georgia, or loading the mining products.

Sandersville's first public school opened in 1877, and in 1880 the first city hall was built. In the two decades between 1890 and 1910, Sandersville prospered and rapidly grew. Many brick buildings were built around the square and stately homes were constructed on the fringe of downtown.



## Tennille

A map of Georgia dated 1837 lists a village in Washington County by the name of Franidinville, three miles south of Sandersville. This community was named for Samuel 0. Franklin, one of the largest landowners, and an influential man in the area. Since there was already a Franklin, Georgia, the name was changed to Tennille for a well known citizen, Francis Tennille. The town grew around the railroad, which was Station Number 13 between Savannah and Atlanta. During the Civil War, much of the railroad was destroyed, having a devastating effect on the economy of Tennille. Tennille was incorporated in 1875, and the railroad was rebuilt. Tennille is still a prosperous community, with daily train service, a state highway department office, sewing operation and plenty of shopping and parking. The community also has its own fire and police departments and two schools.

## Warthen

Warthen was named for the grandson of the first settler, Richard Warthen, who settled here in the late 1<sup>7</sup>00's. Warthen and his sons built the first mills in Washington County: a grist mill, woolen mill, sawmill, and later a cotton gin. They named this settlement Hamburg after the manufacturing town of Hamburg, South Carolina. Warthen was the first town in the County and once held the County's only jail. Aaron Burr, the nation's third Vice President, spent the night here in 1804. His incarceration occurred after his arrest for treason in a plot to form a new Mexican empire. He was later acquitted. The County's and Georgia's oldest church, Bethlehem Baptist, began here in 1790 and remains active today. In 1886, the first train came through Warthen. The Augusta Southern train ran from Tennille to Augusta but it was discontinued in 1933. That, combined with the Depression, contributed to the decline of the economy of the community. Many of its citizens gave up their farms and moved to urban areas seeking work. The community is not incorporated.

# Churches

The first church buildings were made of logs with dirt floors. Records show churches being constituted as early as 1790. In the 1790's there were five well established churches in what is now Washington County; two Methodist: Harris Church and New Hope; and three Baptist: Bethlehem, Ohoopee, and Williamson Swamp Church which later became Jordan's. As more people moved into the County, newly formed fellowships built framed structures with plank siding and shingle roofs. Through the years these buildings were enlarged, remodeled and rebuilt, or replaced. Most of the brick churches were built in the Twentieth century, and some framed ones were brick veneered. The County still has some lovely, well-kept, wooden church buildings. Before the Civil War, some slaves and free blacks belonged to the white churches, usually sitting on back pews or balconies. It was after the Civil War that blacks established their own churches, usually with the help and blessings from the mother church. Campgrounds, with camp meetings lasting two or three weeks each summer, were a large part of the spiritual landscape. Protracted meetings and two-week revivals are fading from the church calendar. Those churches that baptized by immersion were usually built near springs or streams, as evidenced by many church names. A few in the County still baptize in their outdoor pools.



- Bethlehem Baptist Church is the oldest Baptist Church, and perhaps the oldest existing church of any denomination in Washington County. It was constituted on October 3, 1790. It was first located on Keg (Cag) Creek and was called "Church of Christ on Keg Creek." It was moved to Warthen in 1795. A wooden church building was built which later burned. The building in use today was built in 1890.
- New Hope United Methodist Church is the oldest Methodist Church in the County still in existence. Early records have been lost, but it is believed that this church was constituted in the 1790's. A wooden structure was built on three acres of land given by Myers Whitfield and is still being used for worship today.

## Schools

As early as 1784, the State made a payment toward an academy for Washington County. Frontier problems delayed the development of these schools though. By the early nineteenth century, Washington County had an academy that was endowed by the State with a reserve of 1,000 acres. Poor School Fund laws were carried out in the County, and in 1827, 117 children were being taught at State expense. In 1830, four academies were incorporated: Bethlehem, Davisboro, Union and Gum Springs. Before the Civil War, Washington County had several schools, most associated with churches. As male teachers left to fight in the Civil War, the first female teachers appeared in some of Washington County's schools. As the hardships of the War increased, many schools closed completely. After the Civil War, the Freedmen's Bureau was organized in 1865. This bureau had been created to help unsettled persons, primarily former slaves, cope with their situation after the war. One of its activities was to start schools for freedmen and serve as an agent for channelling funds, teachers and textbooks from Northern benefactors to Southern schools.

Formal education for blacks began in 1866 with Emily Bivins' school in her home. Later she moved into an old church building used by the African Methodist Church. Two other schools were opened in 1867 in Sandersville and Davisboro. Soon six other freedman's schools opened throughout the County although many of these closed when government financing expired. In the early 1900's the Julius Rosenwald Fund was established to build schools for black children in the South. Georgia once had 242 Rosenwald schools, but only a small number remain. Built in 1927, Elder High is the oldest existing school building in Washington County. The Thomas Jefferson Elder High and Industrial School in Sandersville was listed on the National Register in 1981, and it is an authenticated Rosenwald Plan School.

The late 1960's until the mid-1970's were very tense times for Washington County. There were many racial tensions both within the schools and throughout the community. Washington County High School had its first black graduate in 1968. Tensions started to ease by the late 1970's.



## **Medical History**

Malaria and typhoid were fairly common early illnesses in Washington County, due mainly to the cleared land which allowed for an increase in mosquitos. One of the area's earliest residents, Dr. Archibald McNeil, treated Indians and settlers alike. In 1856, the County medical association organized, and as early as 1895, Washington County had a hospital. Registered with the American Medical Association the following year, this hospital was recognized for the highly successful surgeries performed by its founder, Dr. William Rawlings, and the innovative equipment (such as X-ray machines in 1901) that he installed. When he died, he left his hospital to the people of Washington County. In 1961, the hospital was replaced with a new facility, Memorial Hospital of Washington County.

The Washington County Health Department dates back to 1928. This facility aids with public health, providing low cost or free services in many areas for local residents.

The County's interest in dental care also reaches to its early history with the first dentists of record locating in the area in 1847.

In the early 1850's there were one or more doctors operating drugstores in the towns of Harrison, Davisboro, Warthen, Tennille and Sandersville.

## Famous People

Washington County has had many citizens who, over the years, have contributed greatly to its history. A few of the more distinguished include Charles Edward Choate, Jared Irwin and Thomas William Hardwick.

Charles Edward Choate was a Georgia architect, now recognized to be of regional importance. He was broadly involved in the buildings of the late 19th and early 20th Century in Sandersviile and Tennille. He is known for his attention to detail, interesting shapes, sculptured brickwork and well-chosen ornament. He designed both residential and commercial buildings.

Jared Irwin, an early governor of Georgia, served two terms and finished one unexpired term between 1796 and 1809. He was born of Irish immigrants in North Carolina in 1750. His family moved to Georgia in 1757. He married and had four children. Irwin fought in the Revolutionary War and was distinguished in battle. He received a land grant and moved to Washington County where he became very active on commissions dealing with land, Indians and roads. Irwin served as a State Legislator from 1789 until 1796. He died at his homestead, Union Hill, on March 1. 1818.

Thomas William Hardwick was born in Thomasville, Georgia on December 9, 1872. His family settled in Washington County in the 1880's. Hardwick practiced law in Sandersville from 1895 until 1897, serving as the prosecuting attorney for Washington County. He was elected to the State House of Representatives in 1898. In 1902 Hardwick was elected to the United States House of Representative where he served until 1914. He served in the United States Senate from 1914 until 1919. In 1920 he was elected Governor



of Georgia, which he held until 1923. He was appointed special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States from 1923 through 1924. Hardwick died. January 31, 1944.

## Properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places

The following properties have been placed on the National Register of Historic Places and enjoy protection from destruction or alteration.

- The Francis Plantation, southeast of Davisboro, was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1975. The plantation was built by Captain W. B. Francis prior to the Civil War. The estate remains in the family today and contains a number of outbuildings. The main house is Greek Revival in style and is raised off the ground. The house has four large rooms divided by a central hall. The outbuildings consist of a well house with a dairy on one side and a larder on the other, a smoke house built of hand-hewn logs, a barn, a work shed, several old cabins, and a dovecote.
- The Washington County Courthouse, located in downtown Sandersville on the courthouse square, was listed on the National Register of Historic places in 1980. Although the site of the Washington County Courthouse has not changed through the years, the structures have. The first courthouse built here was constructed of wood. The first brick courthouse was commissioned and built to replace the original wooden one in 1836. The first brick courthouse was destroyed by fire in 1855. The second brick courthouse was built in 1858. It was destroyed by Sherman's command on November 27, 1864. A third brick courthouse was completed in 1869 on the same foundation.

This third courthouse was extensively remodeled in 1899, changing it to a Victorian style. In 1938 an annex was built and the small tower, which was similar to the clock tower, was lowered and the roof line changed. Another major revitalization was completed in 1970.

- The Thomas Jefferson Elder High and Industrial School, at 316 Hall Street in Sandersville, was listed on the National Register in 1981. It is an authenticated Rosenwald Plan school. The Julius Rosenwald Fund was established to build schools for black children in the South. Built in 1927. Elder High is the oldest existing school building in Washington County.
- Several other sites in the City of Sandersville, including two districts and the city cemetery, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Although there are no other structures or sites listed on the National Register, there are close to two dozen historical markers scattered throughout the County. Most relate to the Civil War and General W. T. Sherman's infamous March through Georgia.

There are many historic structures in the County which warrant recognition as being a part of the rich history of the County. Below is a list of structures which are particularly notable and should be nominated for the State or National Historic Register. These



historic resources are divided into categories as required by the Georgia Minimum Planning Standards for historic community resources.

# **Other Historically Significant Properties**

## **Residential**:

- The William G. Bryan house: Built in the 1830's and located in Riddlevilie.
- The Greek Revival Cottage: Built in approximately 1850 in Riddleville by a man named Wescoloski from Savannah.
- Any residences displaying the works of Charles E. Choate, architect and builder from Augusta. Two fine examples located in Tennille are The Madden-Smith home on East Central Avenue and the Tom W. Smith home on Main Street (1900). Proposals have been made to create a Choate Historic District in Tennille which would include commercial, institutional, industrial and residential buildings.

## Commercial

- The Tennille Banking Company: Designed by Charles Choate, the banking company could be included as part of the Choate Historic District.
- The Warthen commercial district: This area includes the old Post Office, the Warthen Bank, the Jail and other structures contained within old downtown Warthen. Although it is virtually a ghost town now, Warthen once bustled and was the first town in Washington County.

# Industrial

- The Tennille Railroad Company: Once a Freight office, but now vacant and endangered, the old freight office serves as the focal point of Tennille. The railroad has offered it to the City, but will demolish the freight office if it remains vacant. A potential use for the structure would be a "cotton to kaolin" museum, featuring the history of the County and housing the offices of the preservation society. Also a Choate structure, it could be added to the Choate Historic District.
- The Tennille Yarn Mill: Now the Washington Manufacturing Company, the Tennille Yam Mill was designed and built in 1903 by Charles E. Choate. It is the only remaining industrial structure in the County which was designed by the renowned architect.

# Institutional

• The Old Jail, Warthen: The jail where the U.S. President and traitor Aaron Burr spent the night in 1804. The jail is a 12 foot square building made of



hand-hewn logs and is in dire need of restoration. A plaque marks the site.

- Bethlehem Baptist Church (1790): Located in Warthen, Bethiehem Baptist is the County's and one of the State's oldest Churches. The church was formed in 1790.
- New Hope United Methodist Church (1790's): A small wooden church, believed to be built during the 1970's, is still being used for worship services today.

# Rural

• There are several historic rural sites which warrant further research, identification and documentation. These sites include farmsteads, mills and plantations.

# Historic. Archaeological and Cultural:

- The Lower Creek Path (Old Horse Path): Located along the Northeastern part of the County, generally running parallel to the County line, the Lower Creek Path was a famous Indian trading route which ran from Augusta to Rock Landing on the Oconee River. Many Indian artifacts are present in the area. The route could be designated as a historic "Trail."
- Warthen family Cemetery: Located just off the main road of Old Warthen, the cemetery contains the graves of many members of this famous Washington County family.

Washington County and the City of Tennille have very rich histories and a multitude of intact structures of historic value. Several structures, districts and cemeteries are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, but many others warrant nomination. Listed in the previous subsection of this element are properties which should be considered. Additional properties worthy of historic recognition are documented in Appendix B. The County and the City of Tenmlle should make a concrete effort to nominate more properties (outside of Sandersville) to the National Register of Historic Places or the State of Georgia Historic Register. Preservation efforts have been concentrated primarily on Sandersville in the past, therefore, many excellent architectural structures in Tennille and the rest of the County have been overlooked.

Efforts to designate a "Choate Historic District" should be pursued. Nomination of architect Charles Choate's properties to the National Register of Historic Places would include properties in Tennille. Sandersville and unincorporated Washington County. It would also honor a variety of structures including commercial, industrial and residential examples.

In order to "anchor" the new preservation efforts in the County, the old railroad freight office in Tennille, a Choate structure, could be converted to a "cotton to kaolin" museum and house the offices of the preservation society.



#### **GOALS and OBJECTIVES**

**Goal 1:** To preserve and protect natural and cultural resources.

**Policy 1-1:** Protect public water supply sources, wetlands, flood plains, and plant & wildlife animal habitats.

**Policy 1-2:** Continually monitor natural resources for pollution.

**Policy 1-3:** Encourage development away from sensitive areas.

Policy 1-4: Develop scenic views and sites.

**Policy 1-5:** Create a county floodplain map.

**Policy 1-6:** Protect hardwood trees from timber industry.

**Policy 1-7:** Ensure the mining industry follows responsible land reclamation procedures.

**Policy 1-7.1**: Work more closely with mining businesses.

**Goal 2:** To preserve and protect historic resources.

- **Policy 2-1:** Conduct an Updated Historic Resources Survey for Washington County and its cities and communities.
- **Policy 2-2:** Investigate adopting an historic preservation ordinance, appointing an historic preservation commission, and becoming a Certified Local Government. (Sandersville)
- **Policy 2-3:** Investigate nominating locally designated districts for design review. (Sandersville)
- **Policy 2-4:** Nominate the city of Tennille to the National Register of Historic Places.
- **Policy 2-5:** Continue to nominate historic properties throughout the cities and county to the National Register of Historic Places.
- **Policy 2-6:** Place municipal landmarks on the National Register of Historic Places.
- Policy 2-7: Continue Main Street program. (Sandersville)
- **Policy 2-8:** Continue preservation of Sandersville city-owned buildings, such as the old City Hall and Old Jail.

**Policy 2-9:** Continue preservation of the Courthouse.



# **Goal 3: Protect historic cemeteries from mining operations**

Policy 3-1: Create an inventory of all historic cemeteries



# INTRODUCTION

The adequacy and availability of community facilities is a necessary part of the comprehensive planning process due to the importance of maintaining and attracting future residents, businesses and industries to the area. Growth needs to be managed in such a way as to not put an undue burden on existing community facilities, and thereby negatively affect the overall quality of life in the county and municipalities. It is important that the prioritizing, scheduling and construction of community facilities meet the needs of current and future populations, while at the same time guide and direct growth in an orderly and logical manner.

The Community Facilities Element inventories the various public and semi-private facilities and services available in Washington County and the municipalities and assesses the quality and availability of these community facilities.

# TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

An efficient transportation network is a key element in determining Washington County's ability to develop. Adequate transportation facilities are necessary for the transport of people and goods and services. The efficiency of the network has a direct impact on land use through its ability to disperse increased traffic levels as a function of residential, commercial, and industrial development.

# Existing Road Network

Roadways are classified by the U.S. Department of Transportation based on their function within the local highway network. Each major classification category is defined as follows:

**1. Principal Arterials**: These roads, which include interstates and rural freeways, serve substantial regional, statewide or interstate trips; connect most urban areas of 25,000 or more and virtually all urban areas of 50,000 or more; and provide an integrated network without stub connections except where geography dictates otherwise.

**2. Minor Arterials**: These roads form a rural network that links other cities, larger towns, and other traffic generators, capable of attracting travel over similarly long distances; links all developed areas of the state; and serve corridors with trip lengths and travel density greater than those predominantly served by rural collector or local systems. Minor arterials constitute routes whose design should be expected to provide for relatively high overall travel speeds, with minimum interference to through movement.

**3. Major Collectors**: These roads primarily serve the county rather than regional or state traffic. Consequently, more moderate speeds are typical. They serve any county seat or larger town not on an arterial route, and other traffic generators of equivalent intra county importance; link the latter places with nearby larger towns or cities, arterials and freeways; and serve the more important intra county travel corridors.



4. Minor Collectors: These roads also serve county-wide traffic and collect traffic

from local roads and bring all developed areas within a reasonable distance of a collector road; provide service to smaller communities; and link the locally important traffic with more significant generators.

Georgia Highways 15, 24, 68, 88, 102 231, 242 and 272 all intersect a portion of the county and are the primary arterials in Washington County. Paved connecting roads link Washington County with Dublin and Interstate Highway 16. Most of the roadway network is rural, with only a handful of urban roads in Sandersville and Tennille.

**Table C-1** identifies the total mileage and paved roadways of each local jurisdiction. Most of the network is in the unincorporated areas. The municipalities include smaller, mostly-paved roadways. By contrast, approximately half the county road network is paved.

# Level of Service

The quality of service provided by the road network requires quantitative and qualitative measures of operational efficiency. The primary method of analysis is to determine the Level of Service (LOS) of the major thoroughfares within the network. According to the Highway Capacity Manual, LOS is a measure describing operational conditions of a roadway in terms of average speed, travel time, maneuverability, and traffic interruptions. Table C-2 identifies six LOS categories, ranging from A to F, each describing the operating conditions associated with them.

The LOS indicates the roadway conditions during the peak hour of traffic. It is calculated by determining the ratio of traffic volume to roadway capacity for segments of individual roadways based on accumulated flow from collector roads within the traffic shed. The typical design level of a road represents an operational LOS C. This indicates that roads are designed to adequately handle 65% of the traffic capacity while maintaining a stable flow of traffic.

Table C-1: Washington County and Municipalities Road Network		
Jurisdiction	Total Mileage	Unpaved Mileage
Washington County		
State Routes	167.49	167.49
County Roads	724.32	317.98
City Streets	60.18	56.16
Total	891.81	541.62
	Davisboro	
State Routes	3.59	3.59
County Roads	3.77	2.64
City Streets	4.53	3.08
Total	11.89	9.31
Deepstep		
State Routes	0	0
County Roads	2.82	2.82
City Streets	1.2	0.44
Total	4.02	3.26
	Harrison	
State Routes	1.52	1.52
County Roads	3.68	2.81
City Streets	2.9	2.36
Total	8.1	6.69
	Oconee	
State Routes	1.68	1.68
County Roads	0.37	0.34
City Streets	3.33	2.38
Total	5.38	4.4
	Riddleville	
State Routes	2.16	2.16
County Roads	1.69	1.09
City Streets	0	0
Total	3.85	3.25
	Sandersville	
State Routes	9.69	9.69
County Roads	6.39	6.2
City Streets	37.32	36.54
Total	53.4	52.43
	Tennille	
State Routes	2.81	2.81
County Roads	2.78	2.27
City Streets	10.2	9.94
Total	15.79	15.02
Source: Office of Department of T	f Transportation Da Transportation, 200	ta, Georgia 3



The entire traffic network in Washington County is operating at an adequate level of service of C or better, with the majority of roadways operating at LOS A. According to the latest traffic count data provided by the Georgia Department of Transportation (2003) the heaviest traveled

Table C-2: Level of Service Classification		
Level of Service	<b>Operating Conditions</b>	
Α	Free flow, minimum delay at signalized intersections.	
В	Occasional short delays that may require waiting through one red light.	
С	Stable flow with intermittent delays at signalized intersections (typical design level). Backups may develop behind turning vehicles.	
D	Approaching unstable flow and may require waiting through two or more red lights.	
Е	Unstable flow. Roadway is operating at capacity with high levels of congestion that may result in lengthy delays.	
F	Forced flow through jammed intersections. Excessive delays resulting in extremely high levels of congestion	

road in the county is SR88 in Sandersville at just over 15,000 Average Annual Daily Traffic). With the exception of SR15 and SR24, all other roadways carry less than 3,500 AADT.

Traffic levels have increased slightly over the past five years according to the DOT 1998-2003 Annual Average Daily Trips Reports with the largest increases found along SR88 in Sandersville. Sandersville's position as the county's major employment center, combined with easy access to surrounding cities via numerous state routes, has increased the amount of daily vehicle trips into and through the city.

There are currently several major road projects within the Washington County:

- Intersection Improvement SR 15 AT MATTHEWS ROAD IN TENNILLE
- Resurface & Maintenance SR 57 FM E OF PARKER ST TO OCONEE RIVER OVERFLOW/ WASHINGTON
- Widening SR 15 FROM NORTH OF MATTHEWS RD/TENNILLE TO INDUSTRIAL DR
- Widening SR 24/SR 540 FM SOUTH OF CR 186 TO CR 10 IN WASHINGTON CO
- Widening SR 24/SR 540 FM CR 10 TO JUST WEST OF SR 68
- Minor Widening and Resurfacing SR 24 RELOC ALONG CR 67 FM SR 24 N TO SR 540/FALL LINE FWY
- Passing Lanes SR 24 BET SANDERSVILLE & DAVISBORO EB MP
- Passing Lanes SR 15 AT 3 LOC BTWN WRIGHTSVILLE & TENNILLE/& WASHINGTON
- Bridge Replacement SR 24 OVER WILLIAMSON SWAMP CREEK 1.3 MILES NW OF DAVISBORO

# **Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

With the exception of Sandersville, there is no current inventory of pedestrian facilities inventory for Washington County and the municipalities. There are no known sidewalks in the unincorporated areas. The smaller municipalities have very little sidewalk coverage, mostly confined to their Main Street. Sandersville and Tennille have more



extensive pedestrian networks, which includes facilities in both downtown areas and adjacent residential areas.

In 2003, the City of Sandersville completed a Pedestrian Plan with the aim of improving facilities within the city. Several miles of sidewalks were inventoried, along with curb ramps and other pedestrian amenities. The Plan identified numerous improvements needed to improve the condition of those facilities (refer to the 2003 Sandersville Pedestrian Plan).

The CSRA RDC is in the process of conducting a region-wide inventory of pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks and curb ramps. When complete, the inventory will assist in future planning efforts.

With the exception of State Bicycle Route 35, there are no known bicycle facilities in Washington County and the municipalities.

## Signalization and Signage

There are signalized intersections in Sandersville, Tennille and in the unincorporated area. All signalized intersections are located along corridors that handle significant traffic volumes and represent the cities' main commercial corridors. Signalization is essential at these intersections to provide an orderly flow of traffic in and out of the various commercial establishments.

## Bridges

There are numerous bridges scattered throughout Washington County. The county has numerous state highways and all bridges along these roads are maintained by the Georgia Department of Transportation. Bridges located along county roads are maintained by the county.

## Public Transportation

There are no public transportation services provided by Washington County and the municipalities. The Washington County Council on Aging and Way-to-Go Transportation provide limited service through state and private funding.

# Railroads

Rail companies provide crucial cargo transport for industries in Washington County. Many items and materials are too bulky or heavy to be shipped by truck and are moved by rail. Washington County is served by the Norfolk Southern and the Sandersville Railroad Company. Norfolk Southern is a class one railroad with over 14,000 miles of track operating in 20 states and Canada. The Sandersville Railroad Company, a heavy duty freight railroad, began operations in 1893. The company offers competitive rates and customer oriented service and has choice industrial sites for economic development.



## Port Facilities and Aviation

Washington County has its own local airport with a 5,000-foot lighted runway. The airport, which is located adjacent to the county industrial park, offers a full range of services.

Airports located in Dublin and Milledgeville provide small craft aviation services. The nearest commercial air service is in Augusta, 70 miles away. Atlanta-Hartsfield International Airport, located in Atlanta approximately 128 miles from Sandersville, provides major commercial airline service. The ports of Savannah (140 miles) and Charleston (230 miles) provide port facilities.

## Assessment

## **Road Network and LOS**

Roadways drive the Washington County economy and are considered significant as much for their economic development function as for local transport needs. At close to 40%, the county has an unacceptably high percentage of unpaved roads. Neither current nor future needs are being met with so many unpaved roads. While some roads in very low density have always been and will continue to remain dirt roads, the county will need to implement identified projects. Approximately 95% of roads within municipalities are paved. The smaller municipalities have a higher rate of unpaved roadways that will need to be addressed.

Future land use patterns will play a significant role in the continued efficiency of the transportation network. According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, a typical single-family detached home generates an average of 9.54 vehicle trips per day while commercial and industrial facilities generate from 20 to 2000 vehicle trips per day. In 2000, there were close to two passenger vehicles per household in the county and municipalities. Although the county and municipalities' population is projected to increase by close to 20% through 2025, this will not significantly impact the roadway network given current capacity and LOS.

The economic development policy contained in this comprehensive plan directs growth in proximity to Washington County municipalities where infrastructure renders development more cost-effective. Should this occur, the municipalities - particularly Sandersville - and Washington County will need to consider the traffic implications along SR88 and other major roadways.

Sandersville's relatively high traffic levels are not only a result of its concentration of population and housing but also its importance as the county's commercial center. As noted in the Economic Development chapter, Sandersville is the main source of employment opportunities in the county, as well as a magnet for residents of neighboring jurisdictions. As development continues in and around the Sandersville, and the amount of jobs increases traffic, impacts on the urban thoroughfare network can be expected to worsen.



In order to better assess the impacts of land use on the transportation network and to identify potential implementation measurers to mitigate those impacts a detailed thoroughfare study and plan is needed. A thoroughfare plan can provide a much more precise assessment and identify specific needs for implementation.

## Pedestrian and Bicycle

Overall, there is lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the county and the municipalities. Most of the municipalities' sidewalk system is over 30 years old. Sidewalk systems exist within the incorporated areas but are underutilized mainly because they are not contiguous, have structural pavement problems and do not provide inter-modal connections. Only Sandersville among the municipalities maintains its pedestrian facilities on a regular basis.

The CSRA RDC is currently in the process of developing a bicycle and pedestrian plan for the 13-county CSRA area. A complete inventory and assessment as well as recommendations will be completed by 2005. In 2004, Sandersville was awarded Transportation Enhancement funds by GDOT to complete streetscape work along Main Street. The cities should continue applying for TE grants to complete much needed pedestrian and bicycle projects.

No bicycle routes have been identified within the county or the municipalities. The regional bicycle and pedestrian plan will include recommendations for bicycle routes, including facilities along the proposed scenic byway route. In addition to identifying an internal network, the plan will examine ways to link local bicycle networks with the state system, thus providing residents with alternative transportation modes.

# Bridges and Signalization

The adequacy of the overall road network is dependent on bridge maintenance and the adequacy of signalized intersections to maintain a steady traffic flow. The county continues to monitor the condition of bridges and repair them on an as needed basis. The only planned bridge improvement project included in the GDOT State Transportation Improvement Program (for years 2004-2006) is a bridge replacement along SR 24 over Williamson Swamp Creek, 1.3 miles from Davisboro.

The level of service (LOS) of the signalized intersections is direct correlated to the level of service of the road segments that they control. Currently, all signalized intersections in Sandersville and Tennille are operating at a LOS C or better. Signs are well maintained and in clear view and all traffic signals are operational and strategically placed.

# Railroads

Norfolk Southern and the Sandersville Railroad Company currently provide an acceptable level of service and are expected to continue to do so. Even with the anticipated economic growth policy outlines in the Economic Development section, both rail providers have sufficient capacity to continue providing adequate service.

# Water Supply and Treatment



Residents, businesses, and industry require a safe, reliable and adequate supply of water to sustain a good quality of life and to allow for and sustain economic growth and for fire protection. Currently, in Washington County, there are several municipal water systems serving the Cities and the surrounding areas, but no County-owned distribution system. Residents of the County depend on individual wells for water supply.

## Davisboro

The City of Davisboro's existing water system consists of two wells, a distribution system of 8-inch and smaller lines, and two elevated water storage tanks. Both of the wells are capable of producing 450 gallons per minute (gpm) each, which provides the City and its residents with an adequate supply of water. Well No. 2 is located on East Brown Drive, just west of Breezy Hill Road on the eastern side of the City. Well No. 3 is located adjacent to the elevated tank on Cobb Street, just west of Main Street on the northern side of the City. Each well is treated with a sequestering agent for iron control and provides fluoridation and disinfection. Chemicals are stored in a separate room from the wellhead. The well buildings and equipment are generally in a good state of repair. There are 240 water taps serving approximately 1,600 people.

## Deepstep

There are two water wells that alternate pumping at 90 gallons per minute maximum capacity. The current usage averages 35,300 gallons per day for 86 customers, 15 commercial and 71 residential. There is a 75,000 gallon upright water storage tank and 22,912 feet of water distribution lines and 18 fire hydrants.

## Harrison

There are two water wells that serve the 500 citizens of Harrison.

## Oconee

The City of Oconee serves 112 water customers with approximately 28,100 feet of water distribution lines and 25 fire hydrants. There is one storage tank with a capacity of 100,000 gallons and the average usage per month is approximately 850,000 gallons.

## Riddleville

Water service is provided by the City to 87 customers, with an average monthly use of 500,000 gallons. One storage tank has a 100,000-gallon maximum capacity.

## Sandersville

The City of Sandersville operates its own water distribution and treatment system which is located approximately one mile west of the city limits. Raw water is drawn from five deep wells with a combined capacity of 8.06 mgd. The well water, once taken from the ground, is aerated, chlorinated and removed of iron at a rate of 2,500 gallons per minute. Water usage averages 2 mgd. Static water pressure of 65-70 psi is accomplished through



two elevated storage tanks of 300,000 gallons plus two ground tanks of 100,000 gallons each and one of 60,000 gallons.

Over 99 percent of the city's households are served by the municipal water system. The current number of residential, commercial and industrial water customers inside the city limits is approximately 2,645, while outside the city limits there are only 33 customers. The customer base has increased by over 20 percent since 1981.

# Tennille

The water source for the City of Tennille is two deep wells with a combined pumping capacity of 1 MGD per day and has a capacity of 630,000 gallons per day. The well water is aerated and chlorinated. Water usage averages 250,000 gallons per day. The maximum recorded amount pumped in any one day is 378,000 gallons. Static water pressure of 65-70 p.s.i. is generated from one 250,000 gallon elevated storage tank. There is no current map which shows the location of the water system; therefore, it is a top priority of the City to conduct an inventory of the system to produce a map showing exactly where water and sewer lines run.

# Warthen Water Association

Water is supplied by groundwater to 82 households with meters serving 219 people in the small community of Warthen. The private Warthen Water Association governs the town's water system. The system pumps 100 gpm and there is one elevated water tank of 50,000 gallons.

## Assessment

Currently, the water supply needs of the county and municipalities are being met. Current demand is significantly below the municipalities' total permitted withdrawal, treatment, and storage capacities. Population growth is projected at 1.2% through 2025 while housing units are anticipated to increase by approximately 367. Most of the county's housing growth is projected to be in and around Sandersville, where there is adequate infrastructure capacity for growth. Given current water capacities, growth will easily be accommodated. However, the county wishes to pursue and encourage largescale manufacturing, which may add stress on the existing system. The county and providing municipalities will need to coordinate on planning for future water service provision

In Deepstep, replacing water meters at a rate of ten per year is an ongoing project. Replacing the water lines installed in 1960 when the water system was first put in is another need for the city. Digging a third water well as an alternate site for a backup in the event a need should arise is also a priority for the city. Expanding the water system lines to areas in town that are currently not served is yet another need of the city.

In Oconee, some of the older water main lines need to be updated and the water tank will soon require a routine maintenance, which will include new paint. The current water supply and fire protection is adequate and will be adequate through the planning period.



#### SEWERAGE SYSTEM and WASTEWATER

No, countywide sewerage system is available to residents. Due to rural settlement patterns and low-density development, most homes rely on septic tanks for sewage treatment.

#### Davisboro

Davisboro's sewerage treatment facility functions as a land application system with an aerated lagoon. From the lagoon, sewerage moves to a holding pond, then the 45-acre applied site adjacent to the facility. Average daily demand for the facility is 5,000 gallons per day and the maximum capacity is 30,000 gallons per day.

#### Harrison

The City of Harrison operates the Wetlands Sewerage Plant, which utilizes an oxidation pond for aeration. The plant currently serves 185 customers within city limits and the capacity is sufficient to expand service even further. The average daily demand is 55,000 gallons and the maximum capacity is 250,000 gallons per day.

#### Deepstep, Oconee

Deepstep and Oconee residents have no sewerage system and rely solely on septic tanks.

#### Riddleville

Residents have no sewerage system and rely solely on septic tanks.

## Sandersville

The City of Sandersville operates its own sanitary sewerage system, located west of town, which currently serves over 2,500 customers within the city limits. This facility utilizes a trickling filter and activated sludge treatment process. The treatment process uses natural bacteria for the removal of waste. There is little need for chemical treatment in this type of system. Up to 1.75 mgd can be accommodated at the facility; however, average daily demand is approximately 1 mgd. Similar to the water facility, the wastewater system's customer base has increased since 1994.

## Tennille

Tennille maintains a sanitary sewerage system which has an excess sewage treatment capacity of approximately 100,000 gallons per day. Current maximum usage averages 250,000 gpd. Tennille is experiencing severe infiltration/inflow problems with its sewer system. Because of this problem, combined with metering difficulties, Tennille's flows into its oxidation pond is probably 350,000 to 375.000 gpd. The Tennille oxidation pond contains 10 acres and was built to serve a population of 2,500.



#### Assessment

Municipal sewerage systems offer ample capacity for future demand. Across the state, regional watershed studies and TMDL implementation plans have increasingly identified septic tanks as an increasing non-point source pollutant. The abundance of septic tanks in unincorporated areas has increased dramatically over the past twenty years as suburban development has outpaced urban development. The number and location of all of the septic tanks in the county is not precisely known, but the number of households not using a public sewerage system would indicate that there are over 3,000 individual septic systems (according to the number of households in Washington County). This estimate illustrates the large number of unmonitored septic systems in the county, which should be cleaned out every 3-5 years to ensure proper operation. Currently there are only limited regulations in place to monitor the maintenance of septic systems so once a problem occurs; it is generally too late to prevent contaminants from entering the ground and surface water.

## SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Waste collection is operated by the County which maintains approximately 250 green boxes dumpsters) and several compactor trucks which pick up trash at green box locations on a regular basis. Currently, the County is working on a more optimal collection plan, which will reconfigure greenbox locations and pick-up routes. At one time recycling was encouraged by the County but it proved to be uneconomical due to the lack of buyers and transport for the recyclable products.

Washington County operates a landfill along Kaolin Road under permit # 150-010D(MSWL). The majority of solid waste in Washington County comes from residential use or household garbage, including paper products, plastics, glass, aluminum, and ferrous metals. A limited amount of commercial and industrial waste consists of corrugated paperboard and wood waste.

For more information, please see the Washington County Solid Waste Plan.

## Davisboro, Deepstep, Harrison, Oconee, Riddleville

These cities do not have curbside garbage pickup, but contracts with the County to collect trash deposited in green boxes provided by the County. The dumpsters are maintained by the county. The county then contracts the transportation of the solid waste to the county landfill at a cost of \$299 per dumpster per month. Newspapers are recycled in Deepstep using a drop box. Residents are responsible for taking their solid waste to the green boxes. Yard waste collection is not available in any jurisdiction.

# Sandersville and Tennille

The cities of Sandersville and Tennille contract with private haulers for curbside pickup. Contracts are negotiated to save costs for the citizens who are then billed on their utility bills for the service. In Sandersville, curbside collection requires household waste to be bagged in city-supplied black garbage bags. Since the bags are a petroleum-based product, the cost of the bags can fluctuate, and has fluctuated because of the increase in petroleum prices. The city purchases the bags and then delivers the bags to each



household. The bags cost upwards of \$100,000 to the city. The city is now considering changing the garbage bags to polycarts. The city is negotiating the cost of the polycarts for each residence and business. The Town of Tennille already uses polycarts for their curbside pickup. Curbside collection of household garbage, as well as commercial and industrial waste is collected bi-weekly. Once collected, solid waste is transported to a transfer station in Milledgeville and then taken to a landfill from there.

## Assessment

Washington County is experiencing very little population growth and the County's current disposal programs and operations are adequate for meeting needs during the planning period. Collection programs in Washington County are sufficient to meet the demands of residents and businesses. Because the County is rural and residential areas are scattered, at-the-source countywide collection is not a priority at this time.

# **GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

Washington County operates under a commission-based system of government in which five commissioners are elected to four-year terms. All the municipalities operate under a mayoral system of government.

**Table C-3** presents an inventory of general government facilities. Although the respective local governments own and operate a variety of buildings, only those that are used for everyday government activity are reported on.

# Deepstep

The Town of Deepstep has one part-time clerk and no full-time employees. The city is run by a Mayor and five member city council. The government office is located in the town hall which is approximately 1,500 square feet. The town hall houses the local library as well as the town hall where local council meetings are held. The town does not own any vehicles.

## Oconee

The Town of Oconee has a Mayor-Council form of government with five councilmen and a mayor. There is one full time employee, the town clerk and three part-time employees. The water superintendent works part time, and the water maintenance and utility worker each work as needed, part-time. The City Hall consists of two offices, a meeting room, three bathrooms and three storage/closet areas. The building size is approximately 1,486 square feet.

## Riddleville

Five councilmembers are elected at-large to serve two-year terms on the city council. Three part-time employees are the city's only paid staff. They include the mayor, who also serves as water director, and the city clerk.



#### Assessment

In terms of office space and general physical facilities, Washington County is operating near capacity. As future departments expand and grow, additional space may be required in the latter stages of the planning period. As a future option, a county government complex should be considered.

With exception to normal scheduled replacements of vehicles and major equipment, the county has an adequate fleet of vehicles and equipment that is categorized as being in generally fair condition.

## Deepstep

In the future, Deepstep would like to expand the town hall and office space and hire a full-time employee to handle daily town business. The town is currently adequately served by the government buildings, equipment, and personnel.

#### Oconee

The Oconee City Hall is an older building that is badly in need of modernization. The police department is run out of one of the offices in the city hall and does not provide enough space for the police chief. More filing and storage space is needed to adequately store city records and other times.

## Riddleville

According the mayor, office space is adequate for the near future.

## **PUBLIC SAFETY**

Public Safety includes the Sheriff's Department, the Marshal's Department, city police departments, emergency medical services, fire protection and animal control.

## **Fire Protection**

An effective fire department is a vital link in the chain of regional development, affecting insurance costs and, thus, the willingness of people and industries to settle in a given area. Fire protection is directly affected by the quality of the water system and a lack of infrastructure can severely reduce the community's ability to provide adequate fire protection.

The existence and adequacy of a water system become a determining factor in the rating given a fire department by the Insurance Services Organization (ISO). Other factors include: the size and type of buildings in a community, the presence or absence of a fire alarm system, how calls are received and handled, whether fire fighters are paid or volunteer, whether there is a community water system, the size of water mains, and how long it takes a department to respond to a call. This independent organization weighs all these factors to assign a department a rating between one and ten, with a rating of nine or ten meaning that an area is relatively unprotected.



ISO ratings are not legal standards but recommendations that insurance companies can use to set fire insurance rates. Because they are set by an independent organization, they become an easy way of comparing community fire departments. However, because these ratings involve weighing several variables, they do not directly compare. For instance, a rating of seven in two different communities does not mean that each is working with the same equipment under the same circumstances. Rather, one could have an adequate water system but inadequate personnel and equipment, the other, the reverse.

## Washington County

Washington County maintains a Fire Department with 55 volunteer personnel, eight fire stations and eleven vehicles. This Department provides fire protection services for the entire County. The unincorporated County has a fire insurance rating of class 10, except for areas within 5 miles of a station which are rated at a class 8. Each department receives funding from the county to provide services and derives the remainder of its funding through private donations and fund raisers. Each department primary coverage area is within a five mile radius of the fire station and the secondary coverage area is to provide backup to all other departments when needed.

#### Davisboro

In Davisboro, 18 volunteers and one full-time fire chief operate a volunteer fire department. They operate four fire trucks, one ambulance and one pickup truck (with attached pumper). The fire insurance rating for Davisboro is 8 within 1,000 feet of a hydrant, and 9 outside that range.

#### Deepstep

The Town of Deepstep is served by a volunteer fire department with 16 volunteers who run approximately 40 calls per year, including fire calls, first responder alls and general aid calls. Each firefighter is equipped with a portable radio and one set of turnout gear. The department has five trucks in service, two class A pumpers (1968, 2002), two tankers (1976, 1986), and a fire knocker (1972). These fire trucks are housed in a four bay building that also includes a small office area.

#### Oconee

There are 16 volunteer firefighters for the volunteer fire department in Oconee. The fire department is a 60' x 100' building with three bays which houses two fire trucks, a 1991 International and a 1975 Seagraves. Each year there are approximately 10-12 fire calls and 10-12 first responder calls.

#### Riddleville

A new fire station built in 1996 is operated by 22 firefighters and 3 emergency medical technicians, all volunteers. The Class 6 station also includes two Class A pumper trucks and serves 2,800 people in Riddlevilee and in the surrounding unincorporated county.



## Sandersville

The Sandersville Fire Department (SFD) operates one fire station with six bays that houses two pumpers, one pumper/rescue combination, two tankers, and three support trucks. The department has a combination of seven full-time and 25 volunteer firefighters. The full-time members consist of a chief, three captains and three engineers. The volunteers consist of an assistant chief, three lieutenants and 21 firefighters. The office space covers only 713 square feet, for the Chief, three Captains, and three Engineers.

The SFD 's response area is in a district outlined by the 911 area map. Primary responsibility remains in the city limits of Sandersville with one pumper owned by Washington County to respond to rural calls. The Department backs up other fire departments in Washington County as needed.

SFD serves a population of 6,100 citizens in the city limits and larger areas in the county. In the year 2002, SFD responded to 375 fire/rescue calls and conducted 35 training classes and drills. SFD has an ISO classification of a class 5. The Department is certified by the Georgia Firefighter Standards and Training Council. Training is held on the first and third Wednesdays every month.

All personnel are module I trained with most members being certified as Rescue Specialist and in Vehicle Extrication. Some firefighters are also trained as EMT's and First Responders.

The SFD promotes fire safety, fire prevention, and awareness programs to local schools and the business community. Each year fire safety materials are distributed to the elementary schools. The SFD is a member of the Washington County Firefighters Association.

## Tennille

Tennille Fire Department has 15 volunteer fire fighters, 2 vehicles and has a fire insurance rating of class 8. Davisboro also has a volunteer fire department with 20 volunteers and three vehicles.

## Police/Sheriff Department

## Washington County

The Washington County Sheriff's Department is currently staffed with 19 uniformed officers, one investigator and 10 administrative personnel. Some of the uniformed officers serve as jailers at the County and Sheriffs Department facilities. Officers work in 12 hour shifts. The County has 1 canine and 11 vehicles which range from 1985 to 1992 models. The Sheriff's Department is located in Sandersville in the County Annex and contains 3 holding cells. The County Jail is 5,000 square feet and has 8 cells and 1 dormitory.



Washington County is a member of a network of police agencies throughout the area which maintain communications through a computerized system. Additionally, a special weapons and tactics team (SWAT) is operated jointly by the Sheriff's Department and the Sandersville Police Department. The Sheriff reports that, due to the demand for drugs, thefts and burglaries are on the rise. Violent crimes also increase each year. The County is also served by regional offices of the Georgia Bureau of Investigation and The Georgia State Patrol.

## Davisboro

The Davisboro Police Department employs eight part-time officers and one full-time Chief of Police. Two police cars are also used by the department.

## Deepstep

Deepstep public safety is provided by the County, although a neighborhood watch program currently exists in Deepstep to compliment the Sheriff's Department.

## Harrison

Harrison relies upon the Washington County Sheriff's Department for police service.

#### Oconee

There is one part-time police officer for the Town of Oconee who acts as the police chief. The police work out of a small office in city hall. The police department has one car, a 1998 Crown Victoria

## Riddleville

Riddleville relies upon the Washington County Sheriff's Department for police service.

## Sandersville

The Sandersville Police Department currently employs twenty full-time police officers, four part-time police officers, seven records personnel (four full-time, three part-time), and one part-time and one full-time animal control officer. The police department also operates a 24-hour E-911 dispatch. The department maintains a total of nineteen patrol cars, seven of which are equipped with a camera and video recording machine. The police headquarters is located on Malone Street in the City's downtown and houses offices for records, dispatch, and holding cells. Currently there are four holding cells with a capacity for 16 detainees. Enhanced 911 Service is available throughout the County and is operated and coordinated by the Sandersville Police Department. Not including security checks, the number of police calls averages approximately 1,300 per month. The City recently constructed a repeater antenna for county wide communication between police, fire and medical service departments which the City operates.

Police protection outside the Sandersville city limits is provided by the Washington County Sheriff's Department, which also operates a 24—hour dispatch and patrol with a



force of 19 full-time officers and three part-time officers using eight patrol vehicles. Both departments are part of a network of police agencies throughout the area, which maintain communications through a computerized system. Additionally, a joint SWAT team operates with personnel of the Sheriff's Office and the Sandersville Police Department.

## **Emergency Medical Services**

Emergency Medical Service is provided county-wide by the Washington County EMS. There are 15 full-time employees, nine paramedics and six EMTs and 14 part-time employees, eight paramedics and six EMTs, for a total of 29 employees. The department owns four ambulances ranging in model years 1999 to 2003. The EMS operates 4 ambulances from Memorial Hospital in Sandersville, where patients are transported, and receives an excess of 200 calls/month. A secretary is also employed and serves as a dispatcher. The offices are located near the hospital.

## EMA

Sandersville and Washington County operate a volunteer civil defense force which is responsible for coordinating rescue operations during any disaster. The Emergency Management Agency is capable of relieving the police force during emergencies with the aid of trained volunteers, currently totaling 25. Shelters are located within the County at three locations.

## Animal Control

Animal control in Sandersville is provided by two animal control officers from the Sandersville Police Department. There is one full-time and one part-time animal control officer. Currently the County provides no extensive animal control services. The County contracts with Sandersville for spay & neutering, euthanasia and disposal of animals. Services such as viewing areas for individuals interested in adopting pets are found throughout the region.

## **Public Safety Assessment**

The Washington County Commissioners have determined that the fire protection is adequate for Washington County. However, as the population increases, a more in depth study should be done to determine future service needs. The Volunteer Fire Departments should continue to train and raise funds to purchase equipment.

Emergency medical service in Sandersville is generally considered good by city officials and residents. However, Sandersville will need to annually evaluate the adequacy and delivery of emergency medical services as the City's population continues to increase.

With the realignment and reconstruction widening of State Route 88 through Washington County, it is expected that with more traffic, there will be more traffic accidents. These accidents will include semi-tractor trailers that carry all types of



flammable items across the state. Usage by heavy vehicles will increase, thereby requiring special equipment for fire fighting on these types of fires.

Washington County and its municipalities are well served by police, fire and ambulance service. The initial assessment shows that many departments are in need of newer vehicles.

Services for 911 are done countywide, but Wrens also has its own 911 department. These separate services covering the same areas should be analyzed and considered for consolidation of services.

Each municipality and the unincorporated areas of the County are currently being well served by the fire departments. However based upon initial assessment of the inventory it can be seen that many new vehicles are needed. Many vehicles are well over 20 years old and their dependency is questionable. Intergovernmental agreements exist for fire protection and have worked well in the past for full coverage and back-up of all county residents. Water systems in all of the municipalities will need to be improved and maintained to ensure fire hydrant coverage and essential water pressure for fire protection.

In 2000, Washington County spent \$2.7 million or 34.5% of total county spending on public safety which includes spending for law enforcement, fire services and jails.

To address the numerous stray dogs and cats, the county should consider an animal shelter or a humane society.

## Deepstep

Speeding has become a problem in Deepstep since there is no consistent police coverage. The Mayor and Council have plans to purchase a speed control sign to help remind the public that there is a speed limit in town. The level of service needs to be increased based on the potential growth and growing concerns of the citizens, but the town cannot afford to hire its own police officer. Deepstep will continue to work with the county and will continue to stress the importance of security and law enforcement around the town.

The fire protection serves the community well, although it will be important to ensure that the firefighters have adequate equipment, training, and vehicles to continue that high level of service. The fire department seeks to lower the town's ISO rating thus reducing insurance premiums and increasing the public's safety.

Since the Town of Deepstep is currently served by Washington County ambulance service, which provides a valuable service, residents have expressed their concern over the need for better emergency care. A quick response is difficult since the town is located nine to ten miles away from the hospital located in Sandersville. The city does not have any plans to provide its own emergency care, but it is hoped that with the new enhanced 911 system, response times can be improved.


### **RECREATION FACILITIES**

There are several public benefits that may accrue from park and recreation services. Those benefits begin with by contributions to economic development by enhancing real estate values, attracting tourists, attracting businesses, and attracting retirees. Benefits continue by helping to alleviate social problems by preventing youth crime, facilitating healthy lifestyles, and reducing environmental stress. The other major benefits of parks and recreation services are general environmental stewardship through historical preservation and the natural environment.

Year-round programs are offered to all ages by the Washington County Recreation Department including baseball, soccer, basketball, softball and flag football. The department offers programs from gardening to swimming. There are also lighted basketball and tennis courts, playing fields, a playground and picnic area in Washington County.

Washington County operates a Recreational Department which serves the entire community and all age groups. With an operating budget of \$402,538, six full-time employees provide administrative and coaching services. Basketball, soccer, baseball, softball, football and volleyball are offered as team sports. Individual sports include gymnastics and aerobics.

Swimming and tennis lessons are also available.

Two primary parks are operated by the County. The Sandersville City Park is owned by the City, but run by the Washington County Parks and Recreation Department. The park has 3 multi-purpose ball fields, 2 tennis courts, a playground, and 2 basketball courts. The basketball courts are badly in need of repair.

The County dedicated the 30 acre Kaolin Park located in Sandersville in the fall of 1990. The park consists of 4 multi-purpose playing fields, 2 tennis courts, 2 basketball courts, and a picnicking area.

A primary goal of the Parks and Recreation Department is to construct a gymnasium for indoor sporting activities. Currently, County-operated recreational activities such as volleyball and basketball are located in the middle or high school gymnasiums. Schedule conflicts often cause practice times to run late in the evening and sometimes they are canceled.

Projections for future park needs which are based on Washington County population projection indicate that the County will have to expand its system to include more tennis courts and a basketball court. Hamburg Mill State Park was not included in these figures because it is a regional park and is not specifically serving Washington County.

## Deepstep

There is one park in Deepstep which includes a baseball and a softball field, a <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> basketball court, playground equipment, walking trail and a picnic area. There are men's softball games as well as little league baseball games played on the fields. The park also



includes a covered pavilion, restrooms, concession stand, bleachers and a press box for everyone's enjoyment. The park covers 10.64 acres. Recreation is a large part of the high quality of life in Deepstep.

### Oconee

Oconee has three areas referred to as "parks" as they are small areas that have been landscaped for beautification only. Oconee has a community center that is a rentable building used for social functions.

### Riddleville

Completed in 2002, the <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> mile exercise trail at Walker Trail Park serves as the City's only recreation facility. The four-acre park is fully lit and also features a picnic area.

#### Assessment

The National Recreation and Park Association has set as a guideline level of service 10 acres of park, recreation, or open space per 1,000 persons. This is merely a guideline and every community has its own set of needs based on the demographics of the population. Based on this guideline, the county should have at least 170 acres of neighborhood park space. The current neighborhood park space only covers approximately 30 acres, which makes the ratio of neighborhood park space in the county to be approximately 2 acres per 1,000 persons. It is difficult for the county to maintain parks of this type within the unincorporated area because of the low-density, scattered style of residential development that occurs outside of municipal boundaries.

Recreation facilities around the county vary is size and quality. The small community parks are generally small and contain very old equipment that should be removed and upgraded up to the national park and recreation standards.

### Deepstep

Deepstep is currently adequately served by the existing park and recreation facilities which include a baseball diamond and half-court for basketball, but the city would still like to expand its park to enhance the quality of life. Lights are needed for the court and baseball field, as well as an expansion to a full court. The bleachers need covered, new dugout benches are needed, and the walking trail could be lengthened. The town also would like to offer tennis, full basketball facilities or even a swimming pool.

#### Oconee

Oconee is in need of areas and programs for recreation programs.

### Riddleville

The recently-upgraded Walker Trail Park adequately serves the recreational needs of city residents.



### **HOSPITALS and OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH FACILITIES**

The Washington County Regional Medical Center provides comprehensive healthcare services to residents of Washington and surrounding counties in a comfortable, professional setting.

The regional medical center provides care in a number of specialties including anesthesiology, internology, family medicine, obstetrics/gynecology, orthopedic surgery, pathology, pediatrics, psychiatry, radiology, general surgery, and gastroenterology. The Hughston Clinic of Columbus, Georgia has a part-time office at the medical center with orthopedists specializing in sports medicine. The medical center also plans to add an ophthalmologist, oral surgeon, dermatologist and a histologist to its professional staff in the near future.

The Washington County Regional Medical Center, which has won awards such as "Georgia Rural Hospital of the Year" in the past, seeks to provide individualized and quality services to all its patients. The center has just added a fitness facility to the hospital to house its Wellness Works Health and Fitness Center, which has a full circuit of strength-building and cardiovascular equipment, fitness and aerobics classes, massage therapy, and health and wellness education. Continued construction will allow for the addition of an after-hours non-emergency primary care clinic. A surgical services department will be added soon.

### **Health Department**

The Washington County Health Department offers a variety of health services to county residents and has one location in the county located in Sandersville. The department has five Registered Nurses on staff and services offered include children's medical care, preventative health care, women's health services, WIC administration, family planning, birth control, counseling, STD diagnosis and treatment, and TB tests and treatment, and immunizations. The County Health Department is also responsible for private septic tank permitting and environmental controls, water sampling, and restaurant inspections. There are seven administrative personnel in addition to the environmentalist and the five nurses. The Health Department also contracts with the school system to provide four LPNs and one RN to the schools.

### Nursing Homes

Currently Washington County has three skilled nursing facilities with a total of 170 beds and one personal care home with 31 beds, to meet the needs of Washington County's elderly population. These facilities consistently operate at or near capacity and as the county population ages additional housing options may be needed to ensure an adequate supply of special needs housing. At the anticipated growth, 25 additional beds will be needed at skilled nursing homes and almost 5 additional beds will be needed for assisted living. These numbers are based on current availability. If additional senior housing, whether it be nursing homes or personal care homes were available, the facilities may still be used to capacity. There is no way to tell if seniors are moving to other locations to find adequate nursing homes or personal care homes. Washington County should consider providing adequate senior housing to allow for seniors to stay in the county to live.



### Assessment

The demand for health services in the county continues to grow as Washington County's population grows and ages and as poverty remains or increases. With 23% of the individuals in the county are living in poverty, and 19% of families are living in poverty, their needs for healthcare will be fulfilled at the public health facility for basic needs and the hospital for other, more serious needs. It is important that the county works with the education and economic development areas to remove this burden from the healthcare facilities.

Administrators also cited a transportation issue related to healthcare. Many people out in the county cannot make appointments with healthcare providers because of inadequate transportation. Due to the county residential development being spread throughout the county and the county being so large, it is difficult to get around the county without a car.

Washington County had 13.6 licensed nursing home beds per 100 persons in 1999, compared with the state average of 5.5 per 100 persons. Although the number of nursing home beds is below the state average, this does not take into consideration the staff and staff hours per patient. Relating to growth, the nursing home facilities should be adequate for the county. The quality of nursing homes all over the state can always improve.

In 2002, the number of physicians in the county per 10,000 persons was 7.5, compared to the state average of 19.3. The number of physicians in Washington County is below the state average, but the county and the hospital are working diligently to improve that ratio. This problem coincides with economic development, quality of life, and available housing. Bringing physicians to the county will take more than just a job at the local hospital, it will take community and economic development improvements. The number of physicians though will have to work, although not adequate, for the population.

Other areas that are inadequate and should be considered, that could fall under the health facilities category, are the following needs: Birthing centers; substance abuse programs; youth development programs; domestic violence services/programs.

## EDUCATIONAL FACILIITES

The county is home to two primary schools, two elementary schools, a new middle school and a comprehensive high school. A number of renovations have been made to each of these campuses. Four of these schools are Georgia Schools of Excellence. An alternative campus is also available for those youth with behavioral or attendance problems, and allows students smaller classroom size to better accommodate their special needs.

The Washington County Board of Education administers 6 public schools with 221 teachers and 3,601 students. In 2001, the new consolidated high school graduated 233 graduates. In 2000, the two private schools 254 students enrolled. The current capacity of the schools is more than adequate to facilitate any population growth in the county. The School Board has used SPLOST funds to pay for improvements such as roof replacements and various improvements to the elementary schools and to the middle schools.



Table C-4: Washing	gton County P	ublic and Pi	rivate Scho	ols
Private School Name	Location	Grades	<u>Total</u>	Capacity
Brentwood School	Sandersville	PK-12	403	NA
Public School Name	Location	Grades	<u>Total</u>	Capacity
Crawford Primary School	Tennille	KK-02	269	NA
Elder Primary School	Sandersville	KK-02	530	NA
Sandersville Elementary School	Sandersville	5-Mar	637	NA
T. J. Elder Middle School	Sandersville	8-Jun	923	NA
Tennille Elementary School	Tennille	5-Mar	388	NA
Washington County High School	Sandersville	12-Sep	1099	NA
	Total Pu	ublic School	3846	NA

Sandersville Technical College offers over 40 programs in the fields of business and office technology, computers, childcare, transportation, maintenance, electricity, plastics and welding. The programs range in length from short certificates of credit to Diplomas, and include several Associate Degrees. Sandersville Tech is a proud participant in the Georgia Virtual Technical College system, and offers many of classes on line. The college runs a strong Adult Literacy program and is one of only nine communities in the state to achieve the Certified Literate Community status. There is a wide variety of business and industry training (both credit and non credit) and much of that training is at the company site. Sandersville Tech also coordinates the nationally recognized QuickStart training program for the service delivery area.

## Assessment

Ten years ago, the County School system had 3,839 students and in 2002, there were 3,855 students, including the private school students. This is less than a 1% increase over 10 years, which shows that the population has been steady over the past 10 years. The same steady, slow growth is expected in the future for Washington County Schools. The students and teachers have spread out in the schools to take advantage of the space, but there is sufficient capacity for growth.

# LIBRARIES and OTHER CULTURAL FACILIITES

The Oconee Regional Library, one of 57 library systems in the State of Georgia under the University System Board of Regents, is headquartered in Dublin at the Laurens County Library from which it serves a combined population of over 83,000 people in Johnson, Laurens, Treutlen and Washington counties across 2,011 square miles. Part of the Oconee Regional Library system is the Rosa M. Tarbutton Memorial Library in Sandersville which opened in 1998 combining the Sandersville Public Library and the Washington County Library. It serves all of Washington County including Tennille, Harrison, Deepstep, Riddleville, Warthen, Oconee and Davisboro. The Library has three weekly programs for children. On Tuesday afternoons at 4:30, a story-time for those children in grades Kindergarten through 5 is offered. On Fridays and Saturdays at 10:00, a Toddler Time program is offered for children aged 3 to 5 years.



Located in our children's section are 5 computers available for children's use. These computers contain interactive stories as well as skill-building, educational games.

Services provided include:

- Books, including large-print books
- Magazines
- Videos/DVDs
- Audiobooks
- Music CDs (Louisville only)
- PINES Holds/ILL
- Local newspapers
- Internet access computers
- Children's computers with educational games
- Fax machine
- Photocopier
- Children's story hours
- Vacation Reading Club
- Voter registration
- Meeting rooms
- Family Literacy Centers

The Washington County Library, located in Sandersville, is 8,200 square feet and employs 6 full-time and 3 part-time personnel. The meeting space includes 640 square feet and seats 56. The library has 2,579 registered patrons, 27,527 volumes, 141 videos, and 1,000 audio tapes.

The Town of Deepstep also operates a public library. The library is housed in the city hall and has one part-time librarian on staff. The library has more than 5,000 books and magazines for both adults and children. The building is about 400 square feet. The library has two computers, a copy machine, a typewriter, desks and chairs and the center display table doubles as a table with seats.

Services for Senior Citizens in Washington County are provided by the Washington County Senior Citizen Center which is located on in Sandersville. The Center is for people ages 60 and up and is open during the week from 9 AM to 5 PM. The Center provides recreation, an exercise program, and arts and crafts. Lunch is served daily.

## Assessment

The public library system seeks to provide a collection of materials, in a variety of formats, which reflect the diversity of the population served, and of American society. In the collection, as many points of view are included as possible. The library possesses approximately 27,500 volumes, which is equal to 1.3 volumes per capita. The Georgia Public Library System has adopted standardized recommendations for libraries which states that a library should maintain a current, thoroughly weeded collection of materials appropriate to the service responses the library has chosen. The library does not even reach the lowest level of service, or the essential materials collection with having 2



volumes per capita. A library is considered to have a full materials collection with 3 volumes per capita and a comprehensive materials collection with 5 volumes per capita.

The two libraries in Washington County, one a full-service library and the other a town library are funded separately. The County library is funded by the county and the cities, as well as the county school system. The Deepstep library is funded solely by that city and but serves as a resource for residents and visitors of Deepstep.

The Deepstep Public Library currently meets the needs of the residents, even though the library could be more efficiently used if it were open for longer hours. This would require a full-time librarian. Also, for the library to meet the needs of the public and the changing times, the library would need to obtain a microfilm reader, develop a video library, and provide more research and business reference material.

### **GOALS AND POLICIES**

All goals and policies apply to Washington County and the municipalities unless otherwise noted.

### Transportation

Vision Statement

Strengthen the County's transportation network through improvements to infrastructure.

Goal 1: Improve overall transportation system and facilities in Washington County.

**Policy 1-1**: Continue to pave 5 miles of roadway per year.

### Water Supply and Treatment

Vision Statement

Provide potable water service in a safe, clean, efficient, economical, and environmentally sound manner conducive to new development.

Goal 1: Continue to expand and improve the water system.

**Policy 1-1**: Examine the feasibility of developing a countywide water authority and take steps towards implementation (applies to Washington County).

Policy 1-2: Pursue State/Federal funds for expansion and improvement projects.

Policy 1-3: Use expansion and improvement projects to attract businesses.

Policy 1-4: Develop water/sewer system master plan and coordinate expansion.



Goal 2: Provide adequate water service to all Washington County residents.

**Policy 2-1**: Provide adequate and timely services to existing and proposed businesses.

**Policy 2-2**: Identify and replace substandard segments of the public water system.

### Sewerage System and Wastewater Treatment

### Vision Statement

Provide sanitary sewer service in a safe, clean, efficient, economical, and environmentally sound manner conducive to new development.

**Goal 1**: Continue to expand and improve the sewer system.

Policy 1-1: Pursue State/Federal funds for expansion and improvement projects.

**Policy 1-2**: Use expansion and improvement projects to attract businesses.

**Policy 1-3**: Develop water/sewer system master plan and coordinate expansion.

Goal 2: Provide adequate sewage disposal to all Washington County residents.

**Policy 2-1**: Continue to expand the public sewer service as it becomes economically feasible to attract business opportunities.

**Policy 2-2**: Provide adequate and timely services to existing and proposed businesses.

**Policy 2-3**: Improve and expand the public sewer system.

**Goal 3**: Increase level of sewage treatment to improve the quality of life.

**Policy 3-1**: Apply for funds from the Department of Natural Resources for improved water treatment.

## Solid Waste Management

#### Vision Statement

Ensure a dependable, environmentally safe means of disposing solid waste and recyclables is available to all homes and businesses.

**Goal 1**: Provide for the adequate collection, reduction, and disposal of solid waste in Washington County and its municipalities.

**Policy 1-1**: Form a committee for solid waste management.

Policy 1-2: Increase opportunities for recycling/composting and yard waste collection.



Policy 1-3: Implement funding mechanism to keep landfill county-owned.

**Policy 1-4**: Develop landfill policy in Washington County that would prevent acceptance of outside waste.

Policy 1-5: Protect residents from illegal sludge and landfill development.

### **General Government**

Vision Statement

Provide adequate space, equipment and technology to elected officials and staff to facilitate local government operations and decision-making processes.

**Goal 1**: Improve the working conditions of general government buildings in Washington County and the municipalities.

**Policy 1-1**: Consider constructing a county government complex (applies to Washington County).

Policy 1-2: Improve handicapped accessibility at city and county governments.

### **Public Safety**

### Vision Statement

Provide responsive and effective public safety services ensuring adequate staff, equipment and space is available to each of the departments.

**Goal 1**: Provide adequate law enforcement Washington County and the municipalities.

**Policy 1-1**: Strive to bring the management and operation of City and County law enforcement agencies in line with national standards.

**Policy 1-2**: Examine the feasibility of constructing a new City/County jail (applies to Washington County and Louisville).

**Policy 1-3**: Provide additional law enforcement officers to meet peak demand (applies to Washington County and all municipalities except Avera and Stapleton).

**Policy 1-4**: Complete implementation of E-911 dispatch system for law enforcement, as well as fire, EMS, and Rescue services.

**Policy 1-5**: Update and purchase additional equipment including radio and surveillance equipment and vehicles (applies to Washington County and all municipalities except Avera and Stapleton).

Policy 1-6: Purchase and install a networked computer system.



**Policy 1-7**: Consider consolidation of Sheriff, Marshal, and even Police (applies to Washington County and all municipalities except Avera and Stapleton).

Goal 2: Improve fire protection throughout Washington County.

**Policy 2-1**: Continue to replace and upgrade all fire equipment.

**Policy 2-2**: Construct two new fire stations with adequate training facilities for the Washington County Fire Department (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 2-3:** Provide a sufficient number of full-time and volunteer firemen at each fire department to meet national standards.

**Policy 2-4**: Increase the number of fire towers at community fire stations.

**Policy 2-5**: Assemble and coordinate a regional hazardous materials team.

**Goal 3**: Continue to provide adequate emergency medical services for all residents of Washington County.

**Policy 3-1**: Provide adequate training facilities for EMS personnel (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 3-2**: Provide cross training for firefighters and EMS personnel (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 3-3**: Provide a covered facility to house EMS vehicles and equipment in the Louisville station (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 3-4**: Investigate the possibility of locating a county EMS station in Wadley (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 3-5**: Acquire additional ambulances to be used at the Louisville, Wadley, and Wrens EMS stations (applies to Washington County).

**Goal 4**: Consider consolidation of E-911 Services.

**Policy 4-1**: Determine feasibility of delivery methods.

Goal 5: Develop Domestic Violence Center/Shelters

**Policy 5-1**: Address Domestic and child abuse issues.

Policy 5-2: Secure funds for domestic violence and child abuse centers and programs.

**Policy 5-3**: Secure funding for investigators to find a way to protect those who cannot protect themselves.



### **Recreation Facilities**

### Vision Statement

Provide, protect and maintain a high quality, accessible, and economically efficient network of parks, recreation facilities, and open space that serves all residents.

**Goal 1**: Improve and enhance recreational facilities, activities and passive recreation opportunities for people of all ages in Washington County.

**Policy 1-1**: Apply for funds to increase parks and recreation levels of service.

**Policy 1-2**: Identify potential passive recreation opportunities and then apply for funding to implement such activities in the community.

Policy 1-3: Develop additional activities for young people.

Goal 2: Consider feasibility of consolidating the parks and recreation departments.

**Policy 2-1**: Identify resources/inventory.

**Policy 2-2**: Consider changes and improvements in methods of service delivery.

## **Hospitals and Other Public Health Facilities**

### Vision Statement

Continue to support public and private health care providers ensuring that all of the county's needs are met, including all special needs communities.

**Goal 1**: Improve and supplement health care services provided by the Washington County Hospital (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-1**: Actively recruit a surgeon and additional doctors specializing in family practice and pediatrics (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-2**: Acquire a renal dialysis system for the hospital (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-3**: Establish a Rural Health Clinic to provide basic health care services to Washington County residents (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-4**: Strengthen the local hospital by marketing medical services to patients in surrounding communities (applies to Washington County).



**Policy 1-5**: Establish a prenatal program for young mothers through the Medical College of Georgia (applies to Washington County).

# **Educational Facilities**

### Vision Statement

Collaborate with the local school boards to provide and maintain a quality education system that meets the needs of residents now and in the future.

**Goal 1**: Continue to support the long-range plans of the Washington County School Board.

**Policy 1-1**: Renovate current school buildings (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-2:** Continue to improve and expand vocational program in the High School (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-3:** Continue to upgrade and renovate the elementary schools (applies to Washington County).

**Goal 2**: Expand existing Technical Education Center facilities to accommodate growing enrollment.

## Libraries and Other Cultural Facilities

## Vision Statement

Provide and maintain a quality library system and support all cultural facilities to meet the needs of residents now and in the future

**Goal 1:** Continued support of the public library system and other cultural facilities to ensure adequate service is provided to existing and future populations.

**Policy 1-1:** Continue to provide financial and human resource support to the Washington County Public Library System to meet identified needs (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-2:** Maintain a good working relationship with the library system to continue its good service to the citizens of the county (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-3:** Increase the amount of space available for public computer use (applies to Washington County).

**Policy 1-4:** Improve access to library resources (applies to Washington County).



# INTRODUCTION

The Intergovernmental Coordination Element provides local governments an opportunity to inventory existing intergovernmental coordination mechanisms and processes with other local governments and governmental entities that can impact success implementation of the local comprehensive plan. This section also provides an assessment of the adequacy and suitability of existing coordination mechanisms to serve the current and future needs of the community, and to articulate goals and formulate a strategy for effective implementation of community policies and objectives.

# **Adjacent Local Governments**

*Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:* Washington County and Tenille participated in and developed a joint comprehensive plan in 1994 and are now also including the municipalities of Davisboro, Deepstep, Harrison, Oconee, Riddleville and Sandersville in the 2004 joint comprehensive plan update. An advisory committee was established with representatives from each city and the county commission. Public hearings were also held jointly with representatives from the county and cities in attendance.

*Existing Coordination Mechanisms:* Washington County and its municipalities do not have a formal SPLOST agreement outlining the use of tax revenues for each jurisdiction. The cities and county also do not have a formal annexation agreement outlining the process required and circumstances necessary for an annexation to occur, although all cities notify the County of all annexations. Other coordinated efforts include cemeteries, tax collection, economic development, tax assessor, clerk of court and the extension service. The county commission and city councils meet informally several times a year to discuss coordination efforts.

# **School Boards**

*Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:* The school board consults the comprehensive plan for data and direction when applying for school funding grants.

*Existing Coordination Mechanisms:* None exist at this time.

# **Independent Special Districts**

There are no independent special districts in Washington County.



# Industrial Development Authorities

*Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:* The industrial development authorities refer to the comprehensive plan for data, guidance, and implementation purposes, more than any other authority within the county. As a result, the comprehensive plan is a document these organizations will use to develop future projects.

*Existing Coordination Mechanisms:* The Washington County Chamber of Commerce is jointly funded by the County, the City of Sandersville and the City of Tennille to provide economic development services.

# **Utility Companies**

*Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:* Gas service is provided by a private firm, and Georgia Power provides electric service to all jurisdictions within Washington County. There are no relationships between utility companies and the comprehensive plan.

*Existing Coordination Mechanisms:* Although no formal process for coordinating activities is in the place, the county and city clerks within their jurisdictions have primary responsibility for coordination.

# **Service Delivery Strategy**

The Service Delivery Strategy identifies several agreements between local governments within Washington County and with neighboring jurisdictions. Cooperation in carrying out these agreements is generally managed at the staff level on a day-to-day basis. They include agreements:

- Between Washington County and all its municipalities to provide fire protection.
- Between Washington County all its municipalities to provide housing for inmates at the Washington County Sheriff's Department.
- Between Washington County and all its municipalities for police protection from the Washington County Sheriff's Department.
- Between Washington County and Deepstep, Oconnee, Riddleville, Sandersville and Tennille to provide solid waste collection.
- Between Sandersville and Washington County, for Sandersville to provide animal control services county-wide.
- Between Washington County and all its municipalities for the County Coroner to sign death certificates county-wide.



### INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

- Between Washington County and all its municipalities to provide emergency management coordination.
- Between Washington County and all its municipalities to provide library services county-wide through the Washington County Library.
- Between Washington County and all its municipalities for recreation services through the Washington County Recreation and Parks Department.

# Governor's Greenspace Program

Washington County does not qualify for Greenspace grants and therefore have not participated in the Governor's Greenspace Program.

# Costal Management

Washington County is not located within a costal management zone.

# Appalachian Regional Commission

Washington County is not located within the Appalachian Regional Commission.

# Water Planning Districts

Washington County is not located within a state designated water-planning district.

# Transportation Requirements for Non-Attainment Areas

Washington County is not located within a non-attainment area.

# Assessment

# Land Use Conflicts at Jurisdictional Borders

Existing coordination mechanisms are important both regionally and within jurisdictions. Washington County and neighboring counties do not have any land use conflicts at jurisdictional borders due to the lack of development at or near their respective boundaries. However, there are no formal mechanisms in place to ensure future conflicts can be resolved. Numerous highway widening projects, part of the Governor's Road Improvement Program (GRIP) to provide four-lane highway access to most Georgia communities, has the potential to alter traffic patterns given Washington County's proximity to these major highway projects. One of the primary purposes of GRIP is to encourage development in the state's smaller communities. Historically, major highway projects have encouraged development in scattered areas, primarily commercial development as a response to increases in traffic, that have the potential to conflict with Washington



County's forestry land use patterns. The CSRA RDC currently serves as an ad hoc forum to resolve such issues but formal agreements among counties may be needed.

Projections for the county and municipalities highlight minimal population and household growth over the planning period, and zoning is not in Washington County or any of the municipalities. However, one of the economic development objectives pursued by the county and municipalities is to encourage industrial development. Economic development planning is therefore partially tied to the municipalities' infrastructure capacity. Since residential development is the primary need for land, this has the potential to cause land use conflicts in areas adjacent to municipal; boundaries. Coordination between the county and cities will be needed to ensure that land use conflicts do not arise at jurisdictional borders.

One existing mechanism that helps identify land use conflicts at jurisdictional borders is the review of the local comprehensive plan by the CSRA RDC. The RDC reviews all local plans within its jurisdiction for internal consistency and for any conflicts with plans of local governments within the region, plans of contiguous local governments outside the region, and the RDC's regional plan. In the absence of a plan amendment, the RDC reviews such plans every 10-year period and the local government is under no obligation to alter its future land use map and policies to address or resolve a land use conflict with a neighboring community identified during the regional review process. This limitation becomes evident when considering that the community's economic development vision calls for significant levels of development in the context of a county policy with the potential of land use implications. An agreement to hold meetings between city councils and the county commission during the planning phase of a major development impacting jurisdictional land use should be formalized.

# Lack of Information about Plans of Adjacent Communities

Because of the regular meetings and coordinated efforts of the local governments within Washington County, lack of information about plans, policies or other documents relating to the communities is not an issue. However, lack of information among neighboring counties and other affected parties is obvious. The RDC is required only to provide notice of Washington County's joint comprehensive plan to other local governments and is not required to send copies of the plan to these jurisdictions. Furthermore, this mechanism goes into affect after the local comprehensive plan is completed and regional review hearings are optional. Combined, these elements do not allow for meaningful input into the plan contents by contiguous or potentially affected local governments. Finally, the development of a countywide Service Delivery Strategy is a powerful tool to address issues arising within a county but does not address the problem of land use conflicts between two or more counties.



# INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

These limitations point to the need for additional coordinating mechanisms to address possible future issues. Beyond the obvious land use implications outlined in the preceding section, Washington County has economic development objectives and policies that relate specifically to multi-jurisdictional issues. Furthermore, commuting patterns discussed in the economic development section highlight the regional nature of the CSRA economy. These are significant issues that require a formal intergovernmental coordination mechanism. The CSRA RDC should send copies of all planning documents, including Service Delivery Strategies, to all contiguous jurisdictions and to potentially affected jurisdictions identified by Washington County. Moreover, the county and municipalities should use the RDC as a vehicle to encourage multi-jurisdictional consensus on individual SDRs.

# Service Provision Overlaps or Conflicts

There does not seem to be a potential for service conflict or overlap in the areas of public libraries, solid waste collection, recreation, water and sewer service, street/road maintenance and fire protection. These are generally areas that intergovernmental coordination efforts need to be focused, but the city and county seem to have the service delivery responsibilities clearly addressed. The county provides the library, solid waste collection, and emergency medical, fire and police service for county residents and street and road maintenance, while the cities provide solid waste collection and police service for city residents, water and sewer for city residents, and some fire protection and recreation facilities for city and county residents. The existing mechanism of coordination is currently adequate will be adequate through the planning period.

# Annexation Issues Between Cities and Counties

Washington County and the municipalities have no existing annexation agreement in place and no annexation issues are expected, although the cities notify the County of all land annexation. The County and municipalities may want to consider a formal agreement to prevent any annexation disagreements in the future.

# **Conflicting Development Projections and Public Facility Sitting**

Due to existing coordination mechanisms, meetings and information sharing, there are no issues related to conflicting development projections and public facility sitting. All public entities currently use consistent population projections and the sitting of public facilities, particularly schools, recreation facilities and industrial parks, have been and continue to be coordinated through the combined efforts of local governments, the school board, and development authorities.



# **Issues Relating to Applicable State and Regional Programs**

While there is no formal agreed upon process ensuring that extraterritorial water and/or sewer extensions and improvements are consistent with the land use plan and ordinances of the "receiving" jurisdiction, there are several circumstances mitigating any conflicts. Unincorporated Washington County would be the only potentially "receiving" jurisdiction because the county is the only jurisdiction that does not provide public water and sewer. Therefore, there is no potential conflict in offering service outside incorporated jurisdictions. Second, the comprehensive plan is a joint plan addressing current and future needs for infrastructure in each of the incorporated areas as well as the unincorporated county. Because all jurisdictions share the same comprehensive plan, there is no potential conflict for provision of services such as water and sewer that was not addressed during the planning process. Finally, each jurisdiction participated in developing future land use maps for both the county both and the unincorporated areas, and the most efficient method of providing services to areas that are intended to be developed was been identified and agreed upon during the planning process.

Washington County and the municipalities are participating in developing a joint comprehensive plan that will ensure that their plans are compatible. There is no formal process beyond this joint comprehensive planning effort to ensure compatibility between jurisdictions. However, this informal process has been successful and should continue to be so based on the minimal amount of development projected to occur throughout the planning period.

# Vision Statement

Establish formal relationship among governments and quasi-governmental entities within and outside Washington County when necessary to eliminate duplication of services, minimize costs, and create opportunities for cooperation.

# Goals

The following goals apply to Washington County in its municipalities:

**Goal 1:** Washington County will aid the municipalities in expanding their services

**Policy 1-1:** The County will pursue revenue in coordination with the CSRA Regional Development Center

**Goal 2:** Encourage, where outlined, formal intergovernmental coordination mechanisms.



### **INTRODUCTION**

Land use and development patterns are the result of interaction between demographic trends, economic circumstances and social attitudes. Technological changes in areas such as transportation and construction, and the availability and cost of land, water, and energy also influence existing development patterns.

The purpose of the Land Use element is to ensure that the distribution of land uses meets the future economic, social, physical and environmental needs of Washington County and the municipalities. The Future Land Use map can assist local governments in making development decisions that complement long-term goals established throughout this plan and avoid the emergence of inefficient development patterns.

Since the adoption of the Joint Tennille-Washington County Joint Comprehensive Plan in 1994, the county has experienced relatively small growth rates. Overall, the county remains a rural area and has not experienced the suburban growth seen elsewhere in the region. This chapter links other elements of the plan to create a vision for the future of Washington County and the municipalities, and provide direction for managing anticipated growth.

# **EXISTING LAND USE**

The current land use maps were generated using input from local governments and information from the tax assessor's database in Washington County and are mapped by parcel. The parcels were mapped using aerial photography and existing tax maps with best-fit methodology. The parcels were then linked by parcel number to the tax assessor database which includes a land use category. These categories were not an exact match and all parcels were reviewed and corrected as necessary. The following land use categories are used for the current land use map:

**Residential**. The predominant use of land within the residential category is for single-family and multi-family dwelling unit organized into general categories of net densities.

**Commercial**. This category is for land dedicated to non-industrial business uses, including retail sales, office, service and entertainment facilities, organized into general categories of intensities. Commercial uses may be located as a single use on one building or grouped together in a chopping center or office building.

**Industrial**. This category is for land dedicated to manufacturing facilities, processing plants, factories, warehousing and wholesale trade facilities, mining or mineral extraction activities, or other similar uses, organized into general categories of intensity.

**Public/Institutional**. This category includes certain state, federal or local government uses, and institutional land uses. Government uses include city halls and government building complexes, police and fire stations, libraries, prisons, post offices, schools, military installations, etc. Examples of institutional land uses include colleges, churches, cemeteries, hospitals, etc.

**Transportation/Communication/Utilities**. This category includes such uses as



major transportation routes, public transit stations, power generation plants, railroad facilities, radio towers, telephone switching stations, airports, port facilities or other similar uses.

**Park/Recreation/Conservation**. This category is for land dedicated to active or passive recreational uses. These areas may be either publicly or privately owned and may include playgrounds, public parks, nature preserves, wildlife management areas, national forests, golf courses, recreation centers or similar uses.

**Agriculture**. This category is for land dedicated to agriculture, farming (fields, lots, pastures, farmsteads, specialty farms, livestock production, etc.) or other similar rural uses such as pastureland not in commercial use.

**Forestry**. This category is for land dedicated to commercial timber or pulpwood harvesting or other similar rural uses such as woodlands not in commercial use.

**Table L-1** displays current land uses in Washington County and the municipalities and provides percentage breakdowns for all current land use classifications. Maps of existing land uses illustrating the same classifications are attached.

		Table	L-1: 2004	Current	Land Use				
		Washington	County	Davisbo	oro	Deepst	ep	Harriso	on
		Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
F	Forestry	384,781.85	86.78%	0.00	0.00%	442.83	55.99%	618.55	55.16%
Ag	Agriculture	25,655.68	5.79%	242.18	14.07%	95.52	12.08%	186.52	16.63%
С	Commercial	320.98	0.07%	218.91	12.71%	8.64	1.09%	3.70	0.33%
Ι	Industrial	15,642.19	3.53%	0.00	0.00%	3.94	0.50%	0.00	0.00%
PI	Public/Inst	118.63	0.03%	808.61	46.97%	8.53	1.08%	62.34	5.56%
R	Residential	2,476.78	0.56%	452.02	26.25%	151.82	19.19%	158.62	14.14%
TCU	Trans/Comm/Util	250.26	0.06%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	86.27	7.69%
PRC	Parks/Rec	136.41	0.03%	0.00	0.00%	79.69	10.07%	5.42	0.48%
INC	Incorporated	14,040.10	3.17%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	TOTAL	443,422.87	100.00%	1721.72	100.00%	790.97	100.00%	1121.42	100.00%

		Table L-1: 2	2004 Curr	ent Land	l Use Cont	inued			
		Oconee		Riddlev	ville	Sanders	ville	Tennill	e
		Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
F	Forestry	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	485.18	5.80%	0.00	0.00%
Ag	Agriculture	462.12	68.48%	388.48	75.84%	1003.52	12.00%	0.00	0.00%
С	Commercial	2.30	0.34%	2.91	0.57%	943.40	11.28%	61.09	7.12%
Ι	Industrial	10.10	1.50%	0.00	0.00%	1938.91	23.19%	91.74	10.69%
PI	Public/Inst	5.19	0.77%	3.01	0.59%	55.73	0.67%	0.00	0.00%
R	Residential	162.09	24.02%	60.83	11.87%	3915.91	46.84%	705.17	82.19%
TCU	Trans/Comm/Util	26.71	3.96%	53.93	10.53%	1.92	0.02%	0.00	0.00%
PRC	Parks/Rec	6.27	0.93%	3.08	0.60%	16.41	0.20%	0.00	0.00%
INC	Incorporated	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ТОТА	L	674.78	100.00%	512.23	100.00%	8360.97	100.00%	858.01	100.00%
Source	e: Washington County Tax	Assessor's Offic	e and Loca	l governm	ents; calcul	ations by C	SRA RDC		



#### **Washington County**

Of the approximate 443,422 acres in the County, 87 percent of the acreage is dedicated to forestry use alone. The next largest category is agricultural use with 25,656 acres, 5.79 percent of the County. Of the County acreage, 2,477 acres or .56 percent of the land use is dedicated to residential use. County land use patterns have changed little since the last comprehensive plan update. In 1994, forestry and agriculture accounted for approximately the same share of land use.

### City of Davisboro

Public/Institutional is the predominate land use in Davisboro. Due to the penitentiary, 46.97 percent of the city's land is classified as Public/Institutional. Residential use accounts for 26.25 percent of the city's 1,721 acres, while agriculture and commercial uses comprise 14.07 percent and 12.71 percent, respectively.

#### **Town of Deepstep**

Land designated as forestry covers 443 acres or 56 percent of Deepstep's 791 acres. The second most prevalent land use is residential, accounting for 19.19 percent of the city, followed by agriculture with 12.08 percent.

#### **City of Harrison**

Of Harrison's 1,121 incorporated acres, 618 acres or 55.16 percent of total land use are forestry. Agriculture and residential are the only other significant uses, comprising 16.63 percent and 14.14 percent, respectively, of the city's acreage.

#### **City of Oconee**

Oconee is predominantly farmland, as 462 acres or 66.67 percent of the city's 675 acres is agricultural. Additionally, 162 acres or 24 percent of the city's land is designated as residential, with no other single land use accounting for more than four percent of the total acreage.

### City of Riddleville

Like Oconee, Riddleville is rich with farmland. Over 75 percent of the city's incorporated land is devoted to agriculture. Residential use encompasses 61 acres or 11.87 percent of the city and transportation, communications and utilities account for another 54 acres or 10.53 percent of Riddleville's 512 acres.

### City of Sandersville

The most diverse array of municipal land use in Washington County is found in Sandersville. With 8,361 acres, it is over four times larger than any other city in the county. Residential uses comprise 3,916 acres or 46.84 percent of the city and industrial land use comprises 1,939 acres or 23.19 percent of the city's acreage. Agriculture is the third-leading land use, with 1003.5 acres or 12.00 percent of the city, followed by commercial with 943 acres or 11.28 percent of total land uses.



### **City of Tennille**

Of Tennille's 858 acres, 705 acres are residential, 92 are industrial and the remaining 61 acres are commercial. These land uses equate to 82 percent residential, 11 percent industrial and 7 percent commercial.

#### Assessment

#### **Historical Factors**

Existing land use in Washington County is largely a product of historical events. Historically, the economy of Washington County has evolved from agriculture to industry and manufacturing. Cotton played a major role in the economic development of the County through the antebellum and postbellum periods and extended into the early 1900's. Cotton determined the cultural and social standards for the people of Washington County. It dominated the economy and set the standards of living. In 1911 Washington County had more than 28,000 people with three-quarters of them living in rural locations. The boll weevil destroyed the cotton economy during the l920's and changed the direction of the County's economy forever. The County diversified its economy to lumber and other agricultural crops, as well as livestock and kaolin.

Kaolin has replaced cotton as the engine of Washington County's growth. Washington County is called the "Kaolin Capital of the World" for its fine kaolin deposits. The general economy has boomed and diversified with kaolin leading the way after World War II until the present day. For the most part, much of the county's residents traditionally traveled outside the county to take advantage of larger shopping and entertainment opportunities. As a result, major commercial and business development has not been focused in areas outside the existing urban centers.

Other factors have affected the existing land use in Washington County, and these are outlined in the information below.

### **Development and Location**

Existing development patterns can be attributed to the rural characteristics of Washington County. Sandersville's presence in the county, as an established community, has led to the focus of new development in and around the cities, minimizing suburban type development in the rural areas. However, development has been slow and there is little indication land use patterns will change.

The Washington County Board of Commissioners expects little development to occur in the unincorporated county due to the lack of infrastructure and services outside the municipalities, as reflected in the similarity between the current and future land use maps. The county's economic base is in Sandersville, but the city would need to annex land to pursue development. Currently, the city has no plans for further annexation.

#### Infrastructure Availability

Certain types of infrastructure, such as water, sewer, and transportation influence where and how much development occurs. Their impact is as follows:



#### Transportation

Transportation is one of the strongest influences on land use patterns. Travel behavior and the existence of roads have a direct impact on the location of new development. Washington County has several state routes intersecting the rural areas and linking them with the municipalities. Major transportation routes include GA Route 15, GA Route 88 and GA Route 24. Historically, development patterns in the unincorporated areas have occurred along, or within close proximity to these major road networks.

The improved efficiency of road networks has led to increased reliance on motorized travel, which is reflected in the way we develop our neighborhoods. The most prominent features of the county's subdivisions are garages, driveways, wide roads, and a lack of sidewalks. The increased mobility of the population, in general, has led to a drastic decrease in mixed-use and neighborhood commercial development and has decreased our mobility options through a forced reliance on the automobile, even for the shortest of trips.

#### Availability of Water and Sewer

The lack of major infrastructure networks within the unincorporated regions of the county has led to this dispersed pattern, with little opportunity for clustered development. The extension of water and sewer networks to city boundaries has allowed commercial, industrial and residential development to occur at higher densities in the municipalities.

The lack of water and sewer in the unincorporated areas of the county limits the economic development options outside of the infrastructure networks service areas and requires low-density single-family residential development.

The unavailability of sewer means that all new development outside of the municipalities' service area must rely on individual septic tanks to dispose of their wastewater. The environmentally sound use of septic systems relies on the ability of the soils to naturally absorb the septic treated wastewater and on individual homeowners to properly maintain their septic systems. The increased use of septic tanks not only increases the potential for raw waste leaks into groundwater sources, but also limits the ability to reuse treated wastewater.

### **FUTURE LAND USE**

The Future Land Use map is an important tool used in implementing the Comprehensive Plan. The map does not represent an exact pattern of development but identifies appropriate areas of opportunity for each land use category to accommodate the expected growth.

Throughout the planning horizon, real estate markets and the availability of infrastructure and services will determine the exact location and timing of development. The map is intended as a guideline for planning commissioners, staff, and elected officials to use in making development decisions. As local economics and demographics change over time, so too should the Future Land Use map. It requires periodic monitoring to ensure that development decisions are being made using the most accurate illustration of the desired future growth patterns.

To ensure that adequate land is dedicated to each land use according to future needs acreage must be projected throughout the planning period to ensure the future land use map reflects



anticipated development and growth. Normally, the Per Capita Use Rate method is used. This method extrapolates the rate of population per acre for each land use and calculates the projected acreage requirements based on the estimates established in the population element. However, projected population growth is so small that using this method will yield minimal changes in acreage for the various land use classifications. Instead, the future land use map is based on local government policies and priorities.

**Table L-2** displays future land uses in Washington County and its municipalities and provides percentage breakdowns for all current land use classifications. Maps illustrating future land uses using the same classifications are attached.

			Table L-2	: Future	Land Use				
		Washi Cou		Dav	isboro	Deep	ostep	Har	rison
		Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
F	Forestry	381,293.11	85.99%	0.00	0.00%	442.83	55.99%	597.47	53.28%
Ag	Agriculture	25,301.79	5.71%	242.18	14.07%	95.12	12.03%	140.48	12.53%
С	Commercial	323.94	0.07%	218.91 12.71%		6.60	0.83%	3.70	0.33%
Ι	Industrial	15,681.83	3.54%	0.00	0.00%	5.99	0.76%	67.12	5.99%
PI	Public/Inst	118.63			46.97%	8.93	1.13%	62.34	5.56%
R	<b>Residential</b> 6,276.81 1.42%		452.02	26.25%	151.82	19.19%	158.62	14.14%	
TCU	Trans/Comm/Util	250.26	0.06%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	86.27	7.69%
PRC	Parks/Rec	136.41	0.03%	0.00	0.00%	79.69	10.07%	5.42	0.48%
INC	Incorporated	14,040.10	3.17%	0.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	TOTAL	443,422.87	100.00%	1721.72	100.00%	790.97	100.00%	1121.42	100.00%
		Oconee			Riddleville				
		Oco	nee	Ride	ileville	Sande	rsville	Теі	nnille
		Acres	nee %	Ride Acres	ileville %	Sande Acres	rsville %	Ter Acres	nnille %
F	Forestry						1		
F	Forestry Agriculture	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
Ag C	×	Acres 0.00	% 0.00%	Acres 0.00	% 0.00%	Acres 485.18	% 5.80%	Acres 0.00	% 0.00%
Ag	Agriculture	Acres 0.00 462.12	% 0.00% 68.48%	Acres 0.00 388.48	% 0.00% 75.84%	Acres 485.18 1,003.52	% 5.80% 12.00%	Acres 0.00 0.00	% 0.00% 0.00%
Ag C	Agriculture Commercial	Acres 0.00 462.12 2.30	% 0.00% 68.48% 0.34%	Acres 0.00 388.48 2.91	% 0.00% 75.84% 0.57%	Acres 485.18 1,003.52 943.40	% 5.80% 12.00% 11.28%	Acres 0.00 0.00 61.09	% 0.00% 0.00% 7.12%
Ag C I	Agriculture Commercial Industrial	Acres 0.00 462.12 2.30 10.10	% 0.00% 68.48% 0.34% 1.50%	Acres 0.00 388.48 2.91 0.00	% 0.00% 75.84% 0.57% 0.00%	Acres 485.18 1,003.52 943.40 1,938.91	% 5.80% 12.00% 11.28% 23.19%	Acres 0.00 0.00 61.09 91.74	% 0.00% 0.00% 7.12% 10.69%
Ag C I PI	Agriculture Commercial Industrial Public/Inst	Acres 0.00 462.12 2.30 10.10 5.19	%         0.00%         68.48%         0.34%         1.50%         0.77%	Acres 0.00 388.48 2.91 0.00 3.01	%         0.00%         75.84%         0.57%         0.00%         0.59%	Acres 485.18 1,003.52 943.40 1,938.91 55.73	% 5.80% 12.00% 11.28% 23.19% 0.67%	Acres 0.00 0.00 61.09 91.74 0.00	% 0.00% 0.00% 7.12% 10.69% 0.00%
Ag C I PI R	Agriculture Commercial Industrial Public/Inst Residential	Acres 0.00 462.12 2.30 10.10 5.19 162.09	%         0.00%         68.48%         0.34%         1.50%         0.77%         24.02%	Acres 0.00 388.48 2.91 0.00 3.01 60.83	%         0.00%         75.84%         0.57%         0.00%         0.59%         11.87%	Acres 485.18 1,003.52 943.40 1,938.91 55.73 3,915.91	% 5.80% 12.00% 11.28% 23.19% 0.67% 46.84%	Acres 0.00 0.00 61.09 91.74 0.00 705.17	%           0.00%           0.00%           7.12%           10.69%           0.00%           82.19%
Ag C I PI R TCU	Agriculture Commercial Industrial Public/Inst Residential Trans/Comm/Util	Acres 0.00 462.12 2.30 10.10 5.19 162.09 26.71	%         0.00%         68.48%         0.34%         1.50%         0.77%         24.02%         3.96%	Acres 0.00 388.48 2.91 0.00 3.01 60.83 53.93	%           0.00%           75.84%           0.57%           0.00%           0.59%           11.87%           10.53%	Acres 485.18 1,003.52 943.40 1,938.91 55.73 3,915.91 1.92	%           5.80%           12.00%           11.28%           23.19%           0.67%           46.84%           0.02%	Acres 0.00 0.00 61.09 91.74 0.00 705.17 0.00	%           0.00%           0.00%           7.12%           10.69%           0.00%           82.19%           0.00%
Ag C I PI R TCU PRC	Agriculture Commercial Industrial Public/Inst Residential Trans/Comm/Util Parks/Rec	Acres           0.00           462.12           2.30           10.10           5.19           162.09           26.71           6.27	%           0.00%           68.48%           0.34%           1.50%           0.77%           24.02%           3.96%           0.93%	Acres 0.00 388.48 2.91 0.00 3.01 60.83 53.93 3.08	%         0.00%         75.84%         0.57%         0.00%         0.59%         11.87%         10.53%         0.60%	Acres 485.18 1,003.52 943.40 1,938.91 55.73 3,915.91 1.92 16.41	%           5.80%           12.00%           11.28%           23.19%           0.67%           46.84%           0.02%           0.20%	Acres 0.00 0.00 61.09 91.74 0.00 705.17 0.00 0.00	%           0.00%           0.00%           7.12%           10.69%           0.00%           82.19%           0.00%           0.00%

### Washington County

The county has experienced very little growth over the past decade, and future forecasts project relatively slow growth patterns. Despite the slow growth forecasts the county intends to work closely with the city to preemptively manage future growth. Additionally, as the Savannah River Parkway corridor-widening project is completed, the county expects growth to occur.

The main areas of the county considered adequate for growth are those areas in and around municipalities. The majority of planned commercial, industrial and residential expansion is



appropriate for these areas because of their proximity to the city and the community facilities and services that the city provides, as well as their access to major thoroughfares.

Input from the County Commission and County Tax Assessor suggest land uses are projected to remain near their current levels in the future. The county's primary land use, forestry, is anticipated to decrease from its current level of 384,782 acres to 381,293 acres in the future due to the increase of other forms of development. The projected forestry acreage will still lead all other uses in size, accounting for 86 percent of the county's land in the future. Increased development will also reduce the amount of land devoted to agriculture from its present total of 25,656 acres to 25,302 acres in the future. The declining levels of agricultural land are not expected to hinder the county's economic growth, as much of the land classified as "agricultural" is underused. Industrial uses will increase by about 40 acres in the future to accommodate mining operations and will account for 3.5 percent of the county's land. Residential uses will grow substantially as new subdivisions are developed adjacent to Sandersville, Harrison and Davisboro. The projected total of 6,277 acres is an increase of 153 percent and represents the fastest growing land use in the county. Commercial uses are not expected to change significantly, as most business activity is located in incorporated areas of the county. The current .07 percent of the county currently devoted to commercial activity will remain as its current level. Finally, transportation/communication/utilities, public/institutional and parks/recreation are not expected to significantly change in size, as no public projects are anticipated in the near future. All three of the uses combined will occupy only .12 percent of the county.

Washington County's rural character is illustrated by its abundance of natural resources. The lack of development pressures in the county has contributed to the continued presence of these resources and projected development needs can be well managed without negatively impacting any environmentally sensitive area. Refer to the Natural Resources chapter for further discussion on the location and assessment of existing natural areas. The intent of the Future Land Use map is to coordinate growth with the presence of natural resources and to minimize the impacts of development through designating appropriate areas to accommodate growth. All development within the designated areas on the map must adhere to environmental regulations to minimize all impacts on the natural resources identified in the Natural Resources Chapter.

Similarly, the county has an abundance of cultural resources. These are truly fragile resources that must be treated in the same fashion as natural features because of the local importance that they hold. Future development needs to incorporate the preservation of locally significant historic resources as identified in that element of this plan.

Washington County's relative isolation from major urban markets decreases outside influences on local development patterns. This is expected to change as the State completes the Savannah River Parkway, which is being developed into a four-lane highway. As commuting patterns shift and urbanized areas continue to expand Washington County may develop a greater attraction to urban commuters in Augusta, as a suburban, "bedroom," community.

The county is considering implementation of zoning or other land use regulations as a viable method of controlling future land use. Through a zoning ordinance, mobile home ordinance, and/or adult business regulations, the county would be able to foster land use decisions that adequately address the community's land use goals.



### **City of Davisboro**

The only meaningful growth in Davisboro in the last 20 years can be attributed to the construction of a penitentiary in the early 1990s. Like the rest of Washington County, Davisboro is a small rural community that does not anticipate significant changes in land use. Future land use is projected by city officials to remain predominantly public/institutional, with 808 acres (47 percent of the city) devoted to the penitentiary and other public uses, and 452 acres (26 percent of the city) serving residential development. The other major uses, agriculture and commercial, will remain at their current levels, 242 and 218 acres, respectively.

### **Town of Deepstep**

Deepstep is the least-populated municipality in Washington County and representatives from the town government project it to remain relatively small in the next 20 years. Future development is also limited by the town's lack of access to a major transportation network and its relatively isolated location. Forestry will continue to serve as the primary land use, constituting 443 acres or 56 percent of Deepstep's incorporated area. Residential acreage will continue to account for 19 percent of the city and cover 152 acres, and agriculture will remain at 95 acres, or 12 percent of the city.

### **City of Harrison**

Future changes to land use in Harrison are not anticipated due to the city's rural character, lack of highway access and remote location. According to city officials, forestry is now and will remain Harrison's predominant land use, encompassing 618 acres or 55 percent of total land. The other significant uses, agriculture and residential, will continue to comprise 16 percent and 14 percent, respectively, of the city's acreage.

### **City of Oconee**

Development in Oconee will be limited by the city's isolated and poorly-accessible location, lack of infrastructure and rural character. After meetings with city representatives, it was determined two-thirds of Oconee's 675 acres are expected to remain farmland and 162 acres (comprising 24 percent of the city's land) is projected to stay residential, with no other single land use accounting for more than four percent of the total acreage of the city.

## **City of Riddleville**

As the second smallest municipality in a sparsely-populated and rural county, Riddleville will not encounter significant changes to land use in the next 20 years. Opportunities for growth are limited by a lack of infrastructure and distance from any major metropolitan center. The predominant land use, agriculture, is predicted by city officials to remain at its current level of 348 acres, comprising 76 percent of the city. The second most prevalent use, residential, will also be static due to limited population growth. The current total of 61 acres (12 percent of the municipality) will be adequate to accommodate the city's population. Ranking third in acreage, transportation, communications and utilities will still occupy 54 acres of Riddleville in the future, comprising nearly 11 percent of all land.



### **City of Sandersville**

Sandersville represents the largest concentration of development in the county. Sandersville is the county seat and houses not only all of the city government offices, but also the majority of county facilities. Sandersville's location at the intersection of the county's major thoroughfares contributes to its being the economic center of the county. The major corridors intersecting Sandersville are designated for commercial or industrial development because of their access to the road network.

There are no readily identifiable areas suitable for future annexation. The nature of the central business district provides opportunity for alternative land use development patterns. The downtown square and central business district houses some retail and public uses and represents the city's historic district. The local government continues to revitalize and redevelop existing historic structures within the district and promotes the development of a mixed-use environment to developers. To date, there has not been a large demand for these types of development but as economic development initiatives continue within, and surrounding the city, any type of development is encouraged.

Land use patterns are relatively established within the city and illustrate development patterns focusing economic activity along major transportation corridors and within the downtown with residential development radiating outwards from a central business district. This does not generate any significant transition between land uses.

Despite Sandersville's strategy to encourage economic development, city officials expect land use boundaries to remain static. In looking to the future, Sandersville's city staff believes residential uses will continue to comprise 3,916 acres or 49 percent of the city. Industrial land use, accounting for 1,939 acres or 23 percent of the city's acreage, will also remain static. The third and fourth largest uses, agriculture and commercial, are also predicted to stay at their current levels of 1004 acres (12 percent of the city) and 943 acres (11 percent of total land uses), respectively. A number of factors contribute to the fixed location of land uses. First, flood plains prohibit development in locations throughout the city. Additionally, zoning ordinances regulate the locations of uses, and the city has no plans to alter their recently-revised zoning map. Furthermore, commercial development is concentrated in pockets along major thoroughfares. Businesses are attracted to the high visibility and easy access to transportation these pockets of development provide and therefore are expected to remain in their present locales. Finally, the city's housing stock is adequate to accommodate projected population growth, thereby precluding the need for the expansion of residential areas.

### **City of Tennille**

Tennille is roughly the same size as Davisboro, and similarly, its development opportunities are limited. Tennille's close proximity to Sandersville may allow for shared growth in the distant future, but the city has no plans for annexation, infrastructure expansion or development in the next 20 years. Residential use will continue to serve as the primary function of the city, covering 705 acres or 82 percent of Tennille's 858 incorporated acres. As a distant second land use, industrial activities will remain at their current level of 92 acres or 11 percent of the city. The current third-leading land use, commercial, will also remain stable, occupying 61 acres or 7 percent of the city.



#### **Natural Barriers to Growth**

Slopes in Washington County range from nearly level to 25 %. The steepest slopes are along streambeds in the hilly area, which runs south to north through the western side of the County. Development along these steep slopes is limited by soil suitability, but if it is undertaken, responsible measures must be used to avoid soil instability and erosion. Most of the slopes in Washington County should not hinder any development. Some areas along the creek are not developable because of the flood plains.

Additionally, Washington County does not lie within a water supply watershed according to criteria established by the Department of Natural Resources. Wetlands, both small and large, are found throughout Washington County. These wetlands serve as important fish and wildlife habitats and are an integral part of food chain production. The best method for achieving wetland protection in Washington County is through proper enforcement of the Section 404 permitting process. Protected river corridors around the Ogeechee, Ohoopee and the Oconee Rivers also serve as barriers to growth, although current development patterns pose little threat to the affected land area.

#### Assessment

Overall, future land use changes will be relatively minor. Population projections highlight the relatively slow pace of growth in Washington County and its municipalities. Although the county is pursuing more industrial development, much of the county's 16,360 unincorporated acres designated for industrial use are currently under-used and therefore available for future development.

Commercial land use is projected to remain the same. Although the widening of the existing highway and its designation as the Fall Line Freeway (linking two major metropolitan areas) is expected to increase traffic levels enough to justify expansion of existing commercial areas, it is not expected that commercial areas will increase due to the vacancy and under-use of current commercial properties.

Other land uses are not projected to increase through the planning period. There are no community facilities projects planned that would require additional acreage in other land uses.

#### **OTHER ISSUES**

#### **Economic Development**

An important issue in Washington County is the development of industrial and manufacturing uses to compliment the kaolin mining industry. The Washington County Chamber of Commerce plans to continue marketing the county to industries in the hope of relocating them, although the Chamber's efforts have not yet spurred significant growth. If the Chamber succeeds in attracting new industrial businesses to the county, the most likely relocation site would be in Sandersville due to the city's extensive infrastructure and accessibility.

#### **Natural and Historic Resources**

The need to protect cultural and historic resources is paramount. As noted, the County and



municipalities should attempt to encourage development away from watersheds, groundwater recharge areas, wetlands, floodplains, and primary agricultural lands. There are significant land parcels outside these environmentally sensitive areas to develop. Population and housing growth rates are not projected to be significant. Even with the county's aggressive economic policy related to industrial growth, there are plenty to locations in proximity to the larger municipalities that do not impact environmentally sensitive areas.

As the Natural and Historic Resources element of this plan notes, Washington County is ripe with historic resources and has an abundance of natural resources. Over the coming years, the implementation of the Department of Natural Resources Environmental Planning Criteria will help to preserve the natural environmental features of the county and enhance the residents' quality of life.

These initiatives must be fully adopted and regulated in order to ensure the preservation of the natural environment, particularly the Ogeechee River. This includes the preservation of historic resources. The county has a rich and illustrious history that is preserved in the abundance of historic resources throughout the county. It is important that the county and the city treat these resources as susceptible environmental areas to ensure that they are preserved for future generations to enjoy.

#### **Community Facilities, Services and Transportation**

The timing and location of facility and service expansion is a major contributor to the ability of the county and municipalities to manage growth. Intergovernmental cooperation is a necessity in order to take full advantage of existing facilities and to help curb the unnecessary development of vacant land in the county. The ability to focus new developments into those areas that can accommodate them with the necessary infrastructure is the key to the successfully managing growth. This is more applicable to the municipalities because of their existing infrastructure networks.

Sprawling patterns of development further decrease the economic feasibility of extending public infrastructure in the county and will further increase the costs associated with providing public services. The ability to develop in a compact fashion decreases the costs associated with providing the required infrastructure and creates population clusters that are easier to service for the school system, law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical services.

### Housing

Suburban development creates a homogeneous environment dominated by single-family residential development. The dominance of a single type of housing limits housing options and segregates populations based on socioeconomic characteristics. The stigmas attached to mobile/manufactured homes prevent their inclusion in a typical subdivision, and this is generally true of multi-family dwellings as well.

The county and cities want to promote the development of various types of housing and focus residential development in areas equipped with existing, or planned, supportive infrastructure to allow greater flexibility in the type of development that can occur. In order to meet the needs of an expanding and diversifying labor force, a range of housing types are required. However, due to Washington County's limited population growth, housing growth



will be minimal. The most-needed variety of housing will be for the growing elderly population. To accommodate the mobility limitations of senior citizens, housing for the aged should be located near urban centers with easy access to transportation.

It is important that the county and cities continue to monitor their housing and demographic conditions to identify potential deficiencies in the housing market that they may be able to help adjust through regulation.

#### Vision Statement

Promote the orderly development of land to accommodate growth through the protection of sensitive environmental and historic resources and the management of public facilities and services.

### **GOALS AND POLICIES**

The following goals apply to Washington County unless otherwise noted:

### Goal 1: Develop orderly and compatible land uses.

**Policy 1-1**: Accommodate additional residential, commercial, and industrial designated areas.

**Policy 1-2**: Coordinate all new development with other elements in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Policy 1-3**: Investigate the feasibility of creating land use ordinances to regulate mobile homes, junk yards and adult businesses.

# Goal 2: Minimize negative impacts associated with new development on environmentally sensitive areas.

**Policy 2-1**: Maintain water quality through the protection of environmentally sensitive lands.

### Goal 3: Encourage responsible industrial and commercial development

**Policy 3-1**: Work closely with the Washington County Chamber of Commerce to attract businesses



ELEMENT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Responsibility	Cost	Fund Source				
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT												
One Georgia Grant/Industrial Park	x	Х	Х	Х	X	State and City	undetermined	Grants and Ci				
CDBG-upgrade water lines	X	Х				State and City	undetermined	Grants and Ci				
Bring in new business	X	Х	X	Х	Х	City	undetermined	New Busines				
Develop old school property	X	Х	X	Х	Х	City/Grants	undetermined	Grants and Ci				
Recycle Bin	X	Х	X	Х	Х	W.C. Service Ctr.	\$0	W.C. Service C				
NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES												
Build Bridge in Park	Х	Х	X	Х	Х	City	undetermined	City				
Plant flowers and trees in park	X	Х	X	Х	Х	Prison/City	undetermined	Prison/City				
Select places for National Register	x	Х	X	х	x	City	undetermined	City				
LAND USE												
Old school property developed	X	Х	X	X	Х	City/Grants	undetermined	City/Grants				
Industrial Park and Recreation Park	x	Х	X	X	X	City/Grants	undetermined	City/Grants				
HOUSING	<u> </u>		<u> </u>									
Low income housing	X	Х	X	Х	Х	City/Grants	undetermined	City/Grants				
Ord. To clean-up and rehab structures	x	Х	X	x	x	City	undetermined	Home Owner				
COMMUNITY FACILITIES												
Drill new well	X	Х	X	Х	Х	City	\$100,000	City/Grants				
Dillard St. improvements	X	Х	X	Х	Х	City	undetermined	City				
W. Water tr. Plant improvements	X	Х	X	Х	Х	City	undetermined	City				
Gutters, Curbs, and Street improvements	x	Х	X	X	X	City	\$10,000	City				
Multi-Purpose Building/ Ind. Park	X	X	X	Х	Х	City/Grants	undetermined	City/Grants				

	CITY OF DEEPS	TEP FIV	E-YEAR	SHORT	TERM W	ORK PR	OGRAM 2005-20	09	-
	ELEMENT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Responsibility	Cost	Fund Source
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT								
1	Provide Retirement Home					Х	City/County	\$80,000	City/County
	NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES								
1	Encourage nomination of historic resources to the National Register of Historic Places	Х	х	Х	х	Х	City	n/a	n/a
	LAND USE								
1	Continue to provide for similar types of land use	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	City	n/a	n/a
	HOUSING								
1	Enforce minimum County housing codes.	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	City	n/a	n/a
	COMMUNITY FACILITIES								
1	Replace meters at a rate of 10 per year	Х	X	Х	Х	X	City	\$33,000	City
2	Expand the water system lines to areas in town where lines do not presently exist.	Х	х	Х	х	X	City	\$48,000	City/State/ County
3	Replace water lines that were installed in 1960	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	City	\$50,000	City/State/ loan
4	Construct a public sewage system.					Х	City	\$300,000	City/State/ loan
5	Garbage pickup					Х	City	\$20,000	City/County
6	Upgrade recreation facilities, tennis court, volleyball and rec. center			Х			City	\$30,000	City/grant
7	Improve and upgrade fire equipment and build new firehouse		Х				City/County	\$250,000	City/County/ State
-	Resurface all roads	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	City	\$50,000	City/LARP
	Curb and gutter all existing roads					X	City	\$300,000	City/CDBG
	Hire full-time librarian/clerk		Х	Х	Х	Х	City	\$20,000	City
11	Landscape area around town hall		X				City	\$4,000	City
12	Traffic control study		Х				City	\$10,000	City/CSRA/ State
	INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION								
1	Work together to accomplish mutual desired goals	Х	X	Х	X	Х	City	n/a	City/County

	CITY OF HARRIS	ON FI	/E-YEA	R SHC	ORT TE	RM W	ORK PROGRAM 2	2005-2009	
	ELEMENT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Responsibility	Cost	Fund Source
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT								
1	Seek heavy industrial use to come to Harrison.	X	X	X	X	X	Mayor, City Council	N/A	N/A
2	Identify and purchase a suitable light industrial site and pursue an industry to establish a facility in Harrison, including attracting industry and establishing industry.	x	x	X	X	x	IDC, Chamber of Commerce, IDA, County, City	\$ 254,000	Grants, Local Non- Monetary Match, EDA, EIP, IDA
3	Encourage commerical development and diversification by purchasing building sites and establishing local businesses, inculding contacting owners for city purchase, purchasing a building site, rehabilitate a building, encourage establishment of businesses, and promote business growth and maintaining dialogue.	x	x	х	x	x	DDIC, City	\$435,000	Federal, State, and Local Grants, DCA, EIP, Non- Monetary Local Matching Funds
4	Begin downtown revitalization, inculding studying feasibility of organizing a Downtown Development Council.	x	x	X	Х	x	City Council, Mayor	\$10,000	City, EDA, State Grants, Other Grants
	NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES								
1	Identify possible historic sites or buildings.	x	X	X	X	X	Mayor, City Council	\$3,000	Local, State Grants, DNR
2	Pursue federal and state funding to preserve historic structures.	x	x	X	Х	X	City Council, Mayor	N/A	N/A

3	Renovate historic building for Community use, possibly for City Library.	X	X	Х	X	X	City Council, Mayor	\$250,000	State Grants, Federal Grants, Local Match
4	Research, establish,develop, and promote Harrison Arboreal and Aquatic Educational Park.	x	X	X	X	X	Mayor, City Council	\$20,000	Private Donations, Federal Grants, State Grants, City
5	Investigate and address, non-point source pollution along river corridors within the city limits.	х	Х	Х	Х	X	Mayor, City Council, EPD	N/A	State, Grants
	LAND USE				-				
1	Adopt and implement a Zoning Ordinance.	x	X	X	X	X	City Council, Mayor	\$8,000	State, City
2	Consider adopting and implementing manufactured home ordinace and subdivsion regulations.	х	X	X	X	X	City Council, Mayor	\$8,000	DCA, City
	HOUSING								•
1	Improve substandard housing conditions and assist in providing senior citizen housing, including researching funding opportunities for housing improvements, purchase property and construct a senior housing center.	x	X	X	X	X	Housing Improvement Committee, Mayor, City, Council, Citizens	\$41,000	Private Donations, Federal Grants, State Grants, City
	COMMUNITY FACILITIES								
1	Establish a recycling program, inculding beginning recycling activitites, construction of permanent recycling facility, and promotion of the program.	X	X	X	X	X	Mayor, City Council	\$105,000	GEFA Grant, Local

l a	street, sidewalk, and drainiage. Improvements on Edwards, Smith St. Extension, MLK Extension, and McClendon Dr; and street widening and curb and gutter along Church St., Main St., and Railroad Ave.	x	X	X	X	X	Mayor, City Council, D.O.T.	\$900,000	D.O.T., CDBG, Local Match
_	Install sidewalks.	X	X	X	X	X	Mayor, City Council	\$10,000	LDF, TEA, Other Grants
4 f	Initiate rural public transit services for senior citizens and handicapped citizens.	x	X	X	X	X	Mayor, City Council	\$5,000	City, County
5 a	Pursue a City Library, inculding applying for funding, moving into a rennovated building, and purchasing books.	x	X	X	X	X	Mayor, City Council	\$28,000	Private Donations, Federal Grants, State Grants, City
61	Recreation: Establish biking trails.	x	X	X	X	X	City Council, Parks and Recreation Committee	\$5,000	State, Local, Private
	Recreation: Construct city tennis courts.	x	X	X	X	X	City Council, Parks and Recreation Committee	\$50,000	City, State, Local and Private Grants
8	Upgrade the level of police services by adding one new full time officer.	x	X	X	X	X	City Council, Mayor	\$30,000/yea r	COPS Grant, LLEBG, Local

CITY OF OCO	ONEE FI	IVE-YE	AR SHO	ORT TE	RM WOI	RK PROGRAM 200	05-2009						
ELEMENT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Responsibility	Cost	Fund Source					
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT													
Pursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial development	х	x	x	X	х	City	n/a	n/a					
Pursue local fund-raising efforts	X	Х	х	X	Х	City	\$1,000	City					
NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES													
Encourage preservation of historic buildings	Х	х	X	Х	Х	City/CSRA	n/a	n/a					
Encourage preservation of historic cemeteries	Х	х	Х	Х	х	City/CSRA	n/a	n/a					
Investigate possibility of paved boat landing on river for citizens' use	Х	x	x	X	х	NS - RR	unknown	unknown					
LAND USE													
Investigate the purchase of land for future development	Х	x	x	х	X	City	unknown	City					
HOUSING													
Investigate available property for development	Х	x	х	х	Х	City	unknown	City					
COMMUNITY FACILITIES													
Upgrade older water lines	Х	Х	X	Х	Х	City	unknown	City					
trail	Х	x	Х	X	X	City	unknown	City					
Upgrade water tank	Х	Х	X	Х	Х	City	unknown	City					
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION													
Investigate consolidation of solid waste services with Washington County	X	X	x	X	X	City/County	unknown	City/County					
	ELEMENT  ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  Pursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial development  Pursue local fund-raising efforts  NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES  Encourage preservation of historic buildings Encourage preservation of historic cemeteries Investigate possibility of paved boat landing on river for citizens' use LAND USE Investigate the purchase of land for future development HOUSING Investigate available property for development COMMUNITY FACILITIES Upgrade older water lines Investigate possible walking trail Upgrade water tank INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION Investigate consolidation of solid waste services with	ELEMENT2005ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTXPursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial developmentXPursue local fund-raising effortsXNATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCESXEncourage preservation of historic buildingsXEncourage preservation of historic cemeteriesXInvestigate possibility of paved boat landing on river for citizens' useXInvestigate the purchase of land for future developmentXHOUSINGXInvestigate available property for developmentXUpgrade older water lines trailXInvestigate possible walking trailXINTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATIONXInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withX	ELEMENT20052006ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTXXPursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial developmentXXPursue local fund-raising effortsXXNATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCESXXEncourage preservation of historic buildingsXXEncourage preservation of historic cemeteriesXXInvestigate possibility of paved boat landing on river for citizens' useXXInvestigate the purchase of land for future developmentXXHOUSINGXXXInvestigate available property for developmentXXUpgrade older water linesXXInvestigate possible walking trailXXInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withXX	ELEMENT200520062007ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTPursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial developmentXXXPursue local fund-raising effortsXXXNATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCESXXXEncourage preservation of historic buildingsXXXInvestigate possibility of paved boat landing on river for citizens' useXXXInvestigate the purchase of land for future developmentXXXHOUSINGXXXXInvestigate available property for developmentXXXUpgrade older water linesXXXInvestigate possible walking railXXXInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withXXXInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withXXX	ELEMENT2005200620072008ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTNamercial (and strial and commercial developmentXXXXPursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial developmentXXXXXPursue local fund-raising effortsXXXXXNATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCESXXXXXEncourage preservation of historic cemeteriesXXXXXInvestigate possibility of paved boat landing on river for citizens' useXXXXXInvestigate the purchase of land for future developmentXXXXXInvestigate the purchase of land for future developmentXXXXXInvestigate available property for citzens' useXXXXXInvestigate available property for developmentXXXXXInvestigate possible walking trailXXXXXUpgrade older water lines trailXXXXXINTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATIONInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withXXXXXInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withXXXXX	ELEMENT20052006200720082009ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTPursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial developmentXXXXXPursue local fund-raising effortsXXXXXXPursue local fund-raising effortsXXXXXXNATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCESXXXXXXEncourage preservation of historic buildingsXXXXXXEncourage preservation of historic cemeteriesXXXXXXInvestigate possibility of paved boat landing on river for citizens' useXXXXXXInvestigate the purchase of land for future developmentXXXXXXInvestigate available property for developmentXXXXXXUpgrade older water lines trailXXXXXXUpgrade water tank tailXXXXXXInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withXXXXXXInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withXXXXXX	ELEMENT20052006200720082009ResponsibilityECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTPursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial developmentXXXXXXPursue local fund-raising effortsXXXXXXCityNATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCESEncourage preservation of historic buildingsXXXXXXCity/CSRAEncourage preservation of historic cemeteriesXXXXXXCity/CSRAInvestigate possibility of paved boat landing on river for citizens' useXXXXXNS - RRInvestigate the purchase of land for future developmentXXXXXCityInvestigate available property for developmentXXXXXCityUpgrade older water lines trailXXXXXCityUpgrade older water lank trailXXXXXCityInvestigate consolidation of stoil waste services withXXXXXCityInvestigate consolidation of solid waste services withXXXXXCity/County	ECONOMIC         DEVELOPMENT         Pursue avenues of potential industrial and commercial development       X<					
	CITY OF RIDDLEVILLE FIVE-YEAR SHORT TERM WORK PROGRAM 2005-2009												
---	---	------	------	------	------	------	----------------	----------	------------------------	--	--	--	--
Г	ELEMENT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Responsibility	Cost	Fund Source				
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT												
1	Continue to renovate old Potato House building	X	X	Х	Х	Х	City	\$70,000	City/County/ grants				
	NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES												
1	Continue to participate in Georgia Wildflower Program through the Georgia DOT	x	x	х	x	x	City	\$3,000	City				
2	Try to aquire Christmas lights and ecorations for city	Х	X	Х	Х	X	City	\$2,000	City				
3	Landscape Potato House property and walking trail with trees and flowers	X	X	Х	X	X	City	\$10,000	City				
	LAND USE												
	n/a												
	HOUSING												
1	Continue to identify properties that need to be cleaned-up and write letter to landlowerns urging them to clean up property		x		x		City	n/a	n/a				
	COMMUNITY FACILITIES												
1	Put in cardiovascualar exercise stations on walking trail	X	X	Х	X	X	City	\$2,000	City				
2	Try to purchase land between City Hall and the firehouse	Х	X	Х	Х	Х	City	n/a	City				
3	Pave city streets that are dirt	Х	X	Х	Х	Х	City	n/a	County				
	INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION												
1	Coordinate with other cities on all areas of government processes	Х	X	Х	Х	х	City	n/a	City				

	CITY OF SANDERSVILLE FIVE-YEAR SHORT TERM WORK PROGRAM 2005-2009													
	ELEMENT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Responsibility	Cost	Fund Source					
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT													
1	Market City-County-Specific building	x	X	X	X	X	City, County, and Chamber	N/A	City, County, and Chamber					
2	Revitalize downtown area. Project current and will continue in the next work period.	x	X	X	х	Х	City	\$3,000/year	City					
	NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES													
1	Langs Pond Park Project	X	X				City	\$368,096	City/Grants					
1	HOUSING	V					<u>C'</u>	DT / A	DT / A					
1	Assess sites for future housing	X					City	N/A \$40,000 - \$50,000	N/A					
2	Continue Demolition Program	X	Х	Х	Х	Х	City	340,000 - 350,000 per year	City					
	COMMUNITY FACILITIES													
1	Purchase new fire apparatus		Х				City	\$465,000	SPLOST					
2	Fire Station addition/rennovation		X				City	\$350,000	SPLOST					
3	New building for Public Works Dept. Telecom Utilities	X					City	\$174,000	City					
4	Expand Brownwood Cemetery	X	X				City	N/A	City					
5	Complete wall at Old City Cemetery	X					City and Historical Society	\$20,000	Sale of plots and donations					
6	Improve sidewalks downtown	X						\$500,000	Grant					
7	Purchase new garbage truck	X	Х	X	Х	Х	City	\$85,000	City					

8	Apply for funding for street resurfacing, sidewalks & drainage improvements for MLK Ave., Mosley PI., Martin, Hall, Lovett, Carver, Reeves, Cooper, Wiggins, Hillcrest, Spring, and Baker Streets.	X	X			City	\$500,000	City/CDBG
9	Eliminate wastewater sludge pond.	X	X			City	\$130,000	City
10	Provide new ground water well on south side of city. Application of GEFA loan will be made for this project.	x	X	X		City	\$200,000	City/GEFA
11	Make Digester improvements at Wastewater Treatment Plant.	x				City	\$170,000	City

CITY OF TENNILLE FIVE-YEAR SHORT TERM WORK PROGRAM 2005-2009													
ELEMENT	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Responsibility	Cost	Fund Source					
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT													
Request assistance from Local Chamber of Commerce and Washington County to locate industicial business within city limits	X	X	X	X	x	City/County/ Chamber	N/A	City/County/ Chamber					
2 Continued support of Kaolin Festival	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	City	N/A	City					
NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES													
Renovate Tennille Depot and open as 1 museum and a location for community events to be held.	x	x				City	\$150,000- \$225,000	City/T-Grant					
HOUSING				•									
Encourage development of housing within 1 city limits as well as areas that may be annexed into city limits	х	X	X	Х	x	City	N/A	City					
COMMUNITY FACILITIES													
Request assistance from CSRA RDC to update all city ordinances	X	X				City/RDC	N/A	City/RDC					
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION													
1 Develop close working relations with county administrators	X	X	X	X	X	City/County	N/A	City/County					

#### WASHINGTON COUNTY FIVE-YEAR SPEOR FARM WORK PROGRAM 2005-2009

#### ELEMENT

#### 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 Responsibility

Cost

**Fund Source** 

						~000	nesponsibility		
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT		I	I	T	T			
1	Perform professional market study to fully identify the Washington County trade area and its potential for recruiting additional retail businesses.	x	x	x	x	x	County/Chamber of Commerce	\$30,000	Local/Private
2	Develop and promote common promotional activities for the County as a whole	X	x	X	x	X	County/Chamber of Commerce	\$5,000	Local/Private
3	Promote, with the Chamber of Commerce, educational programs and activities for County merchants designed to upgrade retail practices	X	x	X	x	X	County/Chamber of Commerce	\$2,000	Local/Private
5	Work with Chamber of Commerce to maintain a list of all available speculative buildings and industrial sites	X	x	x	x	x	County/Chamber of Commerce	No cost associated	Local/Private
6	Investigate the possibility of an additional industrial park in Washington County	X	X	X	X	X	County/Chamber of Commerce	\$5,000	Local/Private
7	Work with State officials to promote the four-laning of SR-15 between I-20 and I-16	х	x	x	x	x	County/ Sandersville/ Chamber of Commerce	No cost for negotiations.	Local/State/ Federal
8	Update Business Retention and Expansion Program (BREP) in-depth survey of exiting industries	x	x	x	x	x	County/Tennille	\$5,000	Local/Private
9	Work with planned Technical institute to offer continuing educational and non-credit programs to upgrade and expand existing industries	х	X	X	x	x	County/Chamber of Commerce/ DTAE	\$2,000	Local/Private
10	Work with area post-secondary institutions to offer continuing educational and non-credit programs to upgrade and expand technical skills of workforce.	x	x	X	x	x	County/Chamber of Commerce/ WIB	\$2,000	Local/State
11	Work with existing Adult Literacy program to ensure that Washington County remains a Certified Literate Community	x	x	x	x	x	County/Board of Education/ Chamber of Commerce	\$2,000	Local/State

nk with local formore to fully willing the notantial		A	pendi	<b>X</b> A		County/County		
rk with local farmers to fully utilize the potential canola production, including the possibility of a ola refinery and distribution center	X	x	x	x	x	Extension Service/Farm Bureau	\$10,000	Local
ntinue to work with Chamber of Commerce and lin companies to attract "spin-off" industries	X	x	x	x	x	County/Kaolin Industry	\$10,000	Local
ntinue to promote, support and enhance cultural vities such as the Kaolin Festival	X	X	X	X	X	County/Chamber of Commerce	\$7,500	Local
date the Industrial Diversification Study for shington County to broaden and diversify ustrial base	X	x	x	x	x	County/Chamber of Commerce	\$15,000	Local
USING		-	T	-	T			
estigate Community Development Block Grant ding for substandard home modernization	X	x	x	x	x	City/ County/ Development Community/RDC	\$10,000/year	Local
rk with local developers on public/private tures to construct affordable rental and owener upied housing	Х	x	x	x	x	County	\$30,000	State/Local/ private
estigate financing strategies, government sidies, tax breaks and loans which would make using the projects feasible and affordable	X	x	x	x	x	County	\$3,000	Local
TURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES		1		1				
opt and pursue ground water recharge protection eria outlined by the Georgia Department of rural Resources	X	x	x	x	x	County	\$1,000	GADNR/Local
ntify and protect prime agricultural and forest d from development	X	X	X	X	X	County/RDC	\$6,000	Local
e County shall participate in the National Flood urance Program	X	X	X	X	X	County	\$5,000/year	Local/NFIP
ppt a River Corridor Protection Plan	Х	X	X	X	X	County	\$2,000	GADNR/Local
k nomination of additional important historic actures to the National Register of Historic Places I the Georgia Historic Register	X	x	x	x	x	County/ DNR/ SHPO	\$500/structure	County/ DNR/ SHPO
	ric Register	ric Register SHFO	ric Register SHFO					

1	Continue to work with Sandersville to provide water service for areas outside City limits.	X	Ар Х	pendix X	x A X	X	County/ Sandersville	\$100,000/yr	City/County/ GEFA
2	Investigate the possibility of a County Water System to serve future development on Fall-Line Freeway	X	X	X	x	X	County	\$10,000	Local/State/ Federal
3	Work with Chamber of Commerce to form a civic center steering committee	X	X	X	X	X	County, Georgia DOT	\$1,000	Local/Chamber
4	Investigate funding alternatives and grants for civic center project development	X	X	X	X	X	County/ Chamber of Commerce/RDC	\$2,500	Local
5	Coordinate health care and transportation assistance outreach programs to assist more rural residents of the County	X	X	X	X	X	County/DHEC	\$3,000	County
6	Add additional classroom space at all schools to meet the needs of a growing population	X	X	X	X	Х	County/School System	\$150,000	Cities/County/ School System
7	Work with area post-secondary institutions and the Board of Regents to develop a satellite college in Washington County, possibly in conjunction with the Technical Institute	X	X	X	x	X	County/ Board of Education	N/A	County























