



King County

ADDENDUM to Existing Environmental Documents

For the 2012 Amendments to

The King County Comprehensive Plan

**King County
Department of Permitting and Environmental Review**

November 15, 2012

Prepared in Compliance with

The Washington State Environmental Policy Act of 1971
Chapter 43.21C Revised Code of Washington
Chapter 197-11, Washington Administrative Code
Revised SEPA Guidelines, Effective April 4, 1984
And
Chapter 20.44, King County Code

Date of Issuance: November 15, 2012

Responsible Official:
Kimberly Claussen
Department of Permitting and Environmental Review
35030 SE Douglas Street
Snoqualmie, WA 98065

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Fact Sheet.....	i
Environmental Review Process	1
Environmental Review of Proposed Amendments.....	2
Summary of Proposal.....	2
Comprehensive Plan Amendments	2
Introduction	2
Chapter One-Regional Planning	3
Chapter Two-Urban Communities.....	4
Chapter Three- Rural Legacy and Natural Resource Lands	6
Chapter Four-Environment	7
Chapter Five-Shoreline Master Program	10
Chapter Six-Parks, Open Space and Cultural Resources.....	16
Regional Trail Needs Report Summary	17
Chapter Seven-Transportation	17
Chapter Eight-Services, Facilities and Utilities	21
Chapter Nine-Economic Development	22
Chapter Ten-Community Plans.....	23
Chapter Eleven-Implementation	24
Transportation Needs Report Summary.....	25
Map Amendments.....	25
Map Amendment 1. West Hill.....	25
Map Amendment 2. Reserve Silica	26
Map Amendment 3. Taylor Mountain	27
Map Amendment 4. Soaring Eagle.....	27
Map Amendment 5. Snoqualmie Mine.....	28
Map Amendment 6. Pacific Raceway.....	29
Map Amendment 7. Fall City	34
Map Amendment 8. Technical Corrections (for rights of way only)	35
Map Amendment 9. Sammamish Valley.....	36
Map Amendment 10 Snoqualmie Interchange	37
Map Amendment 11. Duthie Notch.....	39
Map Amendment 12. Covington-Jenkins Creek Notch.....	40
Map Amendment 13 Maple Valley Split Parcel.....	41
Map Amendment 14 Melki.....	42
APPENDIX A - Distribution List.....	43

Fact Sheet

Action Sponsor: Dow Constantine, King County Executive

Contact Person: Paul Reitenbach, Comprehensive Plan Manager
Department of Development and Environmental Review
206-477-0345

Lead Agency: Department of Permitting and Environmental Review
35030 SE Douglas Street
Snoqualmie, WA 98065

Proposed Action: Amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan are being proposed in accordance with the provisions of the Growth Management Act and King County Code Title 20. Executive-proposal includes amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, technical appendices and the development regulations that implement the Plan.

Responsible Official: Kimberly Claussen
Department of Permitting and Environmental Review

Approvals Required: Adoption by Metropolitan King County Council

EIS Addendum issued by: Department of Permitting and Environmental Review

Location of Background Data & Supporting Documents: Department of Permitting and Environmental Review
35030 SE Douglas Street
Snoqualmie, WA 98065

Date of Issuance: November 15, 2012

Environmental Review Process

The Growth Management Act (GMA), adopted by the Washington State Legislature in 1990, established an overall framework for tiered and coordinated planning in Washington State. It requires counties and cities to work cooperatively to plan for orderly development. In 1994, King County complied with the GMA through its adoption of Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) and the King County Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan or Plan). The primary function of the CPPs is to provide policy guidance for the orderly development of King County and its cities while the Comprehensive Plan outlines an overall vision for King County and the region. The Comprehensive Plan offers policy direction related to urban land use, rural land use, economic development, housing, natural resource lands, the natural environment, facilities and services, transportation, parks and recreation, cultural resources, energy and communications, and planning and implementation.

The GMA requires that all proposed amendments to a comprehensive plan be considered no more than once a year and that they are considered concurrently so that the cumulative effect of various proposals are considered as one consolidated package. Every ten years the Urban Growth Area (UGA) must be reviewed for adequate capacity. Under King County regulations small routine or technical changes can be made to the Comprehensive Plan every year, but large changes including policy amendments and the urban growth boundary can be made only once every four years. A major update occurred in 2000. The 2004 update was the second major update and the first mandated review of the capacity of the UGA. A third major update was adopted in 2008; and the fourth update is the current 2012 update.

To comply with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), in 1994 King County issued environmental impact statements (EISs) for the CPPs and Comprehensive Plan. King County issued addenda to the Comprehensive Plan EIS in 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998. In 2000 King County issued a Supplemental EIS for the Comprehensive Plan.

Environmental review for the 2004 Comprehensive Plan included review of all existing environmental documents and issuance of an addendum, which adopted existing environmental documents and assessed the environmental effects associated with the Executive Recommended Plan dated March 1, 2004.

Environmental review for the 2008 review of the Comprehensive Plan occurred through the issuance of this addendum adopting existing environmental documents and assessing the environmental effects associated with the Executive Recommended Plan, dated March 1, 2008 and the amendments approved by the King County Council Growth Management and Unincorporated Areas Committee (GMUAC Amendments).

Environmental review for the 2012 review of the Comprehensive Plan occurs through the issuance of this addendum adopting existing environmental documents and assessing the environmental effects associated with the Executive Recommended Plan, dated March 1, 2012 (Executive Proposal) and the amendments approved by the King County Council Transportation, Environment, and Economy Committee (TrEE Amendments). This addendum provides

additional information and analysis and does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the environmental documents adopted in this addendum

Environmental Review of Proposed Amendments

Summary of Proposal

The proposed project is an update of the King County Comprehensive Plan. The update includes amendments and additions to the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, technical appendices and the development regulations that implement the Plan. In addition, the update includes:

- Regional Trail Needs Report
- Transportation Needs Report
- Land use and area zoning map amendments, and
- Amendments to King County Code Titles 13, 14, 16, 19A, 20, and 21A to implement the policy amendments. The impacts associated with the development regulations that are proposed to implement the policy amendments are the same as the impacts associated with the Comprehensive Plan policy amendments and additions.

There are many technical and formatting changes to the Plan such as capitalization, minor language changes and updating references to population figures, names of documents and websites. Several major sections have been moved to different chapters with no substantive changes. This analysis will only consider the effects of those amendments to the Plan that are substantive in nature.

Comprehensive Plan Amendments

1. Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan

1.1 Proposal

Specific amendments include:

- Formulation of guidance policies, including existing framework policies, to form the foundation for more detailed policies in the topical chapters of the Comprehensive Plan
- Acknowledgement of the interrelationship between the Comprehensive Plan and regional plans
- Acknowledgement of the interrelationship between the King County Strategic Plan (KCSP) and the Comprehensive Plan

1.2 Background

The King County Comprehensive Plan provides a legal framework for guiding regional growth and making decisions about land use in unincorporated King County. Public and private agencies, property owners, developers, community groups and King County staff use the Comprehensive Plan in several ways.

First, the Plan is the framework for other plans and regulations such as subarea plans and the King County Code that govern the location and density of land uses in unincorporated King County. It provides guidance to County officials for decisions on proposals such as zoning changes and developments. It also gives the public direction on the County's position on proposed changes in land use or zoning, environmental regulations, or broader policy issues. The Plan also provides a basis for decisions about public spending on facilities and services. And, the Plan presents other agencies, such as cities and special purpose districts, with King County's position on large-scale matters such as annexation, use of resource lands, environmental protection and others.

1.3 Analysis

While the 2012 King County Comprehensive Plan update also continues the emphasis on public health and sustainability from the previous plan, three new or updated planning documents further shape this 2012 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan. These documents include VISION 2040, the 2011 King County Countywide Planning Policies, and the King County Strategic Plan.

The concept of environmental sustainability from the King County Strategic Plan is more fully and clearly integrated into the 2012 Comprehensive Plan update. Environmental sustainability means meeting the needs of the current generation without compromising the capacity of the environment to support future generations, while anticipating effects of natural and human factors, such as climate change and population growth.

2. Chapter One—Regional Planning

2.1 Proposal

- Changes chapter title to insert “Growth Management”
- Clarifies role of public participation in County’s planning processes
- Updates background text for various policies
- Updates references on regional planning
- Revises policies to be consistent with KCSP goals
- Moves “Review and Evaluation” subpart to Chapter 11, Implementation

2.2 Background

The vision and goals of this Plan are based on the 14 planning goals specified in the GMA, the CPPs, the region’s VISION 2040 and the values voiced by the residents of King County. The official King County Land Use Map is included in this chapter.

2.3 Analysis

The 2012 King County Comprehensive Plan update includes a new policy requiring consistency with the goals of the KCSP and further clarifying the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan and the KCSP.

No policy issues are raised by moving the “Review and Evaluation” section to the Implementation Chapter.

3. **Chapter Two—Urban Communities**

3.1 Proposal

- Includes new concepts into text (including healthy communities and housing)
- Replaces growth targets table
- Recognizes the benefits derived from design of healthy communities on residents and reducing carbon footprint
- Includes a new strategy known as Healthy Routes to School
- Revises policy to clarify when a parcel split by the Urban Growth Boundary should be redesignated
- Modifies existing policies regarding when lower densities should be allowed
- Modifies existing policies regarding when increases in densities should be allowed
- Preserves Four-to-One program
- Except under limited circumstances, drainage facilities to support urban development in Four-to-One development must be located in urban area
- Preserves current Transfer of Development Rights incentive ratios
- Updates the narrative text relating to Potential Annexation Areas to clarify the County’s role in annexations
- Revamps policies in Housing subpart to provide better clarity
- Updates data upon which affordable housing policies predicated
- Encourages fruit and produce operations in the commercially zoned areas
- Includes increased linkage between land use policies and public health
- Strengthens policy regarding when King County awards subsidies, to take into consideration an affordable housing development’s commitment to healthy housing, universal design and sustainability
- Broadens policy regarding King County’s efforts to assist home owners in disaster situations and moved it to Chapter 8, Facilities, Services and Utilities.

- Moves polices regarding sustainability and low impact development to Chapter 8, Facilities, Services and Utilities for King County infrastructure development and to Chapter 9, Economic Development for private development
- Replaces Urban Centers map

3.2 Background

The Urban Communities chapter brings together several of the major elements necessary to make a community whole: housing, business centers, and human services. By merging these elements into one chapter, King County emphasizes the importance each plays as a part of a livable community. A major tenet of the GMA is to target growth in the urban areas, so the policies in this chapter better facilitate urban development where infrastructure and facilities exist or can be readily provided. This chapter also draws the connection between urban development and public health.

3.3 Analysis

King County is successfully promoting and supporting policies and programs that focus on the health of students at school. However, the school environment is only one aspect of the overall health of the student. A new King County strategy included in the 2012 King County Comprehensive Plan update, Healthy Routes to School, is presented in order to consider the impact the broader environmental factors have on the health of a student. This strategy focuses on the environment surrounding a school and the routes a typical student travels to school or nearby school-related destinations.

The 2012 Comprehensive Plan update fine tunes policies related to residential densities in Urban Areas, working with cities to address proposed changes in residential density within potential Annexation Area, the Four-to-One Program, and Transfer of Development rights. No fundamental shift in policy direction for these programs is proposed.

The housing policies address low-cost housing development, preservation and assistance programs needed to ensure safe, healthy, and adequate housing for lower-income and special needs residents. The proposed Comprehensive Plan update also strengthens the linkage of affordable housing to jobs and public transportation through transit-oriented development and along transit corridors. Proposed policies also balance support for housing redevelopment with the need to preserve existing low-cost housing and neighborhoods.

Moving polices regarding sustainability and low impact development to Chapter 8, Facilities, Services and Utilities for King County infrastructure development and to Chapter 9, Economic Development for private development raises no policy issues.

4. Chapter Three—Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands

4.1 Proposal

- Provides greater recognition of the role, needs and impacts of equestrian uses that are a key element in defining the character of the rural and resource lands
- Amends policies related to the Transfer of Development Rights program to simplify program procedures and clarify sending site priorities
- Requires management plans for open space or resource tracts within a new subdivision
- Establishes balanced criteria that recognize the needs of farming when evaluating proposals to place salmon-habitat recovery, wetland management and flood control projects within the agricultural production districts
- Creates a watershed-level planning effort to identify future projects in agricultural production districts while protecting the viability of farming
- Amends policies affecting the placement of schools within the RA (Rural Area) zone and limits the use of sewers
- Broadens opportunities for public engagement from stakeholder groups that have a vested interest in rural and resource land issues
- Establishes policy for County to work with small farmers and foresters and jurisdictions to provide technical assistance in broadening access to local farm and forest products
- Continues focus on increasing the health of the Rural Area residents

4.2 Background

Protecting a rural way-of-life in King County is a major thrust of the Comprehensive Plan in compliance with both the GMA and the KCSP. This chapter delineates the County's approach to conserving rural and natural resource lands, supporting rural communities and their heritage, and supporting the agriculture, forestry, and mining economies. Integral to these efforts are the incentive tools such as the Transfer of Development Rights program that ensure the protection of environmental quality and wildlife habitat.

4.3 Analysis

The proposed 2012 update carries forward the existing residential densities and development guidelines in the existing Comprehensive Plan. The proposed update includes greater recognition of the equestrian community of King County. The proposed update also continues the Four-to-One Program. The Transfer of Development Rights Program procedures are simplified and the priorities of sending and receiving sites are clarified. These changes do not reflect a significant change in County policy towards the Rural Area.

King County Comprehensive Plan policies call for the preservation of productive agricultural soils and local agricultural production and the protection of public safety in flood prone areas through the restoration of floodplain processes. 2012 Comprehensive Plan update policies also recognize that fish, flood management and farm interests must work together in a collaborative manner and that the farmers in the County support fish protection and fish recovery through many regulated and voluntary actions.

The most significant policy change related to forestry calls for the County to work with forest landowners and forestry business to better understand and address the barriers to local wood processing. Existing policy direction for forestry is not otherwise proposed to be substantially changed.

The 2012 Comprehensive Plan update proposed to carry forward policies guiding mineral resource development with no significant changes.

5. Chapter Four—Environment

5.1 Proposal

This chapter reflects the environment in King County that includes a rich and valuable array of land and water resources ranging from marine and freshwater bodies, to highly urbanized areas to nearly pristine landscapes in the foothills of the Cascades. King County's programs for protecting its environment include some of the most progressive in the country. Together King County's environmental programs and the King County code implement the policies in this chapter and ensure that the environment is protected and restored, and that the environmental sustainability goal of the KCSP is achieved.

King County seeks to adapt to, and mitigate the effects of climate change including reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. King County seeks to promote environmental management practices that support habitats for native plant and animal species, including those listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act and the restoration of environments threatened by past development, degraded water quality, and invasive species. Such practices include traditional treatment and habitat restoration projects, low impact development, incentive-based approaches and education and technical assistance. The chapter establishes policies to ensure future protection of the environment and its contribution to the quality of life in King County. This chapter also reflects the role of the Puget Sound Partnership in coordinating environmental management, including providing leadership for a coordinated and comprehensive environmental monitoring program across Puget Sound. Specific amendments include:

- Clarification of policy of County's role when water impaired
- Updates policies to be consistent with state laws and regulations
- Updates data regarding effects of climate change
- Includes text of interrelationship between Strategic Climate Action Plan and Comprehensive Plan

- Clarifies County’s reporting on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions
- Clarifies County’s long term GHG emissions reduction goal
- New policy recognizing need for intermediate GHG emissions reduction goals
- New policy for County to work with cities to meet long term goal regionally
- Recognition of zero-based GHG emissions energy sources
- New text describing vulnerable populations
- Policy committing County to use best available science to evaluate options to address climate change
- Increased textual context for habitat preservation
- New policies linking habitat preservation to climate change adaptation
- Clarification in existing policies that species of importance refers to those in King County
- Reformats text regarding conservation areas
- Adds areas that are considered Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas
- Requires mapping of conservation areas
- Revisions to policies designating species and habitats of local importance
- Revises livestock waste management policy on recycling infrastructure
- Updating policies for current cross references
- Revisions to wetland mitigation policies to support long term viability
- Revisions to wetland mitigation policies recognizing mitigation reserves program
- Inclusion of groundwater monitoring as an element of groundwater protection policy
- New policies recognizing inherent danger of rivers
- Revisions to coal mine hazards policies

5.2 Background

King County’s diverse array of environmental resources and conditions, ranging from highly urban to nearly pristine wilderness areas in the Cascades, warrants sound management to preserve quality of life for future generations in addition to protecting public health and safety.

Federal and state regulatory structures exist to protect key elements of the natural environment, including threatened or endangered species and the habitats that are critical to their lifecycles.

Global climate change is a pervasive environmental challenge facing King County. The effects of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on local and global meteorological metrics carry profound implications for residents of King County. Increased precipitation and decreases in annual snow packs may dramatically impact ecosystems, agriculture, local and regional economies, biodiversity and public health and safety.

Certain groups of individuals (those with chronic health conditions, the elderly or those who live in close proximity to high traffic volume roadways) are considered more sensitive to air pollutants than the general population. Children are also considered a sensitive population to the long-term damaging effects of poor air quality. Reducing the six criteria pollutants should be a priority to restore health equity for these populations.

King County maintains collaborative relationships with other governmental agencies to carry out mandated monitoring and assessment of risk to listed threatened species and their habitat and to protect and conserve essential water and land resources.

King County is located in what is considered a geologically hazardous area, part of the Pacific “Rim of Fire”. Mudflow hazards, known as lahars, are a present danger to King County residents living in the shadow of Mount Rainier.

The protection and recovery of salmonid species that are listed under the ESA is and will continue to be a significant issue for King County.

King County’s environment is constantly changing in response to land and water management actions, driven by its residents and by nature.

5.3 Analysis

Federal and state programs provide regulatory oversight and guidance for protection of the natural and built environment. The Comprehensive Plan and implementing development regulations supplement these state and federal regulations, providing additional protection for natural resources and environmentally sensitive areas.

The effects of climate change require that King County continue to provide leadership and collaborate with federal and state agencies and other governments to raise awareness about climate change impacts, evaluate and plan for potential impacts caused by climate change and educate its citizens. Numerous predicted impacts to the Pacific Northwest and King County from climate change warrant a carefully considered strategic assessment of risk and measures to reduce, cap and mitigate GHG emissions at the local level through responsible development practices and programs that create incentives to lowering GHG emissions. The Comprehensive Plan includes a number of policies designed to reduce King County’s contribution to climate change and to prepare for the impacts that are expected.

Clean air, free of pollutants, is essential for the day-to-day quality of life and long-term health of County residents. King County works in partnership with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA), the lead regulatory and monitoring agency for air quality issues. Because air quality impacts water quality, a better understanding is needed regarding the input of pollutants via air transport from local and distant sources. The public health benefits from strategies that encourage the reduction of harmful air toxics. The Comprehensive Plan includes policies designed to protect and improve air quality.

Land and water resource management requires coordinated and collaborative efforts between King County departments with oversight and other governmental agencies and regulatory authorities. Biodiversity, upland areas, aquatic resources, fish and wildlife, flood hazard management and hazardous waste management are the major elements of this discipline. Impacts of development, including climate change, must be carefully assessed and monitored to assure appropriate levels of protection to these key elements of the natural environment. Conservancy and good stewardship of these resources is important to maintaining quality of life as current residents of King County know it for future generations. The Comprehensive Plan includes policies encouraging stewardship through a variety of means.

The Comprehensive Plan emphasizes the importance of identification of lahar hazard areas within King County as an important component to an effective risk management strategy that should include emergency management and implementation of risk specific development considerations.

The Comprehensive Plan continues implementation of watershed-based salmonid recovery plans as a way to provide the framework for continued assessment of threatened species and their habitat and help provide adaptive responses for salmon conservation and recovery strategies. Working at the watershed scale, as opposed to site-by-site and species-by-species, will result in improved protection now and reduce future threats to species and habitat.

An important component of any environmental protection system is implementation of monitoring and adaptive management strategies to provide the framework to track changes in the natural and built environment. Tracking such changes, collaboratively with other affected agencies, provides essential data in creating a quantitative approach of adaptive management. The Comprehensive Plan includes policies to encourage and expand upon existing King County monitoring and adaptive management programs.

6. Chapter Five—Shoreline Master Program

6.1 Proposal

King County adopted its first Shoreline Master Program (SMP) in 1977. In November, 2010, King County approved an update to the SMP. This update incorporated the shoreline policies in the Comprehensive Plan for the first time. Under the Shoreline Management Act (SMA), the SMP must be approved by the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) before it takes effect. In September 2012, Ecology conditionally approved the November 2010 SMP, but has required King County to amend some policies and shoreline regulations to bring the SMP into compliance with the SMA. The amendments to Chapter 5 adopt those required changes.

6.2 Background

The SMA was passed by the Legislature in 1971 and adopted by the public in a 1972 referendum. The goal of the SMA is “to prevent the inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state’s shorelines.”

The act establishes a broad policy giving preference to uses that:

- Protect the quality of water and the natural environment,
- Depend on proximity to the shoreline (“water-dependent uses”), and
- Preserve and enhance public access or increase recreational opportunities for the public along shorelines.

The SMA establishes a balance of authority between local and state government. Ecology has the responsibility under the SMA to adopt regulations guiding the content and standards that apply to local shoreline master programs and to review and approve local shoreline master programs. Cities and counties adopt local shoreline master programs designed to address their particular circumstances and are responsible for issuing permits for shoreline development, subject to Ecology’s oversight and, for some types of permits, Ecology’s approval.

Under the SMA, each city and county adopts a shoreline master program that is based on Ecology's shoreline master program rules or guidelines, but tailored to the specific needs of the community. More than 200 cities and all 39 counties have shoreline master programs. Local shoreline master programs combine both plans and regulations. The plans are a comprehensive vision of how shoreline areas will be used and developed over time. Regulations are the standards that shoreline projects and uses must meet.

Shorelines of the State in King County, as defined by the SMA, include all marine waters, lakes greater than 20 acres, and rivers and streams with a minimum of 20 cubic feet per second (cfs) mean annual flow. The shoreline jurisdiction includes these water bodies and shorelands. Shorelands are defined as those areas extending landward for two hundred feet from the ordinary high water mark, floodways and contiguous floodplain areas landward two hundred feet from such floodways, and all associated wetlands and river deltas. King County also includes the 100-year floodplain in its shoreline jurisdiction.

Table S-1 below shows the number of shoreline miles managed under King County's SMP.

Table S-1. Miles of shoreline under King County’s jurisdiction

Shoreline (miles)		
Lake	River/Stream	Marine
234	1,696	51

King County adopted its original SMP through two ordinances adopted by the King County Council and approved by the King County Executive, John Spellman, on May 2, 1978. Ordinance 3692 adopted the SMP, which established the goals, objectives, and policies of the King County SMP. Ordinance 3688 adopted the development regulations that implemented the SMP. Ecology approved King County's SMP in June, 1978.

The 1978 Shoreline Master Plan addressed the required elements of the shoreline regulations originally adopted by Ecology in 1972. The 1978 Plan established goals, objectives, and policies for eight different shoreline elements. For each of the four shoreline environments, it also established general policies.

The 1978 Plan stated that:

Each environment represents a particular emphasis in the type of uses and the extent of development that should occur within it. The system is designed to encourage uses in each Environment which enhance the character of the Environment while at the same time requiring reasonable standards and restrictions on development so that the character of the Environment is not destroyed.

Finally, the 1978 SMP included general policies for a variety of different shoreline use activities, including agriculture, mining, recreation, and residential development. Associated shoreline regulations establish the designation criteria, the allowed uses, and development standards for the four shoreline environments recognized by the 1972 state guidelines.

In 1990, the King County Council adopted regulations governing environmentally sensitive areas, some of which include areas also within shoreline jurisdiction (Ordinance 9614). King County updated its critical areas regulations effective January 1, 2005 (Ordinances 15032, 15033, and 15034). King County's Critical Areas Regulations and its SMP both provide that the regulations that are most protective of the environment apply in the case of a conflict.

Ecology adopted updated regulations governing shoreline master programs that became effective in January 2003. Under the revised regulations and subsequent changes to the SMA, all counties and cities subject to the SMA were required to update their SMPs over a period of several years. King County began the process of updating its SMP in 2005 with a grant from Ecology. One of the first steps in the update process was the development of a shoreline characterization and inventory. See [King County Shorelines Technical Appendix \(May 2007\)](#). The analysis evaluated the existing physical and shoreline ecological processes and functions, public access and recreation, land use and economic development, public facilities and utilities, and archaeological and historic resources of all shoreline reaches in King County.

This analysis, in conjunction with the [Shoreline Protection and Restoration Plan](#) and the [Critical Area Basin Condition Map](#), was used to establish the shoreline environment designations.

The updated SMP was adopted by King County in November, 2010.

6.3 Analysis

Chapter 5 adopts shoreline policies that establish broad shoreline management directives. They are statements of intent by King County that direct or authorize a course of action or specify criteria for regulatory or non-regulatory action. The policies serve as the basis for regulations that govern use and development along the shoreline.

The shoreline policies provide a comprehensive foundation for the SMP regulations, which are more specific standards that are used to evaluate shoreline development proposals. King County evaluates permit applications in light of the shoreline policies and may approve a permit only after determining that the development conforms to the policies in the SMP.

In addition, the shoreline policies assist in prioritizing King County's spending on facilities and services within shorelines of the state. Finally, the shoreline policies provide direction for regional issues such as resource management, environmental protection, transportation, inter-governmental coordination and regional planning.

In compliance with the SMA, Chapter 5 classifies King County's shorelines into eight environment designations. These environment designations are:

High Intensity Shoreline Environment: Applied to areas that provide high-intensity water-oriented commercial, transportation, and industrial uses.

Residential Shoreline Environment: Applied to accommodate residential uses at urban densities, while allowing for non-residential uses that are consistent with the protection of the shoreline jurisdiction.

Rural Shoreline Environment: Applied to accommodate rural residential shoreline development, while allowing for rural non-residential uses that are consistent with the protection of the shoreline.

Conservancy Shoreline Environment: Applied to protect and conserve the shoreline for ecological, public safety, and recreation purposes. This environment includes areas with important shoreline ecological processes and functions, valuable historic and cultural features, flood and geological hazards and recreational opportunities. Residential areas can also be designated as conservancy shorelines.

Resource Shoreline Environment: Applied to allow for mining and agriculture land uses, except for shorelines that are relatively intact or that have minimally degraded shoreline processes and functions.

Forestry Shoreline Environment: Applied in areas to allow for forest production and protect municipal water supplies.

Natural Shoreline Environment: Applied to shorelines that are relatively intact or have minimally degraded shoreline processes and functions that are intolerant of human use.

Aquatic Shoreline Environment: Applied to the areas waterward of the ordinary high water mark.

The SMP addresses the following eight program elements that are required by the SMA:

An **economic development element** that considers the location and design of industries, industrial projects of statewide significance, transportation facilities, port facilities, tourist facilities, commerce, and other developments that are particularly dependent on shorelines of the state.

A **public access element** that considers public access to publicly owned land along shorelines of the state.

A **recreational element** that identifies recreational opportunities along shorelines, such as parks, tidelands, beaches, and recreational areas, and that pursues acquisition through implementation of the King County SMP.

A **circulation element** that consists of the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other public utilities and facilities.

A **land use element** that considers the general distribution and location, as well as the extent of use on the shorelines and adjacent areas for housing, business, industry, transportation, agriculture, natural resources, recreation, education, public buildings and grounds, and other categories of public and private use of the land.

A **conservation element** that addresses the preservation of natural resources including, but not limited to, scenic vistas, aesthetics, and vital estuarine areas for fish and wildlife.

A **historic, cultural, scientific and educational element** that prevents the destruction of or damage to any site having historic, cultural, scientific, or educational value as identified by the appropriate authorities, including affected Tribes, and the state office of archaeology and historic preservation.

A **flood hazard element** that considers the prevention and minimization of flood damages.

The SMP, in compliance with the SMA, distinguishes between shoreline modifications and shoreline uses.

Shoreline modifications are generally related to construction of a physical element such as a dike, breakwater, dredged basin, or fill, but can include other actions such as clearing, grading or application of chemicals. A shoreline modification is usually undertaken in support of or in preparation for a shoreline use.

Shoreline uses are classified as "water-dependent," "water-related," "water-enjoyment," or "water-oriented."

A water-dependent use is a use or portion of a use that cannot exist in a location that is not adjacent to the water and that is dependent on the water by reason of the intrinsic nature of its operations.

A water-related use is a use or portion of a use that is not intrinsically dependent on a waterfront location but whose economic viability is dependent upon a waterfront location because:

- (a) The use has a functional requirement for a waterfront location such as the arrival or shipment of materials by water or the need for large quantities of water; or
- (b) The use provides a necessary service supportive of the water-dependent uses and the proximity of the use to its customers makes its services less expensive or more convenient.

A water-enjoyment use is a recreational use or other use that facilitates public access to the shoreline as a primary characteristic of the use; or a use that provides for recreational use or aesthetic enjoyment of the shoreline for a substantial number of people as a general characteristic of the use and which, through location, design and operation, ensures the public's ability to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of the shoreline. In order to qualify as a water-enjoyment use, the use must be open to the general public and the shoreline-oriented space within the project must be devoted to the specific aspects of the use that fosters shoreline enjoyment.

A water-oriented use is a use that is water-dependent, water-related, water-enjoyment, or a combination of such uses.

In adopting its regulations governing shoreline development, King County relied on elements of its existing regulations. In particular, King County's critical area regulations, codified at K.C.C. Chapter 21A.24, establish the standards for protection of shorelines. Those regulations were subject to extensive environmental review and analysis before their adoption in 2004. [See, Best Available Science: Critical Areas, Stormwater, and Clearing and Grading Proposed Ordinances \(February 2004\).](#) The SMP regulations also rely on the permitted uses established under K.C.C. Chapter 21A.08 as a starting point for regulating uses in the shorelines. The shoreline regulations supplement those standards by further conditioning allowed uses depending on the shoreline environment.

Adoption of the SMP will bring King County's 30-year-old policies and regulations up to date and result in improved protection for this fragile resource.

7. Chapter Six—Parks, Open Space and Cultural Resources

7.1 Proposal

- Reorganization of text and policies to acknowledge that local parks are part of King County's Regional Open Space System
- Strengthens emphasis in existing policies on the benefits to public health the County's open space system engenders
- Reorganization of Cultural Resources subpart of chapter to acknowledge unique role King County has 4Culture play in implementing policies
- More policy emphasis on relationships with other entities to foster cultural resources policies

7.2 Background

Protecting and enhancing King County's environment and quality of life through the stewardship and enhancement of its open space system of parks, trails, natural areas and working resource lands along with its valued cultural resources continues to be the central focus of this chapter. Furthering the regional trail system will be guided by the Regional Trails Needs Project map and corresponding project list found in the chapter. The chapter acknowledges the broad and growing support for the County's backcountry trails.

7.3 Analysis

The policies in this chapter provide the basis to develop a contiguous and functional open space system, connecting and including active and passive parks, trails, natural areas and forest resource lands. The components of this system contribute to the physical, mental and emotional well-being of County residents.

The 2012 Comprehensive Plan update recognizes that cultural resource management crosses jurisdictional boundaries and involves countless public and private players throughout the region. The proposed Plan update also recognizes that the range and complexity of cultural activity in the region requires coordination and cooperation since many municipalities do not have sufficient resources to administer an historic preservation program. As a result, the proposed Plan update calls for comprehensive and coordinated protection of significant historic properties to ensure that King County's history is preserved.

No significant change in policy direction is proposed for parks, cultural resources or historic preservation.

8. Regional Trail Needs Report Summary

8.1 Proposal

The proposal lists existing and future regional trail projects in unincorporated King County. The future trail projects are prioritized and their costs are estimated.

8.2 Background

These future trail projects and cost estimates are prioritized for future consideration by the King County Executive and the King County Council when Capital Improvement Projects are evaluated in the context of future budget decisions. The public review process for the King County Comprehensive Plan provides an opportunity for the public to become informed and comment on the trail projects and priorities.

8.3 Analysis

Inclusion of the Regional Trails Needs Report in the King County Comprehensive Plan creates a link between King County land use planning and planning for future park service for unincorporated King County. The prioritization process is intended to inform future budget decisions.

9. Chapter Seven—Transportation

9.1 Proposal

- Revises policies to support maximizing efficiency and effectiveness of the current transportation system given funding shortfalls
- Adds new policies supporting equity and social justice in transportation
- Adds new policy supporting disaster relief protection for the transportation system, where feasible
- Adds new policies clarifying urban and rural transportation responsibilities
- Adds new policies replacing “urban connectors” with “rural regional corridors,” high-volume primary arterials that travel through rural areas but primarily serve and connect urban areas, and establishing conditions for improving these roads
- Adds new policy to protect airports in the unincorporated area from encroachment by incompatible development
- Adds new policy in support of annexing to cities of county road segments, or “islands,” that are surrounded entirely by cities

- Revises non-motorized policies to clarify the County’s role given funding constraints, commitment to preserving rural character and seeking grants for non-motorized projects
- Adds new policy supporting safe access to schools for bicyclists and pedestrians
- Adds new policy providing guidance for equestrian travel investments
- Adds new policy supporting Puget Sound Regional Council’s regional bicycle network planning efforts
- Adds new policy encouraging road designs that discourage cut-through traffic in neighborhoods
- Updates policies supporting funding partnerships and regional funding
- Adds new policies supporting preservation of identified Heritage Corridors
- Adds new policy providing that King County airports shall be good neighbors

9.2 Background

This chapter sets the policy framework that guides efficient provision of vital transportation infrastructure and services that support a vibrant economy, thriving communities, and the County’s participation in critical regional transportation issues. The chapter reflects the goals of the KCSP and the priorities established in the strategic plans for public transportation and road services. It also reflects the County’s continuing transition to becoming a road service provider for a primarily rural road system, and speaks to the challenges of providing transportation services and infrastructure in a time of growing need and severely constrained financial resources.

The chapter promotes an integrated, multimodal transportation system that provides mobility options for a wide range of users, including historically disadvantaged populations. It also emphasizes safety, options for healthful transportation choices, and support for GHG emissions reduction goals. Additional policy focus is provided on maintaining and preserving existing services and infrastructure, implementing clear service priorities and guidelines, using transportation resources wisely and efficiently, and developing sustainable funding sources to support the level of services needed by communities.

9.3 Analysis

The following summarizes County priorities for responding to policy direction established and articulated in the KCSP, the King County Comprehensive Plan, County transportation agencies’ functional plans, and the associated state and regional laws and planning requirements:

- Coordinate and develop multimodal services and facilities for an integrated and seamless regional and local transportation system;

- Deliver transportation services that support density and growth in the urban area, and meet the transportation needs of rural areas without creating additional growth pressure;
- Maintain and preserve infrastructure that facilitates the efficient movement of freight and goods to support economic vitality and regional trade;
- Maintain safe and secure County-owned infrastructure, including roads, bridges, buses and transit facilities, and airport facilities;
- Provide transportation choices and support travel modes that use less energy, produce fewer pollutants and reduce greenhouse gases in the region;
- Provide opportunities for people to make active transportation choices by increasing the convenience, accessibility, and comfort of taking transit, walking and bicycling;
- Address the transportation needs of people of color, low-income communities, people with limited English proficiency, and others who may have limited transportation options;
- Identify and adapt to the impacts of climate change on transportation infrastructure and services;
- Incorporate sustainable development practices into the design, construction and operation of infrastructure and facilities;
- Establish and implement clear transportation service priorities and guidelines and use transportation resources wisely and efficiently;
- Develop sustainable funding sources to support the level of services needed by communities; and
- Monitor and measure system performance and use this feedback to continuously improve transportation products and services.

The current and projected economic climate, however, places severe constraints on the County's ability to meet these important goals. The strategic plans for both the Metro Transit and Road Services Divisions identify priorities, analyze available funding and constraints, and set targets to help reach these goals.

The transportation policies support the County land use strategy, which seeks to concentrate development and services in urban areas, conserve and enhance rural areas, and create communities that have a positive effect on public health and climate change. One focus of this section is on issues related to the County's responsibilities in the

unincorporated area, including Level of Service (LOS) standards for County roads, transportation concurrency management, mitigation of growth-related impacts, avoidance of road expansion in rural areas, prevention of airport/land use conflicts, and support for nonmotorized transportation options. Another focus is on County transportation activities that affect a broader region, notably the four-county region's policy of concentrating development in more densely populated urban areas. King County Metro operates a majority of the transit service in the region and provides transportation demand management services to cities and employers. Consequently, the region's success in achieving its development goals will depend to a great extent on King County's ability to provide appropriate transit services within King County.

King County has a structural funding deficit that continues to severely impact the County's ability to provide basic preservation and maintenance of its aging and declining road system. Therefore, as revenue available to manage the road system fluctuates, so will the County's ability to maintain and preserve its roads and bridges. If sufficient revenue is not available to sustain the road system, then infrastructure may be downgraded or closed. The County's focus then will remain on those priorities in the Strategic Plan for Road Services (SPRS) to guide these critical decisions. SPRS also prioritizes funding of services and projects, including both the type of activities and the location of investments. The SPRS lays out the priority for the Road Services Division (RSD) funding decisions in the following order:

1. Regulatory compliance;
2. Safety, narrowly defined as actions to address immediate operational hazards and projects to improve identified collision locations;
3. Maintenance and preservation of existing facilities;
4. Mobility improvements; and
5. Capacity improvements.

Based on the SPRS, King County has implemented a graduated service level framework. Priority will be given to keep the most vital components of the road system operational for users. This approach guides service provision under limited funding scenarios and also helps direct investments toward the most critical needs when additional resources are available. Performance measurement and reporting is also an important aspect of SPRS and a critical tool in managing the County's road system.

To improve efficiency and productivity, starting in 2013, King County will be implementing a data driven asset management approach that, combined with the policy direction in this Comprehensive Plan and the SPRS, will guide investment choices over the next biennium and beyond.

RSD's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Financial Plan must be consistent with this Comprehensive Plan and consider the current performance of the transportation

system, concurrency needs of planned developments, priority projects, phased implementation of improvements, and other related factors. Revenues from a range of sources, including grants and Mitigation Payment System fees, are programmed to appropriate projects.

10. Chapter Eight—Services, Facilities and Utilities

10.1 Proposal

- Inclusion of policies and text regarding placement of affordable housing countywide
- Inclusion of policy on County’s role during disaster regarding housing
- New policy encouraging regional partners to use sustainable development practices
- Inclusion of existing and new text, as well as moving policies from Chapter 2, Urban Communities, on use of sustainable development in County infrastructure projects
- Revisions to policies to use LEED certification as benchmark for County infrastructure projects
- Revisions to potable water systems policies to clarify role of County (a) has under the GMA; and (b) as a local government providing policy guidance for water supply issues in the unincorporated areas
- Amending policy limiting the use of sewers for schools within the RA (Rural Area) zone

10.2 Background

This chapter guides service provision in King County recognizing the different service levels within the Urban Growth Area and in the Rural Area. The GMA requires coordinated planning so that the services required by new residents and their homes and businesses are available as growth occurs. This chapter addresses a wide range of facilities and services provided by the County consistent with specific operational plans such as the Flood Plan and the Energy Plan and recognizing that the County is both a regional and a local service provider. The chapter also clarifies County’s intent regarding water supply planning.

10.3 Analysis

King County government is a regional and local service provider. Types of regional services provided include transit, wastewater treatment, regional human services, and solid waste management. Local services provided to citizens of unincorporated urban King County and the Rural Area includes police, building permits, and health and human services. As annexations and incorporations of unincorporated urban areas continue, King County government will focus more on its role as the provider of regional services

and protector of the County's Rural Area and Resource Lands. The 2012 Comprehensive Plan continues this approach.

Policies guiding the provision of water and sewer service to unincorporated King County have been updated and refined, with no fundamental or environmentally significant changes. An extended effort was made to address the concerns of water districts, and the 2012 Comprehensive Plan update reflects this successful effort.

King County protects water quality and public health in the central Puget Sound region by providing high quality and effective treatment to wastewater collected from 34 local sewer utilities. The County's Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) serves about 1.5 million people within a 420-square-mile service area, which includes most urban areas of King County and parts of south Snohomish County and northeast Pierce County. In addition to treating wastewater, King County also creates resources such as energy, reclaimed water and biosolids from byproducts of the treatment process. Comprehensive Plan policies continue to guide the provision of these services. None of the proposed Plan amendments will significantly change the delivery of these services.

11. Chapter Nine—Economic Development

11.1 Proposal

- Policy moved from Chapter 6, Parks, Open Space and Cultural Resources, that recognizes link between preserving cultural resources and economic vitality in King County
- Emphasis in policy of encouraging home grown companies
- Renewed policy emphasis on fostering job growth
- Acknowledgement of benefits of historic preservation and economic development
- Renewed emphasis on international trade policy
- Renewed emphasis to preserve industrial and commercial land and uses
- Acknowledges the evolving nature of the rural economy and calls for the provision of annual reports to the Council outlining the progress towards implementing the Rural Economic Strategies
- New chapter subpart, including text and policies, to encourage sustainable development in the private sector

11.2 Background

This chapter supports the County's long-term commitment to a prosperous, diverse, and sustainable economy by promoting public programs and actions that create the foundation for a successful economy whether within the Urban Growth Area or in the Rural Area. A successful economy is one in which the private, nonprofit, and public

sectors can thrive and create jobs compatible with the environment. King County understands that a successful economy contributes to a strong and stable tax base and a high quality of life for all residents. This chapter recognizes businesses and the workforce as customers of an economic development system and supports actions and programs that promote the strength and health of both groups.

11.3 Analysis

The policies in this chapter are designed to continue King County's long-term commitment to a prosperous, diverse, and sustainable economy. They do so by promoting public programs and actions that support a successful economy, one in which the private, nonprofit, and public sectors can thrive and create jobs, is compatible with the environment, and contributes to a strong and stable tax base and a high quality of life for all residents.

The policies also recognize businesses and the workforce as customers of an economic development system; and they support actions and programs that promote the strength and health of both groups.

King County partners with businesses, economic development organizations, and other jurisdictions in efforts to grow our economy to ensure the elements for a prosperous and successful economy are provided. The County also provides infrastructure, business, and workforce development products and services as part of its regional responsibilities; and it makes many other contributions to sustain the quality of life that makes the region a desirable place to live and work.

King County provides programs and participates in partnerships to address the ongoing workforce challenges of the Puget Sound region and within the County. The current economic climate has created an even greater need to ensure access by all residents to information about local workforce development programs, to work with employers in skills training and worker retention, and recognize the importance of worker training and retraining to provide the skilled workers needed by industry today. While traditionally, many low-income people have difficulties gaining access to quality education, training, and support services needed to prepare them for the world of work, many displaced workers also need access to retraining opportunities to obtain employment. Meeting these challenges successfully will require the County to continue and strengthen strategies and working relationships between business, government, labor, advocacy organizations, education and training institutions, and human service providers.

12. **Chapter Ten—Community Plans**

12.1 Proposal

- **Northshore** – Deletes outdated policies related to: (1) work programs or processes that have been completed and (2) areas that are no longer under County jurisdiction (i.e. located within cities).

- **Snoqualmie** – Deletes outdated policies related to work programs or processes that have been completed. Amends and adds new policies relating to the development of sewage treatment systems within the business district of the Rural Town of Fall City. (NOTE: There are revisions to Fall City Subarea Plan policies that parallel the policy changes for the Fall City business district.)
- **Soos Creek** – Corrects name references in a policy relating to Pacific Raceways.
- **Vashon** – Adds new policies related to watershed planning, specifically focusing on the need for measurement, monitoring and reporting of groundwater quality and quantity to protect the sole-source aquifer on Vashon and Maury Islands.

12.2 Background

King County's community plans (except for the Vashon Town Plan, West Hill, and White Center) are no longer in effect as separately adopted plans. In many cases, however, the plans contain valuable historical information about King County's communities and often provide background for the land uses in effect today. Policies from the community plans were retained as part of the Comprehensive Plan to recognize the unique characteristics of each community and to provide historical context.

12.3 Analysis

The Fall City subarea plan proposes to uncouple two important policy issues linked in both the Snoqualmie Community Plan and the 1999 Fall City Subarea plan: the future construction of an alternative wastewater system and the ability of potentially zoned properties within downtown Fall City to actuate their potential commercial zoning. The subarea plan proposes to actuate the potential commercial zoning and allow property owners to seek Health Department approval of their on-site septic systems. The subarea plan also strongly encourages the downtown business community and King County to find a long-term solution to the wastewater disposal issue for Fall City.

No other significant changes in policy are proposed for the community plan policies included in the 2012 King County Comprehensive Plan update.

13. **Chapter Eleven--Implementation**

13.1 Proposal

Inclusion of policies previously in Chapter 2, Regional Planning that guide future proposed changes to the King County Comprehensive Plan are now included in this chapter.

13.2 Background

The Comprehensive Plan policies, development regulations and CPP framework have been adopted to achieve the objectives of growth management. This chapter describes

the County's process for amending the Comprehensive Plan and outlines and distinguishes the annual cycle and the four-year-cycle amendments. This chapter further explains the relationship between planning and zoning.

13.3 Analysis

There have been no significant policy changes proposed for this chapter.

14. Transportation Needs Report Summary

14.1 Proposal

The proposal lists existing and future transportation projects in unincorporated King County. The future transportation projects are prioritized and their costs are estimated.

14.2 Background

These future transportation projects and cost estimates are prioritized for future consideration by the King County Executive and the King County Council when Capital Improvement Projects are evaluated in the context of future budget decisions. The public review process for the King County Comprehensive Plan provides an opportunity for the public to become informed and comment on these transportation projects and priorities.

14.3 Analysis

Inclusion of the Transportation Needs Report in the King County Comprehensive Plan creates a link between King County land use planning and planning for future road and transit service for unincorporated King County. The prioritization process is intended to inform future budget decisions.

Map Amendments

Map Amendment 1: West Hill Renton Ave @ 76th Ave S.

Proposal

The owner of parcel number 7580200440 filed a docket request to change the land use designation of this parcel from Urban Residential, 4-12 homes per acre to a commercial designation, and to include the subject property within the West Hill Community Business Center. This request also calls for the existing R-6-P zoning to be changed to commercial zoning.

Background

This parcel is adjacent to the existing commercial center. The subject property is developed with a commercial structure that is attached to and may be part of the laundry

business on adjacent parcel 7580200435. There is also a driveway and old garage on the site. The adjacent residential properties to the east are all developed with single family residences, consistent with their R-6-P zoning. Directly south of the subject property is a parcel zoned R-24 that is developed with multifamily residences. To the west is a laundry establishment that shares a common wall with the office on the subject property. Further to the west, on the corner of Renton Ave. S. and 76th Ave S., are an insurance office and its parking lot.

Analysis

The subject property appears to already be in commercial use as a parking lot for the adjacent business. This proposal raises no significant policy issues.

Map Amendment 2: Reserve Silica

Proposal

The original docketed proposal is to designate 322 acres of the subject property Rural with RA-10 zoning and continue the Forest designation and zoning for the remaining 80 acres. Subsequently, the applicant included the 80 acres in Forestry to the proposal for RA10 zoning, one home per 10 acres. The Executive proposal is to rezone the property to Forest and include the property within the Forest Production District.

Background

Existing Comprehensive Plan policy calls for redesignation of depleted mining sites to a land use and zoning classification compatible with surrounding properties, and for reclamation of the mining site. The property owner indicates the resource on the site – silica/sand - has been removed to the extent practical, and mining operations are being completed. There is an approved reclamation plan for this property and reclamation is underway.

Analysis

Residential development on the subject property could result in conflicts with adjacent forestry and mining activity. Clustered residential development with a conservation easement on the remainder of this property would not fully mitigate a likely conflict between residential development and resource-related activities. New residents may complain about the noise and other impacts from nearby mining or forestry activities. Resource operators may complain about increased traffic from new homes. Residential development adjacent to the Forest Production District (FPD) may also bring pressure to bear on other resource-designated properties for residential development. Including the property within the Forest Production District with Forest zoning would significantly reduce or eliminate conflicts with nearby resource uses.

Map Amendment 3: Taylor Mountain

Proposal

To reevaluate the zoning designation for the following parcels owned by King County: 3223079027, 3223079021, 3323079009, 3323079005, 3223079001, 3223079014, 3223079011, and 0522079001. The goal of the zoning proposal is to change the existing rural zoning to Forest zoning, and to include the subject property within the FPD.

Background

The study area is part of Taylor Mountain Forest, which is owned and managed by King County Parks. When the property was acquired by King County, about one third of the property was zoned F, Forest, and the remaining two thirds, which is the study area, was zoned RA, Rural Area. After King County purchased the property, the entire site was designated Open Space, but the two different zoning designations remained in place.

Analysis

The study area is adjacent to the FPD and is being managed for forestry. It is encumbered by a forest conservation easement and is subject to a forest stewardship plan.

The purpose of the FPD is to prevent intrusion of incompatible uses, manage adjacent land uses to minimize land use conflicts, and prevent or discourage conversion to non-forestry uses. Inclusion of the study area within the FPD is consistent with applicable King County Comprehensive Plan Policies R-606 and R-621.

Changing the zoning for the study area to F, Forest zoning, reflects the ongoing use of the site as a working forest, and makes the zoning the same across the site.

The entire Taylor Mountain Forest is designated Open Space land use, as are other properties owned by King County Parks that are in the Forest Production District.

Map Amendment 4: Soaring Eagle Park

Proposal

This is a proposal to change the land use designation and zoning for a 29.9-acre parcel (tax lot # 3625069023) that is part of the 600-acre Soaring Eagle Park. The purpose of the land use change is to include this 29.9 acre portion of soaring Eagle Park within the Urban Growth Area and Potential Annexation Area of the City of Sammamish. This will allow the City to annex the subject property and develop it with an active recreation city park.

Background

The ownership of this property has been transferred from King County to the City of Sammamish. There will be an interlocal agreement related to this park transfer that will call for this property to be kept in park use in perpetuity.

Analysis

This is not request for additional development capacity and there is no justification for redesignating this study area as Urban based on a need for additional residential development capacity. There is sufficient development capacity within the existing Urban Growth Area.

In this case a public benefit, a city park, will result by adding the study area to the Urban Area. There will be no added development capacity as a result of this amendment. The Urban designation allows municipal annexation and extension of public sewers to the park to serve the restrooms.

Map Amendment 5: Snoqualmie Mining Site

Proposal

The City of Snoqualmie submitted a 2011 docket request to remove a portion of parcel 2024089017 as shown on the attached land use map, and parcel 2024089020 from the Snoqualmie Rural City Urban Growth Area.

Background

These properties contain a long-term mining operation. The city submitted written evidence that the property owner, Weyerhaeuser, supported removing this site from the UGA.

Analysis

Comprehensive Plan policy R-510 calls for land designated Rural City Urban Growth Area to be planned and developed with urban uses, not mining activity. The Comprehensive Plan land use map designates the portion of the mining operation on the subject property that is outside and adjacent to the Rural City UGA as Mining, but shows a portion of the mining operation within the Rural City UGA.

In their docket request, the City of Snoqualmie points out that “these (mining) parcels should remain in King County jurisdiction and be classified as mineral resource lands

that are not already characterized by urban growth and have long-term significance for the extraction of minerals under RCW 36.70A.170”.

Consistent with Comprehensive Plan policy R-676, the subject property is proposed to be identified as a mining site, and to be removed from both the Rural City UGA and the Potential Annexation Area of the City of Snoqualmie.

Map Amendment 6: Pacific Raceway

Proposal

The King County Council included the following directions in the scope of work for the 2012 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan:

Conduct an area zoning study of parcels 1021059002, 1021059008 and 0321059190 as follows:

- (1) Establish a conservation easement that averages at least 300 feet from the ordinary high watermark along the east side of Little Soos Creek. In establishing the conservation easement, ensure that areas of high ecological value are given special consideration;
- (2) If necessary, modify the underlying zoning in the area of the conservation easement to be consistent with the purposes of the easement;
- (3) Consider rezoning of a small portion of northwest corner of parcel 102105-9002 from RA-5 to Industrial- consistent with conservation easement along the Little Soos Creek and consistent with the Industrial zoning on the rest of the parcel; and
- (4) Consider rezoning parcel 032105-9190 from RA-5 to Industrial, if necessary to allow for an ingress and egress easement to access parcel 102105-9002.

The area zoning study is limited in scope to the issues listed above, so all other issues related to the operation and potential future redevelopment of the Pacific Raceway operation are beyond the scope of this study.

Background

A 300’ buffer for Little Soos Creek, protected by a conservation easement, was discussed during deliberations about the 2000 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan. The conservation easement was not formally required by King County and was not dedicated by the property owner at that time.

Analysis

This analysis is focused on three key areas – the site’s high ecological value, protecting water quality, and the width of the recommended conservation easement.

I. High Ecological Value

The site has known for probable presence of Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitats and Priority Species (PHS). The Priority Habitats and Species List is a catalog of habitats and species considered to be priorities for conservation and management. The following are the types of Priority Habitat and Species that may be found on this site:

Terrestrial habitat

Biodiversity Areas and Corridors – This site contains biologically diverse areas and corridors that contain habitat that is relatively important to various species of native fish and wildlife. Soosette Creek ravine is part of the larger Big Soos Creek watershed which is a critical habitat for Chinook and a major producer of Chinook both natural and hatchery-raised in King County (Gino Lucchetti, personal communication Nov. 14, 2011). In addition, the Soosette ravine is relatively undisturbed to the top of the steep slope and the vegetation is structurally diverse including mature and significant trees.

Mature Forest habitat – The wetland report prepared by Sewall Wetland Consulting, Inc. March 14, 2008, (Sewall Report) documented mature forest habitat on this site as part of the Washington State Department of Ecology Wetland Rating forms. In addition to mature forest habitat, many of the trees on site would certainly meet the definition of “significant tree” as defined in K.C.C. 21A.06.1167.

Riparian habitat – This is the area adjacent to flowing or standing freshwater aquatic systems. Riparian habitat encompasses the area beginning at the ordinary high water mark and extends to that portion of the terrestrial landscape that is influenced by, or that directly influences, the aquatic ecosystem. Riparian habitat includes the entire extent of the floodplain and riparian areas of wetlands that are directly connected to stream courses or other fresh water bodies. Soosette Creek contains high quality riparian habitat including five known wetlands and a tributary Type N stream identified in the Sewall Report. There are numerous seeps located on the slopes that are a source of water for the stream, and mature, multi-layered riparian vegetation is present.

Aquatic habitat

Freshwater wetlands – Wetlands were documented in the Sewall Report. At this time, these wetlands have not been verified by King County. It is unknown if there are additional wetlands on site.

Instream habitat – Soosette Creek’s instream habitat was the subject of an extensive restoration project implemented by King County following a major debris slide in this ravine, in the mid-1990s. Restoration included adding large woody debris and installing a wide range of native plantings.

Priority Species

Fish - The site is well documented by the WDFW Salmonscape database with the presence of endangered fish species. The database shows presence of winter steelhead (ESA listed as "threatened") and Coho salmon (species of concern). Cutthroat trout (species of concern) were documented by King County (Gino Lucchetti, Nov. 14, 2011, personal communication). Soosette Creek feeds into Soos Creek which is critical habitat for Chinook and as mentioned above, is major producer of Chinook, both natural and hatchery-raised in King County.

Wildlife – The WDFW PHS list does not document any bird nests on or near the site. The area is known to be used by eagles, hawks and herons. However, a wildlife study to look at potential habitat and nest sites would need to be conducted to confirm the presence of priority species and/or their nests.

Critical Areas

Pursuant to K.C.C. 21A.24 and the Sewall Report, the site has been identified as having the critical areas described below.

Wetlands and their buffers – Five wetlands in the Sewall Report were delineated and rated using the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) Wetlands Rating System for Western Washington. It is important to note that four of the five wetlands were rated Category III and received a very high habitat score of 32 points out of a total of 36 points. The total wetland rating score was 49 points. This is just 2 points short of a Category II wetland. The Critical Areas Code has changed since the report was prepared. Although buffer widths have not changed for Category III wetlands, buffers for Category II wetlands with 32 habitat points have increased from 150 feet to 330 feet. Buffers are measured perpendicular from the edge of the wetland. However, since the wetland buffer includes a steep slope and landslide hazard area, the greater of the two buffers would apply. In this case, the wetland buffer would extend to the top of the landslide hazard area (K.C.C. 21A.24.325.D.2). It is unknown whether there are wetlands on the slope that would have buffers that would extend beyond the top of the steep slope hazard area. Another unknown is whether the five wetlands in the Sewall Report or any other unidentified wetlands meet the criteria for a wetland complex pursuant to K.C.C.21A.06.1392. These large wetland buffers and potential wetland complexes add to the high habitat value of the site. To reiterate, wetlands on this site have not been verified by King County.

Aquatic Areas and their buffers – The predominant mapped stream on site is a Type F stream which has a buffer width of 165 feet (K.C.C. 21A.24.358.B), measured from the edge of the ordinary high water mark. However, since the stream buffer includes a steep slope and landslide hazard area, the greater or the two buffers would apply, and, in this

case, the stream buffer would extend to the top of the slope/hazard area (K.C.C. 21A.24.358.A.3). These large aquatic area buffers contribute to the high habitat value of the site. There are at least a few small channels, probably starting as seeps or wetlands on the slopes, which flow down the ravine slopes. The Sewall Report identified one Type N stream located between two of the delineated wetlands that drained directly into Soosette Creek.

Steep slopes/landslide hazard and their buffers – The site is mapped with steep slopes and landslide hazard. These slopes have a standard 50-foot buffer measured from the top of slope (K.C.C. 21A.24.310B) as does the landslide hazard area (K.C.C. 21A.24.280B). These slopes are geologically unstable. Protecting the slopes and their buffers is crucial to controlling erosion and fine sediments entering the stream, maintaining clean stable base flows in the stream, and minimizing water quality problems downstream.

Nests – As stated above, the area is known to be used by eagles, hawks and herons. However, a habitat study is required to determine potential nest trees on site. A wildlife study would need to be conducted during the breeding season to determine the presence of priority species and/or their active nests. K.C.C. 21A.24.382 protects certain nests with wildlife habitat conservation areas around each nest.

II. Protecting Water Quality

The Soos Creek basin is an extensive system of interacting lakes, wetlands and infiltrating soils that collectively attenuate peak stream flows. Soosette Creek is one of four main tributaries to Soos Creek.

Water quality issues such as pollutants such as fecal coliform and water temperatures have been well documented in Soosette Creek. The DOE has determined that Soosette Creek is polluted and placed it on a list of impaired water bodies known as the 303(d) list. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act establishes a process to identify and clean up polluted waters. Water bodies are divided into five categories. A Category 1 meets the standards for clean water, where a Category 5 is polluted and requires a pollution control plan. Soosette Creek was given a Water Quality Assessment of Category 5, meaning that water quality standards have been violated for one or more pollutants, and there are no total maximum daily loads (TMDL) or pollution control in place.

Soos Creek was considered a “4Class A” water body under the DOE’s State Standard water quality rules in 1997. It is categorized as “Core Salmon Migration and Rearing Habitat” for aquatic life use and “Primary Contact” for recreational use under DOE’s State Standard 2003 water quality rules. Soos Creek is also on the 2004 DOE 303(d) list for violation of dissolved oxygen and fecal coliform bacteria standards.

Given the 303(d) listing of Soosette Creek and the Class A rating of Soos Creek, protecting the Soosette ravine will protect the natural processes that contribute to the overall water quality of Soosette Creek and the greater Soos Creek Watershed. Given this site’s steep, unstable ravine topography, a particular water quality and habitat

concern is protecting against excessive erosion and sedimentation that would increase turbidity and fine sediments as well as degrade salmon spawning and rearing habitat.

III. Recommended Conservation Easement Width

Based on the high ecological values and water quality issues documented above, the following conservation easement is recommended:

- a. A conservation easement that extends to 50 feet beyond the top of the steep slope and landslide hazard area on both sides of Soosette Creek (see Appendix 2);
- b. In areas where the top of slope/landslide area and the 50-foot area that extends beyond the top of the steep slope is less than 300 feet from the ordinary high water mark of the Soosette Creek, the conservation easement will extend no less than 300 feet from the ordinary high water mark (see Appendix 2); and
- c. Revegetation of currently disturbed areas with native tree and shrub species will be required. These areas could include the dirt bike trail located on the steep slope and other areas in the steep slope/landslide hazard area or the 50-foot area that extends beyond the steep slope that are determined to be disturbed. These areas will be field located once the easement is established.

Please note that the recommended conservation easement overlaps with the existing areas already protected by the Critical Areas Ordinance. This analysis was peer reviewed by Environmental Scientists at King County Departments of Permitting and Environmental Review and Natural Resources and Parks.

To Determine the Location of the Easement in the Field:

1. Flag and survey the top of the highest steep slope on the east side of Soosette Creek and prepare a map showing the steep slope and its 50-foot buffer. Everything on the west side of the stream is mapped landslide hazard. Since the area is all critical area of one kind or another, the easement will extend to the property line on the west side of Soosette Creek.
2. In the north portion of parcels 1021059002 and 0591900321, where a 300-foot buffer measured from the ordinary high water mark may extend past the top of the steep slope/landslide hazard area and its buffer, survey the 300-foot buffer and survey the top of slope. Prepare a map overlay of the 300-foot buffer easement, the top of slope and 50-foot steep slope buffer.

Future development adjacent to or on these parcels will require critical areas studies and could include but not be limited to:

A wetland /stream study within 330 feet of the top of the steep slope on the east side of Soosette Creek. Any wetlands identified in this area should be delineated, rated,

surveyed and mapped. Any streams identified in this area should be flagged, rated, surveyed, and mapped per K.C.C. 21A.24. As noted earlier, buffer widths for Category II wetlands have increased per K.C.C. 21A.24 for wetlands rated as having high habitat function. If the wetlands on this site are determined to be Category II with high habitat value, buffers could be as large as 330 feet. Therefore, it is important to identify wetlands within 330 feet of top of slope, in the event the buffers extend beyond the top of the hazard area; and

A wildlife habitat assessment to determine the potential nest trees on the east side of Soosette Creek.

Map Amendment 7: Fall City Subarea Plan

Proposal

Key recommendations of the proposed subarea plan are to establish a downtown Fall City commercial district with a list of permitted and conditional uses that differ from the permitted use table in the King County Zoning Code. This downtown district is proposed to be established by means of a Special District Overlay (SDO).

Additionally, the existing requirement of Policy L-4 of the 1999 Fall City Subarea Plan that all future commercial rezones be denied until a sewer system or alternative wastewater disposal is in place is proposed to be modified to allow future commercial development subject to approval of a wastewater disposal method by the Seattle-King County Department of Health.

Background

On January 31, 2011, King County conducted a community meeting to determine whether there was interest and need to update the 1999 Fall City Subarea Plan. This meeting was attended by about 100 people, who expressed many concerns about land use and zoning and the need for an alternative method of waste disposal for the downtown business district, and the strong concern that the existing residential areas within Fall City should not be forced to hook up to a future sewer system. County staff encouraged the community to continue to meet and develop recommendations for King County consideration during the 2012 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.

Analysis

To address concerns raised by Fall City business owners that similar properties in the downtown area are designated with different zoning, and that existing development conditions are antiquated, and that the boundaries of downtown Fall City are not clearly mapped, an SDO is proposed to address these issues.

All property within downtown Fall City is recommended to be zoned Community Business and included within this SDO (CB-SO zoning designation). This SDO includes

a list of permitted and conditional uses for all property within the SDO, replacing the permitted use table in King County Code Chapter 21A.08. Design standards for new construction are also required. All other provisions of King County Code Chapter 21A continue to apply to properties within the SDO.

The unique list of permitted and conditional uses proposed for downtown Fall City may serve as a model for other Rural Towns and perhaps the larger Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers in King County.

Policy L-4 of the 1999 Fall City Subarea Plan and the corresponding policy CP-937 from the community plan chapter of the King County Comprehensive Plan link future commercial rezones to the existence of an alternative wastewater disposal system or a sewer system. Since neither has been put in place, all commercial docket requests have been denied and all properties with existing potential commercial zoning have been unable to activate and use their potential commercial zoning. The proposed action recommends uncoupling the requirement for a new wastewater method from the ability to request commercial zoning within the Fall City downtown commercial district. This will allow property owners who are able to get Health Department approval for their on-site waste disposal system to develop their property consistent with zoning.

The proposed Fall City subarea plan calls for either an alternative wastewater disposal method or a self-contained sewer system designed to only serve the downtown commercial area. No cost of the downtown waste disposal system or self-contained sewer system shall be borne by the residential properties of Fall City. It is also significant to note that only a self-contained sewer system is proposed – no direct connection to the Metro sewer system is proposed. A direct connection to the Metro system, even by a tightline connection, would have significant growth management implications for the surrounding Rural Area, since there is no direct Metro sewer service (i.e. an extension of trunk sewer lines) within the Snoqualmie Valley at this time and no such service is envisioned by the King County Comprehensive Plan in the foreseeable future.

Map Amendment 8: Department of Transportation Technical Corrections to the Urban Growth Area Boundary

Proposal

The King County Department of Transportation has identified 12 segments of King County road right of way that are not correctly designated on the King County Comprehensive Plan land use map for the purposes of efficient future road maintenance. In 8 cases, the right of way segment should be included within the UGA so that the adjacent city, not King County, will have long term maintenance responsibility. In 3 cases, the right of way segment should be included in the Rural Area, so King County continues to have maintenance responsibility. One case involves two segments; one should be designated Rural and the other Urban to clarify maintenance responsibility between King County and the City of Redmond.

Background

This proposal does not affect any private property. The proposal also does not cause or compel annexation of any land.

Analysis

This proposal clarifies future annexation boundaries and creates logical future road maintenance responsibilities. There are no significant policy issues raised by this proposal.

Map Amendment 9: Sammamish Valley UGA

Proposal

On May 10, 2011, the King County Council adopted Motion 13475, which calls for the Executive to conduct an area zoning for two property groups in the Sammamish Valley. These property groups are designated Rural and Agricultural on the King County Comprehensive Plan land use map and are being studied to determine whether any or all should be changed to Urban and added to the UGA for the purpose of annexation by the City of Woodinville and subsequent urban development.

The Executive has agreed to work with the City of Woodinville to make joint recommendations regarding the promotion of the wine and agriculture industries in the greater Woodinville area.

Analysis of the original Woodinville docket request to add several properties to the UGA follows:

Background

One property group is located south of NE 171st Street, west of 140th Place NE. This northern property group has been the subject of two recent area zoning studies, including the most recent 2005 study, which was completed in response to a Growth Management Hearings Board decision. A portion of one parcel and another parcel in this property group are within the Agricultural Production District (APD). All of the remaining property in this group are designated and zoned Rural.

The other property group is located to the south, on the west side of 148th Ave. NE, just north of NE 145th Street. This is a group of three parcels each under 2 acres in size that are designated Rural on the land use map and zoned Agriculture. These parcels are outside and adjacent to the APD, which at this location is developed with Northshore athletic fields. The south margin of parcel 1526059051 abuts the City of Woodinville.

Parcel 1526059056 includes Derby Creek, which is proposed for restoration by King County.

Both property groups are outside of the UGA and both are adjacent to the APD.

Analysis

The City of Woodinville has requested that several properties be added to the UGA without making an argument that the City lacks the development capacity under their existing land use plans and zoning to accommodate the household and employment targets established by the CPPs. Instead, the City states in their 2010 docket request that the northern property group would complement the existing central business district by becoming an institutional gateway developed with medical office buildings. The City states that the southern property group would be added to their existing Tourism District, presumably for the purpose of commercial development.

Countywide Planning Policy FW-1, Step 8 contains the factors by which proposed expansions of the UGA should be evaluated. The City has provided no evidence that there have been reasonable measures undertaken to plan for a gateway to the existing central business district within the existing UGA, or to locate a complex of medical offices elsewhere within the UGA.

The City makes no distinction between the three southern parcels they request be added to their Tourism District, and any other similarly situated rural properties that also abut the Tourism District. Presumably, any rural property that abuts the City's Tourism District would be under increased development pressure if the requested urban land use and zoning is approved. The two southerly parcels are developed with a single family residence, a tractor parts and service business, and several outbuildings. Derby Creek and associated wetlands are located on the northern parcel in the southern property group.

The policy issues addressed in previous studies for the Sammamish Valley APD and the adjacent Rural Area are essentially the same. King County and its taxpayers have invested public funds to extinguish the development rights of many parcels within the APD. Rural Areas have been designated on the eastern perimeter of the APD to buffer the APD from increasing development pressure from Redmond and Woodinville.

Protection of the APD and nearby Rural Areas is a matter of regional importance recognized by both the CPPs and the King County Comprehensive Plan. Loss of any part of the adjacent rural buffer would bring additional pressure to bear on the APD and on other nearby rural properties for urban development.

Map Amendment 10: Snoqualmie Interchange

Proposal

This area zoning study was conducted in response to a docket request for properties along Snoqualmie Parkway at the intersection of SR-18 and I-90. This docket, submitted on behalf of the City of Snoqualmie and the owners of about 85 acres of land immediately north of the SR-18/I-90 intersection, requests an urban land use designation for the interchange area for the purpose of commercial development. Currently these properties are designated as Rural Area and zoned RA-5, one home per five acres.

Snoqualmie and the Executive have agreed to a joint planning process to further evaluate future land use at this interchange. There is a proposed modification of policy and code to allow consideration of land use changes involving the UGA boundary in an annual Comprehensive Plan update.

Analysis of the original docket proposal follows:

Background

North of the study area is the Snoqualmie Ridge development within the City of Snoqualmie. East of the study area are Rural Residential properties with RA-2.5 zoning (Rural Area, one home per 2.5 acres). Interstate 90 is to the south with publicly held land across the interstate highway. The study area is within the Mountains to Sound Greenway, the corridor along I-90 that has been the focus of a major effort to preserve the natural scenic character of this area.

The area between I-90 and the incorporated area of the City of Snoqualmie was identified as an area for future review of long-term land use by King County and the City of Snoqualmie by the 1990 Interlocal Agreement that preceded the Snoqualmie Ridge annexation. This agreement also recognized this study area as the potential gateway to the City of Snoqualmie, but did not commit to a future urban land use designation.

Analysis

The 2012 proposal is very different from an unsuccessful 2008 proposal. Instead of institutional uses such as a hospital or a community college with ancillary commercial development, commercial development is now the primary use that is proposed. There is also no proposal for the use of transfer of development rights and the creation of at least four times as much nearby open space as new urban land that would be created. Instead, the proponents are citing recent amendments to the GMA, which they interpret to allow expansion of the UGA boundary when an individual city conducts a study that determines that there is a shortage of land for commercial, industrial or institutional purposes within their city.

The City of Snoqualmie authorized a consultant study to determine whether such a shortage of available land exists within Snoqualmie, and whether there are reasonable measures that could be undertaken by the City to alleviate any shortfall of land capacity. Since the City's consultant study identified a "leakage" of retail activity by City residents

and no feasible reasonable measures, the City believes an expansion of the UGA boundary should be allowed.

It is important to consider the implications of retail leakage from one city to another as justification to amend the UGA in King County. In this case, Snoqualmie points out it is losing 99% of vehicle purchases and 91% of clothing, shoes, jewelry purchases to other cities. Unanswered is the question: Does the demand exist within Snoqualmie to support an auto row or department store? This case has not been made and probably cannot be made.

Nor has the case been made that Snoqualmie residents' demand for retail services is not being met; only that it is being met outside Snoqualmie. Without an increase in total demand, adding retail capacity in Snoqualmie would therefore produce a zero-sum result where the additional development in Snoqualmie reduces demand currently being met in other areas at no aggregate net gain.

Additionally, what if several cities adjacent to the UGA made similar claims, each basing a request for rural land to be changed to urban because their residents purchase vehicles in Issaquah and shop for clothes at Bellevue Square? If approved, the cumulative result would be a substantial loss of rural land and competing auto rows and department stores in multiple edge cities. A more likely outcome is that highway-oriented commercial development such as fast food, motels and gas stations will locate at the Snoqualmie Interchange should this request be granted.

Map Amendment 11: Duthie Hill Road “Notch”

Proposal

The Duthie Hill Road study area is a ‘notch’ of 20 properties totaling approximately 47 acres north of SE Duthie Hill Road. These properties are adjacent on three sides to the City of Sammamish, with a large contiguous Rural Area to the south, across Duthie Hill Road. The proposed action is to change the land use designation and zoning from Rural Area to Urban for the purpose of annexation and future urban development.

Background

A pond is located on two properties (Tax Parcel Numbers 1224069075 and 1224069054) in the southwest corner of the study area. The pond extends into the incorporated area onto the City of Sammamish owned High Country open area and surface water detention property. A stream leads to the pond from the south. The area around the pond is mapped as a wetland.

Analysis

The City of Sammamish did not submit evidence of insufficient development capacity for future growth within the current city limits or the UGA. No property owner within the

study area has submitted a docket request during the Comprehensive Plan update to request that the area be redesignated as urban and zoned to a higher density.

The development that has occurred within the Duthie Notch is rural in character with low residential density with limited services.

A pond and a surrounding larger wetland take up roughly one-quarter of the study area. Comprehensive Plan policy U-102(d) calls for land in the UGA to be free of environmental constraints. The pond, stream, and wetland make redesignation of the study area to urban inconsistent with this policy. There are no service delivery issues created by maintaining the existing Rural Land use designation. An Urban designation would allow annexation by the City of Sammamish and the extension of public services to serve urban development.

Map Amendment 12: Covington – Jenkins Creek Notch

Proposal

The City of Covington is requesting that the Jenkins Creek Notch, a 272 acre property group that is designated Rural Area by the Comprehensive Plan , be designated Urban for the purpose of annexation and future Urban development.

The 105 properties within the study area are currently zoned RA-5, one home per five acres. A docket request was filed by a property owner for approximately 70 acres within the study area that also proposes a redesignation from Rural Area to commercial use.

Background

The City of Covington identified the Jenkins Creek Notch as a Potential Annexation Area even though the notch is designated Rural by the Comprehensive Plan .

The Jenkins Creek Notch was first created by the Soos Creek Basin Plan in 1990. Recommendation BW1 called for a density of one home per five acres near streams in Locally Significant Resource areas (LSRA). The portion of Jenkins Creek near Covington was specifically addressed by Soos Creek Basin Plan recommendation AS9. Implementing this recommendation for rural densities along stream corridors, the Revised Tahoma/Raven Heights Communities Plan established RA-5 zoning to maintain the one home per five acre density. The 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan continued this density by designating the area Rural Residential with RA-5 zoning.

A new interchange for SR-18 at SE 256th Street was completed within the Jenkins Creek Notch in 2002. This project included mitigation for Jenkins Creek, which was determined to be a salmonid supporting stream with significant wetland habitat. The new interchange did not create any additional access points for the notch from the City of Covington. King County staff did not notice considerable alterations to the neighborhood aside from the interchange itself.

The Little Soos Creek Wetlands Natural Area is in the southwestern corner of the notch on a King County owned property. This natural area is part of the King County managed Ecological Lands system.

The six properties comprising the 70-acre docket request are along SR-18, near the new interchange. The remaining properties in the 272-acre notch are either low density residential or vacant.

Analysis

The area of the Jenkins Creek Notch was originally created by the Soos Creek Basin Plan to protect the creek from the urban development that was occurring in the nearby City of Covington and return it to 1985 level flows. Rural density of one home per five acres was established to protect the streams within the Soos Creek Basin and the Jenkins Creek near Covington specifically. Consistent with the Soos Creek Basin Plan, the Jenkins Creek Notch was first established by the 1991 Revised Tahoma/Raven Heights Community Plan Area Zoning and then by the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan .

No evidence has been submitted by the City of Covington that the City has insufficient development capacity to accommodate the adopted households and jobs growth targets established by the CPPs.

Expanding the UGA into the Rural Area would mean extension of costly urban services. For example, urban density development would require the need for improvements of the roads servicing the area. The Soos Creek Water and Sewer District (SCWSD) would also have to amend their comprehensive sewer plan to reflect service to the entire 272 acre notch, as sewers are required in Urban Areas. Currently, residences in the notch are serviced by private septic systems. Further, allowing commercial development on 70 acres in the notch will bring pressure to bear on the remaining 200 acres to seek similar land use and zoning.

Map Amendment 13 Maple Valley Split Parcel

Proposal

Include a small portion of a parcel split by the UGA boundary within the UGA. The Urban portion of the site is within the City of Maple Valley Potential Annexation Area.

Background

This property is developed with a single family residence and has no future subdivision potential under existing zoning. The City of Maple Valley has not objected to this minor UGA amendment addressing one tax lot.

Analysis

This proposal raises no significant policy issues.

Map Amendment 14 Melki

Proposal

To actualize the existing potential Regional Business (RB) zoning on the subject property without changing the existing Commercial Outside of Center land use designation.

Background

The property currently has Office zoning and is developed with a small business office and a parking lot. There have been complaints about car sales on the subject property. A recent rezone request to actualize the existing potential zoning generated significant public opposition and was denied by the King County Hearing Examiner. Regional Business zoning would allow car sales.

There is a wetland to the south of the existing business office. The subject property is located within the UGA and it is within the Potential Annexation Area (PAA) of the City of Renton.

Analysis

Detailed analysis of the proposal to actualize the existing potential RB zoning is included in the Hearing Examiner's report for rezone file number L08TY403. The proposal also includes limits on allowed uses in the RB zone and a new conservation easement for the adjoining wetland.

The subject property is located within the UGA, but is not served by public sewers. The City of Renton is the sewer service provider for the subject property. Renton did not support of the proposed rezone in the Hearing Examiner process and there is no proposal for this property to be annexed by Renton at this time.

APPENDIX A

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Federal Agencies

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

Tribal Entities

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe
Puyallup Indian Tribe
Tulalip Indian Tribe
Snoqualmie Indian Tribe
Suquamish Indian Tribe

State of Washington

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development
Department of Ecology
Department of Fish and Wildlife
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Transportation

Regional Agencies

Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
Puget Sound Regional Council

King County

Dow Constantine, King County Executive

Bob Ferguson, King County Councilmember
Larry Gossett, Chair, King County Councilmember
Kathy Lambert, King County Councilmember
Larry Phillips, King County Councilmember
Julia Patterson, King County Councilmember
Jane Hague, King County Councilmember
Peter Von Reichbauer, King County Councilmember
Joe McDermott, King County Councilmember
Reagan Dunn, King County Councilmember

Office of the Prosecuting Attorney
Department of Housing and Community Development
Department of Permitting and Environmental Review
Department of Natural Resources and Parks
Department of Transportation / Road Services Division

Organizations

American Planning Association
Center for Environmental Law & Policy
East Lake Washington Audubon
King County Building Trades Council
League of Women Voters of Washington
League of Women Voters, King County South
League of Women Voters, Lake Washington East
League of Women Voters, Seattle
Master Builders of King & Snohomish Counties
Property Rights Alliance
Puget Sound Energy
Puget Sound Transit Consultants
Rainier Audubon Society
Seattle-KC Association of Realtors
Seattle Transportation Choices
Sierra Club
Snoqualmie River Valley Audubon
Suburban Cities Association
University of Washington - Department of Urban Design and Planning
Washington Conservation Voters
Washington Environmental Council
Washington Wilderness Coalition
WASHPIRG

Community Councils

Upper Bear Creek Community Council
Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council
Greater Maple Valley Area Council
North Highline Unincorporated Area Council
Vashon-Maury Island Community Council
West Hill Community Council

Public Review Locations

Algona-Pacific Library
Auburn Library
Bellevue Regional Library

Black Diamond Library
Bothell Regional Library
Boulevard Park Library
Burien Library
Carnation Library
Covington Library
Des Moines Library
Duvall Library
Fairwood Library
Fall City Library
Federal Way Regional Library
Federal Way Library
Foster Library
Issaquah Library
Kenmore Library
Kent Regional Library
King County Library System
Kingsgate Library
Kirkland Library
Lake Forest Park Library
Lake Hills Library
Maple Valley Library
Mercer Island Library
Muckleshoot Library
Newport Way Library
North Bend Library
Redmond Regional Library
Richmond Beach Library
Sammamish Library
Service Center
Shoreline Library
Skykomish Library
Skyway Library
Snoqualmie Library
Tukwila Library
Valley View Library
Vashon Library
White Center Library
Woodinville Library
Woodmont Library

Newspapers

Seattle Times