From: Jeffrey Longstead
To: Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject: Comment on Comprehensive Plan
Date: Friday, December 13, 2024 8:57:42 AM

Please find my comments below on the referenced section of the Comprehensive Plan:

2710 ((E-483)) E-413 Wetland impacts ((should)) shall be avoided if possible, and

2711 minimized in all cases. Applicants shall demonstrate that impacts are

2712 unavoidable due to circumstances outside of the applicant's control,

2713 and not for the profit or convenience of development. Where impacts

2714 cannot be avoided, they should be mitigated on site if the proposed

Comment: This language is different from State or Federal regulatory guidance for avoidance and minimization of wetland impacts. “Outside of the applicant’s control, and not for the profit or convenience of development” is nebulous and does not make any sense within the context of growth management and watershed-based protection of aquatic areas. The writer of this section of the Comprehensive Plan is obviously ideologically opposed to “profit” and “convenience”, two things that are critical to making effective communities and planning for growth in our County. Zoning codes plan for development to occur in a specific way in the County, for the betterment of it’s citizens. Developers of suitable development projects and infrastructure must make a “profit” in order to stay in business and provide services and products to King County residents. This is not a dirty word. “Convenience” is also important for development projects who are tasked with meeting growth targets for things like housing and services on appropriately zoned parcels. Underutilizing zoning codes is counterproductive for planning for growth. It is critical in some cases to make development projects operate “conveniently” in the community for future use of these structures. There are many examples of development projects underutilizing current zoning designations to build a smaller or less operable project in order to avoid a low value wetland or aquatic area, when far superior options exist to mitigate for that wetland or aquatic area and build a better project. This language is short-sided and fails to take into account the options the county already has for highly functioning mitigation solutions like the Mitigation Reserves program and State and Federally Certified Wetland Mitigation Banks. I have toured these projects and they are far superior than avoiding a small low functioning wetland on a highly zoned multi-family parcel or industrial development that creates jobs and homes.

Thanks,

Jeff

From:	Jensen, Chris (they/them)
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject:	FW: Ecology Comments on King County's Draft Critical Areas Ordinance Update
Date:	Friday, March 14, 2025 9:40:24 AM
Attachments:	03142025_ECYLetter_KingCountyCAO.pdf

***Chris Jensen** – they/them*
Comprehensive Planning Manager
King County Executive Department | Office of Performance, Strategy, and Budget

Sign up for email news about the King County Comprehensive Plan

From: Atkins, Emily (ECY) <eatk461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Friday, March 14, 2025 9:33 AM
To: Jensen, Chris (they/them) <Chris.Jensen@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Proebsting, Robin <rproebsting@kingcounty.gov>; Opolka, Teresa (ECY) <topo461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Molstad, Neil (ECY) <NEMO461@ECY.WA.GOV>; jobu461 <jobu461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Aken, Jeff (COM) <jeff.aken@commerce.wa.gov>
Subject: Ecology Comments on King County's Draft Critical Areas Ordinance Update

Hello Chris Jensen,

Please see the attached letter from Ecology regarding comments on King County's proposed draft Critical Area Ordinance update submitted to PlanView (Submittal 2024-S-7674) on 10/29/2024.

Best,

Emily Atkins

She/Her

Critical Areas Ordinance Coordinator

Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program

WA State Dept of Ecology

emily.atkins@ecy.wa.gov **| 360-628-6680**

From:	Peter Rimbos
To:	Perry, Sarah; Quinn, De"Sean; Mosqueda, Teresa; Dunn, Reagan
Cc:	Balducci, Claudia; Barón, Jorge L.; Dembowski, Rod; Von Reichbauer, Pete; Zahilay, Girmay; Smith, Lauren; Jensen, Chris (they/them); Smith, Megan (DNRP)
Subject:	Joint Rural Team Review & Comment—KC Exec's 2024 Prop"d Upd to the KC CAO & BAS
Date:	Monday, March 17, 2025 10:38:57 AM
Attachments:	KCCP CAO Upd-BAS--JRT Comments.pdf

KC Local Services and Land-Use Committee Chair Perry and Members,

Please accept the Joint Rural Team's **Comment Letter** (attached) on the King County Executive's ***2024 Proposed Update to the King County Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) and Best Available Science (BAS),* October 2024**, as part of our continuing review of the *2024 KCCP Major Ten-Year Update*.

Peter Rimbos
Coordinator, Joint Rural Team--*KCCP*, *CPPs*, and *VISION 2050*
Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council (GMVUAC)
primbos@comcast.net

"To know and not to do is not to know."-- Chinese proverb

From: Paige, Robby
To: Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject: The Snoqualmie Tribe - CAO Comment Letter
Date: Monday, March 31, 2025 2:28:39 PM
Attachments: 2025_3_KC_CAO_STComments.pdf

Hello,

Providing a copy of The Snoqualmie Tribe's most recent comment letter for the Critical Areas Ordinance. They asked if this could be distributed to the rest of the Councilmembers.

Best,
Robby

Robby Paige
Policy Analyst
Councilmember Sarah Perry
King County Council, District 3
206-445-9246

From: Vande Griend, Carryn
To: KCC - Legislative Clerks - Distribution Group
Subject: April 16: Local Services and Land Use Committee
Date: Monday, April 14, 2025 4:35:49 PM

Hello,

My name is Carryn Vande Griend and I work at Puget Sound Energy. I'm sending in PSE's comments ahead of the Local Services and Land Use Committee's briefing on wildfire preparedness on April 16. Thank you for distributing to the committee.

Puget Sound Energy takes a holistic approach to the evolving risk of wildfires by operating and improving our infrastructure to create an electric system that is reliable, resilient, and above all, safe. PSE's Wildfire Risk Management Program includes our year-round work to prevent wildfires by investing in projects to strengthen our infrastructure, utilizing tools and new technologies to enhance our situational awareness, monitoring real-time conditions and operating the electric system at varying levels of sensitivity and partnering with emergency responders, local organizations, and our customers to build more resilient communities.

We also use weather forecasting and modeling tools to evaluate conditions, and we may operate our electric system more conservatively during critical fire weather conditions to prevent wildfires. This includes turning on Enhanced Powerline Settings (EPS) or using a Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) to help keep our customers and communities safe. These measures can result in power outages, and we want you to be prepared.

We consider multiple factors when deciding which measures to use to safely operate the electric system, including wind speed, humidity, temperature, moisture levels in trees and brush, fire risk modeling, and observations from field crews and local emergency response partners.

During high-risk conditions, PSE uses Enhanced Powerline Settings on targeted lines to make the electric system more sensitive to potential hazards, such as a tree branch touching a line, and automatically turn power off to prevent sparks. Customers may experience unplanned power outages when these settings are in place, and can find restoration updates on the outage map.

When conditions threaten our ability to safely operate the electric system, we may use a Public Safety Power Shutoff to prevent wildfires from starting by proactively turning off power. We will notify impacted customers and emergency response partners in advance of a PSPS and provide updates throughout the event.

As we approach the summer, here are some steps you can take to prepare for peak wildfire season:

- Create and practice a household emergency plan and build an emergency kit.
- Learn more about how we operate the electric grid to prevent wildfires and keep communities safe, including using Public Safety Power Shutoffs: **pse.com/psps**
- Make sure your PSE account contact information is up to date: **pse.com**
- If you use a medical device in your home that relies on electricity, apply for Life Support status on your account: **pse.com/medical**
- Get your free Wildfire Ready Plan and take action to make your home and community more resilient: **wildfireready.dnr.wa.gov**

We appreciate all the work King County has been doing to prepare for peak wildfire season, and look forward to working in partnership to keep our communities safe.

Thank you,
Carryn

Carryn Vande Griend
PSE Local Government Affairs

Central & Eastern Washington
Carryn.VandeGriend@pse.com
509.218.9012

From: Lauren Silver-Turner
To: KCC - Legislative Clerks - Distribution Group
Subject: Public Comment - Proposed Ordinance 2024-0408
Date: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 7:56:16 AM

Good morning Councilmembers,

My name is Lauren Silver-Turner and I'm the Executive Director of the Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance, a nonprofit working to protect and enhance the lives, livelihoods, lands, and waters of the Snoqualmie Valley. Farmland protection, agricultural viability, and a resilient local food system are core to our mission.

I am emailing to provide comment on the proposed critical areas ordinance updates.

To begin, I was surprised—and frankly disappointed—to hear that executive branch staff cited robust outreach and engagement of agricultural stakeholders for this update process. It was even suggested that the Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee, or FFF IOC, was consulted. As a long-time IOC member and the current Farm Caucus Co-Chair, I must respectfully disagree. We had a single, presentation-style meeting on the Best Available Science report, but no opportunity was given to provide substantive input or collaboratively shape revisions.

To my knowledge, the Agricultural Commission also received only a high-level overview in Fall 2023. No drafts were shared, and while commissioners could ask questions, they were not given the opportunity to offer recommendations or raise concerns about potential impacts to agriculture.

My role at SVPA is centered on listening to and amplifying the voices of farmers. What I've consistently heard is that they did not feel meaningfully engaged in this process. And yet, these are the very people who manage the land and water every day—many of whom care deeply about ecological health and salmon recovery.

In fact, SVPA and the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum conducted a community-based social marketing study to understand farmers' motivations for riparian restoration. Nearly every participant cited environmental ethos and ecological function—such as habitat or water quality—as their primary motivator. These are not farmers who need to be coerced into stewardship; they are already participating, voluntarily, when engagement is collaborative and incentives are clear.

If SVPA, the FFF Farm Caucus, the Agricultural Commission, the Snoqualmie Valley Watershed Improvement District, SnoValley Tilth, and even King County Ag staff were not engaged—then I ask: who was?

Beyond the process, I want to raise a deeper concern about alignment with the collaborative Fish, Farm, Flood framework. Since 2013, the FFF caucuses and IOC have

worked together in good faith to balance agricultural viability, salmon recovery, and flood risk mitigation. That work led to Comprehensive Plan policies—including R-751—which direct King County, through this collaborative watershed planning process, to determine minimum acreage targets for agriculture and habitat in the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District (SVAPD), and to develop a tracking system to monitor land use.

Through years of work by the Buffers Task Force, the Buffer Implementation Task Force, and Agricultural Strategic Plan Task Force, we've identified how many acres are needed to maintain agriculture as the predominant land use in the SVAPD—while still meeting multi-benefit, variable-width buffer goals. What's unclear is how this proposed ordinance—and the potential for mandatory buffer conversions—will be reconciled with those targets.

We urge the Council to ensure that any new buffer requirements are integrated into the existing framework, and that all land conversions—voluntary or mandated—are accurately tracked. If these regulatory changes are layered on without aligning with previous agreements, it risks unraveling over a decade of hard-won, consensus-based work.

Finally, I want to flag two outstanding concerns:

- The proposed definition of "commercial agriculture" is vague and the implications for farmers is unclear.
- And the new provisions could limit a farm's ability to adapt to changing conditions —especially if adaptations aren't already written into a farm plan. Since plans are tied to the individual, not the land, generational transitions could trigger new requirements, posing yet another hurdle for family farms.

Thank you for your time and your thoughtful consideration. We urge you to ensure this ordinance supports—not undermines—the future of agriculture in King County, and upholds the integrity of the collaborative processes that so many stakeholders have invested in.

Sincerely,
Lauren

Lauren Silver-Turner
Executive Director
Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance
PO Box 1148, Carnation WA 98014
c: (989) 464-1335 | o: (425) 549-0316 | w: SVPA.us

From:	Peter Rimbos
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Cc:	Auzins, Erin; Steadman, Marka; Hollingshead, Libby
Subject:	Public Comment--KCCP CAO Update
Date:	Saturday, April 12, 2025 11:21:04 AM
Attachments:	KCCP CAO Upd-BAS--JRT Comments.pdf

KC Council KCCP Policy Staff,

On March 17 we submitted the attached **Written Comments** to the KC LS&L-U Committee. We are *re-submitting* the same comments in response to the April 16 Meeting Announcement on Committee's the Critical Areas Regulations Ordinance and Schedule Update, which we received yesterday, calling for Public Comment.

Peter Rimbos
Coordinator, Joint Rural Team (JRT)—*KCCP*, *CPPs*, and *VISION 2050*
Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council (GMVUAC)
primbos@comcast.net

"To know and not to do is not to know."-- Chinese proverb

Please consider our shared environment before printing.

From:	Carolyn Boatsman
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan; KCC - Legislative Clerks - Distribution Group
Cc:	Proebsting, Robin; Bowles, Mason
Subject:	Comments draft critical areas regulations April 16, 2025 meeting of Local Services and Land Use Committee., Item 6
Date:	Wednesday, April 16, 2025 1:20:45 AM
Attachments:	Comments LSLU meeting April 16 2025.docx

LSLU Committee Members:
My comments are attached. Thank you for considering!
Sincerely,
Carolyn Boatsman

From:	mthomas424
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan; Communications, Comments
Cc:	Perry, Sarah; Schneider, Lynn; Marote, Corrina; Mosqueda, Teresa; Paige, Robby
Subject:	Comment regarding Comp Plan Update: Critical Areas BAS Update Issues / Local Service & Land Use Committee 4/16 Comment
Date:	Wednesday, April 16, 2025 5:06:43 PM
Attachments:	Objection to adoption of 2024 Comp Plan- .pdf

Comment on Meeting on the Critical Areas Regulations Ordinance and Local Services and Land Use Committee 4/16

In furtherance to my verbal comment today (4/16)

There are problems with the critical areas update and critical aquifer recharge areas. The maps are in need of update, the methods behind the critical area definition are deficient and inconsistent with the Groundwater Management Plan in East King County such as rainfall, are questionable science by the updates own references, and implications of maps do not match actual experience and characteristics in the North Bend area.

Statements that critical aquifer recharge area maps do not need to be updated because the methodology King County uses has not changed does not consider the reality of well management and advances in wellhead protection mappjng are questionable. Wells can be added, moved, changed, and abandoned. New mapping can become available changing to more advanced methods such as addressing topography and movement of groundwater. This means the underlying wellhead protection area may change and the critical aquifer recharge area change. The process by which wellhead protection areas are adopted is governed by WA DOH ODW as part of water system planning and the county reviews and approves water system plans which have wellhead protection as a component and subject to significant review.

There are expensive requirements to being mapped to a CARA; one of which from a septic system owners perspective is the requirement to reduce nitrates pand arbitrarily set at <1 acre in KCC 21A.24.313-316; however, the method which is the basis of 1 acre is suspect... areas of the county get far more rainfall than the average used to make the 1 acre recommendation (and in East King County rainfall is part of the East King County Groundwater Management Plan), and areas such as North Bend (within East King County) are in topography (mountains) and have high horizontal movement of groundwater. There is no history of nitrate issues in public drinking water sources in North Bend and in the presence of 1000s of aging and basic septic systems that do little to address nitrates. Reducing nitrates in septic systems is expensive, and costs relative to very simple gravity systems owners currently have to one that reduces can be 10k's of dollars more... and not needed.

I attach an earlier memo which has additional
information about the inadequacy of CARA methodolgy and BAS which are the basis of KCC 21A.24.313-316 and should be taken as comment on the land use and policy elements and critical area regulations update. It is very clear it is problematic and needs change to fairly address OSS costs and protect water resources.

Mrs. Perry's office has been previously contacted on the matter last year but there has been no followup. This issue can waste $10k's per septic system and there are 1000s in North Bend

alone. I very much agree with remarks by the farmer who feels their rights are affected; septic owners in areas with no record of nitrate impacted public drinking water and supported by science and actual experience should not be faced with expensive requirements. An over arching theme expressed today by those speaking about the Snoqualmie Valley is the failure to engage those affected and I must agree.

Michael Thomas
North Bend WA

From:	Auzins, Erin
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject:	FW: 5-21-25 LSLU Written Public Comment - NONE
Date:	Wednesday, May 21, 2025 8:45:48 AM
Attachments:	2024-0408 Dulin Written Comments.pdf

From: Steadman, Marka <Marka.Steadman@kingcounty.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2025 8:36 AM
To: Auzins, Erin <Erin.Auzins@kingcounty.gov>; Calderon, Angelica <Angelica.Calderon@kingcounty.gov>; Daly, Sharon <Sharon.Daly@kingcounty.gov>; Dunn, Reagan <Reagan.Dunn@kingcounty.gov>; Eccles, Cody <Cody.Eccles@kingcounty.gov>; Hollingshead, Libby <Libby.Hollingshead@kingcounty.gov>; House, Erin <Erin.House@kingcounty.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <Teresa.Mosqueda@kingcounty.gov>; Ngo, Jenny <Jenny.Ngo@kingcounty.gov>; Perry, Sarah <Sarah.Perry@kingcounty.gov>; Quinn, De'Sean <DeSean.Quinn@kingcounty.gov>; Steadman, Marka <Marka.Steadman@kingcounty.gov>; Swift, Bryndel (KCC) <Bryndel.Swift@kingcounty.gov>; Williams, Gabbi (she/her) <gabriela.williams@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: 5-21-25 LSLU Written Public Comment - NONE

Attached is written public comment submitted in regard to today's Local Services and Land Use Committee meeting.

If part of the submission is an attachment to an email, double-click on the attachment to open it.

Marka

From: Auzins, Erin
To: Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject: FW: 5-21-25 LSLU Written Public Comment
Date: Friday, May 23, 2025 8:43:59 AM
Attachments: 2024-0408 Kreymer Comments.pdf

From: Steadman, Marka <Marka.Steadman@kingcounty.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 1:21 PM
To: Auzins, Erin <Erin.Auzins@kingcounty.gov>; Calderon, Angelica <Angelica.Calderon@kingcounty.gov>; Daly, Sharon <Sharon.Daly@kingcounty.gov>; Dunn, Reagan <Reagan.Dunn@kingcounty.gov>; Eccles, Cody <Cody.Eccles@kingcounty.gov>; Hollingshead, Libby <Libby.Hollingshead@kingcounty.gov>; House, Erin <Erin.House@kingcounty.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <Teresa.Mosqueda@kingcounty.gov>; Ngo, Jenny <Jenny.Ngo@kingcounty.gov>; Perry, Sarah <Sarah.Perry@kingcounty.gov>; Quinn, De'Sean <DeSean.Quinn@kingcounty.gov>; Steadman, Marka <Marka.Steadman@kingcounty.gov>; Swift, Bryndel (KCC) <Bryndel.Swift@kingcounty.gov>; Williams, Gabbi (she/her) <gabriela.williams@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: 5-21-25 LSLU Written Public Comment

Attached is an additional written public comment submitted in regard to yesterday's Local Services and Land Use Committee meeting.

Marka

From: Auzins, Erin
To: Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject: FW: MBAKS Written Comments re: Ordinance 2024-0408 (Critical Area Regulations)
Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 3:57:40 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
2025. 5-28 MBAKS King County LSLU Written Comments CAO BAS.pdf

---

From: Veronica Shakotko <Vshakotko@mbaks.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 3:56 PM
To: Perry, Sarah <sarah.perry@kingcounty.gov>; Quinn, De'Sean <desean.quinn@kingcounty.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <teresa.mosqueda@kingcounty.gov>; Dunn, Reagan <reagan.dunn@kingcounty.gov>; KCC - Legislative Clerks - Distribution Group <kcccomitt@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Auzins, Erin <erin.auzins@kingcounty.gov>; Ngo, Jenny <jenny.ngo@kingcounty.gov>; Rowe, Mark <mrowe@kingcounty.gov>; Chan, Jim <Jim.Chan@kingcounty.gov>; Richardson, Leon <lrichardson@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: MBAKS Written Comments re: Ordinance 2024-0408 (Critical Area Regulations)

Dear Chair Perry, Vice Chair Quinn, and Councilmembers,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on Ordinance 2024-0408. As you consider updates to the Critical Areas Ordinance, we encourage you to carefully evaluate how the proposed changes may impact housing affordability, permitting timelines, and overall clarity in the development process.

MBAKS supports King County's efforts to update critical areas regulations in line with environmental goals. However, we also encourage the Council to consider how proposed changes may impact other key Growth Management Act (GMA) goals, including housing affordability, urban growth, timely permitting, and clarity in the development process.

In our attached comments, we raise concerns around implementation clarity, ambiguous language in key definitions, and the need for more predictable permitting requirements. We ask that the Council carefully evaluate proposed changes to setbacks, buffer widths, and mitigation standards—ensuring that any revisions are supported by best available science (BAS) and do not unintentionally increase housing costs or delays. We also want to express our strong support for the use of mitigation banks and other programmatic mitigation tools, which are recognized by state and federal agencies as more effective and predictable than traditional permittee-responsible approaches. Aligning with these modern practices would improve outcomes for both the environment and applicants.

We appreciate your work on this important update and are happy to serve as a resource as the process moves forward. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at vshakotko@mbaks.com or 425.435.8990.

Respectfully,
Veronica

Veronica Shakotko
Senior King County Manager
Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties
m 425.435.8990
335 116th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA 98004

Find us on
We believe everybody deserves a place to call home.

From: Veronica Shakotko
To: Perry, Sarah; Quinn, De"Sean; Mosqueda, Teresa; Dunn, Reagan; KCC - Legislative Clerks - Distribution Group
Cc: Auzins, Erin; Ngo, Jenny; Rowe, Mark; Chan, Jim; Richardson, Leon
Subject: MBAKS Written Comments re: Striking Amendment to Ordinance 2024-0408 (Critical Area Regulations) - July 16 Agenda
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 3:40:51 PM
Attachments: Outlook-Master Bui.png
Outlook-facebook.c.png
Outlook-twitter.co.png
Outlook-linkedin.c.png
Outlook-instagram..png
2025. 7-15 MBAKS King County LSLU Written Comments CAO BAS.pdf

---

Dear Chair Perry, Vice Chair Quinn, and Councilmembers,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the proposed Striking Amendment S1 to King County's Critical Areas Ordinance in preparation for your discussion on the July 16 agenda. We appreciate the County's continued effort to modernize its critical areas regulations and the thoughtful work of the Local Services and Land Use Committee in developing the proposed amendment.

Our letter acknowledges several positive elements in the striking amendment, including improved organization, procedural transparency around habitat updates, and the County's ongoing public engagement. At the same time, we outline a several remaining concerns about the potential impacts on housing feasibility, particularly in urban and infill areas.

Key issues include:

- Expanded buffer widths that may reduce buildable land area without localized performance data
- Vague permitting language and unclear report standards that could delay project approvals
- A preference for on-site mitigation that diverges from current state and federal policy
- New hazard area restrictions that lack publicly available mapping or transparent criteria
- The absence of SEPA exemptions, which have proven effective in streamlining permitting in other jurisdictions

MBAKS remains committed to working collaboratively with Council and staff to ensure the final ordinance supports both critical area protection and the production of attainable housing. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at vshakotko@mbaks.com or 425.435.8990.

Respectfully,
Veronica

Veronica Shakotko
Senior King County Manager
Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties
m 425.435.8990
335 116th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA 98004

Find us on
Everyone deserves a place to call home.

From: Nicole McKernan
To: Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject: Critical areas code change
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 4:03:25 PM

Hello,

We have a few questions about the code change to the critical areas part of the plan. To give you background:

> We have a new house project that we are preparing to submit to the building department.· Critically, with this specific property and the impacts of the critical areas change, the property will become unbuildable after the code change.

1. Will the changes apply as of the day/time of the vote, or will they apply at some later date? If so, is there a specified later date yet? Is the vote expected to be delayed again?

2. Vesting. With the new law requiring permits to be processed faster, King County permit reviewers are now using the "screening" period (where they check for application completeness before they officially accept the permit) as a much longer and more ambiguous timeline where they could ask for all sorts of new things from the applicant that they normally would ask for during permit review time. We prepare very thorough applications, but with the recent staff changes, the items being asked for are not the same reviewer to reviewer, so we have not been able to adequately predict what they will expect *on top of* standard application items. This is a problem relating to the comp plan because a project is not "vested" into the current code until it passes screening. We are planning to submit in August to give it plenty of time to go through screening before the Dec 2nd vote, but we are concerned with the ambiguous amount of screening time, we will possibly lose the whole project if the screeners ask for something that we cannot produce in the time remaining (such as revisions to complex consultant reports, for instance).

   Until the code change is official, can Council either A) add an amendment that will allow for vesting at time of submittal for projects that will be adversely affected by the code change and have made a best effort to be accepted in time or B) permit the building officials to allow earlier vesting at their discretion during this time.

Thank you,
Nicole McKernan

Nicole McKernan
Associate, Architecture

+1 206 970 1698 (d)

Personal Pronouns: She/Her

Board & Vellum
115 15th Avenue East, Suite 100
Seattle, WA 98112

boardandvellum.com

MUCKLESHOOT TRIBAL COUNCIL
39015-A 172nd Avenue S.E. • Auburn, Washington 98092-9763
(253) 939-3311 • Fax (253) 931-8570

July 30, 2025

Honorable Sarah Perry
King County Council Vice-Chair
Attn: King County Local Services and Land Use Committee
King County Courthouse
516 3rd Ave
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear King County Local Services and Land Use Committee,

On behalf of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, I write to respectfully comment on the Striking Amendment to the 2025 Comprehensive Plan & Critical Areas Regulations Ordinance. Both the King County Comprehensive Plan and the Critical Areas Regulation Ordinance reference Indian tribes, and respectfully include tribes in planning related matters; however, neither clearly define Indian tribes as those that are federally recognized.

The Muckleshoot Tribe encourages King County to define Indian tribes as "federally recognized Indian tribes" at the outset of the Critical Areas Regulations Ordinance, and to limit consultation and comment solicitation to tribes that are federally recognized. Tribes that are federally recognized retain certain rights as sovereign political nations that other groups do not. The rights reserved by the treaties and the principles of self-government are fundamentally linked to recognition as a sovereign political entity. Tribal heritage groups push to overlook established criteria for tribal recognition and equate their heritage-based voluntary groups with legitimate Indian tribes; doing so risks undermining the very principles of tribal sovereignty. This not only diminishes the inherent value of tribal governance but also jeopardizes the vital government-to-government relationship that exists between the County and legitimately recognized Indian tribes.

Thus, we ask that King County defines Indian tribe in its Critical Areas Regulations Ordinance as "federally recognized Indian tribes," or change the language to "federally recognized Indian tribe" anywhere where "Indian tribe" is referenced. These references exist on the following pages of the Striking Amendment:

- Page 93, Section 45b editing KCC 21A.24.045 (here, in fact, the Striking Amendment proposes to strike "federally recognized tribe" and replace it with "Indian tribe".)
- Page 118, Section 51(C)(2)(a)

- Page 150, Section 63(C)(2)(a)
- Page 237, Section 96 (*does* reference treaty fishing rights)
- Page 241 (*does* reference treaty fishing rights)

We appreciate your leadership and commitment to honoring tribal sovereignty and commend you on King County's current efforts to honor true government-to-government relations.

Sincerely,

Jaison Elkins, Chairperson

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe

JE/db

From:	Auzins, Erin
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject:	FW: 2025 Comprehensive Plan & Critical Areas Ordinance
Date:	Tuesday, August 5, 2025 10:00:19 AM
Attachments:	image001.png Muckleshoot letter to KC Local Services and Land Use Committee 20250730.pdf
Importance:	High

From: Edna Shim <Edna.Shim@muckleshoot.nsn.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 9:37 AM
To: Perry, Sarah <sarah.perry@kingcounty.gov>; Quinn, De'Sean <de'sean.quinn@kingcounty.gov>; Dunn, Reagan <reagan.dunn@kingcounty.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <teresa.mosqueda@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Spencer, Quanah <qspencer@kingcounty.gov>; Auzins, Erin <erin.auzins@kingcounty.gov>; Steadman, Marka <marka.steadman@kingcounty.gov>; Rob Otsea <Rob@muckleshoot.nsn.us>; Danielle Bargala <Danielle.Bargala@muckleshoot.nsn.us>; Von Reichbauer, Pete <Pete.vonReichbauer@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: 2025 Comprehensive Plan & Critical Areas Ordinance
Importance: High

Dear King County Councilmembers of the Local Services and Land Use Committee,

Attached please find a letter from Muckleshoot Chairperson Elkins regarding the 2025 Comprehensive Plan and Critical Areas Ordinance.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Edna

Edna C. Shim

Director of Intergovernmental Affairs and Public Relations
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe

Philip Starr Administration Building
39015 172nd Avenue SE
Auburn, WA 98092-2689

Desk: (253) 876-3374 | Cell: (253) 453-9859
Edna.Shim@muckleshoot.nsn.us
https://www.wearemuckleshoot.org/
Muckleshoot Charity Fund

From:	Auzins, Erin
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Subject:	FW: MBAKS Written Comments re: Striking Amendment to Ordinance 2024-0408 (Critical Area Regulations) - August 20 Agenda
Date:	Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:05:50 AM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png 2025. 8-18 MBAKS King County LSLU Written Comments CAO BAS.pdf

---

From: Veronica Shakotko <Vshakotko@mbaks.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:05 AM
To: Perry, Sarah <sarah.perry@kingcounty.gov>; Quinn, De'Sean <desean.quinn@kingcounty.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <teresa.mosqueda@kingcounty.gov>; Dunn, Reagan <reagan.dunn@kingcounty.gov>; KCC - Legislative Clerks - Distribution Group <kcccomitt@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Auzins, Erin <erin.auzins@kingcounty.gov>; Ngo, Jenny <jenny.ngo@kingcounty.gov>; Rowe, Mark <mrowe@kingcounty.gov>; Chan, Jim <Jim.Chan@kingcounty.gov>; Richardson, Leon <lrichardson@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: MBAKS Written Comments re: Striking Amendment to Ordinance 2024-0408 (Critical Area Regulations) - August 20 Agenda

Dear Chair Perry, Vice Chair Quinn, and Councilmembers,

Thank you for your continued work on the Critical Areas Ordinance update. On behalf of the Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties, I'm writing to share a supplemental comment letter (attached) in response to the August 20 LSLU packet and the latest version of Ordinance 2024-0408.

We appreciate the County's effort to modernize these regulations and recognize the thoughtful refinements made throughout the process. However, we remain concerned that several provisions, if not further clarified or adjusted, could limit housing feasibility, especially for smaller, urban, and infill sites.

Key concerns outlined in the attached letter include:

- **Expanded buffers** that may significantly reduce buildable area, particularly on constrained urban parcels
- **Unclear or unmapped geologic hazard areas** that could restrict development without sufficient transparency or predictability
- **Added septic regulations** in aquifer recharge zones that go beyond state standards and may increase rural housing costs
- **Overreliance on onsite mitigation** can block small projects where offsite mitigation tools are more viable
- **Unclear critical area reporting requirements** that introduce cost and delay for homeowners and smaller builders
- **Lack of transition mapping or timing** may result in confusion or project denial if standards shift mid-application

As the Council moves toward final adoption, we urge further refinements to ensure the ordinance supports both environmental protection and housing opportunity across King County. Please don't hesitate to reach out if we can provide additional detail or serve as a resource. We look forward to continued collaboration.

Warm regards,
Veronica

Veronica Shakotko

Senior King County Manager

Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties

m 425.435.8990

335 116th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA 98004

Find us on

Everyone deserves a place to call home.

From:	Tim Trohimovich
To:	KCC - Legislative Clerks - Distribution Group; Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan; Compplan; Smith, Lauren
Subject:	Comments on Proposed Ord No. 2024-0408, an ordinance related to critical area regulations
Date:	Tuesday, August 19, 2025 4:33:00 PM
Attachments:	image.png image.png Outlook-anusi3k1 2025-08-19 Futurewise Comments on 2025 CAR Update.pdf 5.8.25 WDFW Amendment 3 Statement and Analysis.pdf

---

Dear Council Members and Staff:

Enclosed please find Futurewise's comments on Proposed Ordinance No. 2024-0408, an ordinance related to critical area regulations. If you require anything else, please let me know.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Tim Trohimovich, AICP (he/him)
Director of Planning & Law

Futurewise
1201 3rd Ave #2200, Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 343-0681
tim@futurewise.org
futurewise.org
connect:

From:	cindy@capr.us
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Cc:	Dunn, Reagan; Perry, Sarah
Subject:	Citizens" Alliance for Property Rights Comments regarding Proposed Ordinance 2024-0408 Proposed Critical Areas Ordinance.
Date:	Tuesday, August 19, 2025 5:02:13 PM

CouncilCompPlan@kingcounty.gov CouncilCompPlan@kingcounty.gov
Reagan Dunn Reagan.Dunn@kingcounty.gov
Sarah Perry Sarah.Perry@kingcounty.gov

Comments regarding Proposed Ordinance 2024-0408 Proposed Critical Areas Ordinance.
Subject
Request for Specific Details on Buffer Widths in Amendments to Proposed Ordinance 2024-0408

Dear King County Council,
I am writing regarding Proposed Ordinance 2024-0408, which updates critical area regulations for the 2025 Comprehensive Plan. The July 16, 2025, Local Services and Land Use Committee meeting packet outlines the ordinance's purpose but does not provide specific details about Striking Amendment S1 (released July 15, 2025) or the public line amendments (released August 15, 2025).

I request the full text of these amendments, particularly details on changes to buffer widths and sizes for wetlands, streams, floodplains, and steep slopes. For example, I am interested in any modifications to minimum buffer requirements or conditions for buffer averaging, as these directly impact environmental protection and development. Please make these details available on the council's website.
(https://kingcounty.gov/en/dept/council/governance-leadership/county-council/useful-links/comprehensive-plan/2025) or provide them upon request.

Prior to final passage, comments and concerns of impacted property owners should be specifically addressed. In general, a perceived lack of engagement with various property owners and their concern for their property rights is not adequately considered or presented to property owners by the county.
Concerns range from buffer widths through impact to farming, development, to concisely and accurately mapped CARAs, public line amendment availability is needed for an informed analysis by the public.

Attending to the lack of readily available, accessible, and easily located information for the public would comply with the need to provide clear and specific details to documents that are placed on the county website. The lack of specifics in the information presently provided with an abundance

of language (more than 800 pages in one document, and over 400 pages in another) in CAO update documents and related published documents is an oversight that must be rectified. With improvements, we could thank you for ensuring transparency in this process.

Sincerely,
Cindy Alia
Citizens' Alliance for Property Rights

From:	DomScarimbolo
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Cc:	Perry, Sarah; reagan.dun@kingcounty.gov
Subject:	Citizens" Alliance for Property Rights Comments Regarding Proposed Ordinance 2024-0408 Proposed Critical Areas Ordinance
Date:	Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:39:18 PM
Attachments:	KC CAPR Official Letter for CAO Aug 20 2025.pdf

Dear Councilmembers,

On behalf of the Citizens' Alliance for Property Rights (CAPR), King County Chapter as the new President, I submit the following written comments to be entered into the record regarding the August 20, 2025 Local Services and Land Use Committee meeting packet and agenda. CAPR represents property owners and small business stakeholders across King County who are deeply concerned about the ongoing erosion of private property rights under the guise of "comprehensive planning," "equity," and "environmental stewardship."

I. Accessibility and Transparency Failures

The meeting materials for this agenda exceed 800 pages, filled with technical amendments to dozens of code provisions. This sheer volume and complexity makes it impossible for the average property owner to meaningfully participate. When King County produces documents of this size, written in bureaucratic and legal jargon, it effectively denies citizens the ability to understand or challenge the policies being advanced.

Public comment under these circumstances becomes a hollow procedural checkbox, not a meaningful consultation. This lack of accessibility undermines public trust in the process and raises serious questions about whether the Council is meeting its obligations for transparency and fair notice.

II. Predetermined Outcomes

CAPR has observed that Comprehensive Plan amendments and Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) updates follow a familiar pattern: lengthy public comment processes are held, yet the final outcome has already been decided. Language is adjusted for optics, but the core policy direction remains unchanged.

This meeting continues that pattern. The Council has already signaled support for the 30-Year Forest Plan, the expansion of critical areas regulations, and new monitoring and adaptive management systems. Citizens are asked to engage, but the decisions are preordained. This undermines democratic legitimacy.

III. Critical Areas Ordinance Expansion (Ordinance 2024-0408)

The proposed amendments to K.C.C. 21A and related provisions represent a significant expansion of the CAO. Each update imposes greater restrictions: larger buffers, more setbacks, reduced buildable land, and heightened permitting requirements.

Particularly troubling is the incorporation of "adaptive management" provisions, which allow unelected staff to impose further restrictions without direct Council vote or meaningful public oversight. This creates open-ended regulatory power over private property and amounts to a regulatory taking without compensation, contrary to both state and federal constitutional protections.

For rural property owners in unincorporated King County, this translates into a loss of use, value, and economic opportunity. These residents are being asked to subsidize the County's environmental ambitions by sacrificing their private rights without relief or fair balance.

IV. 30-Year Forest Plan (Motion 2025-0204)

The Forest Plan, finalized in 2021 and now formally before the Council, is framed around seven "priority areas," including climate mitigation, salmon habitat, urban canopy expansion, and sustainable timber.

While laudable in theory, the plan is riddled with vague commitments, reliance on "equity frameworks," and perpetual obligations to align all forestry-related work with other bureaucratic initiatives. This locks King County into policy silos that privilege climate agendas and cultural priorities over the rights of private landowners who already bear the majority of stewardship responsibility.

Instead of rewarding rural landowners for the forests they already maintain at their own expense, the County envisions further restrictions, conservation easements, and programs that reduce landowner control. This is not partnership; it is control through regulation.

V. Snoqualmie Pass Mobility Study (Briefing 2025-B0119)

The study on alternatives to driving alone to Snoqualmie Pass is another example of fiscal waste. Despite survey data and stakeholder meetings, King County Metro has already stated that service to Snoqualmie Pass does not align with County service guidelines or priorities. Yet funds are still being spent on duplicative studies that ignore economic and workforce realities.

At a time when rural infrastructure needs remain unmet, taxpayers should not be funding studies and pilot programs that will never result in practical or cost-effective service.

VI. Equity, Environment, and Unincorporated Communities

King County consistently uses the language of equity, climate, and environmental stewardship

to justify greater regulation. Yet unincorporated residents – those most directly impacted – are left without meaningful support.

- Salmon recovery efforts continue to fail despite decades of regulation.
- Tree planting initiatives are symbolic but do not compensate landowners for the burdens imposed.
- Small businesses and rural economies suffer as permitting barriers and compliance costs mount.

Equity, properly understood, should mean equal protection of the law for all residents. Instead, the County's approach has become selective, divisive, and discriminatory against rural property owners.

VII. CAPR's Position

For these reasons, CAPR respectfully urges the Council to:

1. Reject Ordinance 2024-0408 as an unconstitutional expansion of the Critical Areas Ordinance.
2. Decline to adopt Motion 2025-0204 until a transparent cost-benefit analysis is conducted and landowner compensation mechanisms are included.
3. End wasteful spending on mobility studies that Metro has already deemed misaligned with its priorities.
4. Commit to genuine transparency by producing summaries of all Comprehensive Plan and CAO amendments in plain language, under 25 pages, so ordinary citizens can understand the impacts.

Conclusion

King County's current process is inaccessible, predetermined, and fundamentally dismissive of property owners' rights. CAPR stands firmly opposed to the continued erosion of property rights under the guise of planning and environmental stewardship.

We call on the Council to restore balance, accountability, and respect for the citizens of unincorporated King County.

Respectfully submitted,

Dominique Scarimbolo
President, King County Chapter

Citizens' Alliance for Property Rights (CAPR)

From: cindy@capr.us
To: Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Cc: Perry, Sarah; Dunn, Reagan
Subject: Post S-1 hearing Comments regarding the proposed Critical Areas Ordinance updates 2025 Striking Amendment S1 to Proposed Ordinance 2024-0408
Date: Monday, September 1, 2025 2:54:45 PM

To the King County Council, Reagan Dunn, and Sarah Perry,

Comments regarding the proposed Critical Areas Ordinance updates 2025

As farmers and property owners in unincorporated King County, we demand that the 2025 Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) update, including Striking Amendment S1 to Proposed Ordinance 2024-0408, address our concerns to protect our livelihoods and property rights.

As public servants, you are accountable to us, not to speculative environmental policies. The CAO's reliance on the precautionary principle, which imposes restrictions without proving specific harm from our land use, erodes the essential nexus test required by law, risking unconstitutional takings. Below are our concerns and demands for a fair and balanced CAO.

CAPR Concerns:

1. Expanded Buffer Widths Reducing Usable Land

Buffer increases (e.g., 100–225 feet for wetlands, 50–150 feet for streams) drastically cut arable and developable land, reducing a 10-acre farm's usable area by 30–50% and limiting construction. This threatens our $150 million agricultural economy and property values. The precautionary approach, lacking a clear cause-and-effect link to our activities, unjustly restricts our land. We demand site-specific buffer adjustments, universal flexibility beyond Agricultural Production Districts, and proof of harm per the essential nexus test.

2. Costly and Complex Permitting Processes

Stricter permitting, with environmental assessments costing $5,000–$20,000, burdens small farmers and owners, delaying projects by 6–12 months. These costs, driven by precautionary regulations, hinder farm upgrades and development without proven necessity. Simplify permitting, provide subsidies, and ensure restrictions are tied to specific impacts, as required by law.

3. Economic Impacts on Property Value and Farm Profitability

Buffer expansions and zoning restrictions reduce property values (e.g.,

40% loss on a 5-acre parcel with a 2-acre buffer), threatening financial stability. Precautionary rules, lacking a nexus to our land use, risk takings without compensation. Implement tax relief or compensation to address these losses.

4. Erosion of Property Rights by Precautionary Regulations

The CAO's Best Available Science (BAS) prioritizes speculative environmental goals over our property rights, restricting farming and development without proving harm. This mirrors past ordinances upheld despite lacking an essential nexus, undermining our rights. Involve stakeholders in BAS reviews, exempt low-impact farming, and justify restrictions with clear causation.

5. Inaccessible Mitigation and Incentive Programs

Mitigation programs like the Voluntary Stewardship Program are complex and costly, with credits unaffordable for small farmers and owners. Precautionary burdens without a nexus make compliance inequitable. Simplify these programs and fund them to ensure accessibility for all.

6. Floodplain Management and Climate-Driven Flood Risks

Floodplain buffers restrict mitigation projects (e.g., drainage improvements), exacerbating climate-driven flooding losses ($1–2 million annually for farms). Precautionary restrictions, without proving our activities cause harm, limit resilience. Allow climate-adaptive measures like water storage, tied to a clear nexus.

CAPR Demands:

- Apply site-specific buffers with proven harm, per the essential nexus test.

- Simplify permitting and fund subsidies for small stakeholders.

- Provide compensation for reduced property values.

- Include stakeholders in BAS reviews and exempt low-impact uses.

- Make mitigation programs accessible with increased funding.

- Allow climate-adaptive flood measures with clear causation.

The county must balance environmental protection with our rights and economic needs. The precautionary principle's overreach risks takings, as seen in past legal challenges. Revise the CAO to comply with the essential

nexus test and serve our community.

Signed,

Cindy Alia

Citizens’ Alliance for Property Rights

From:	Carolyn Boatsman
To:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan
Cc:	Paige, Robby; Emily Atkins; Reinbold, Stewart G (DFW); Mcnaughton, Maria (DFW); Hollingshead, Libby
Subject:	Re: Climate adaptive plants proposal in critical areas regulations (Striking amendment to proposed ordinance 2024-0408, Version 1)
Date:	Thursday, October 2, 2025 5:14:45 PM
Attachments:	Comments KCC native plants rev 2.docx NEW SECTION 63 amended native.pdf NEW SECTION 15 def CAPs amend native only.pdf Code context considerations.docx Assisted migration agency policies.docx

---

Greetings Council Members.
The attached comments are a revision of those I sent on 9/22/25. The revision is for clarification and ease of access to the topics addressed in the comments. The comments start out with a list of topics. Proposed amendments are attached as appendices to the comments. An informal compilation of federal and state agency views on assisted migration is included.
I have done my best to effectively explain the downsides of the proposed amendment, lack of scientific support for it, and lack of conformance with the GMA. The key point, however, is that it would be the County's role to demonstrate that the the proposed amendment *is* scientifically supported *does meet* GMA requirements. I don't think that has been accomplished.
Is a revised Best Available Science report likely to be released? If so, when would that likely occur? On what date will a revised amendment be released to the public?
I would appreciate discussion with King County Council Members, Council staff, and department staff.
Thank you for considering my comments.
Sincerely,
Carolyn Boatsman
Forest Steward
Mercer Island
Phone 206-595-8579

> On 09/22/2025 1:27 PM PDT Carolyn Boatsman <c.boatsman@comcast.net> wrote:
> Greetings Council Members. I have attached comments regarding the climate adaptive plants amendment in the critical areas update. I have testified several times over the past year in opposition to the proposed amendment. It would allow the substitution of non-native "climate adaptive" plants for native plants when revegetating critical areas where native plants are currently required.
> I regret that I was not able to testify at the Local Services and Land Use Committee regarding this topic in recent months. I was responsible for a person who had suffered a severe stroke. I have however carefully reviewed recent updates to the code language.
> Please feel free to contact me if you have questions regarding my comments or wish to request information or clarification.
> Thank you for your consideration.
> Carolyn Boatsman

From:	Peter Rimbos
To:	Quinn, De"Sean; Mosqueda, Teresa; Dembowski, Rod; Von Reichbauer, Pete; Balducci, Claudia; Barón, Jorge L.; Zahilay, Girmay; Perry, Sarah; Dunn, Reagan; Communications, Comments
Cc:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan; Jensen, Chris (they/them); Smith, Lauren; Richardson, Leon; Taylor, John - Dir
Subject:	CAO Update--Joint Team Written Comments to KC Council
Date:	Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:54:33 AM
Attachments:	CAO Public Comments--Joint Team.pdf

King County Council Members,

Please accept the Joint Team [*] Comments (attached) regarding the proposed ***Critical Areas Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan***, part of the ***Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) Update*** before you and soon to be the subject of a Public Hearing.

Previously we provided you and your Local Services and Land-Use Committee both Oral and Written Comments on the ***CAO Update*** and ***Best Available Science*** (these included: Joint Team CAO/BAS Comments and Joint Team 2024 KCCP Major Update CAO/BAS Comments, when we were the *Joint Rural Team* before expanding to include three Urban Unincorporated Area Organizations earlier this year and becoming the *Joint Team*).

Even though technically part of the ***2025 King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) Annual Update***, we consider the ***CAO Update*** an important last step of the 2024 KCCP Major Ten-Year Update, for which we began our participation, including thorough review and comment, back in early 2022.

Thank you in advance for your due consideration of our attached Comments.

[*] *The Joint Team consists of the following King County Rural & Urban Unincorporated Area Organizations (listed alphabetically): Enumclaw Plateau Community Association (EPCA), Fairwood Community Group (FCG), Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council (FCVUAC), Friends of Sammamish Valley (FoSV), Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council (GMVUAC), Green River Coalition (GRC), Green Valley/Lake Holm Association (GV/LHA), Hollywood Hill Association (HHA), Skyway Coalition (SC), Soos Creek Area Response (SCAR), Vashon-Maury Island Community Council (V-MCC), West Hill Community Association (WHCA), Upper Bear Creek Unincorporated Area Council (UBCUAC), and Technical Consultants: Mike Birdsall, Transportation; Susan Boundy-Sanders, Government Policy; Ken Konigsmark, Growth Management; and Terry Lavender, Environment.*

Peter Rimbos
Coordinator, Joint Team (King County Rural & Urban Unincorporated Area Organizations)
Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council (GMVUAC)
primbos@comcast.net

"To know and not to do is not to know."-- Chinese proverb

From:	Carolyn Boatsman
To:	Paige, Robby; Hollingshead, Libby
Cc:	Legislative Staff, Council CompPlan; Khanna, Raman; Proebsting, Robin
Subject:	RE: Revised comments - NEW IDEA TO SIMPLIFY CLIMATE ADAPTIVE PLANTS LIST
Date:	Wednesday, October 22, 2025 5:32:43 PM
Attachments:	NEW SECTION 63 amend re genotype.docx

Hello Robby. Thank you again for sharing the essence of the Snoqualmie Tribe's comments regarding the draft amendment of the critical areas regulations, in which they requested;

1. Tribal consultation in the development of the climate-adaptive plant list; and
2. The requirement for revegetation with native species.

In thinking about the Snoqualmie Tribe's requests, I wanted to point out that the amendment, as it stands, would not "require revegetation with native species", as they request. It is important to note that the amendment, though offering native plants as an option and a vaguely stated priority, does not require them. Here is the text in NEW SECTION 63:

4. Use only native or climate-adaptive plant species that are well suited to thrive in the current and future site conditions;

5. Prioritize the selection of native vegetation, with the use of climate-adaptive plants only when appropriate for site conditions;

Wherever, throughout the critical areas regulations, when reference is made to revegetation, the two options are presented equally.

I wanted to offer a possible amendment to the existing draft that might save a lot of confusion and work for staff and permit applicants. It would likely resolve concerns about undercutting the food web. It would result in a useful list, which you've mentioned Council Member Perry thinks a good idea. I think that it would allow an administrative rule for a list of plants rather than a public rule.

NEW IDEA:

Today I was researching the incidence of Puget Sound native plants that are also native to surrounding ecoregions. I used the National Wildlife Federation's Native Plant Finder and compared tree species that are favorites of moths (butterflies) and form the foundation of the food web. There is a lot of co-incidence of these plants, not new information for County ecologists. And I was only looking at trees. Yet, I was thinking about it in a new way.

Roughly summarized, when comparing my zip code in King County to Wenatchee zip code 98801, I found 13 native trees in common high on the list used by moths (butterflies). Comparing my zip code to Eugene, OR, I found 25. There are so many native species in common.

I think it would be a powerful tool were King County to:

1. Compile a list of the plants native to the Puget Sound ecoregion that are resilient in heat and drought; and
2. Build upon it by allowing genotypes of these native plants (seed stock and plants) from surrounding ecoregions that are drier and warmer.

Such an approach would:

1. Be consistent with the ideas expressed in the Best Available Science report on page 43;
2. Be consistent with the approach that the DNR foresters are studying in regards to native tree genotypes from warmer, drier ecoregions;

3. Not undercut the food web;
4. Likely satisfy the Snoqualmie Tribe's concerns; and
4. Likely avoid the need for a public rule.

I've attached a draft amendment for your consideration.

It is possible that King County could inspire the market, both public and private, to begin to source seed and stock for native plants from surrounding ecoregions to be used in revegetation projects. My understanding is that this would not undercut the food web since local insects could still use this vegetation in their reproductive cycles. It has to be better than non-native plants.

I don't think that DNR would need to conduct a public rule to create the list. I think it could be an administrative process, if I'm using the right term.

I hope that you'll consider this simple approach. I would appreciate a response to this suggestion, if possible.

Thank you for continuing to engage with my recommendations on climate-adaptive plants.

Carolyn Boatsman
Forest Steward
Mercer Island

> On 10/07/2025 3:00 PM PDT Paige, Robby <robby.paige@kingcounty.gov> wrote:
>
> Hi Carolyn,
>
> Sorry for the delay. The Tribe's comments were not submitted via public methods. They shared their comments with Councilmember Perry directly. That said, these were the two points relevant to this topic that they submitted to CM Perry:
>
> 1. Include tribal consultation in the development of climate-smart plant list
> 2. Require revegetation with native species
>
> Best,
>
> Robby
>
> **Robby Paige**
>
> Deputy Chief of Staff
>
> Councilmember Sarah Perry
>
> King County Council, District 3

206-445-9246

From: Carolyn Boatsman <c.boatsman@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, October 3, 2025 2:29 PM
To: Paige, Robby <robby.paige@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: RE: Revised comments

Thank you Robbie.

I have a favor to ask. Would you be able to locate the comments on the draft CAO from the Snoqualmie Tribe? They are not shown on the Comprehensive Plan link. Thank you!

Carolyn

> On 10/03/2025 9:26 AM PDT Paige, Robby <robby.paige@kingcounty.gov> wrote:
>
> Thank you Carolyn, appreciate you sharing your updated comments. I did receive them and will be reviewing them over the next few days.
>
> Appreciate your continued engagement!
>
> Best,
>
> Robby
>
> **Robby Paige**
>
> Deputy Chief of Staff
>
> Councilmember Sarah Perry
>
> King County Council, District 3

206-445-9246

From: Carolyn Boatsman <c.boatsman@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 5:37 PM
To: Paige, Robby <robby.paige@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Revised comments

Hi Robby. You may have already seen my revised comments. I apologize for a feeling of confusion if that may occur! The new comments are much easier to follow, everything being organized under numbered sections. There is no change in the intent or viewpoint.

I did want to clear up an impression that I thought my previous comments may have created. The impression may have been that certain weaknesses of Section 63 that I listed; if addressed, would resolve my concerns. I've removed a few comments that may have led to that impression. I do still include proposed amendments to Section 63 that would result only in a list of native climate adaptive plants from the Puget Sound Ecoregion.

I won't attempt to attach today's documents here as you will have already received them twice.

Thank you again for our discussion!

Carolyn Boatsman