

# King County Comprehensive Plan Scoping Summary Report

Prepared for



**King County**

October 2022

# King County Comprehensive Plan Scoping Summary Report

*Prepared for*



**King County**

*Prepared by*

**Parametrix**

719 2nd Avenue, Suite 200

Seattle, WA 98104

T. 206.394.3700 F. 1.855.542.6353

[www.parametrix.com](http://www.parametrix.com)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. SCOPING PROCESS AND OUTREACH.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1 Summary of Participation .....	2
3.2 Summary of Comments .....	2
3.2.1 Individual Members of the Public.....	2
3.2.2 Community Organizations .....	2
<b>4. NEXT STEPS.....</b>	<b>3</b>

## APPENDICES

Appendix A	Scoping Comment Letters
------------	-------------------------

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

EIS	environmental impact statement
GMA	Growth Management Act
HB	House Bill
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
WAC	Washington Administrative Code

## 1. INTRODUCTION

King County is proposing to review and update its comprehensive plan consistent with the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Chapter 36.70A. The King County Comprehensive Plan is the long-range guiding policy document for all land use and development regulations in unincorporated King County and for regional services throughout the County, including transit, sewers, parks, trails, and open space. King County uses the long-range comprehensive planning process to guide growth and protect natural resources.

The current plan is the 2016 Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted by the King County Council on December 5, 2016. The plan has been amended multiple times with the last amendment occurring on July 24, 2020. The plan can be amended annually to address technical updates and make revisions that do not require substantive policy changes. Prior to 2022, King County used the “eight-year cycle” to conduct a complete review of the plan to address broader policy issues; however, recent legislation extended the review cycle to 10 years (House Bill [HB] 1241). Therefore, King County must complete the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update by December 31, 2024, and every 10 years thereafter (RCW 36.70A.130).

The current comprehensive plan consists of goals and policies related to regional growth management planning; urban communities; rural areas and natural resource lands; housing and human services; environment; shorelines; parks, open space, and cultural resources; transportation; services, facilities, and utilities; economic development; community service subarea planning; and plan implementation. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update will address a suite of policy and topical issues as defined in King County Motion 16142, and the update will have three focus areas: climate change and environment, housing, and pro-equity actions.

## 2. SCOPING PROCESS AND OUTREACH

King County has determined that the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts on the environment; therefore, an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required by RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). Scoping for the EIS was conducted under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-410. King County is the lead agency under SEPA.

The purpose of scoping is to allow tribes, agencies, and members of the public to comment on the scope of the EIS for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. The scoping comment period was from August 10 through 31, 2022. People were able to provide comments to the County via email or mail:

- Email: [ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov](mailto:ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov)
- Mail: King County  
Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget  
Attn: Ivan Miller  
Chinook Office Building  
401 Fifth Ave, Suite 819  
Seattle, WA 98104

People were invited to comment on alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts, and licenses or other required approvals. The lead agency identified the following areas for discussion in the EIS:

- Air Quality and Climate
- Water Resources

- Wildlife and Vegetation
- Energy and Natural Resources
- Land and Shoreline Use
- Housing
- Environmental Justice, Equity, and Displacement
- Aesthetics
- Parks, Open Space, and Recreation
- Historic and Archaeological Resources
- Transportation
- Public Services and Utilities

A summary of the comment period participants and comment topics is provided below.

## 3. SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY

### 3.1 Summary of Participation

King County received 10 comments during the scoping comment period: 6 comments from members of the public and 4 comments from community organizations. The comments are included in their entirety in Appendix A.

### 3.2 Summary of Comments

#### 3.2.1 Individual Members of the Public

Of the 6 comments from individual members of the public, several requested additional clarity about the Plan and how to participate in the process. Other comments were related to the Plan's policies and the impacts of those policies, such as residential zoning, transportation, and environmental justice.

Commenters were concerned with housing policies in the North Highline Subarea and requested additional study in areas with substantial residential zoning changes for topics such as affordable housing, building heights, and housing density. Commenters were also concerned with impacts to transportation and public services as a result of zoning changes, including traffic, street infrastructure, nonmotorized access, utilities, and community facilities. Finally, commenters requested that the EIS include discussion of impacts associated with environmental justice, including equity, displacements, and neighborhood health.

#### 3.2.2 Community Organizations

**Futurewise:** Futurewise's comments were focused on three main areas: alternatives, plan/policy consistency, and potential significant impacts. Futurewise recommended that at least one of the Comprehensive Plan alternatives achieve the Washington State limits on greenhouse gas emissions and associated climate change goals. Futurewise noted that the Comprehensive Plan must be consistent with the GMA and multicounty planning policies, and they also recommended analysis of the Farmland Preservation Program policies. Finally, Futurewise identified several elements of the environment for which the plan update could have potential significant adverse impacts and suggests potential

mitigation measures for those impacts. These elements include air quality and climate; water resources; fish, wildlife, vegetation, and wetlands; environmental justice, equity, and displacement; cultural, historic, and archaeological resources; transportation; public services; and natural hazards.

**Joint Team of King County Unincorporated Rural Area Organizations:** The Joint Rural Area Team provided extensive comments on specific Comprehensive Plan policies, including the 2020 Strategic Climate Action Plan; Clean Water, Healthy Habitat goals; land conservation (e.g., Four to One Program, Transfer of Development Rights Program); Countywide Planning Policies; Community Service Area Subarea Plans; transportation policies; rural and natural resource regulations; and land use and zoning studies. They also proposed several new Comprehensive Plan policies related to nonresidential uses and non-hydroelectric facilities in rural areas; property-specific development standards and special district overlays; and other commercial, mixed-use, and residential zoning policies.

**King County Component of the Puget Sound School Coalition:** The School Coalition’s comments were focused on impacts to public services and infrastructure. In general, the School Coalition supports the inclusion of public services and utilities as an area of study for the EIS. The School Coalition encouraged King County to analyze the effects of development on school capacity, and they recommended several mitigation measures related to school capacity expansion and citing to be included in the EIS.

**Washington Aggregates & Concrete Association:** The Washington Aggregates and Construction Association’s comments were focused on potential impacts to mineral resources and aggregate mining as a result of Comprehensive Plan policies. They were specifically concerned with mineral resource plan designations in the current Comprehensive Plan as well as the inventory of King County mineral resource lands. They recommended that the EIS evaluate impacts of mineral resource policies on transportation, energy, air quality, and water.

## 4. NEXT STEPS

King County used the comments and information received during scoping to confirm the elements of the environment to study in an EIS and to inform the range of alternatives. The next steps in the process include the following:

- Preparing a Draft EIS – Work on the Draft EIS is anticipated to start in winter 2022. King County will evaluate a No Action Alternative and up to two action alternatives in the Draft EIS.
- Public Comment Period – King County will publish the Draft EIS with a public review and comment period of at least 30 days and will host at least one public hearing. Publication of the Draft EIS is expected in summer 2023.
- Preparing a Final EIS – King County will consider the findings in and comments on the Draft EIS to update the environmental information for the Preferred Alternative and other alternatives, as necessary; respond to public, agency, and tribal comments on the Draft EIS; and further define measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential impacts. Publication of the Final EIS is expected in winter 2023.

# Appendix A

## Scoping Comment Letters





## APPENDIX A: SCOPING COMMENT LETTERS

### Table of Contents

#### Public Comments

1. Christine Scharrer
2. Hilary Emmer
3. Jane Slade
4. Julia Bobadilla-Melby
5. Liz Giba
6. Trevor Lind

#### Community Organization Comments

7. Futurewise
8. Joint Team of King County Unincorporated Rural Area Organizations
9. King County Component of the Puget Sound School Coalition
10. Washington Aggregates & Concrete Association

Subject: 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update – EIS Scoping Notice Comments  
Date: 8.30.2022  
From: Christine Scharrer <christine@scharrerad.com>

Hello Ivan,

As the scope for the EIS is developed for the King County Comprehensive Plan Updates, Please note that several residents in the White Center area have serious concern regarding the increased heights proposed for the North Highline Subarea, specifically as shown in the zoning amendments for the study area just west of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW. (Reference Map Amendment 5, Page 525 of the subarea zoning document). This neighborhood is currently zoned R-6 and has a mix of mostly very small houses and some duplexes and taller homes. The proposed up-zone to R-18 would allow of up to 80' high apartment buildings in this area.

While limited outreach was done on the Subarea Design Guidelines, there was little or no transparency in this community to the actual zoning changes proposed. There cannot be enough emphasis that the community outreach on this issue was obscure and misleading. Nowhere in any of the presentations or outreach materials were graphics that depicted the scale of proposed upzones – all of the graphics shown depicted small 2-4 story townhomes, duplexes, and small apartment buildings. 60-80' tall projects were never shown, and that is what the zoning proposes.

The current Draft Subarea Design Standards reference the community desire to keep the current scale and feel of our residential neighborhoods intact. The subarea plan notes that heights and scale for the neighborhoods surrounding the 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW corridor should remain similar to what is existing. **The proposed zoning is in complete opposition to the language of the Subarea Plan (see Pages 89-90 of the draft Subarea Plan “intended outcome”).**

In addition to being a small neighborhood with mostly one to two story houses, this neighborhood has narrow streets, no sidewalks, and no curbs and gutters. Most alleyways have long been abandoned and are unimproved to the point of not existing. Most of the streets end or do continue more than 3-4 blocks. This neighborhood is not able to support densities of that magnitude without major re-construction of the roads, infrastructure, and road networks, none of which is planned or funded. The Highline Fire Chief has expressed major concern regarding the ability to service this area as is not to mention if large-scale residential only apartment blocks are constructed.

There is also a case to be made for civil rights violations with this kind of zoning action. Increasing the zoning ONLY in the most diverse and lower income urban areas in the county **to previously unallowed** densities and building heights certainly creates an unequal and oppressive situation for one individual neighborhood.

I appreciate and support the need to add density, but there are ways to add density without adding drastic changes to neighborhood character and allowable heights. There is an increased emphasis within housing affordability circles on the “**missing middle**” (<https://missingmiddlehousing.com/>), and this neighborhood is a perfect example of how that missing middle could be enabled and encouraged. Zoning increased to 80' heights is absolutely

not going to add to the missing middle, conversely, if the neighborhood is taken over by large multifamily projects (most certainly to be a rental product only, and mostly at reduced rental rates) the missing middle, which currently exists in this neighborhood, will disappear.

To that end, I highly recommend that in addition to the scoping sections identified for study, for any and all areas with substantial zoning changes the following should be studied:

- Housing types including the mix of housing that might be affordable to rent vs. affordable to own
- Displacement of current residents who own their homes
- Housing types that would encourage the development of tax exempt housing and the affect of tax exempt housing on community services including schools
- Impacts to traffic including current street infrastructure barriers
- Impacts to local services including Fire, Safety, and Utilities and access requirements for local services
- Impacts to light and views including visual exhibits that show the actual potential build out of the proposed zoning
- Pedestrian access routes and
- Actual walk-sheds to parks and transit given existing access and terrain barriers

Thank you for the ability to comment and for studying the impacts of these major proposed changes.

Christine Scharrer

White Center

Christine Scharrer, AIA

**SCHARRERAD**

110 Cherry Street #303

Seattle, WA 98104

206.316.9321 ex. 101

Scharrerad.com

Subject: 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update – EIS Scoping Notice Comments

Date: 8.30.2022

**From:** Hilary Emmer <[hilonvashon@yahoo.com](mailto:hilonvashon@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, August 11, 2022 1:05 PM

**To:** [dsvogel.atty@gmail.com](mailto:dsvogel.atty@gmail.com); Diane Emerson <[dianeemerson@yahoo.com](mailto:dianeemerson@yahoo.com)>; Fin Hardy <[fin.hardy@mywesthill.org](mailto:fin.hardy@mywesthill.org)>; Beth Hintz <[beth.hintz@mywesthill.org](mailto:beth.hintz@mywesthill.org)>; Liz Giba <[liz\\_giba@comcast.net](mailto:liz_giba@comcast.net)>; Barbara Dobkin <[bmdobkin@gmail.com](mailto:bmdobkin@gmail.com)>; [julieseitz.js@gmail.com](mailto:julieseitz.js@gmail.com); Sili Savusa <[sili@wccda.org](mailto:sili@wccda.org)>; Rochelle Puariea <[shelleyp004@gmail.com](mailto:shelleyp004@gmail.com)>; Tim OBrien <[obrien\\_timothy@hotmail.com](mailto:obrien_timothy@hotmail.com)>; Nancy Merrill <[epca.wa@gmail.com](mailto:epca.wa@gmail.com)>; StoDomingo, Bong <[Bong.StoDomingo@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Bong.StoDomingo@kingcounty.gov)>

Bong,

I know you did not write this message below but it is written very poorly. The message should clearly state what parts of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan is not in compliance. I did go to the two links and it wants me to wade through everything. To me it is King County checking off a box of giving communities notice...but the community or at least I, have no idea what they are.

Clarity is transparency. Hidden information is not.

Hilary Emmer  
Vashon

Subject: 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update – EIS Scoping Notice Comments  
Date: 8.30.2022  
From: Jane Slade <sladejane@gmail.com>

Hello—I clicked on some of the links in the email about the Comprehensive Plan and the EIS. There are pages and pages of unintelligible process and legal details, but no way for a regular citizen to understand any of it in a way that invites participation or review. Is there a constituent-friendly overview of some kind?

Thank you,  
Jane

Subject: 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update – EIS Scoping Notice Comments  
Date: 8.30.2022  
From: Julia Bobadilla-Melby <julia.bobadilla@icloud.com>

In response to the email I received further below, Are there libraries that have paper formats of this plan and info? My new phone's screen reader is not able to read the pdf of this page

<https://kingcounty.gov/~media/depts/executive/performance-strategy-budget/regional-planning/Comprehensive-Plan/CompPlan-Overview-Jan2019.ashx?la=en>

Will there be community meetings explaining this? I live in Skyway but can get to or can get a ride to elsewhere.

It would be most appreciated if you can call me with this information. Thank you.

Sent from Julia Bobadilla-Melby's iPhone  
Cell: 612-309-0189

**Comments Of Liz Giba RE: Scope of an Environmental Impact Statement for the  
2024 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan Update**

1. The scope of the required EIS includes “Environmental Justice, Equity, and Displacement.” It should include economic and ethnic segregation, integration, and opportunity.
2. The EIS should be based on the most current data available. King County Public Health’s **CITY HEALTH PROFILES** cover 48 King County Areas and are regularly updated. The most current is for 2021. [City health profiles - King County](#)
3. The EIS should look at all plans the King County has for an area. For instance, it has proposed a Subarea Plan for North Highline, which would increase potential housing units by more than 5,000.

In addition, its Anti-Displacement Plan would have a high impact on North Highline with the institution of Inclusionary Zoning (IZ), which would be used to increase low-income housing. Historically, IZ has been used to counter-act exclusionary zoning in upper income neighborhoods NOT places like White Center. Executive Summary: Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-Displacement Strategies Report, September 30, 2021

White Center is also designated to as one of two Microhousing Demonstration Projects in King County. When it was designated, over 375 lots were designated as possibilities for the 60-unit project. The developer found a lot for the project and filed the initial permitting docs in 2021 under PREA21-0188. Nothing appears to have happened since August of last year although the developer paid \$4,506 in fees. Meanwhile, the “potential” R-12 and R-18 designations to over 375 parcels remain.

4. The EIS should also look at: impacts of tax-exempt housing on our schools, fire district, roads, and parks.

Subject: 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update – EIS Scoping Notice Comments  
Date: 8.30.2022  
From: Trevor Lind [trevor.lind@gmail.com](mailto:trevor.lind@gmail.com)

Hey Ivan,

I am writing (likely in vain) to express my concern with the scope for the EIS developed for the King County Comprehensive Plan. When I first learned about this proposal I thought R-6 to R-18 wow those are different numbers but soon I was explained that this would allow for 80' high apartment buildings.

I expressed my concern and was invited to a meeting held on an extremely "convenient" day... Tuesday... at 9:30 am... a time when clearly everyone who works and lives in White Center can take time off and provide comments and opinions (to be crystal clear: I am being sarcastic).

In a lot of ways this experience has taught me just how realistic the series Parks and Rec is. A public body pushing an agenda without educating or realistically engaging the community that is affected. I've been informed that this is important for the "Missing Middle", a term that gets thrown around without anyone attaching meaning or data or really anything more than using it to stop further questions. Currently we have a neighborhood that is unique in its diversity. According to Niche neighborhood rating it is the 43 most diverse in America and #3 in Washington... But who cares about that... Instead we can line the pockets of some large scale developers that will slowly increase rent until this neighborhood resembles Ballard or Capitol Hill and we can all sit around reminiscing about when White Center was \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in the blank with your favorite memory).

I'm not saying any of this because I don't want a better housing situation for the less fortunate. On the contrary I grew up poor, I scratched and fought my way into some over paid tech job that has opened a lot of doors for myself and even more doors were opened when I became a property owner. It is fundamentally life changing in America. I want to see others find this path and I want this path to be easier for everyone.

So that brings me here to this letter (which is too long at this point). It appears King County wants to cut this neighborhood's heart out using a knife they crudely painted the word "progress" on. From putting in the bare minimum effort to collect input from the community to the half-hearted tuesday public meetings it is clear to me you don't care to investigate the following issues realistically:

- Housing types including the mix of housing that might be affordable to rent vs. affordable to own
- Displacement of current residents who own their homes
- Housing types that would encourage the development of tax exempt housing and the effect of tax exempt housing on community services including schools
- Impacts to traffic including current street infrastructure barriers



- Impacts to local services including Fire, Safety, and Utilities and access requirements for local services
- Impacts to light and views including visual exhibits that show the actual potential build out of the proposed zoning
- Pedestrian access routes and
- Actual walk-sheds to parks and transit given existing access and terrain barriers

Feel free to prove me wrong. In the end thank you for the ability to provide comments here and I hope you have a nice day as I am not blaming you personally Ivan the system is the issue.

Trevor Lind  
White Center



816 Second Ave, Suite 200, Seattle, WA 98104  
p. (206) 343-0681  
futurewise.org

August 31, 2022

King County  
Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget  
Attn: Ivan Miller  
Chinook Office Building  
401 Fifth Ave, Suite 810  
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Mr. Miller:

**Subject: Comments on the Scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for the 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan Update**

Send via email to: [ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov](mailto:ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for the 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan Update. Futurewise strongly supports the County's decision to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and the areas identified for analysis in the EIS scoping notice. We do have some suggestions related to the EIS identified below.

Futurewise works throughout Washington State to support land-use policies that encourage healthy, equitable and opportunity-rich communities, and that protect our most valuable farmlands, forests, and water resources. Futurewise has members and supporters throughout Washington State including the King County.

## Comments on the Alternatives

We recommend that at least one of the alternatives should achieve the Washington State limits on greenhouse gas emissions and the statewide goal to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles traveled for light-duty vehicles.<sup>1</sup>

## Comments on Probable Significant Adverse Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### Air Quality/Climate Change

We support including air quality and climate change as an element of the environment to be analyzed in the EIS. Climate is an element of the environment.<sup>2</sup> There are two broad types of climate impacts. There are the impacts of development in generating greenhouse gas pollution.

---

<sup>1</sup> RCW 70A.45.020(1)(a) (greenhouse gas pollution limits) and RCW 47.01.440(1) (vehicle miles traveled benchmarks).

<sup>2</sup> WAC 197-11-444(1)(b)(iii).



SEPA EISs are required to analyze greenhouse gas pollution.<sup>3</sup> Washington State enacted limits on greenhouse gas emissions and a statewide goal to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles traveled for light-duty vehicles.<sup>4</sup>

Comprehensive planning is one way to address both the reduction of greenhouse gasses and vehicle miles traveled. Almost half of all greenhouse gas emissions in our state result from the transportation sector. Land use and transportation strategies that promote compact and mixed-use development and infill within urban growth areas reduce the need to drive, reducing the amount of greenhouse gas emissions. In an article published in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, Goldstein et al. analyzed greenhouse emissions from housing and concluded that:

If the electrical grid is decarbonized, then the residential housing sector can meet the 28% emission reduction target for 2025 under the Paris Agreement. However, grid decarbonization will be insufficient to meet the 80% emissions reduction target for 2050 due to a growing housing stock and continued use of fossil fuels (natural gas, propane, and fuel oil) in homes. Meeting this target will also require deep energy retrofits and transitioning to distributed low-carbon energy sources, as well as reducing per capita floor space and zoning denser settlement patterns.<sup>5</sup>

The denser settlement patterns were fairly modest and could be met by building a mix of small apartment buildings and modest single-family homes at eight to ten housing units per acre inside the urban growth area.<sup>6</sup> Since Washington's greenhouse gas limits are modeled after the Paris Agreement, Goldstein et al. shows that a growing community can meet these limits with wise land use policies and regulations.

Another important method of reducing greenhouse gas emissions is to include complementary land uses not already present in local urban zoning districts, such as supermarkets, parks, schools, and services in residential neighborhoods.<sup>7</sup> These measures are often referred to as the 15-minute city. The EIS should assess the potential for complete neighborhoods to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by shifting from car trips to carbon-neutral modes like walking, rolling, and bicycling.

The second type of climate impacts is that climate change is adversely impacting land uses and the natural services on which land uses depend. These impacts include sea level rise, increased flooding, decreased snow storage of water reducing available water supplies in the summer and fall, more

---

<sup>3</sup> *Columbia Riverkeeper, Sierra Club, and Center For Biological Diversity v. Cowlitz County, Port of Kalama, Northwest Innovation Works-Kalama, LLC, and State of Washington, Department of Ecology*, Shorelines Hearings Board (SHB) No. 17-010c, Order on Motions for Partial Summary Judgment (Sept. 15, 2017), at 18, 2017 WL 10573749, at \*9.

<sup>4</sup> RCW 70A.45.020(1)(a) (greenhouse gas pollution limits) and RCW 47.01.440(1) (vehicle miles traveled benchmarks).

<sup>5</sup> Goldstein et al., *The carbon footprint of household energy use in the United States*, 117 PNAS 19122, 19122 (July 20, 2020) last accessed on Aug. 29, 2022, at: [https://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1922205117\\_pnas.1922205117](https://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1922205117_pnas.1922205117) and at the following Dropbox link <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ix6ibk3t3pqhms1/AACZyFZ32P61TWIAA2V6BkmVa?dl=0> with the filename: "pnas.1922205117.pdf."

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 19128.

<sup>7</sup> Matt Bucchin and Aaron Tuley, *Planning for Climate Mitigation and Adaption* p. 141 (American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Report 601: July 2022) at the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: "PAS-Report-601-r2 Planning for Climate Mitigation & Adaption.pdf."

intense storms and rainfall, increases in landslides, and other impacts.<sup>8</sup> Focusing growth away from flood plains, areas with low instream flows and closed basins, and into existing cities and towns especially areas near high-capacity transit stations can help address the climate impacts on lands uses.

Unless wetlands and shoreline vegetation can migrate landward, their area and ecological functions will decline.<sup>9</sup> If development regulations are not updated to address the need for vegetation to migrate landward in feasible locations, wetlands and shoreline vegetation will decline. This loss of shoreline vegetation will harm the environment. It will also deprive marine shorelines of the vegetation that protects property from erosion and storm damage by modifying soils and accreting sediment.<sup>10</sup> This will increase damage to upland properties.

All of these impacts need to be addressed in the EIS.

## Water Resources

Water including surface water movement, quantity and quality, runoff and absorption, groundwater movement, quantity, and quality, and public water supplies are all elements of the environment.<sup>11</sup> Rural development adversely impacts water resources in King County.

Permit-exempt wells are reducing instream flows, reducing instream habitat, increasing temperatures, and reducing dissolved oxygen levels.<sup>12</sup> In summarizing recent surface and ground water trends affecting the Lake Washington and Green-Duwamish River basins the *2020 State of Our Watersheds* report documented that:

From 2015-2019, 398 new water wells (7% increase) were added to the Lake Washington and Green-Duwamish basins .... 482 miles of streams in the Lake Washington and Green-Duwamish basins are identified as having low streamflow

---

<sup>8</sup> A.K. Snover, C.L. Raymond, H.A. Roop, H. Morgan, *No Time To Waste: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C and Implications for Washington State* pp. 4 – 5 (Climate Impacts Growth University of Washington, Seattle, WA: 2019) last accessed on Aug. 31, 2022, at: <https://cig.uw.edu/publications/no-time-to-waste-the-ipcc-special-report-on-global-warming-of-1-5-oc-and-implications-for-washington-state/> and at the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: “NoTimeToWaste\_CIG\_Feb2019.pdf.”

<sup>9</sup> Christopher Craft, Jonathan Clough, Jeff Ehman, Samantha Joye, Richard Park, Steve Pennings, Hongyu Guo, and Megan Machmuller, *Forecasting the effects of accelerated sea-level rise on tidal marsh ecosystem services* FRONT ECOL ENVIRON 2009; 7, doi:10.1890/070219 p. \*6 last accessed on Aug. 31, 2022, at: <http://nsmn1.uh.edu/steve/CV/Publications/Craft%20et%20al%202009.pdf> and at the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: “Craft et al 2009.pdf.”

<sup>10</sup> R. A. Feagin, S. M. Lozada-Bernard, T. M. Ravens, I. Möller, K. M. Yeagei, A. H. Baird and David H. Thomas, *Does Vegetation Prevent Wave Erosion of Salt Marsh Edges?* 106 PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA pp. 10110-10111 (Jun. 23, 2009) last accessed on Feb. 10, 2022, at: <http://www.pnas.org/content/106/25/10109.full> and at the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: “pnas.0901297106.pdf.”

<sup>11</sup> WAC 197-11-444(1)(c).

<sup>12</sup> Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission Member Tribes, *2020 State of Our Watersheds Report: A Report by the Treaty Tribes in Western Washington* p. 40, pp. 143 – 44 last accessed on Aug. 29, 2022, at: <https://nwifc.org/publications/state-of-our-watersheds/> and at the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: “state-of-our-watersheds-sow-2020-final-web.pdf.”

problems .... In the future, the rate of declining stream flow levels will likely increase, as population growth and reduced snowpack continue to put more stress on this finite resource.<sup>13</sup>

Similarly, for the Snohomish River basin the report documents that:

An estimated 2,133 wells or 29% of the 7,293 water wells drilled in the Snohomish River basin fall inside of seven tributary watersheds that have been closed to new water rights and permitted withdrawal since the 1950's. From the beginning of 2015, an estimated 560 water wells have been developed in the Snohomish basin of which 164 (29%) were developed within the seven closed tributary watersheds.<sup>14</sup>

The closed basins cover a significant portion of unincorporated King County.<sup>15</sup> These wells create significant adverse impacts as the *2020 State of Our Watersheds* documents.

The reduced availability of surface water can have a negative impact on all stages of the salmonid life cycle. Water quality (e.g. temperature, flows) is affected by decreased inputs from groundwater. Lessened groundwater input concentrates pollutants, increases temperature, and diminishing dissolved oxygen. This is detrimental to salmonid migration, spawning and rearing.

Wells are drilled without regard to aquifer sensitivity and stream recharge needs. As Puget Sound Region's freshwater demand increases, something has to change. Unchecked growth and its associated increased demand for groundwater must be addressed, if implementation of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery plan is to successfully move forward.<sup>16</sup>

The available data shows that rural residences use over half of total water use outdoors and 90 percent of the consumptive water use outdoors.<sup>17</sup> Ecology estimates that irrigating a half-acre "of non-commercial lawn or garden can use from 2,000 to 4,500 gallons per day in the month of July, depending on your location. Most of that water use is consumptive, meaning it does not return to

---

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* p. 136.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* p. 354.

<sup>15</sup> State of Washington Department of Ecology Water Resources Program, *Focus on Water Availability Snohomish River Watershed*, WRLA 7 p. 4 (Publication Number: 11-11-012; Revised August 2012). Enclosed in the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: "1111012.pdf." While this report is out of print, its map still accurately shows the closed basins.

<sup>16</sup> *2020 State of Our Watersheds: A Report by the Treaty Tribes in Western Washington* p. 40.

<sup>17</sup> Tom Culhane and Dave Nazy, *Permit-Exempt Domestic Well Use in Washington State* p. 19 (Washington State Department of Ecology Water Resources Program Olympia, WA: Feb. 2015 Publication no. 15-11-006) last accessed on Aug. 31, 2022, at: <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/1511006.pdf> and at the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: "1511006.pdf."

the aquifer.”<sup>18</sup> And summer and fall are the times of year when stream flows are lowest and the high water uses by rural residential development will be the highest.<sup>19</sup>

It is important to consider water and related fish and wildlife habitat impacts because permit-exempt wells do not require a permit from the State of Washington Department of Ecology. They can be drilled even in many closed areas and Ecology is largely powerless to stop them from being drilled and being used. It is local governments including King County that must regulate the uses that require these wells as required by RCW 19.27.097.

Climate change is increasing winter flows and floods and decreasing summer and fall flows. So, the problem of low flows in county rivers and streams is only going to get worse. The water demand from all of these uses is a significant environmental impact that must be addressed in the EIS. In addition to being a climate and environmental issue, this is also an equity issue. Low flows are suppressing salmon production, reducing the salmon available to everyone and especially Native American Tribes and Nations that have a treaty right to salmon. Low flows are also affecting irrigation and stock water available to the county’s farmers. Equity, climate, and environmental concerns all require the County to address these important issues in the EIS.

### Fish/Wildlife/Vegetation/Wetlands

Development in King County is adversely impacting fish habitat, wildlife habitat, vegetation, and wetlands.

By 2011, every urban stream watershed identified in the Snohomish River Salmon Conservation Plan had percent impervious surface levels exceeding 20%. Between 2011 and 2016, percent impervious surface continued to increase in the watersheds including or adjacent to Monroe, Sultan, Snohomish, Duvall, Snoqualmie and North Bend Urban Growth Areas (UGA), from just over 12% impervious to just under 13% impervious.<sup>20</sup>

The Snohomish River Basin Salmon Conservation plan warns that “watershed degradation is likely occurring at 12% impervious surface cover at the sub-basin scale. The urban, mainstem and rural watersheds of the lower Snohomish River system are continuing to move away from conservation plan targets toward a worsening watershed condition.”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Ann Wessel, *Mitigation Options for the Impacts of New Permit-Exempt Groundwater Withdrawals* Draft p. 19 (Water Resources Program Washington State Department of Ecology Olympia, WA: October 2015 Publication No. 15-11-017) at the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: “Ecology-Draft-Mitigation-Alternatives-Report.pdf.”

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at p. 10, p. 13.

<sup>20</sup> *2020 State of Our Watersheds State of Our Watersheds: A Report by the Treaty Tribes in Western Washington* p. 361 footnotes omitted.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* footnote omitted.

In addition, “[t]he majority of lowland forest cover loss between 1992 and 2016 was in rural residential areas and the second largest amount of forest cover loss was in the city UGA areas.”<sup>22</sup> Between 2011 and 2016, the largest amount of forest cover loss was again in rural residential areas.<sup>23</sup> Between 2005 and 2017, there has been a net loss of 25 acres of riparian forest cover within 150 of fish bearing streams in the Snohomish River Basin Salmon Conservation Plan Riparian Restoration Strategy Target Area.<sup>24</sup> The increases in impervious surfaces and losses of forest cover including riparian forest adversely impact fish and wildlife habitat including salmon habitat.<sup>25</sup>

Potential UGA expansions and rural development will increase these impacts on fish and wildlife habitats. These impacts need to be analyzed in the EIS. These impacts can be mitigated by not expanding UGAs and focusing growth near high-capacity transit stations within UGAs.

## Plans and Policies

Comprehensive plans must be consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA) and multicounty planning policies.<sup>26</sup> The EIS should analyze the alternatives compliance with the GMA and the multicounty planning policies and include as suggested mitigation measures if necessary to bring them into compliance.

King County is justifiably proud of its Farmland Preservation Program. Unfortunately, both the Farmland Preservation Program and the County’s Agricultural zones allow estates that do not farm the land on preserved farmland and within the Agricultural zones.<sup>27</sup> As housing prices increase, estates on farmland are an increasing problem that will price farmers off the land. These estates can locate their large homes in areas that make continued farming operations difficult. They can also complain about nearby agricultural operations, increasing the difficulty of farming.

We recommend that the EIS evaluate the effectiveness of the County’s existing agricultural policies and regulations. There is evidence that they are not effective to protect agricultural lands long-term resulting in adverse impacts to working farms. The EIS should include as mitigating measures removing the nonagricultural uses from the agricultural zones.

---

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* p. 362.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

<sup>24</sup> *Id.* p. 363.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* pp. 31 – 33, pp. 35 – 37, pp. 361 – 63.

<sup>26</sup> RCW 36.70A.320(3); *West Seattle Defense Fund v. City of Seattle*, CPSGMHB Case No. 94-3-0016, Final Decision and Order (April 4, 1995), at \*55; *Friends of Pierce County, et al., City of Bonney Lake, and Marilyn Sanders, et al. v. Pierce County, and Orton Farms et al., City of Sumner, Bethell School District, Puyallup School District, and Forterra NW*, CPSRGMHB Case No. 12-3-0002c, Final Decision and Order (July 9, 2012), at 11 of 138.

<sup>27</sup> Kit Oldham, *King County Farmland Preservation Program* (HistoryLink.org Essay 7691: Posted 3/15/2006) last accessed on Aug. 31, 2022, at: <https://historylink.org/File/7691#:~:text=King%20County's%20Farmland%20Preservation%20Program,be%20enacted%20by%20public%20vote>; King County Code (K.C.C.) 21A.08.030A.



## Environmental Justice, Equity, and Displacement

Futurewise strongly supports analyzing environmental justice, equity, and displacement impacts as part of the EIS. The county is to be commended for including environmental justice, equity, and displacement analysis in the EIS.

The environmental health impacts of siting multifamily housing next to high-volume roadways should be assessed and appropriate mitigation measures should be identified. Access to public services including transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, emergency services, parks, libraries, and public restrooms should be assessed to determine whether it is equitable—particularly for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color people, as well as low-income earning households of all races and ethnicities. The impacts of environmental hazards should be assessed and mitigation measures should be identified to address any disparate impacts affecting Communities of Color and low-income communities.

While public and private investment in urban, unincorporated communities like Skyway-West Hill and North Highline (which includes White Center) is necessary to address both the rising costs of housing and inadequate access to essential services, such investments can contribute to the involuntary displacement of the residents and businesses currently located in those communities. The EIS needs to both address these displacement impacts and identify mitigation measures.

## Cultural, Historic, and Archaeological Resources

Historic and cultural preservation are elements of the environment.<sup>28</sup> We commend the County for including this topic.

The Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation has developed an archaeological predictive model that can predict where archaeological resources, a type of cultural resource, are likely to be located.<sup>29</sup> This may assist the County in its analysis. As we are sure you will, consulting with the area tribes will also be helpful in this analysis.

## Transportation

Transportation systems, vehicular traffic, the movement and circulation of people or goods, and traffic hazards are elements of the environment.<sup>30</sup> Population and employment growth has the potential to increase vehicle miles traveled and to increase traffic hazards. The EIS should analyze the adverse impacts on the transportation system, including motor vehicles, transit, walking, bicycling, and transportation safety. As required by RCW 36.70A.070(6)(iii), impacts on the state highway system should also be analyzed.

---

<sup>28</sup> WAC 197-11-444(2)(b)(iv).

<sup>29</sup> Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation WISAARD webpage last accessed on Aug. 31, 2022, at: <https://dahp.wa.gov/historic-preservation/find-a-historic-place>.

<sup>30</sup> WAC 197-11-444(2)(c).





Potential mitigation measures include growth near high-capacity transit centers and working with transit providers to improve access to transit and to improve walking and bicycling facilities.

## Public Services

We support analyzing public services as part of the EIS. Given the very limited water sources in the county, this analysis should include whether water is both legally and physically available.

Large areas of unincorporated King County are located in the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI).<sup>31</sup> Wildfire is a significant threat in King County and climate change is making the threat worse.<sup>32</sup> We strongly support the County's recent wildfire initiatives. Wildfire impacts that should be analyzed in the EIS. Mitigating measures should include directing growth away from the WUI fringe.

## Natural Hazards

We also recommend that the EIS analyze impacts of natural hazards on development such as landslides. The Washington Geological Survey inventoried known landslides in the western two-thirds of King County, including the part of Bothell in Snohomish County. The survey identified 2,838 landslides and 1,251 landslide fans covering approximately 4.3 percent of the study area.<sup>33</sup> The survey identified a high landslide density along Puget Sound bluffs, river corridors, and in the upland areas of the Cascade Range.<sup>34</sup> These landslides pose a significant risk to life and property and should be analyzed in the EIS.<sup>35</sup> The good news is that the landslides and their buffers do not occupy a large enough area to affect the land available for development.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you require additional information, please contact me at telephone 206-343-0681 Ext. 102 and email: [tim@futurewise.org](mailto:tim@futurewise.org).

---

<sup>31</sup> Ashley Blazina and Kirk Davis, *The Wildland-Urban Interface: Mapping Washington State's fastest-growing environment* (Sept. 2, 2020) last accessed on Aug. 31, 2022, at: <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/7016c437623a445997c072a05e26afbb>.

<sup>32</sup> H.A. Morgan, A. Bagley, L. McGill, and C.L., Raymond, *Managing Western Washington Wildfire Risk in a Changing Climate Workshop Summary* pp. 4 – 7 (Workshop summary report prepared by the Northwest Climate Adaptation Science Center and the Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington, Seattle: Dec. 3, 2018) last accessed on Aug. 31, 2022 at: <https://cig.uw.edu/publications/managing-western-washington-wildfire-risk-in-a-changing-climate/> and at the Dropbox link in footnote 1 with the filename: “Managing-Western-Washington-Wildfire-Risk-in-a-Changing-Climate.pdf.”

<sup>33</sup> Katherine A. Mickelson, Kara E. Jacobacci, Trevor A. Contreras, William N. Gallin, and Stephen L. Slaughter, *Landslide Inventory of Western King County*, Washington p. 4 (Washington Geological Survey Report of Investigations 41: Jan. 2019) accessed on Aug. 29, 2022, at: <https://www.dnr.wa.gov/news/dnr-publishes-inventory-king-county-landslides>. The report on the inventory is at the Dropbox link in footnote 5 and the last page of this letter with the filename: “ger\_ri41\_western\_king\_county\_landslide\_inventory\_pamphlet.pdf.” The GIS data for the report is in the Dropbox link in the “publication\_gis\_data” directory.

<sup>34</sup> *Id.* at p. 5.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* at p. 1.

Comments on the Scope of the EIS for the 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan Update  
August 31, 2022  
Page 9

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of two stylized, overlapping loops that resemble the letter 'S'.

Tim Trohimovich, AICP  
**Director of Planning and Law**

Enclosures at the following Dropbox link:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ix6ibk3t3pqhms1/AACZyFZ32P61TWIAA2V6BkmVa?dl=0>

June 3, 2022

To: **KC Council:** [council@kingcounty.gov](mailto:council@kingcounty.gov)  
Re: **Written Testimony for June 7 Public Hearing—KCCP 2024 Major Update**

Please accept *Written Testimony* herein from our Joint Team of King County Unincorporated Rural Area organizations (\*) as you review the May 24 Striker (S1) from your Local Services & Land-Use (LS & L-U) Committee regarding the SCOPE for the **King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) 2024 Major Update**.

As we did following the March 25 release of the King County Executive's Recommended SCOPE, we conducted an in-depth review of the Striker. Our *Written Testimony* shows our **Comments** on the Executive's Recommended SCOPE, as well as our **Comments** on **changes** included in the LS & L-U Committee Striker.

We offer comments on each item in the SCOPE, as well as propose *additional* items to consider as the Council develops and passes a final SCOPE later in June. Our *Comments* encompass KCCP Policy changes and/or changes to King County Code. We encourage you to please consider these to minimize unintended negative consequences to the Rural Area as the County proceeds on the **KCCP 2024 Major Update**.

Herein our *Written Testimony* addresses the four **Focus Areas** in the recommended SCOPE:

- I. Pro-Equity** — We fully support and offer no comment.
- II. Housing** — We fully support and offer no comment.
- III. Climate Change & Environment** — We fully support, but offer specific comments on the *4:1 Program Review* and the *Transfer of Development Rights Program*. (see pp. 2-3)
- IV. General** — We offer extensive comments (see pp. 4-9), as well as offer several *additional items* (see pp. 10-13) for inclusion in the final SCOPE.

Our Joint Team endeavors to review, consult, develop, and offer solutions on issues of interest to people who live in a wide expanse of King County's unincorporated rural areas. Each of our organizations considers its work on the KCCP one of its most important duties and responsibilities. Indeed, our Joint Team has been through multiple KCCP Major Updates (including the 2020 Mid-Point Update) with some of our member organization's work on same going back nearly 20 years to the **2004 KCCP Major Update**.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. As we move forward, we wish to continue an open dialogue with the Executive's staff, Council committees, and the full Council on the **KCCP 2024 Major Update**.

(\*) *Enumclaw Plateau Community Association (EPCA), Friends of Sammamish Valley (FoSV), Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council (GMVUAC), Green River Coalition (GRC), Green Valley/Lake Holms Association (GV/LHA), Hollywood Hill Association (HHA), Soos Creek Area Response (SCAR), and Upper Bear Creek Unincorporated Area Council (UBCUAC).*

Coordinated by:

Peter Rimbos  
[primbos@comcast.net](mailto:primbos@comcast.net)  
Coordinator—Joint Rural Area Team, KCCP Updates, GMVUAC

Approved by:

Steve Hiester <a href="mailto:gmvac_chair@hotmail.com">gmvac_chair@hotmail.com</a> Chair, GMVUAC	Michael Tanksley <a href="mailto:wmtanksley@comcast.net">wmtanksley@comcast.net</a> President, HHA	Nancy Stafford <a href="mailto:nancy@go2email.net">nancy@go2email.net</a> Chair, UBCUAC	Jeff Guddat <a href="mailto:jeffguddat@yahoo.com">jeffguddat@yahoo.com</a> President, SCAR
Andy Bennedetti <a href="mailto:andyb929@gmail.com">andyb929@gmail.com</a> Chair, GV/LHA	Serena Glover <a href="mailto:serena@allenglover.com">serena@allenglover.com</a> Executive Director, FoSV	Greg Wingard <a href="mailto:gwingard@earthlink.net">gwingard@earthlink.net</a> President, GRC	
Tim O'Brien <a href="mailto:obrien_timothy@hotmail.com">obrien_timothy@hotmail.com</a> Chair, EPCA	Ken Konigsmark <a href="mailto:kenkonigsmark@yahoo.com">kenkonigsmark@yahoo.com</a> Rural Technical Consultant	Mike Birdsall <a href="mailto:mike_birdsall@yahoo.com">mike_birdsall@yahoo.com</a> Rural Technical Consultant	

**2024 KCCP Update**  
**KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***  
**KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker Additions to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***

**Focus Area — I. Pro-Equity — *Support.***

**Focus Area — II. Housing — *Support.***

**Focus Area — III. Climate Change & Environment**

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p>A. Alignment with and advancement of 2020 Strategic Climate Action Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, support sustainable and resilient communities, and prepare for climate change</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build on the goals of House Bill 1099, which did not pass the state legislature in 2022, which included strengthening the County's climate policies and regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase resiliency to local climate impacts</li> <li>2. Advance environmental justice and reduce climate-related health impacts</li> <li>3. Increase climate resilience by supporting investments in urban green spaces that would help eliminate disparities in access due to historic and ongoing underinvestment, such as the communities of Skyway-West Hill and North Highline</li> <li>4. Support decarbonization/elimination of fossil fuel use in the built environment and increase affordable and equitable access to energy efficiency and decarbonization programs</li> <li>5. Reduce transportation-related emissions</li> <li>6. Evaluate policies, regulations and programs regarding in wildfire risk areas, including prevention of wildfires. Strengthen regional coordination of service provision and policies, including federal, state, city, private forestland owners, and tribal partners. Incorporate applicable recommendations from the Wildfire Risk Strategy.</li> <li>7. Support development of and access to green jobs that advance sustainability and living wage opportunities and increase representation and access for populations who earn less than 80% of the area median income, and those who are Black, Indigenous, People of Color, immigrants, refugees, people with disabilities, and/or seniors, while also recognizing the disproportionate impacts in each of these populations of gender identity</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. thru 7. <i>Support.</i></b></p> <p><b>Additions to 6. &amp; 7.—Support.</b></p>
<p>B. Integrate and implement Clean Water, Healthy Habitat goals</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update shoreline armoring regulations</li> <li>2. Support net ecological gains and accelerate improvements to salmon habitat and removal of barriers to fish passage</li> <li>3. Improve integrated floodplain management</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. thru 4. <i>Support.</i></b></p>

**2024 KCCP Update**  
**KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***  
**KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker Additions to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
C. Increase land conservation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase open space investments to help eliminate disparities in access due to historic and ongoing underinvestment, especially in urban areas such as Skyway and North Highline</li> <li>2. Review Four-to-One Program</li> <li>3. Strengthen Transfer of Development Rights Program</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Support.</b>  <b>Additions to 1.—Support.</b></p> <p><b>2. We seek to participate in this review to ensure the successful 4:1 Program continues to thrive.</b></p> <p><b>3. Support. We’ve initiated dialogue with Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program Manager, Michael Murphy, to ensure key KCCP policies are strengthened:</b></p> <p><i>“R-309 The RA-2.5 zone has generally been applied to Rural Areas with an existing pattern of lots below five acres in size that were created prior to the adoption of the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. ... A subdivision at a density of one home per 2.5 acres shall only be permitted through the TDRs from property in the designated Rural Forest Focus Areas. The site receiving the density must be approved as a TDRs receiving site in accordance with the King County Code. ....”</i></p> <p><i>“R-313 The purpose of the TDRs Program is to reduce development potential in the Rural Area and designated Natural Resource Lands, and its priority is to encourage the transfer of development rights from private rural properties into the Urban Growth Area.”</i></p> <p><i>“R-319 TDRs may be used on receiving sites in the following order of preference as follows: ... d. Rural Areas zoned RA-2.5 ... may receive transfers of development rights, but only from the Rural Forest Focus Areas.”</i></p>

**2024 KCCP Update**  
**KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***  
**KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker Additions to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***

**Focus Area — IV. General**

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
A. Implement unincorporated area-related changes from the CPPs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adopt new housing and jobs growth targets for unincorporated King County</li> <li>2. Evaluate designating the White Center Unincorporated Activity Center and the Skyway Community Business Center as countywide centers</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Support.</i></li> <li>2. <i>No comment.</i></li> </ol>
B. Implement Subarea Planning Program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluate possible unincorporated-wide policies and regulations for applicable issues raised during subarea planning processes</li> <li>2. Update Vashon-Maury Island p-suffix and special district overlay regulations</li> <li>3. Review the requirements and process for developing community needs lists, including evaluating whether and how community engagement could occur at the "county and community work together" level of engagement as outlined in the Office of Equity and Social Justice (OESJ) Community Engagement Guide</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>All Community Service Area (CSA) Subarea plans need to be completed first.</i></li> <li>2. <i>No comment.</i>  <b>Additions to 2.—No comment.</b></li> <li><b>Additions to 3.—Support.</b></li> </ol>
C. Update transportation policies  <i>(continued on next page)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support equitable access to mobility options and invest in transit services where the needs are greatest, especially for populations who earn less than 80% of the area median income and no income, and those who are Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color; and immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, seniors, and/or people with special transportation needs, while also recognizing the disproportionate impacts in each of these populations of gender identity</li> <li>2. Support investments to increase safe access to public transit</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. &amp; 2. <i>Primarily are of interest inside Urban Growth Area (UGA), where most transit service exists. Rural Area (RA) improvements should take these forms:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Demand-responsive (dial-a-ride) transit will be more effective than fixed-route operations to provide transit-dependent RA residents with similar mobility options that 1. explores for a more diverse range of underserved groups.</i></li> <li>• <i>Tailored high-capacity, high-speed transit is needed to provide commuter runs between isolated outlying cities to urban core area jobs.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><i>A growing number of such commuters congest Rural Area (RA) roads, devastating quality of life the Growth Management Act (GMA) was meant to protect. Less commuting by cars is also a climate change priority, and thus need to prioritize peak period express transit service to outlying cities.</i></p> <b>Additions to 1.—Support.</b>

2024 KCCP Update

KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*  
 KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker **Additions** to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p>C. Update transportation policies</p> <p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p>	<p>3. <b>Advance</b> integrated approaches to enhanced traffic safety for all users, such as supporting complete streets and equitable infrastructure investments</p> <p><i>[Note: T-208’s “rural regional corridors” are not defined in the Appendix C—Transportation Needs Report as currently is cited.]</i></p> <p>4. Make Urban Growth Area boundary corrections for road rights-of-way</p> <p>5. Review policies, regulations, and programs related to transportation improvements and access in the rural area, including mitigation of impacts of urban development on the rural area transportation network.</p>	<p><b>3. Rural Area (RA) roads are being overwhelmed by commuter flows between isolated outlying cities and the urban core. State highways should serve that function, but are too few and far between, thus excess volume uses many county roads. King County (KC) has designated four “rural regional arterials” for that purpose to implement policy T-208. But at least two dozen other KC minor and collector arterials are now forced to serve traffic far above historic levels. RA residents along those roads are being deprived of safe access during peak commuter periods—several hours each day. The Level of Service (LOS) for local access movements (not through movements) in that situation varies from D to F, whereas the LOS standard in the RA is B. From the local access perspective many RA roads are fail concurrency. High volumes also make them unsafe for pedestrians and bicyclists. KC must work with outlying urban jurisdictions to alleviate this.</b></p> <p><b>We support Complete Streets policies applied to RA roads, as well as the Federal Safe System Approach, traffic calming techniques, and funding priority to mitigate these impacts in the RA caused by the rapidly growing use of rural roads by urban commuters, in direct opposition to GMA intent.</b></p> <p><b>Current policies T-208, T-209, and T-210 provide guidance about capacity for through movements, where such need is paramount. Missing is support for a fundamental requirement of the GMA to preserve and protect the RA from urban encroachments. We recommend adding a new policy:</b></p> <p><b>“T-2XX King County shall seek to mitigate adverse impacts on local access movements of high volumes of through travel using rural county roads, by a range of traffic operations and road reconstruction strategies including traffic calming, complete streets design, Federal Safe Systems Approach, and travel-demand management.”</b></p> <p><b>There is also a need for policy to focus on the safety of active transportation in the presence of high traffic volumes on RA roads. As a practical matter this should focus on selected locations of highest priority, such as blind curves, blind hillcrests, and high activity areas. We recommend adding a new policy:</b></p> <p><b>“T-2YY King County shall endeavor to improve the safety and utility of the rural arterial network for active transportation, by making improvements to separate active transportation from high traffic volumes in those spot locations where the conflict between modes is accentuated by adverse topography or by high levels of active transportation. Complete reconstruction of long road sections for this purpose is not intended.”</b></p> <p><b>4. No comment.</b></p> <p><b>5. This appears to address our Comments above—Support.</b></p>

**2024 KCCP Update**  
**KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***  
**KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker **Additions** to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p>D. Review rural and natural resources regulations</p>	<p>1. Advance key Farm, Fish, Flood goals</p> <p>2. Increase the amount of farmland in active production</p> <p>3. Evaluate <b>existing and establishing new</b> regulations for resorts in the rural area</p> <p>4. Review mineral processing regulations in forest zones  <i>[Note: This needs to look beyond just the “forest zones.”]</i></p>	<p><b>1. Support.</b></p> <p><b>2. Support. The existing code language that requires a 1:1 swap in the same Agricultural Production District (APD) should be strengthened. The effect of several proposed amendments by a former King County Councilmember, which failed last year (“Amends mitigation requirements for when land is removed from an APD. Land is required to be replaced at a 1:1 ratio in the same agricultural production district, at a 1.5:1 ratio in a different agricultural production district, or 2:1 ratio for the financial value of the land if no other land is available.”), would have allowed for speculators to buy land within close-in APDs near urban centers (such as the Sammamish Valley APD) and try to swap it out for land in APDs that are in farther flung corners of the County. This would destroy the close-in APDs. Even worse, the subsequent line amendment would have allowed for financial considerations to be taken into account, such that all a speculator would have to do is pay off at twice the value in cash and they can sit on farmland. Consequently, KC Code and KCCP Policies regarding APDs must be strengthened and made “bulletproof.”</b></p> <p><b>3. Resorts do not belong in Rural Area (RA). Event Centers are not defined in KC Code and, therefore, not allowed in the RA. Several entities just want Event Centers, and thought they would get them through the Winery/Brewery/Distillery (WBD) legislation. We fear they again will try to get them another way. Consequently, we seek a KC Code change such that Event Centers, as “stand-alone” operations, are not allowed in the RA and on Ag-zoned parcels. KC Code needs a definition for Special Events.</b>  <b>Additions to 3.—We re-emphasize our comments above.</b></p> <p><b>4. Support (please see our KCCP Annual Docket Request submitted in 2021). Limitations are needed on the number of mineral extraction sites in a Subarea. Mitigation of collective impacts on roads, safety, environment need to be systematically addressed per King County goals to reduce Greenhouse-Gas Emissions 80% by 2050. In addition, operations at mineral extraction sites should not include material processing/debris storage/disposal operations (no stumps, or “inert material” allowed from offsite), as allowing same creates additional impacts and makes mitigation within a Subarea much more difficult to identify and monitor. We seek appropriate changes in KCCP Policies: R-616, R-681, R-686, R-690, etc. and KC Code: 21A.22.—050, 060, 081, etc., as necessary.</b></p>



2024 KCCP Update

KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*  
 KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker Additions to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p>D. Review rural and natural resources regulations</p> <p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p>	<p>5. Review code provisions for manufacturing and regional land use uses allowed in the Industrial zone and evaluate whether the restriction on uses requiring a CUP/SUP is necessary or could be revised to remove the prohibition outside the UGA or revise the uses that require a CUP/SUP, consistent with existing or revised Comprehensive Plan policies.</p>	<p><b>NEW 5. This is incorrectly stated., It should state:</b></p> <p><i>“...non-residential, resource industrial, manufacturing and regional land uses allowed in the Industrial-zone rural area...”</i></p> <p><b>A major concern in the Rural Area is land uses that are “non-residential and resource industrial...” Also, there are only three (3) industrial areas in the entire King County Rural Area [*]. The real problem is the continual pressure to allow industrial uses on RA-zoned parcels.</b></p> <p><b>[*] KCCP--2016 Comprehensive Plan – updated 7/23/20 Ordin 18427, as amended by Ordine 18623, Ordin 18810, Ordin 19034, and Ordin 19146 (p. 3-35):</b>  <i>“D. Non-Resource Industrial Uses and Development Standards in the Rural Area</i>  <i>There are three existing industrial areas in the Rural Area containing multiple industrial uses on several sites. One is located within the southwest portion of the Town of Vashon. The second is a designated industrial area adjacent to the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center of Preston. The Preston Industrial Area recognizes an existing concentration of industrial uses that contributes to the economic diversity of the Rural Area, but expansion of this industrial area beyond the identified boundaries is not permitted (see Policy CP-547). The third industrial area is located along State Route 169 on lands that have been and continue to be used as for industrial purposes and have a designation as a King County Historic Site.”</i></p> <p><b>We strongly oppose any lifting of requirements for a CUP/ SUP outside the UGA. Requiring a CUP/SUP is the appropriate vehicle within the context of “keeping the rural area rural” when a party desires an exception to the current protections in the current King County laws. The primary example of how this can work, albeit not perfectly, is the example of Pacific Raceways in SE King County, which has been operating under the provisions of a CUP since the 80’s, which has enabled a more appropriate balance between the parameters of business operations and the need to maintain the rural character of the surrounding areas as well as protection of a highly sensitive environmental corridor. During this ensuing time, Pacific Raceways has operated successfully, has been able to apply for a SUP for specific circumstances, but continues to operate under the broad umbrella provisions of the CUP, which has afforded some 40 years of operation, while giving the surrounding community needed protections to maintain the very environment that the surrounding community desires.</b></p> <p><b>The requirement to obtain a CUP or a SUP should not in any way be compromised due to the growth pressures in King County. The existence of the opportunity to operate with a CUP/SUP, depending on the circumstances, allows for business operations to be considered, along with appropriate public discourse on the parameters of a CUP/ SUP application by said business(es). Do NOT weaken this important protection needed in the Rural Area of King County!</b></p>

**2024 KCCP Update**  
**KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***  
**KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker Additions to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p>D. Review rural and natural resources regulations</p> <p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p>	<p>6. Review policies, regulations and programs related to rural economic development, rural economic strategies, and tourism in the rural area and on natural resource lands, evaluate the appropriate balance between economic development and protection of rural character, working farms and natural resource lands.</p>	<p><b>NEW 6.</b> While we welcome the review, we remain concerned about opening the Rural Area to <b>non-traditional</b> businesses primarily meant to serve urban residents, not Rural Area residents as the GMA clearly states:</p> <p><b>“... accommodate appropriate rural economic ... uses that are ... consistent with rural character ...”</b> and <b>“... allow the expansion of small-scale businesses (that) conform with the rural character of the area ...”</b></p> <p><b>Further, KCCP ED-602 states:</b></p> <p><b>“... As a means and in support of protecting rural character and Natural Resource Lands, King County recognizes the value of the partnership with Cities in the Rural Area to act as local urban centers for employment and centers of commerce that provides goods and services for the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands. The county will work with the cities and other organizations to support economic development for Cities in the Rural Area, at a size and scale consistent with the Growth Management Act.... King County is committed to ensuring that all economic development, including the provision of infrastructure, within the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands shall be compatible with the surrounding rural character, be of an appropriate size and scale, &amp; protect the natural environment.”</b></p>
<p>E. Advance public Docket amendment requests, where appropriate</p>	<p>1. Evaluate Vashon grange retail proposal</p> <p>2. Review materials processing standards in rural area</p>	<p><b>1. No comment.</b></p> <p><b>2. Support (please see our King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) Annual Docket Request submitted in 2021). KC Code 21A.06.742 Materials Processing Facility allows facilities engaged in: “... preparing earth materials, ... and is not final disposal site” on RA-zoned parcels. Much could be improved here, particularly to be more protective of rural character. For example, potential changes should be made to in the Code Development Conditions tables, in particular: consideration of size of parcel, setbacks, impervious surface requirements, noise controls, reducing fire risk, provisions for fire protection on site, etc. Currently, concerns exist with construction and demolition materials shipped from far and wide to such sites to be “processed,” clearly going beyond the original permits.</b></p> <p><b>We seek a separation of different regulations of mining vs. material processing. For example, KC Code 21.08.080 Manufacturing Land Uses (and its affiliated Development Conditions) should be re-assessed.</b></p>

2024 KCCP Update

KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*  
 KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker Additions to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p>F. Land Use and Zoning Studies</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Maple Valley Industrial:</b> Review land use designations and implementing zoning on parcels 1622069091, 1522069034, and 1522069036 and the surrounding area, and consider changes that would facilitate development of this area, including modifying the land use designation and/or implementing zoning, and/or whether to revise or eliminate the development conditions.</li> <li>2. <b>Snoqualmie Interchange:</b> Conduct a land use and zoning study for the Snoqualmie Interchange, and area north of I-90 impacted by the new Interstate 90/ Highway 18 interchange. The study should include, at a minimum, review and recommendation of the appropriate zoning for properties abutting the urban growth area boundary. The study should include the properties west of Snoqualmie Way along SE 99th that could have access to urban services, including whether the area should be included inside the urban growth area, and should recognize and protect the forested visual character of the Mountains to Sound National Scenic byway on Interstate 90 as well as provide appropriate conservation mitigation for any newly allowed development. The land use and zoning study and land use designations and zoning classifications should focus on solutions for the northwest corner while planning a vision for the properties on the northeast portions abutting the urban growth area. The study should include a review of whether affordable housing and/or behavioral health support services and/or facilities could locate in this area. The study should also ensure potential trail connections for regional trails and adhere to current King County policies. The Executive should collaborate with the City of Snoqualmie, affected Tribes, Washington state DOT, DNR, property owners, Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust, regional partners and the community.</li> <li>3. <b>Black Diamond Fire Station:</b> Review land use designations and implementing zoning on parcel 0421069092 and the surrounding area; to consider changes to the land use designation and zoning that would allow sewer service, including whether this area should be inside the urban growth area; and evaluate whether policy and/or code modifications should be enacted to allow sewer service for public safety facilities that are outside the UGB. growth area boundary.</li> </ol>	<p><b>NEW 1.</b> The first two parcels are in the Maple Valley UGA and zoned I-P. The third parcel (adjacent to the second parcel) has dual zoning, both RA-5 and I-P, and is labeled “Rural and Urban.” The third parcel has the following description in iMap:  <i>“TR-P17: R &amp; H Partnership Urban Reserve Study, August 18, 1997” and “Future industrial development shall be limited to those that do not require a conditional use permit. A limited scope Master Drainage Plan shall be completed by the developer to address groundwater concerns.”</i></p> <p>The City of Maple Valley Comprehensive Plan Zoning Maps show that <u>none of these parcels are within the city limits</u>. The KCCP Land-Use Map also does not show any of these parcels within the UGA or as PAAs of the City. Consequently we are very interested in monitoring this “Land-Use and Zoning Study.” Our starting concerns are <i>why</i> are these parcels zoned Industrial (“I”) and what is the specific meaning here for the “P” suffix? All three parcels are &lt;1,500 ft from the Cedar River, with one parcel is &lt;1,000 ft away.</p> <p><b>NEW 2.—Support.</b></p> <p><b>NEW 3.</b> We oppose this. There is ample room for a new, larger Fire Station to be built <i>within</i> the City limits (an extremely large amount of available acreage!) to accommodate the growing needs as the City quintuples its population with the ongoing construction of its two Master-Planned Developments.</p>

2024 KCCP Update

KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—**Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments**  
 KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker **Additions** to SCOPE—**Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments**

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p><b>NEW—Non-Residential Uses in Rural Area: Resource Industrial Uses and Facilities</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Strengthen King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) Chapter 3—Rural Area &amp; Natural Resource Lands:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>III.—Rural Densities &amp; Development, D. Nonresidential Uses: Policies R-324 thru R-329</b></li> <li>• <b>IV. Rural Public Facilities &amp; Services: Policies R-401 thru R-403</b></li> <li>• <b>V. Rural Commercial Centers, D. Non-Resource Industrial Uses &amp; Development Standards in the RA: Policies R-512 thru R-515</b></li> </ul> <p>2. <b>Do not allow new sites to be added during annual Docket process</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Rural Area (RA) residents have continually had to fight against many industrial and non-industrial uses that do not belong in the RA. We do not agree that industrial uses belong in the RA. Further, there have been continual attempts by various entities since GMA went into effect to site schools, mega-churches, wineries/breweries, and other retail/commercial uses in the RA and/or to seek improper urban rezoning to enable such uses. All of these Growth Management Act (GMA)-flaunting attempts have taken enormous effort to oppose (and several were nonetheless approved by action or inaction by King County). The pressure to site GMA-designated urban facilities in the RA will only increase and King County must clarify and tighten restrictions to prevent such inappropriate uses.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The annual Docket process should not be used as a “back-door” way to add new sites.</b></p>
<p><b>NEW—Non-Hydro-electric Facilities in Rural Area</b></p>	<p><b>Code Title 21A.08.100 Regional land use allows such facilities in the Rural Area under Development Conditions 12 and 29 using a CUP or SUP, respectively</b></p>	<p><b>Such facilities should not be sited in the Rural Area (RA). Current Code Title 21A.08.100 Regional land use table is not consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) Policies R-201, R-324, R-402, R-403, R-512, R-513, F-228, F-229, F-230, F-324, and F-325. At a minimum, all such facilities sited in the RA should require a Special-Use Permit (SUP) and the requirements under Development Condition 29.</b></p>
<p><b>NEW—Property-Specific Development Standards/Special District Overlays</b></p>	<p><b>Existing standards for alternative development for sites with unique characteristics are not addressed by the general zoning requirements of KC Code. These include “Property Specific Development Standards” (-P Suffix) and the designation for “Special District Overlay” (-SO Suffix), as described in County Code Chapters:</b></p> <p><b>21A.38.030 Property-Specific Development Standards - General Provisions and</b></p> <p><b>21A.38.040 Special District Overlays - General Provisions.</b></p>	<p><b>Although Subarea planning can look at standards for specific sites, we seek changes to Chapter 21A.38 that would tighten up general language on definitions and requirements related to both the property-specific -P and Special District Overlay -SO suffixes.</b></p>

2024 KCCP Update

KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*  
 KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker **Additions** to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p><b>NEW—                      Demonstration                      Projects in Rural                      Area</b></p>	<p><b>KC Code Title</b> 21A.55 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS <b>states under:</b> 21A55.010  <b>Purpose —</b> "All demonstration projects shall have broad public benefit...."</p>	<p><b>For example,</b> 21A55.105 Regional motor sports facility – master planning process demonstration project <b>and</b> 21A55.110 Remote tasting room – demonstration project <b>A do not belong in the Rural Area, as neither meets: 21A.55.030 Demonstration project - general provisions.</b></p> <p><b>"B. Demonstration projects must be consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan. Classification of a demonstration project and its provisions to waive or modify development standards must not require nor result in amendment of the Comprehensive Plan nor the Comprehensive Plan land use map."</b></p> <p><b>Specifically,</b> 21A55.105 Regional motor sports facility – master planning process demonstration project <b>has had many problems fulfilling the many promises made by Pacific Raceways to garner the Demonstration Project designation for its development. A myriad of warehouse facilities to support experimentation with next generation racing vehicles, including vehicles utilizing electric vehicle technology in the racing arena, has consistently been years behind the promised schedule, years behind the promised incremental net new, ongoing jobs for the community, and has consistently not met its promises for environmental protections, including noise pollution. Even with the broadest interpretation of "broad public benefit", this ongoing Demonstration project does not meet the spirit of this term. As a result, Pacific Raceways continues to operate, on its roughly 300 acres, essentially an entertainment venue racing facility with ideas of growing well beyond the current laws/agreements governing its development and operations. Ultimately, this Demonstration project likely will require changes to the Comprehensive Plan land-use map that reflect those current zoning restrictions to protect an incredibly environmentally sensitive area which sits in the Soos Creek watershed, one of the largest salmon breeding grounds in the lower 48 United States.</b></p> <p><b>Specifically,</b> 21A55.110 Remote tasting room – demonstration project <b>A was included in the invalidated Adult Beverage Ordinance (ABO). It would not have provided a "broad public benefit" and was unnecessary because the purported study topics could be easily enough observed by looking at existing tasting room businesses operating legally inside the Urban Growth Area (UGA), across the street from the Demonstration Project A properties. Fortunately, this concept has been abandoned in the new ordinance being worked up to replace the invalidated ABO (Ordinance 19030).</b></p>

**2024 KCCP Update**  
**KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***  
**KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker **Additions** to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments***

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p><b>NEW— Demonstration Projects in Rural Area (continued from previous page)</b></p>		<p><b>Further, such demonstration projects do not meet multiple and comparable Policies such as:</b>  <b>PSRC’s VISION 2050:</b>  <i>”MPP-DP-37 Ensure that development occurring in rural areas is rural in character and is focused into communities and activity areas”</i>  <b>2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPP) Update:</b>  <i>“DP-47 Limit growth in the Rural Area to prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, minimize the need for new rural infrastructure, maintain rural character, and protect open spaces and the natural environment;”</i>  <b>2020 KCCP Mid-Point Update:</b>  <i>“R-301 A low growth rate is desirable for the Rural Area, including Rural Towns and Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers, to comply with the State Growth Management Act, continue preventing sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, reduce the need for capital expenditures for rural roads, maintain rural character,…”</i></p>
<p><b>NEW—Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers and Mixed-Uses— Zoning</b></p>	<p><b>Clarify that, in Neighborhood Business (NB), Commercial Business (CB), and Regional Business (RB) zones, mixed uses (housing and retail/service) are allowed <u>only</u> when inside the Urban Growth Area (UGA) or in a Rural Town, not in the Rural Area. This “loophole” already was exploited in a permit application submitted in 2018 (since approved) at the intersection of Cedar Grove Rd &amp; Issaquah-Hobart Rd.</b></p>	<p><b>Originally asked for in 2017 and handled by Chris Jensen when at King County (KC) Department of Local Services (DLS)-Permitting. The King County Council was about to vote on this when it was pulled from the 2018 Omnibus Package. The King County Council-proposed changes were:</b></p> <p>21A.04.090 Neighborhood business zone. — “...2. Allowing for mixed use (housing and retail/ service) developments <u>in the urban area and in Rural Towns.</u> ((and-for)) <u>Townhouse developments are permitted</u> as a sole use on properties in the urban area with the land use designation of commercial outside of center; and....”</p> <p>21A.04.100 Community business zone. — “...2. Allowing for mixed use (housing and retail/service) developments <u>in urban areas and in Rural Towns;</u> and....”</p> <p>21A.04.110 Regional business zone. — “...4. <u>Allowing for mixed use (housing and retail/service) developments in urban areas and in Rural Towns...</u>”</p> <p><b>In January 2022 we were told by KC DLS Permitting Division Director, Jim Chan, that it would be handled in the 2024 KCCP Update. We support the above Council-proposed changes.</b></p>

2024 KCCP Update

KC Executive’s Recommended SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*  
 KC LS & L-U Committee’s Striker **Additions** to SCOPE—*Joint Rural Area Team’s Comments*

Scoping Topic	Possible Issues to be Evaluated	Joint Rural Area Team Comments
<p><b>NEW—Home Occupation and Home Industry Zoning</b></p>	<p><i>Reconsider the residential requirements for Home Occupation (HO) and Home Industry (HI) zoning. Return to the original (pre-2008) stipulations for HO and HI in A, F and RA zones to require the property be the primary residence of the business owner. also, return to the original (pre-2008) stipulations to include outbuildings and garages in square-foot calculations of what is permissible to use for activities and/or storage by a HO enterprise.</i></p>	<p><i>Over the years there have been many problems associated with what a real Home Occupation (HO) and Home Industry (HI) is, including associated code enforcement issues that linger for years.</i></p> <p><i>The original intent of allowing HO’s and HI’s to exist in our Rural Areas is implicit in the title word “Home” — in the home of the business owner. Changes in 2008 removed this requirement, replacing it with a vague reference to “residents of a dwelling”. This has resulted in a significant expansion of commercial activities in neighborhoods and resource lands that are incompatible with our Growth Management Act (GMA) goals of protecting rural resources and character.</i></p> <p><i>A primary residence can be verified in a number of ways. A palate of options could be provided to a person to prove their primary residence.</i></p> <p><i>Another concern deals with total square footage of facilities on a property used for an HO business. Allowing outbuildings and garages to be used without ANY limits greatly expanded the scale of what can occur as an HO. While HI’s are a conditional use, HO’s are simply permitted, per KC Code 21A.08.030 Residential land uses.</i></p> <p><i>For example, we seek changes to: 21A.30.085 Home occupations in the A, F and RA zones. ... “B. Areas within garages and storage buildings shall not be considered part of the dwelling unit and may be used for activities associated with the home occupation;...” and 21A.30.090 Home industry. ... “C. Areas within attached garages and storage buildings shall not be considered part of the dwelling unit for purposes of calculating allowable home industry area but may be used for storage of goods associated with the home industry;...”</i></p>

Denise L. Stiffarm  
[denise.stiffarm@pacificalawgroup.com](mailto:denise.stiffarm@pacificalawgroup.com)

August 31, 2022

**Via Email: [ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov](mailto:ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov)**  
King County  
Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget  
Attn: Ivan Miller  
Chinook Office Building  
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 810  
Seattle, WA 98104

**Re: Comments – 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan EIS Scope**

Dear Ivan:

The King County Component of the Puget Sound School Coalition<sup>1</sup> (the “School Coalition”) submits these comments regarding the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) for the 2024 update to the King County Comprehensive Plan (the “Comprehensive Plan Update”). The Coalition is an active participant in regional planning efforts as related to needed school capacity and school siting considerations. As population across King County continues to grow, school capacity needs remain critical, particularly given increasing challenges with locating developable land and in the project permitting process. The School Coalition views King County as a partner in its school siting efforts and requests that the County continue to prioritize this necessary public infrastructure as a part of this planning exercise.

The School Coalition agrees with the lead agency’s identification of public services and utilities as one environmental area for discussion in the EIS. As you know, the Growth Management Act (GMA) specifies a planning goal to “[e]nsure that public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.” RCW 36.70A.020(12) (“GMA Goal 12”). The GMA definition of “public facilities” and “public services” include schools and education, respectively. RCW 36.70A.030(12) and (13). New development affects significantly a public school district’s capacity through enrollment increases resulting from the construction of new dwelling units and by further reducing land available for school capacity construction. Related impacts occur when students must travel further across a school district to reach available school capacity.

The School Coalition recognizes that much of the anticipated growth within King County will occur within the incorporated areas of the County and, as such, members intend to provide

---

<sup>1</sup> The King County Component of the Coalition includes the Issaquah, Lake Washington, Northshore, Riverview, Snoqualmie Valley, and Tahoma School Districts.



input to their various cities as they plan for their own comprehensive plan updates. However, consistent with adopted Countywide Planning Policy PF-22 (formerly PF-19A) and PF-23, the County plays an important role in working collaboratively with the school districts and partner jurisdictions to develop and implement strategies for assuring adequate school capacity (including early learning opportunities). This cooperation is particularly important given (1) the County's directive for new schools to be located within the urban growth boundary; and (2) that boundaries of Coalition member districts include multiple jurisdictions (including the unincorporated area). As such, the EIS should consider mitigation measures that:

- Prioritize a school district's ability to purchase surplus County property located within the school district's boundaries;
- Emphasize the County's priority for sharing use of its public properties with school districts where logical and practical;
- Permit playfields on land in the rural area directly adjacent to school sites located within the urban area and with direct access from the urban area;
- Allow school districts to access the Four-to-One Program in a practical and cost-effective manner;
- Require regular review and updates to local regulatory approaches, including code requirements and permitted uses in zones, with the intent to facilitate and prioritize the siting of schools;
- Ensure new residential development pays its fair share of costs of needed school capacity and that the County's existing school impact fee program is not compromised; and
- Advance the ability of school districts, as providers of education (including early learning services) and community spaces, to play a key role in the County's overall planning processes.

We recognize that existing King County Comprehensive Plan policies provide a basis for some of the above measures and anticipate that those policies could be strengthened to reflect the County's continuing school siting priorities.

The Coalition appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments. Please add my name, on behalf of the Coalition, as an interested party for purposes of the EIS process and the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Sincerely,

PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP



Denise L. Stiffarm

cc: Members, Puget Sound School Coalition – King County Component



# WASHINGTON AGGREGATES & CONCRETE ASSOCIATION

22223 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Des Moines, WA 98198

O 206.878.1622 F 206.878.6282

WWW.WASHINGTONCONCRETE.ORG

## 2021-2022 OFFICERS

### **PRESIDENT**

**MATT HINCK**

CalPortland  
Seattle

### **VICE PRESIDENT**

**JANA McDONALD**

CRH Materials  
Spokane

### **SECRETARY/TREASURER**

### **PAST PRESIDENT**

**JAMES ESSIG**

Granite Construction  
Everett

### **DIRECTORS**

**LARRY BUSCH**

CADMAN  
Redmond

**KC KLOSTERMAN**

CRH Materials  
Salem

**DAVID FREELS**

Godbey Redi Mix  
Brewster

**WALT MILES**

Miles S & G  
Puyallup

**CHAD PATTERSON**

Cascade Concrete Prod.  
Winthrop

**MIKE WEEKS**

Stoneway Concrete  
Seattle

### **ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR**

**TIM SAIZ**

PAPÉ Kenworth Northwest  
Seattle

### **CEMENT DIRECTOR**

**SETH HOLT**

Lehigh NW Cement Co.  
Redmond

### **ASSOCIATION STAFF**

**Bruce Chattin**

Executive Director

**Mary Bauer**

Membership Services Director

**Steve Buckner**

Millennia Public Affairs

King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget

August 31, 2022

Attn: Ivan Miller

Chinook Office Building

401 Fifth Ave, Suite 810

Seattle, WA 98104

email: ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov

Re: Scoping Comments

2024 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan EIS

Dear Mr. Miller:

The Washington Aggregates and Concrete Association (the "Association") submits these comments to the EIS Scoping Notice for the 2024 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan (the "2024 KCCP"). The EIS for the 2024 KCCP should address the following issues and impacts:

- The existing KCCP improperly provides that the mineral resource plan designation for a site must be removed if permits to develop the mineral resource are denied. This approach is contrary to RCW 36.70B, under which mineral resource designation are to be based on the availability of the mineral resource, not whether an individual permit application succeeds in a difficult entitlement process. The denial of such a permit application does not indicate the absence of the mineral resource, only that one particular plan for development of the resource did not meet approval standards. The EIS should evaluate modifications to these policies of the KCCP.
- The section on Land and Shoreline Use should review the existing inventory of mineral resource lands in King County and evaluate whether additional mineral resource lands should be designated in King County in order to meet the growing needs for aggregates in the region. We believe that the existing inventory of mineral resource lands is not adequate to meet the future needs of the region.
- The sections on Transportation, Energy, Air and Water should evaluate the impacts to these elements of the environment if it becomes necessary to import aggregates from outside the region. Increased transportation distances will have impacts in each of these areas.
- The EIS should assume that existing aggregate mining sites, following reclamation, will no longer be appropriate for a Mineral zoning designation. As such, alternative designations that allow redevelopment would be appropriate. As noted above, the existing KCCP will remove a mineral resource designation where a permit application fails, even when the mineral resource remains. But when the resource is exhausted and the site is reclaimed, the designation must be removed. The EIS should assume that reclaimed mineral resource lands must be redesignated to allow for redevelopment of the sites.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these EIS Scoping comments.

Sincerely,

Bruce Chattin

Executive Director

Washington Aggregates & Concrete Association