COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKETING FORM

I. CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOXES

COMP PLAN MAP [x] COMP PLAN TEXT

NOTICE: If the amendment you are applying for is within an URBAN GROWTH AREA or you are proposing a UGA expansion of the Ellensburg, Cle Elum, or Roslyn UGA you are required to docket your item with that City as well. You must contact the appropriate City for filing deadlines, fees, application, and costs.

II. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. APPLICANT'S NAME: American Forest Resources LLC
   MAILING ADDRESS: 700 E. Mountain View Ave, Ste 507
                     Ellensburg, WA 98926

   E-MAIL ADDRESS: 
   BUSINESS PHONE: 
   HOME PHONE: 

B. AGENT'S NAME: Chad Bala, Terra Design Group, Inc.
   MAILING ADDRESS: PO Box 686
                     Cle Elum, WA 98922

   E-MAIL ADDRESS: 
   BUSINESS PHONE: 509-649-3169

III. FOR MAP AMENDMENTS

A. TAX PARCEL NUMBER(S): SEE ATTACHED
   ACREAGE: SEE ATTACHED
   SITE ADDRESS: SEE ATTACHED
   OWNER(S): American Forest Resources LLC
   MAILING ADDRESS: 700 E. Mountain View Ave, Ste 507
                      Ellensburg, WA 98926

   HOME PHONE:  

RECEIVED
JUN 30 2006
KITTITAS COUNTY CDS

411 N. Ruby St., Suite 2, Ellensburg, WA 98926 Phone (509) 962-7506 Fax (509) 962-7682
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX PARCEL NUMBER(S):</th>
<th>ACREAGE:</th>
<th>Portion of Section 01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-15-01000-0001</td>
<td>572.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-16-05000-0009</td>
<td>399.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-16-06000-0003</td>
<td>510.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-16-15000-0001</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-15-27000-0001</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-15-34000-0001</td>
<td>320.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-15-35000-0003</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-16-28000-0001</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-16-29000-0001</td>
<td>638.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-16-33000-0001</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-16-30000-0001</td>
<td>183.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-16-30040-0001</td>
<td>431.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Additional sheets may be attached if more then one parcel is involved)

All information to be addressed to Authorized Agent.

B. EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION: Commercial Forest

C. EXISTING ZONING: Commercial Forest

D. PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION: Rural Land Use

E. PROPOSED ZONING DESIGNATION: Forest & Range-20

F. THE PRESENT USE OF THE PROPERTY IS: Forestry

G. SURROUNDING LAND USE: Rural Residential, Agricultural, Commercial Forest and Forest and Range.

H. SERVICES

Please provide the following information regarding the availability of services.

The site is currently served by sewer _____; septic_____ (check one) None
Sewer purveyor (if on public sewer system):_________________________

The site is currently served by a public water system _____; well______ None
Water purveyor (if on public water system):_________________________

The site is located on a public road see below response private road ________ (check one)

Name of road: Off of Kittitas County Roads, Teanaway Road, North Fork Teanaway Road, West Fork Teanaway Road & Middle Fork Teanaway Road.

Fire District #: ______ 7 ____________________
IV. FOR TEXT AMENDMENTS

Identify the sections of the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance that you are proposing to change and provide the proposed wording (attach additional pages if necessary)

Not applicable

V. FOR ALL AMENDMENTS

A. Why is the amendment needed and being proposed?

In order to preserve the rest of commercial forest lands owned by American Forest Resources, this grants the flexibility for American Forest Resources to continue to preserve a major portion of their land holdings in Commercial Forest lands and the ability to sustain the timber business within Kittitas County.

B. How does the proposed amendment consistent with the County-Wide Planning Policies for Kittitas County?

This proposal is consistent with the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan therefore is consistent with the Kittitas County Wide Planning Policies. Speaking specifically to the County-Wide Planning Policies, the policies speak to development within UGA’s, UGN’s, Major Commercial and Industrial Development within UGA’s, Economic Development and Employment, Siting of Essential Public Facilities, Transportation, Contiguous and Orderly Development within UGA’s, Planned Unit Developments, Analysis of Fiscal Impacts, and Master Planned Resorts. All of which do not apply to this amendment since the locations of this proposal is not within the boundaries of a UGA or UGN.

C. How is the proposed amendment consistent with the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan?

See Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan Goals Policies and Objectives (GPO’s)

GPO 2.131
GPO 2.133
GPO 2.137
GPO 2.140
GPO 2.142
GPO 2.143 (a & b)
D. How have conditions changed that warrant a comprehensive plan amendment?

The major and most influential change that warrants this comprehensive plan amendment is the change in the timber business industry in Eastern Washington, specifically the closure of the Yakima Mill on August 5th, 2006. Since this mill has decided to close it's doors it has drastically increased the costs to American Forest Resources in transporting their main product of Pine wood up to 245 miles depending on the mill location and the acceptance of the product.
With the Yakima Mill shutting down the economic vitality of the logging industry has been limited drastically. Secondly, the area has also seen a drastick increase over the years of residential development up the Teanaway corridor and has been slowly encroaching towards the subject parcels.

VI. SUPPORTING INFORMATION (ATTACH THE FOLLOWING)

A. SITE PLAN OF THE PROPERTY WITH THE FOLLOWING FEATURES: buildings; points of access, ABUTTING roads, and parking areas; septic tank and drainfield and replacement area.

B. Application is hereby made for A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT to authorize the activities described herein. I certify that I am familiar with the information contained in this application, and that to the best of my knowledge and belief such information is true, complete, and accurate. I further certify that I possess the authority to undertake the proposed activities. I hereby grant to the agencies to which this application is made, the right to enter the above-described location to inspect the proposed and or completed work.

Signature of Authorized Agent  
[Signature]

Date  6/30/04

Signature of Land Owner of Record (required for application submittal)  
[Signature]

Date  6/30/06
Parcel #: 20-16-06000-0003
Portion of, South of River.

Assessor's Documents  Treasurer's Documents  District Information

RCW 36.70A.030
Definitions.

Unless the context clearly requires otherwise, the definitions in this section apply throughout this chapter.

(1) "Adopt a comprehensive land use plan" means to enact a new comprehensive land use plan or to update an existing comprehensive land use plan.

(2) "Agricultural land" means land primarily devoted to the commercial production of horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, dairy, apiary, vegetable, or animal products or of berries, grain, hay, straw, turf, seed, Christmas trees not subject to the excise tax imposed by "RCW 84.33.100 through 84.33.140, finfish in upland hatcheries, or livestock, and that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production.

(3) "City" means any city or town, including a code city.

(4) "Comprehensive land use plan," "comprehensive plan," or "plan" means a generalized coordinated land use policy statement of the governing body of a county or city that is adopted pursuant to this chapter.

(5) "Critical areas" include the following areas and ecosystems: (a) Wetlands; (b) areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water; (c) fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas; (d) frequently flooded areas; and (e) geologically hazardous areas.

(6) "Department" means the department of community, trade, and economic development.

(7) "Development regulations" or "regulation" means the controls placed on development or land use activities by a county or city, including, but not limited to, zoning ordinances, critical areas ordinances, shoreline master programs, official controls, planned unit development ordinances, subdivision ordinances, and binding site plan ordinances together with any amendments thereto. A development regulation does not include a decision to approve a project permit application, as defined in RCW 36.70B.020, even though the decision may be expressed in a resolution or ordinance of the legislative body of the county or city.

(8) "Forest land" means land primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on land that can be economically and practically managed for such production, including Christmas trees subject to the excise tax imposed under "RCW 84.33.100 through 84.33.140, and that has long-term commercial significance. In determining whether forest land is primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on land that can be economically and practically managed for such production, the following factors shall be considered: (a) The proximity of the land to urban, suburban, and rural settlements; (b) surrounding parcel size and the compatibility and intensity of adjacent and nearby land uses; (c) long-term local economic conditions that affect the ability to manage for timber production; and (d) the availability of public facilities and services conducive to conversion of forest land to other uses.

(9) "Geologically hazardous areas" means areas that because of their susceptibility to erosion, sliding, earthquake, or other geological events, are not suited to the siting of commercial, residential, or industrial development consistent with public health or safety concerns.

(10) "Long-term commercial significance" includes the growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of the land for long-term commercial production, in consideration with the land's proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more intense uses of the land.

(11) "Minerals" include gravel, sand, and valuable metallic substances.

(12) "Public facilities" include streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreational facilities, and schools.

(13) "Public services" include fire protection and suppression, law enforcement, public health, education, recreation, environmental protection, and other governmental services.

(14) "Recreational land" means land so designated under RCW 36.70A.1701 and that, immediately prior to this designation, was designated as agricultural land of long-term commercial significance under RCW 36.70A.170. Recreational land must have playing fields and supporting facilities existing before July 1, 2004, for sports played on grass playing fields.

(15) "Rural character" refers to the patterns of land use and development established by a county in the rural element of its comprehensive plan.
(a) In which open space, the natural landscape, and vegetation predominate over the built environment;

(b) That foster traditional rural lifestyles, rural-based economies, and opportunities to both live and work in rural areas;

(c) That provide visual landscapes that are traditionally found in rural areas and communities;

(d) That are compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat;

(e) That reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development;

(f) That generally do not require the extension of urban governmental services; and

(g) That are consistent with the protection of natural surface water flows and ground water and surface water recharge and discharge areas.

(16) "Rural development" refers to development outside the urban growth area and outside agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. Rural development can consist of a variety of uses and residential densities, including clustered residential development, at levels that are consistent with the preservation of rural character and the requirements of the rural element. Rural development does not refer to agriculture or forestry activities that may be conducted in rural areas.

(17) "Rural governmental services" or "rural services" include those public services and public facilities historically and typically delivered at an intensity usually found in rural areas, and may include domestic water systems, fire and police protection services, transportation and public transit services, and other public utilities associated with rural development and normally not associated with urban areas. Rural services do not include storm or sanitary sewers, except as otherwise authorized by RCW 36.70A.110(4).

(18) "Urban growth" refers to growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources, rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. A pattern of more intensive rural development, as provided in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d), is not urban growth. When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services. "Characterized by urban growth" refers to land having urban growth located on it, or to land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth.

(19) "Urban growth areas" means those areas designated by a county pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110.

(20) "Urban governmental services" or "urban services" include those public services and public facilities at an intensity historically and typically provided in cities, specifically including storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, street cleaning services, fire and police protection services, public transit services, and other public utilities associated with urban areas and normally not associated with rural areas.

(21) "Wetland" or "wetlands" means areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas. Wetlands do not include those artificial wetlands intentionally created from nonwetland sites, including, but not limited to, irrigation and drainage ditches, grass-lined swales, canals, detention facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, farm ponds, and landscape amenities, or those wetlands created after July 1, 1990, that were unintentionally created as a result of the construction of a road, street, or highway. Wetlands may include those artificial wetlands intentionally created from nonwetland areas created to mitigate conversion of wetlands.


Notes:

*Reviser's note: RCW 84.33.100 through 84.33.118 were repealed or decodified by 2001 c 249 §§ 15 and 16. RCW 84.33.120 was repealed by 2001 c 249 § 16 and by 2003 c 170 § 7.

Intent -- 2005 c 423: "The legislature recognizes the need for playing fields and supporting facilities for sports played on grass as well as the need to preserve agricultural land of long-term commercial significance. With thoughtful and deliberate planning, and adherance to the goals and requirements of the growth management act, both needs can be met."
The legislature acknowledges the state's interest in preserving the agricultural industry and family farms, and recognizes that the state's rich and productive lands enable agricultural production. Because of its unique qualities and limited quantities, designated agricultural land of long-term commercial significance is best suited for agricultural and farm uses, not recreational uses.

The legislature acknowledges also that certain local governments have either failed or neglected to properly plan for population growth and the sufficient number of playing fields and supporting facilities needed to accommodate this growth. The legislature recognizes that citizens responded to this lack of planning, fields, and supporting facilities by constructing nonconforming fields and facilities on agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. It is the intent of the legislature to permit the continued existence and use of these fields and facilities in very limited circumstances if specific criteria are satisfied within a limited time frame. It is also the intent of the legislature to grant this authorization without diminishing the designation and preservation requirements of the growth management act pertaining to Washington's invaluable farmland." [2005 c 423 § 1.]

Effective date -- 2005 c 423: "This act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, or support of the state government and its existing public institutions, and takes effect immediately [May 12, 2005]." [2005 c 423 § 7.]

Prospective application -- 1997 c 429 §§ 1-21: See note following RCW 36.70A.3201.

Severability -- 1997 c 429: See note following RCW 36.70A.3201.

Finding -- Intent -- 1994 c 307: "The legislature finds that it is in the public interest to identify and provide long-term conservation of those productive natural resource lands that are critical to and can be managed economically and practically for long-term commercial production of food, fiber, and minerals. Successful achievement of the natural resource industries' goal set forth in RCW 36.70A.020 requires the conservation of a land base sufficient in size and quality to maintain and enhance those industries and the development and use of land use techniques that discourage uses incompatible with the management of designated lands. The 1994 amendment to RCW 36.70A.030(8) (section 2(8), chapter 307, Laws of 1994) is intended to clarify legislative intent regarding the designation of forest lands and is not intended to require every county that has already complied with the interim forest land designation requirement of RCW 36.70A.170 to review its actions until the adoption of its comprehensive plans and development regulations as provided in RCW 36.70A.060(3)." [1994 c 307 § 1.]

Effective date -- 1994 c 257 § 5: "Section 5 of this act shall take effect July 1, 1994." [1994 c 257 § 25.]

Severability -- 1994 c 257: See note following RCW 36.70A.270.
Commercial forestland claims approximately half of the Kittitas county land area. A checkerboard pattern of land ownerships characterizes the County forests separating private and public sectors. Public ownership accounts for approximately sixty percent of forestland in Kittitas County. A great majority of private forestland is owned corporately by Boise Cascade and by Plum Creek.

Forestlands represent a vital portion of the County economic base providing employment and income in resource management, harvesting, fishing, hunting and recreation. The purpose of this section and classification is to focus on the importance of sustaining forest productivity and associated forest values including watershed, wildlife, mining and recreation.

Major concerns in Kittitas County forest lands are the rate of timber harvest, the long term consequences such harvesting has on a sustaining forest economy, and that amount of conversion to non-forestry land uses following the harvest. A related issue is the amount of clear cutting occurring on public and private lands and the potential environmental impacts on water quality and quantity, flooding and soil stability, as well as aesthetic considerations. In addition, the continued subdivision of commercial forestlands for residential and other purposes represents a potential threat to the natural resource land base and creates conflicts for forestry, wildlife and watershed management.

To address the concerns identified above, this designation is applied to those lands which have long-term significance for the commercial production of timber. The designation recognizes that some other land uses and activities which do not conflict with long-term forest management are necessary and/or appropriate on commercial forest lands. Commercial forest lands have been identified by: parcel size; current lands use; tax status as classified forest land, designated forest lands, or forest open space; the availability of public services and facilities; land uses and long-term commercial significance; history of land use permits issued nearby; feasibility of alternative uses; long-term economic and technological conditions which affect the ability to manage forest lands for long-term commercial production; and soil productivity, geology, topography and other physical characteristics conducive to growing merchantable crops of timber within conventional rotation periods and under traditional and accepted forest practices.

The intent of this plan, therefore, is to declare top priority for sustained natural resource productivity and related activities. Land use activities which are not compatible with resource management should be discouraged within this land category.

The following policies will guide the county in land use decisions effecting the private sector:

GPO 2.130 To conserve forest lands for productive economic use by identifying and designating forest lands where the principal and preferred land use is commercial resource management.

GPO 2.131 Commercial forestland should be identified and designated based on operational factors; growing capacity; site productivity and soil composition; surrounding land use; parcel size; and the absence of urban public services.
GPO 2.132 The primary land use activities in commercial forest areas are commercial forest management, forest recreation, agriculture, mineral extraction, sand and gravel operations and those uses that maintain and/or enhance the long-term management of designated commercial forest lands.

GPO 2.133 To discourage non-forestry development and direct such activities and land uses to areas more suited to those purposes.

GPO 2.134 To encourage multiple use concepts of forest management of the greatest lasting benefit to present and future generations.

GPO 2.135 Resource activities performed in accordance with county, state and federal laws should not be subject to legal actions as public nuisances.

GPO 2.136 To support and encourage the maintenance of commercial forest lands in timber and current use property tax classifications consistent with RCW 84.28, 84.33 and 84.34.

GPO 2.137 To encourage the reasonable location, size and configuration of clear cuts so as to minimize their environmental impact and visual effect on adjacent lands and scenic routes, and on the County economic base.

GPO 2.138 To encourage landscape management practices in areas along streams, and recreation travel routes, and around lakes, including that part of the scenic foreground seen from these areas.

GPO 2.139 To encourage the concept of cooperative resource management among industrial timber landowners, environmental groups, state resource agencies and Indian tribes for managing the state's public and private timberlands and public resources.

GPO 2.140 Land use activities within or adjacent to commercial forest land should be sited and designed to minimize conflicts with forest management and other activities on commercial forest lands.

GPO 2.141 To explore the possibility of clustering residential developments on adjacent non-commercial forest lands. The open space in clustered development should buffer adjacent forest land from development.

GPO 2.142 Special development standards for access, lot size and configuration, fire protection, forest protection, water supply, and dwelling unit location should be adopted for development within or adjacent to commercial forest lands.

GPO 2.143 It is the policy of the county to encourage the continuation of commercial forest management by:

a. supporting land trades that result in consolidated forest ownerships provided that the best interests of the public are served; and,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
COUNTY OF KITTITAS
STATE OF WASHINGTON

ORDINANCE

NO. 97 - 7

FOREST LANDS OF LONG-TERM COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE and ADOPTION OF ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS WITHIN THOSE AREAS AFFECTED BY THE ORDER OF INVALIDITY

Whereas, due to the complexity of the issues and the extensive public record that has been generated through all of the public meetings and hearings over the past five (5) years, this ordinance contains seven different sections of findings, as follows:

Section I - Procedural Findings
Section II - Previous Findings for Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.
Section III - Specific Findings for Sections Under Remand
Section IV - Findings for Specific Analysis Areas of the Remand
Section V - Findings for the Entire Remand Area
Section VI - Findings for Zoning Classifications within Remand Area
Section VII - Final Decision and Signatures
Attachments - Statement made by Commissioner Bill Hinkle
Township 20, Range 14 Zoning Map
Township 20, Range 15 Zoning Map (Shaded Change)
Township 20, Range 15 Zoning Map (Official Zoning Map)
Township 20, Range 16 Zoning Map
SECTION I
PROCEDURAL FINDINGS

Whereas, Kittitas County opted into the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A, voluntarily on December 27, 1990, through Resolution 90-138; and,

Whereas, Kittitas County, under the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A, is required to adopt development regulations to assure the conservation of Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance; and,

Whereas, the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board ("Growth Board") issued a Final Decision and Order dated March 28, 1997, which found the County in noncompliance with the Growth Management Act ("GMA" or "Act") for failing to designate the so-called Exhibit 1 lands as forest lands of long-term commercial significance in its Comprehensive Plan. In its accompanying Order of Invalidity, the Growth Board remanded the matter to the County "for inclusion of the property described in Exhibit 1 as Commercial Forest Lands. If a lesser portion is designated, a showing must be made that the 'excluded' property is not forest lands or otherwise should not be so designated consistent with the GMA and the holdings by this Board in this case." The Growth Board also concluded the County's Exhibit 1 lands designation substantially interfered with the fulfillment of GMA Planning Goals 1-3, 5, 8-10 and 12.

Whereas, the Growth Board also concluded in its March 28, 1997 Final Decision in Order that the County's Comprehensive Plan policies related to master planned resorts ("MPRs") and its "forest lands" definition were inconsistent with the Act.

Whereas, the County appealed the Growth Board's March 28, 1997 Final Decision and Order on the designation issue to the Kittitas County Superior Court on June 9, 1997. The City of Cle Elum, the Town of South Cle Elum, and two Exhibit 1 property landowners, Jeld-Wen/Trendwest and Plum Creek Timber Company, also appealed the Growth Board's designation decision.

Whereas, by letter dated June 23, 1997, the County advised the Growth Board that its Comprehensive Plan "forest lands" definition would be changed, and that new MPR policies would be adopted, as part of the County's 1997 comprehensive plan amendment process. Planning Commission review of proposed comprehensive plan amendments, including a new "forest lands" definition and MPR policies, has now been completed. The "forest lands" definition will be amended and new MPR policies adopted by the County before the end of 1997.

Whereas, by letter dated August 14, 1997, the County advised the Growth Board that a public hearing in connection with the remand of the designation issue had been set for September 5, 1997, and that, upon its completion, the County would forward to the Board its designation decision and copies of all related information presented during the remand process.
Whereas, the Board of County Commissioners held public hearings on September 5, September 16, September 24, October 7, October 28, November 4, and November 10, 1997, to hear public testimony regarding the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board remand on Case No. 96-1-0017 for Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance; and,

Whereas, the Commissioners held public study sessions in Ellensburg on October 7, November 10, November 19, and November 20, 1997.

Whereas, the Commissioners acted on the designation issue at a public hearing held in Ellensburg on November 24, 1997.

Whereas, testimony was taken and documentary evidence received by the Board of County Commissioners from those persons wishing to be heard; and,

Whereas, due notice of the hearings has been given as required by law.
SECTION II - PREVIOUS FINDINGS FOR FOREST LANDS OF LONG-TERM COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Whereas, the Planning Department solicited the help of a Resource Advisory Committee to assist in the classification and designation process pursuant to RCW 36.70A and WAC 365.190; and

Whereas, public hearings were held Feb. 4 through April 14, 1992 and March 23, 1993 to consider the classification and designation which were recommended to the Kittitas County Planning Commission; and

Whereas, the Board of Kittitas County Commissioners approved an interim classification and designation system for natural resource lands of long-term commercial significance - Forest lands, Resolution 93-41 on April 14, 1993, with the following finding:

1. The standards and procedures set forth in this Resolution to be essential to the protection of the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of Kittitas County and the adoption thereof to be in the public interest; and,

Whereas, The Board of Kittitas County Commissioners did on April 14, 1996 amend the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan to include policies for a new land use designation entitled Commercial Forest Lands (designation was to come at a later date) with public notice being given according to law and testimony being taken from those persons wishing to be heard by adoption of Resolution 93-42; and

Whereas, the Board of Kittitas County Commissioners passed Ordinance 94-1 and Resolution 94-04, on January 4, 1994 designating 671,045 acres as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance with a comprehensive plan land use designation of Commercial Forest with the following findings-of-fact:

1. The Board finds RCW 36.70A.060 and 36.70A.170 requires that a county that plans under the Washington Growth Management Act identify Forest Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance ("Forest Lands") and adopt development regulations that conserve those Lands for forestry-related uses, ensuring that all uses within and adjacent to the Forest Lands do not interfere with the continued, accustomed use for the production of timber, yet will not prohibit uses legally existing prior to their adoption.

2. The Board finds RCW 36.70A.170 requires a county to consider the Minimum Guidelines to Classifying and Designating Natural Resource Lands and Critical Areas ("Guidelines") authorized by RCW 36.70A.050 as a guide in complying with RCW 36.70A.060 and 36.70A.170, while allowing for regional differences that exist in Washington state.
3. The Board finds that consideration of the Guidelines is demonstrated in County classification-designation system documents, specifically for Forest Lands, especially draft County documents for classification-designation dated May 29, 1991, draft May 4, 1993 and Resolution 93-41, which include direct reference of WAC 365-190-050 Definitions, (6) Forest land, (11) Long-term commercial significance, (15) Natural resource lands, (20) Urban growth, WAC 365-190-060 Forest Lands Resources, which references the Washington Department of Revenue Private Forest Land Grades, and the effects of proximity to population areas and more intense uses as indicated by subsections (I) through (7).

4. The Board finds Kittitas County complying with RCW 36.70A.060 and 30.70A.170 by the following actions, sessions, meetings and hearings:

A. Beginning March, 1991, Kittitas County organized a Resource Advisory Committee ("RAC"), consisting of local representatives of public and private organizations with management responsibilities or interests in the natural resources; whose goal was to recommend classification-designation systems and development regulations for the Board; who held meetings on May 8, June 5, July 10, August 7, and September 11, 1991; and who at the September 11 meeting determined to transmit drafts of classification-designation systems for Resource Lands to the Board who in turn referred such drafts to the County Planning Commission ("Commission") as of October, 1991.

B. On January 7, 1992 the Commission held a session in order to organize a Growth Management work strategy on a weekly meeting basis and at the January 7 session requested the RAC reconvene to determine recommendations on mapping and development regulations for Resource Lands; and the Commission has since met on a weekly basis regarding Growth Management requirements.

C. On January 29, February 5 and 12, 1992, RAC meetings were held and at the February 12 meeting RAC determined to send forward to the Commission their recommendations with conditions for classification-designation of Resource Lands and accompanying development regulations; and at a February 26, 1992 meeting, the RAC determined to transmit to the Commission their draft Resource Lands development regulations; and in such transmittal were included RAC, Planning Department and Wash. Forestry Protection Assoc. recommendations regarding Resource Lands.

D. On February 25, March 3, 10, 17, and 24, 1992, the Commission studied the February, 1992 transmittal packet of recommendations in
classifying-designating Resource Lands, including a "opt in, opt out" redesignation process.

E. On April 7, 1992 the Commission conducted final review of a Resource Lands packet consisting of classification-designation systems for Resource Lands, a draft map, and a comprehensive plan amendment for Forest Lands; and at the April 7, 1992 session had an initial discussion of a "Cle Elum River Property" and whether or not it could meet the draft classification-designation criteria for Forest Lands.

F. On April 14, 1992 the Commission held the first public hearing on the Resource Lands packet and at that hearing voted to recommend the draft classification-designation systems for Resource Lands (3-18-92 draft) and that it be transmitted to Board and it was so transmitted.

G. On April 28, 1992 the Commission held a second public hearing on Comprehensive Plan text amendments for Forest Lands.

H. On April 30, 1992 the Board held its first study session on classification-designation systems of Resource Lands as transmitted from the Commission.

I. On May 5, 1992 the Commission met on Forest Lands designation map, Comprehensive Plan text amendment regarding Forest Lands, and Forest Land development regulations; it was at this session the Commission voted to defer decision on whether or not the "Cle Elum River Property" met the classification-designation criteria for Forest Lands until January, 1993.

J. On May 6, 1992 the Board held the second study session on the classification-designation systems of Resource Lands.

K. On May 12, 1992 the Commission studied Comprehensive Plan text amendments for Forest Lands, and Forest Land development regulations; it was at this session that the Commission voted to recommend approval of the Comprehensive Plan text amendment for Forest Lands to the Board and it was so transmitted.

L. On May 19, 1992 the Commission met on Forest Land development regulations.

M. On May 19, 1992 the Board held a third study session on classification-designation systems of Resource Lands.
N. On May 26, June 9, 23 and 30, 1992 the Commission met on Forest Land development regulations in the form of a new zoning district entitled "Commercial Forest."

O. On June 29, 1992 the Board scheduled yet canceled a fourth study session on classification-designation of Resource Lands and no new date was set.

P. On January 26, 1993 the Commission held a study session on whether or not the "Cle Elum River Property" met the classification-designation criteria of Forest Lands. And on February 24, 1993 the Commission held a public hearing on potential meeting of the classification-designation criteria of the "Cle Elum River Property" as Forest Lands; and at that session the Commission voted to request the Board move forward with adoption of the classification-designation system for Forest Lands and it was so transmitted April 14, 1992.

Q. On March 23 and April 13 and 14, 1993 the Board held public hearing on the draft classification-designation system and policies for Forest Lands; and during the April 14, 1993 session adopted an interim classification-designation system and comprehensive plan policies for Forest Lands by Resolution 93-41 and Resolution 93-42.

R. On May 4, 1993 the Commission held a meeting on the designation system of Forest Lands adopted by the Board. And on June 15, and July 6 and 20, 1993 the Commission held a meeting on the classification-designation countywide of Forest Lands and draft development regulations.

S. On August 3, 1993 the Commission toured the "Cle Elum River Property." And on August 17, 1993 the Commission held the second public hearing on whether or not the "Cle Elum River Property" met the classification-designation criteria as Forest Lands; and at that session voted to recommend the "Property" did not met the criteria and should be excluded from the draft countywide designation map to the Board and it was be to so transmitted when the remainder of county's consideration of classification-designation was complete by the Commission.

T. On September 21 and 28, 1993 the Commission held a public hearing for the purpose of considering the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan map on designation of Forest Lands and development regulations of those designated Forest Lands in the form of a new zoning district; and at the September 28 session voted to recommend approval of those items to the Board and it was so transmitted.
On October 26 and November 13, 1993, the Board held sessions on the overall County classification-designation of Forest Lands and development regulations for those designated Forest Lands as transmitted by the Commission.

On November 1 and 9, 1993 the Board held public hearings for the purpose of considering the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan map on designation of Forest Lands and development regulations in the form of a new Zoning district entitled "Commercial Forest" and a revised Zoning Code map, for those designated Forest Lands.

The Board finds the vast majority of public testimony taken by the Commission and Board regarding designation of Forest Lands has focused on one specific area in ownership by a single timber management company, commonly referred to as the "Cle Elum River Property."

The Board finds the "Cle Elum River Property" ("Property") consists of approximately 7,000 to 7,500 acres located in portions of or entirely in Sections 11, 13, 14, 15, 23, 24, and 25 of Township 20N., Range 14E., W.M., and portions of or entirely in Sections 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 of Township 20N., Range 15E., W.M., under the ownership of Plum Creek Timber Company.

The Board finds the Commission held additional public hearings on the designation as Forest Lands of the Property in order to accommodate the high level of public interest in this particular area's designation. The Board further finds that the majority of public comment addressed Criteria 6 of Resolution 93-41 ("Suitability of alternative land uses.") as it related to the concept of a potential master planned resort, with the majority of the public comment opposing such a use, and did not relate to whether or not the Property met the overall classification-designation system as identified in Resolution 93-41.

The Board finds it should be recognized that a substantial amount of information was presented to the County in connection with potential designation of all properties owned by Plum Creek Timber Company and approximately 120,000 of Plum Creek Timber Co. property is to be designated on an interim basis as Forest Lands.

The Board finds appropriate land uses designations for the Property have been considered extensively over the last two years by numerous individual citizens, private citizen organizations and groups, Plum Creek Timber Co., a Plum Creek Timber Co.-sponsored Citizen's Guidance Panel, private planning consultants, and the Commission. The information, materials, conclusions
16. The Board finds the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) was complied with by issuance of a completed Environmental Checklist and Determination of Non-significance on March 15, 1993 regarding a non-project action by creation of a new Comprehensive Plan section entitled "Commercial Forest," a new Zoning Code zoning district entitled "Commercial Forest," and attached designation map depicting a draft designation area to which the new plan section and new zone would apply; and that significant alterations have not occurred to the action. And such non-project action was partially adopted in Resolution 93-42 (Amending the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan Commercial Forest Lands). And such non-project action will be completed by this resolution. State Environmental Policy Act Register March 15-19, 1993 identified such action. No appeals were filed to the action and it is considered final.

17. The Board finds this is an interim measure regarding compliance with RCW 36.70A.170(1)(b); and therefore, this designation and development regulation will be reviewed as required by RCW 36.70A.060(3) which states "...counties...shall review these designations and development regulations when adopting their comprehensive plans under RCW 36.70A.040 and implementing development regulations under RCW 36.70A.120 and may alter such designations and development regulations to ensure consistency." Such review will occur as directed in the 1994 Kittitas County Growth Management Work Plan.

18. The Board finds the interim designation process recognizes that Kittitas County needs to balance all the planning goals of the Growth Management Act identified in RCW 36.70A.020, including: (5) Economic development, (6) Property rights protected, (8) Natural resource industries maintenance and enhancements, and (10) Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life.

19. The Board finds the new Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation entitled "Commercial Forest" and new Zoning Code zoning district entitled "Commercial Forest" will designate approximately 783,107 acres of Kittitas County as Forest Lands, or approximately one-half of Kittitas County which consists of 1,492,842 acres. This Forest Land designation will include 406,638 acres under the jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service, and 376,469 acres under the jurisdiction of Washington State agencies and private entities (that figure being approximately ninety percent of all state and private timber lands in Kittitas County overall).

20. The Board finds the Commission and Board considered all written and oral testimony, reports, exhibits and other materials presented and/or submitted to the Planning Department, Commission and Board in regards to Resource
and recommendations from these individuals and entities has been carefully considered by the Board.

10. The Board finds the Planning Department and Commission have recommended that the Property does not meet the classification-designation system for Forest Lands as identified in Resolution 93-41, by considering the combined effects of proximity of the Forest Lands to population areas and the possibility of more intense uses of the land as indicated by the eight criteria within Section 3.020, Resolution 93-41. The Planning staff report and Commission recommendations are based on extensive information and analysis. The Board further finds that the classification-designation system within Resolution 93-41 is based on subjective criteria.

11. The Board finds these combined effects of proximity to population areas and the possibility of more intense uses, indicated by Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 of Resolution 93-41: the Property is proximate to population areas and transportation corridors (with the exception of a one-mile wide corridor consisting of Sec. 15, T. 20N., R. 14E., W.M.), and to the interim urban growth areas of Cle Elum and Roslyn and the proposed urban growth node of Ronald, and to suburban and rural settlements, along State Route 903, Bullfrog Road, Interstate-90, and Nelson Siding, and is subject to public use that is incompatible with long-term commercial production of timber, and has created excessive cost in administrating these lands regarding recreational uses such as off-road vehicles and camping, which introduce additional threat of liability for inappropriate use, forest fire potential, garbage removal, erosion control, and illegal cutting practices. The Board further finds that the possibility of more intense uses of portions of the Property should be considered and that other uses can, if properly planned, enhance and protect the environment and advance the Growth Management Act's planning goals.

\[\text{RCW 36.70A.020.}\]

12. The Board finds no development permit has been submitted for any portion of the Property and the sole owner of the Property, Plum Creek Timber Co., has agreed to maintain the Property under single ownership for a reasonable planning period if the Property is not designated as Forest Lands.

13. The Board finds interest has been demonstrated in review of a possible public land trust regarding the Property and that the public's interest may be involved in such a circumstance.

14. The Board finds comprehensive planning of the Property should continue.

15. The Board finds that review should be accomplished regarding economic impacts to adjoining properties as a result of the Property being designated/non-designated as Forest Lands.
Lands and in particular Forest Lands through the public review process beginning March, 1991. This material includes public written and oral testimony, Commission recommendations, Resolution 93-41 (Interim Classification and Designation System for Natural Resource Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance - Forest Lands), Resolution 93-42 (Amending the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan Commercial Forest Lands), RCW 36.70A (Growth Management Act), and WAC 365-190 (Minimum Guidelines to Classifying and Designating Natural Resource Lands and Critical Areas).

21. The Board finds all sessions, meetings, and hearings identified in this document were open to the public, by legal notice given in the paper of record, notice sent to all County post offices, notice sent to interested entities and individuals, and/or notice sent to local newspapers and radio stations announcing the sessions and agenda, and the public was specifically invited to attend and participate as per the Kittitas County Growth Management Public Participation Plan, adopted July 7, 1992 by Resolution No. 92-75.

22. The Board finds in accordance with RCW 36.70 and Chapter 365.190 WAC the Commission held public hearings for the purpose of considering the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan map on designation of Forest Lands and development regulations for those designated Forest Lands on September 21 and 28, 1993; and at the September 28, 1993 session voted to recommend approval of those items to the Board and it was so transmitted.

23. The Board finds in accordance with RCW 36.70 and Chapter 365.190 WAC the Board held public hearings November 1 and 9, 1993 for the purpose of considering the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan map on designation of Forest Lands and development regulations in the form of a new Zoning district entitled "Commercial Forest" and a revised Zoning Code map, for those designated Forest Lands.

24. The Board finds due notice of the hearings has been given, as required by law, and the necessary inquiry has been made into the public use and interest to be served by such amendments.

25. The Board finds testimony was taken from those persons present who wished to be heard.

Whereas, the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board remanded back to Kittitas County Ordinance 94-01, the classification and designation of Forest Lands of Long Term Commercial Significance; and

Whereas, the Board of County Commissioners reviewed the criteria and found that none of the lands in question met the classification and designation criteria under
Ordinance 94-01 and issued Resolution 94-4 on January 4, 1994 with the following findings of fact:

1. On July 28, 1994, the Growth Planning Hearings Board of Eastern Washington remanded back to Kittitas County for either inclusion of the "Cle Elum River Property" and "Exhibit A" lands in the forest land of long-term commercial significance designation pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170 or inclusion of a lesser portion of these lands upon a showing that the excluded property should not be so designated consistent with the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the principles of the Hearings Board opinion.

2. RCW 36.70A.060 and 36.70A.170 requires that a county that plans under the Growth Management Act identify forest lands of long-term commercial significance and adopt development regulations that conserve those lands for commercial forestry-related uses, ensuring that all uses within and adjacent do not interfere with the continued, accustomed use for the production of timber.

3. The Kittitas County Board of Commissioners decided to review in detail whether the whole or portions of "Cle Elum River Property", and "Exhibit A" lands met state definitions for forest lands and long-term commercial significance, and local classification and designation criteria.

4. RCW 36.70A.030 (8) states "Forest land" means land primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on land that can be economically and practically managed for such production, including Christmas trees..., and that has long-term commercial significance. In determining whether forest land is primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on land that can be economically and practically managed for such production, the following factors shall be considered: (a) The proximity of the land to urban, suburban, and rural settlements; (b) surrounding parcel size and the compatibility and intensity of adjacent and nearby land uses; (c) long-term local economic conditions that affect the ability to manage for timber production; and (d) the availability of public facilities and services conducive to conversion of forest land to other uses.

5. RCW 36.70A.030 (10) states "Long-term commercial significance" includes the growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of the land for long-term commercial production, in consideration with the land's proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more intense uses of the land.

6. RCW 36.70A.170 requires Kittitas County to consider Minimum Guidelines to Classifying and Designating Natural Resource Lands and Critical Areas in complying with RCW 36.70A.060 and 36.70A.170 and these guidelines state
in WAC 365-190-060(2) Forest lands of long-term commercial significance are located outside of urban and suburban areas and rural settlements.

7. County consideration of the state definitions and guidelines, which allow for regional differences that exist in Washington, is demonstrated in the Kittitas County classification-designation system. Resolution 93-41, Establishment of Interim Classification and Designation System for Natural Resource Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance - Forest Lands. Resolution 93-41 has not been appealed for lack of compliance with requirements of the Growth Management Act.

8. The Kittitas County Board of Commissioners held public study sessions on October 19, October 21, October 28, and public hearings on October 26, October 27, November 1, and November 2, 1994 and due notice was given as required by law for all sessions and hearings, and the public was specifically invited to attend and participate per Kittitas County Growth Management Public Participation Plan. Oral and written testimony was taken from all persons who wished to be heard at those hearings. Written testimony was also taken from those not present.

9. The "Cle Elum River Property" and "Exhibit A" lands were divided into three analysis areas so that review could be specific to distinct geographic areas; and Board of County Commissioners' detailed analysis of the physical capabilities of the lands, and the combined effects of proximity to population areas and the possibility of more intense uses has been documented in the attached guides, one for each of the three analysis areas.

10. The Kittitas County Board of Commissioners evaluated in detail all oral and written testimony given by all interested members of the public up to and including November 1, 1994. This testimony includes: comments by large-acreage and small-acreage landowners within the three analysis areas regarding management activities and costs; comments from Roslyn area citizens and Roslyn City Council regarding adjoining forest lands in Analysis Areas #2 and #3; county population growth projections; a water analysis of Analysis Area #3; relationships between recreation and the local economy from many different sources; physical capacity to produce timber at a commercial rate in Analysis Area #3 in the form of forest practices approvals, stumpage prices, forest grading maps and aerial photography, from many different sources; County ordinance regarding closure of portions of the county to off-road vehicles; analysis of the Citizens Guidance Panel report regarding a master planned resort within Analysis Area #3; petition by local citizens regarding designation of Analysis Area #3; county-wide land use survey on overall opinions conducted by County staff in 1992; road configurations in Analysis Area #3; economic trends in central Washington counties; and, analysis of the Board's draft findings and conclusions.
11. The majority of the public comment to forest lands of long-term commercial significance over the previous three years has regarded the desirability of siting a master planned resort within Analysis Area #3 and not on whether lands within the Analysis Area #3 meet the classification and designation criteria for forest lands of long-term commercial significance. Note: the siting of a master planned resort is possible on any lands within Kittitas County, regardless of designation as forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

12. From an in-depth analysis of all information on record there does not appear to be information that would show proof that portions of the three analysis areas meet classification and designation criteria for forest lands of long-term commercial significance per RCW 36.70A.030(8) forest land, RCW 36.70A.030(10) long-term commercial significance, and Kittitas County Resolution 93-41 Establishment of Interim Classification and Designation System for Natural Resource Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance - Forest Lands.

13. The present Comprehensive Plan land use designation "Commercial Forest" and Zoning Code zoning district "Commercial Forest" designate approximately 783,107 acres or one-half of Kittitas County as forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

14. The intent of this decision is to emphatically state the County's previous decision to not designate these properties as forest lands of long-term commercial significance, thus clarifying ambiguity on any entity's part concerning deferral of designation purported with Resolution 94-04 and Ordinance '94-01. Requirements concerning single-ownership and a comprehensive study of the "Cle Elum River Property" within Res. 94-04 and Ord. 94-01 are not modified by this resolution.

Whereas, on June 25, 1996, the following findings were made by the Board of County Commissioners:

1. Upon review of classification and designation criteria used for Forest Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance is was noted that:
   A. economic factors are varied and different in relation to other counties from Kittitas County; and
   B. that only timber grades 4, 5 & 6 (Dept. of Revenue Private Forest Land Grades) are available in Kittitas County; and
   C. Kittitas County rezoned in excess of half of a million acres of land to Forest & Range 80, one of the most significant zone changes ever; and
   D. the Board of County Commissioners applied the GMA criteria on each section of land to comply with the first remand.
Whereas, on June 28, 1996, the following findings were made by the Board of County Commissioners:

1. The inclusion of additional lands into the Forest Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance designation, the west half of Section 4, all of Section 9, and the west half of Section 15 which were not originally included in the designation due to split ownership in Section 4 and questions in Section 9 involving annexation of 2,200 acres into the Roslyn city limits to protect their watershed.

Whereas, on July 2, 1996, the Board of Kittitas County Commissioners made successful motions to adopt the interim classification and designation system, designation and policies for Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance for inclusion in the final comprehensive plan. Exception to this is the Board's July 2, 1996 successful motions to designate an additional approximately one-thousand two-hundred acres as Forest Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance.

Whereas, due notice was provided to the public for the September 10, 1996 public hearing, in that legal notices were published in the North Kittitas County Tribune, the paper of record, and the Daily Record on August 29, 1996 and September 5, 1996.

Whereas, on September 10, 1996, public testimony was heard regarding the proposed amendments.

Whereas, on September 10, 1996, the Board of County Commissioners made a successful motion to amend the Kittitas County Commercial Forest Zoning map, to reflect the changes made during the Comprehensive Plan adoption. Specifically, the map reflects the additional one-thousand two-hundred acres as Forest Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance.
SECTION III - SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR REMAND AREAS

Whereas, The Board of County Commissioners on the remand from the Growth Hearings Board’s March 28, 1997 Final Decision and Order make the following findings and conclusions for the specific sections under the remand order. These findings and conclusions were derived from the staff’s section-by-section analysis presented during the public hearings. Findings and conclusions are as follows:

Section 19, Township 20, Range 16:

A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the South 1/2 of Section 19 is adjacent to the Lannigan Springs plat, a suburban area with 64 lots in the North 1/2 of Section 30 and, the SW 1/4 of Section 19 is within 3/4 mile of an urban area (Cle Elum city limits). Based on the designation criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a) and (10), Section 19 does not meet this criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum Ridge provides a physical barrier between rural residential and commercial forest land uses; and that topographical continuity with the Cle Elum Ridge ties Section 19 more to the rural areas (south) than the resource lands (north). Also, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 19 is located within 3/4 mile of rural residential zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 19 does not meet this criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 20, Township 20, Range 16:

A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Southwest 1/4 of Section 20 is adjacent to the Lannigan Springs plat, a suburban area with 64 lots in the North 2 of Section 30. Based on the designation criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a) and (10), Section 20 does not meet this criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum Ridge provides a physical barrier between rural residential and commercial forest land uses; and that topographical continuity with the Cle Elum Ridge ties Section 20 more to the rural areas (south) than the resource lands (north). Also, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 20 is located within 1/2 to 3/4 mile of rural residential zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 20 does not meet this criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 21, Township 20, Range 16:

A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the South 1/2 of Section 21 is adjacent to a rural settlement of eight (8) parcels in the North 1/2 of Section 28. Based on the designation criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a) and 10, Section 21 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum Ridge provides a physical
barrier between rural residential and commercial forest land uses; and that topographical continuity with the Cle Elum Ridge ties Section 21 more to the rural areas (south) than the resource lands (north). Also, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 21 is located within 3/4 mile of rural residential zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 21 does not meet this criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 22, Township 20, Range 16:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum Ridge provides a physical barrier between rural residential and commercial forest land uses; and, that topographical continuity with the Cle Elum Ridge ties Section 22 more to the rural areas (south) than the resource lands (north). Also, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 22 is immediately adjacent to rural residential zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 22 does not meet this criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 23, Township 20, Range 16:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 23 contains a rural settlement of twelve (12) parcels and is adjacent to a rural settlement of 52 parcels in Section 26. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a) and (10), Section 23 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 7, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 7 contains the unincorporated townsite of Ronald, which has been designated as an urban growth node (UGN) through the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that the Southwest 1/4 of Section 7 contains urban uses, facilities, and services. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b)(d) and (10), Section 7 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 7 is immediately adjacent to Section 12, Township 20, Range 14, W.M., which includes several suburban and urban settlements and is part of the Kittitas County Conference of Governments (KCCOG) approved urban growth node (UGN) for Ronald. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 7 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.
C. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 7 is located immediately adjacent to or within 1/2 mile of rural residential and commercial zoning and the Roslyn city limits. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 7 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

D. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 7 contains a portion of the Coal Mines Trail, which is a non-motorized recreation trail. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b)(c), Section 7 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 8, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the southern boundary of Section 8 is the northern boundary of the city limits for Roslyn. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 8 is within 1/2 mile of rural residential and commercial zoning and the Roslyn city limits. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(a)(b) and (10), Section 8 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 9, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the southwest corner of Section 9 constitutes the Roslyn city limits and that Section 9 is within 1/4 to 1 mile of rural residential and commercial zoning and the Roslyn city limits. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(a)(b) and (10), Section 9 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 16, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the western boundary of Section 16 constitutes the Roslyn city limits. Further the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 16 is located within 1/4 to 1 mile of rural residential, suburban, and commercial zoning, as well as the incorporated city limits of Roslyn. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 16 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 16 contains a portion of the Coal Mines Trail, which is a non-motorized recreation trail. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(b)(c), Section 16 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 18, Township 20, Range 15
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the eastern boundary of Section 18 constitutes the Roslyn city limits and that the urban area of Roslyn is immediately to the north of Section 18. Further, the Board of County commissioners find that Section 18 contains a rural settlement of fifteen (15) parcels. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 18 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.
B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 18 provides a suburban / rural residential transition area between the urban areas of Roslyn and Ronald. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 18 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

C. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 18 consists of or is immediately adjacent to areas of rural residential, suburban residential, and commercial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 18 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

D. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 18 contains a portion of the Coal Mines Trail, which is a non-motorized recreation trail. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b)(c), Section 18 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 19, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 19 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of rural residential, suburban residential, and commercial zoning, as well as the Ronald urban growth node (UGN) which is an area with urban characteristics. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 19 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the west ¼ of Section 19 contains portions of the Cle Elum River, making commercial forest management difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 19 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 20, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the northeast ¼ of Section 20 contains the incorporated community of Roslyn and suburban settlements. Further, The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 20 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of rural residential, suburban residential, and commercial zoning, as well as the urban settlement of Ronald. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 20 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 20 contains a portion of the Coal Mines Trail, which is a non-motorized recreation trail. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b)(c), Section 20 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 21, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 21 contains a portion of the Roslyn corporate limits, suburban areas, and rural settlements. Further, the Board of County
Commissioners find that Section 21 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of rural residential, suburban residential, commercial, and urban zoning classifications. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 21 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 21 contains the Cle Elum-Roslyn corridor along State Route 903. Existing land uses in this area include the Cle Elum/Roslyn High School and Middle School as well as an established commercial area at the intersection of SR 903 and Bullfrog Road. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 21 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

C. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum Ridge provides a physical barrier between urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning and commercial forest uses. Further, that topographic continuity of this ridge with surrounding sections ties Section 21 more as a transition area to the south, than to the north. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 21 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

D. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 21 contains a portion of the Coal Mines Trail, which is a non-motorized recreation trail. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b)(c), Section 21 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 22, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 22 is located within ¼ to ½ mile of the Cities of Cle Elum and Roslyn, as well as suburban and rural settlements. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 22 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning and commercial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 22 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum Ridge provides a physical barrier between urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning and commercial forest uses. Further, that topographic continuity of this ridge with surrounding sections ties Section 22 more as a transition area to the south, than to the north. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 22 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 23, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 23 is located within ¼ mile of the Cle Elum city limits. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 23 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning and commercial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 23 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.
Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the northern boundary of Section 23 is immediately adjacent to a rural settlement of eight lots, currently zoned as Forest and Range-20 and not part of the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board remand order. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 23 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

C. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum Ridge provides a physical barrier between urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning and commercial forest uses. Further, topographic continuity of this ridge with surrounding sections ties Section 23 more as a transition area to the south, than to the north. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 23 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 24, Township 20, Range 15:

A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 24 is located within ½ mile of the Cle Elum city limits is immediately adjacent to the suburban settlement of Lannigan Springs, a 64-lot subdivision located in Section 30, Township 20, Range 16, W.M. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 24 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning and commercial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 24 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum Ridge provides a physical barrier between urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning and commercial forest uses. Further, topographic continuity of this ridge with surrounding sections ties Section 24 more as a transition area to the south, than to the north. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 24 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 27, Township 20, Range 15:

A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the majority of Section 27 lies within the corporate limits of the City of Cle Elum. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 27 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning and commercial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 27 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 27 contains a portion of the Coal Mines Trail, which is a non-motorized recreation trail. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 27 contains the Cle Elum-Roslyn corridor along State Route 903. Existing land uses in this area include the Cle Elum/Roslyn High School and Middle School as well as an established commercial area at the intersection of SR 903 and Bullfrog Road. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b)(c), Section 27
does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 28, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 28 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning, commercial zoning, and the city limits of Cle Elum and Roslyn. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 28 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 28 contains a portion of the Coal Mines Trail, which is a non-motorized recreation trail. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 28 contains the Cle Elum-Roslyn corridor along State Route 903. Existing land uses in this area include the Cle Elum/Roslyn High School and Middle School as well as an established commercial area at the intersection of SR 903 and Bullfrog Road. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b)(c), Section 28 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

C. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 28 contains a portion of the major east-west highway corridor of Interstate-90, as well as the Yakima River and its associated riparian areas. Forest Practices along such corridors are difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 28 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 29, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 29 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning, commercial zoning, and the city limits of Cle Elum and Roslyn. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 29 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 30, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 30 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of rural residential and industrial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 30 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum River bisects Section 30. Forest Practices along such corridors are difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 30 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 31, Township 20, Range 15:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 31 is located adjacent to or within ¼
to 1 mile of rural residential and industrial zoning. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that there is existing industrial zoning within the north ¼ of the south ⅛ of Section 31. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 31 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 31 contains a portion of the major east-west highway corridor of Interstate-90, as well as the Yakima River and its associated riparian areas. Forest Practices along such corridors are difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 31 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 32, Township 20, Range 15:

A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 32 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of rural residential and industrial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 32 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 32 contains a portion of the major east-west highway corridor of Interstate-90, as well as the Yakima River and its associated riparian areas. Forest Practices along such corridors are difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 32 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 4, Township 20, Range 14:

A. The Board of County Commissioners find that southeast ¼ of Section 4 (the remand area) contains a four (4) lots, all of which are less than forty-five (45) acres in size. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 4 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 4 is immediately adjacent to a rural settlement of thirty-six (36) lots located in Section 10. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 4 does not meet the criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 11, Township 20, Range 14:

A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 11 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban residential, rural residential and industrial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 11 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 11 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural settlements. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 11 is immediately adjacent to the Ronald urban growth node (UGN) as approved by the Kittitas County Conference of Governments (KCCOG).
Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 11 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

C. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum River bisects Section 11. Forest Practices along such corridors are difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 11 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

D. The Board of County Commissioners find that the northeast ¼ of Section 11 is bisected by State Route 903, which is reported to carry over 250,000 vehicles per year. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 11 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

E. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 11 is immediately adjacent, on three (3) sides, to urban areas which include public water systems. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 11 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 13, Township 20, Range 14:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 13 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban residential, rural residential and industrial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 13 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 13 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural settlements. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 13 is immediately adjacent to the Ronald urban growth node (UGN) as approved by the Kittitas County Conference of Governments (KCCOG). Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 13 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 14, Township 20, Range 14:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Cle Elum River bisects Section 14. Forest Practices along such corridors are difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 14 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 14 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban residential, rural residential and industrial zoning. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 14 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

C. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 14 is located adjacent to or within ¼
to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural settlements. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 14 is immediately adjacent to the Ronald urban growth node (UGN) as approved by the Kittitas County Conference of Governments (KCCOG). Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 13 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 15, Township 20, Range 14:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 15 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of suburban and rural residential settlements. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 15 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 23, Township 20, Range 14:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 23 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of rural residential zoning. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 23 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural settlements. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 23 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Yakima River bisects Section 23. Forest Practices along such corridors are difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 23 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

C. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Easton Ridge provides a physical barrier between rural residential and transitional land uses. Further, topographical continuity with the Easton Ridge ties Section 23 more to the rural areas (south) than the transition areas (north). Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(b), Section 23 does not meet this criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

D. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 23 is adjacent to Section 22 which contains approximately 310 parcels in full-time and part-time residential uses at urban densities, with urban services. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 23 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Section 24, Township 20, Range 14:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 24 contains a rural settlement of 16 parcels and is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of rural residential zoning. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 24 includes or is within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural settlements. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 24 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.
Section 25, Township 20, Range 14:
A. The Board of County Commissioners find that Section 25 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of rural residential zoning. Further, the Board of County Commissioners find that Section 25 is located adjacent to or within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural settlements. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(a)(b) and (10), Section 25 does not meet the designation criteria for designation as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

B. The Board of County Commissioners find that the Yakima River bisects Section 25. Forest Practices along such corridors are difficult and costly. Based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.030(8)(c), Section 25 does not meet the criteria to be designated as Forest Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.
SECTION IV - FINDINGS FOR SPECIFIC STUDY AREAS OF REMAND

Whereas, The Board of County Commissioners make the following findings for three analysis areas discussed during the public hearings. These findings were derived from the staff's presentation of the analysis areas. Findings are as follows:

Analysis Area #1 - Sections 19 - 23, Township 20, Range 16:

1. The sections within Analysis Area #1 are located proximate to the city limits for Cle Elum and suburban and rural settlements.

2. Analysis Area #1 provides a transition area between the currently designated Commercial Forest lands to the north and the incompatible suburban and rural uses to the south of the remand areas.

3. The costs associated with managing commercial forest lands next to the suburban and rural land uses surrounding Masterson Road is high in relation to less populated areas of the county, especially regarding recreational users and wildfire potential.

4. The current zoning for the remand area is Forest and Range-20. This zoning classification provides for both forestry land uses and a variety of alternative land uses and acts as a transitional zone between commercial forest land uses and rural residential zoning.

5. Not designating the sections contained in Analysis Area #1 provide for and protect the scenic views of the area.

Analysis Area #2 - Sections 7-9, 16, 18-24, and 27-32, Township 20, Range 15:

1. All of the remand sections within Analysis Area #2 contain, are adjacent to, or are within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural settlements.

2. All of the remand sections within Analysis Area #2 contain, are adjacent to, or are within ¼ to 1 mile of urban, suburban, and rural residential zoning.

3. The current zoning for much of the remand area within Analysis Area #2 is Forest and Range-20. This zoning classification provides for both forestry land uses and a variety of alternative land uses and acts as a transitional zone between commercial forest land uses and rural residential zoning.

4. For portions of Analysis Area #2 the Cle Elum Ridge provides a natural boundary that tends to divide economic management considerations south of the ridge and away from those areas north of the ridge.

5. Kittitas County and the Cities of Cle Elum and Roslyn have worked cooperatively to establish the Coal Mines Trail, a recreational trail which traverses portions of
Analysis Area #2.

6. The 'Cle Elum River Citizen Guidance Panel' report and accompanying 'Technical Report' indicates that portions of the remand area, within Analysis Area #2, may be suitable for alternative land uses, other than commercial forest management.

7. According to the parcel database on record with Kittitas County, there are a large number of lots within Analysis Area #2 which are less than the required eighty (80) acre minimum provided in the Commercial Forest Zone.

Analysis Area #3 - Sections 4, 11, 13-15, and 23-25, Township 20, Range 14:

1. All sections within Analysis Area #3 have some relationship to urban and suburban areas, rural settlements, and rural residential zoning.

2. Much of the remand area within Analysis Area #3 is in close proximity to urban, suburban, and rural settlements.

3. Due to Analysis Area #3's proximity to urban, suburban, and rural settlements, it could be difficult or impossible to practically or economically manage the remand area for commercial forestry in the long-term.

4. There is a definite possibility of a more intensive use of portions of the remand area, west of Bullfrog Road. As testimony has shown, Trendwest has applied for a master planned resort on portions of the remand area.

5. There is a definite possibility of a more intensive use of portions of the remand area, east of Bull Frog Road. As testimony has shown, there is the possibility of an equestrian facility, expanded school and/or cemetery facilities, and a community center within this area.

6. The 'Cle Elum River Citizen Guidance Panel' report and accompanying 'Technical Report' indicates that portions of the remand area, within Analysis Area #3, may be suitable for alternative land uses, other than commercial forest management.

7. Analysis Area #3 is physically located between the Interstate-90 and SR 903 corridors. The SR 903 corridor contains a full array of land use types, including but not limited to, urban/suburban/rural residential zoning and settlements, commercial development, and industrial zoning.

8. According to the parcel database on record with Kittitas County, there are a large number of lots within Analysis Area #3 which are less than the required eighty (80) acre minimum provided in the Commercial Forest Zone.
SECTION V - FINDINGS FOR ENTIRE REMAND AREA

Whereas, the Board of County Commissioners make the following findings based on the staff and public testimony presented during the public hearings. Findings are as follows:

1. The initial, interim designation of the remand areas is no longer relevant or at issue. Rather, it is the final designation of the remand areas in the County’s Comprehensive Plan that is relevant and at issue. The Act requires the County to make its final Comprehensive Plan designation decisions based on the newest and most recent information available.

2. Determining whether the remand areas constitute “forest lands of long-term commercial significance” under the Act is essentially a two-step process. The first step is determining whether such lands have “long-term commercial significance” under the Act. If they do, the second step involves determining whether such lands also meet the remaining required criteria for “forest lands” under the Act, including whether such lands are primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on lands that can be economically and practically managed for such production.

3. “Long-term commercial significance” includes the growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of the remand areas for long-term commercial production, in consideration with the land’s proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more intense development of the land.

4. In determining whether the remand areas are “primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on land that can be economically and practically managed for such production,” the following factors must be considered under the Act:

   (a) The proximity of the land to urban, suburban, and rural settlements;

   (b) Surrounding parcel size and the compatibility and intensity of adjacent and nearby land uses;

   (c) Long-term economic conditions that affect the ability to manage for timber production; and

   (d) Availability of public facilities and services conducive to conversion of forest land to other uses.

5. The balancing required by the Act’s definitions of “long-term commercial significance” and “forest lands” clearly involves and requires the exercise of discretion, which discretion is vested in this Board of County Commissioners.
6. The remand areas lie in close proximity to existing population areas, including the Cities of Roslyn, Cle Elum and South Cle Elum and the Ronald UGN.

7. A substantial majority of the testimony presented at the remand hearing, including testimony from the Mayors of Roslyn and Cle Elum and members of the public, was to the effect that significant transition zones between existing population areas in the County and commercial timber production activities are both necessary and important to maintaining a high quality of life for those citizens living within such population areas, and that commercial timber production activities directly adjacent to such population areas are therefore incompatible with the best interests of those communities and the County.

8. The County has previously created many transition zones in the Upper County between commercial forest lands and other uses, including recreational uses and rural settlements. The County has found that transition zones are appropriate and necessary both for long-term timber production which can be economically and practically managed and for the protection of other uses. The GMA requires consistency in all Comprehensive Plan policies and designations. It would be inconsistent with County policies and a violation of the Act if the County did not create transition zones within the remand areas.

9. For the reasons established in the record, some of which are recited in these Findings and Conclusions, all of the remand areas are appropriate as transition zones. Most of the existing parcels within the remand areas are smaller than the minimum parcel size, 80-acres, in the Commercial Forest Lands zone. The County does not want to create islands or “fingers” of commercial forest lands as would be the case if any of the remand areas were designated. The multiplicity of smaller parcels and other uses in the remand areas would create severe conflicts for both commercial forestry and other uses if these lands were designated, and would constitute poor public policy.

10. Testimony from the Washington State Fish and Wildlife Service was to the effect that commercial forest lands often provide good habitat for multiple species and that larger parcels, rather than smaller parcels, are important for this purpose. Given the advice of the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the remand areas are not appropriate for designation as forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

11. The record developed during the remand process demonstrates that the effects of the proximity of the remand areas, if designated as forest lands of long-term commercial significance, on existing population areas would be significant and unduly burdensome.

12. Where possible, comprehensive plan and zoning lines should reflect topography, what our professional staff refers to as “topographical continuity.”
In this case, as the maps demonstrate, the principles of topographical continuity would exclude the remand areas from designation as forest land of long-term commercial significance.

13. There was substantial evidence presented at the remand hearing that demonstrated the very real possibility of more intense uses of the remand areas.

(a) On March 7, 1997, Trendwest submitted to the County a Development Activities Application for a MPR on the Cle Elum River Property. The Cle Elum River Property is approximately 7,400 acres in size, and makes up roughly half of the remand areas. In response to a prior Growth Board finding that there had not been a sufficient showing that adequate water could be made available for a resort on the Cle Elum River Property, testimony was offered at the remand hearing that showed significant, tangible steps, including the purchase of substantial water rights, have already been taken to address the need for adequate water for the proposed resort. The Trendwest MPR application also indicates that most, if not all, of the Cle Elum River Property will be necessary for the resort. The Trendwest MPR project is identifiable and sufficiently developed to afford valid consideration of the project compared to commercial forest use.

(b) A comprehensive environmental review process is now underway in connection with Trendwest's MPR application. The required environmental impact statement ("EIS") will consider as one alternative to the proposed resort a so-called "No Action" alternative. The "No Action" alternative contemplates the active development of the Cle Elum River Property in accordance with a 1994 lot segregation that divided the Cle Elum River Property into more than 130 parcels, each of which could be lawfully developed under individual ownership regardless of the designation of the Cle Elum River Property in the Comprehensive Plan.

(c) The possibility of more intense use of the land represented by the Trendwest MPR application could bring with it significant additional environment benefits, including the enhancement of the Mountains To Sound Greenway project, based on commitments already made by Trendwest to grant permanent conservation easements with respect to those portions of the Cle Elum River Property which are visible from Interstate 90.

14. A portion of the Cle Elum River Property, known as the "Bullfrog Flats" area, also has possible more intensive uses in addition to a master planned resort. In general, this is the area of the Cle Elum River Property owned by Trendwest between Interstate 90 and the Bullfrog Road. The County and the City of Cle
Elum consider it possible that all or a portion of the Bullfrog Flats area may be more intensely used in the future. As a result, the County and the City have now acted to formally create an urban growth study area in the Bullfrog Flats area, known as the Cle Elum Study Area, to study and evaluate the suitability of all or a significant portion of this property for future urban growth.

(a) The City of Cle Elum has an interest in the possible expansion of its municipal cemetery. Such expansion would require the acquisition of property owned by Trendwest in the Bullfrog Area. Trendwest is willing to donate property to the City of Cle Elum for that purpose, but cemetery expansion into this or any portion of the remand areas would not be a permitted or conditionally allowed use in a Commercial Forest Zone. Possible expansion of the cemetery represents a possibility of a more intense use of the land that could not occur within forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

(b) The Cle Elum-Roslyn School District has an interest in the possible expansion of its school facilities. Such expansion would require the acquisition of property owned by Trendwest in the Bullfrog Flats area. Trendwest is willing to donate property to the School District for that purpose, but school expansion into this or any portion of the remand areas would not be a permitted or conditionally allowed use in a Commercial Forest Zone. Possible expansion of the school facilities represents a possibility of more intense use of the land that could not occur within forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

(c) The State Legislature created the Washington State Horse Park Authority to develop a world-class equestrian facility. The Horse Park Authority is actively moving forward with this possible development on approximately 200 acres in the Bullfrog Flats and has already secured start-up funding from the Legislature for that purpose. An equestrian facility in this or any portion of the remand areas would not be a permitted or conditionally allowed use in a Commercial Forest Zone. Development of an equestrian facility represents a possibility of more intense use of the land that could not occur within forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

(d) The Cle Elum community is actively pursuing the possibility of a new and badly needed community center on property in the Bullfrog Flats area owned by Trendwest. A public survey of area residents suggests overwhelming support for the community center. A community center in any portion of the remand areas would not be a permitted or conditionally allowed use in a Commercial Forest Zone. Development of a community center represents a possibility of more intense use of the land that could not occur within forest lands of long-term commercial significance.
(e) There is also interest in the development of a kennel club in the Bullfrog Flats area. A kennel club would not be a permitted or conditionally allowed use in a Commercial Forest Zone. Development of a kennel club represents a possibility of more intense use of the land that could not occur within forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

15. The remand areas do not have "long-term commercial significance" within the meaning of the Act.

16. Trendwest did not purchase the Cle Elum River Property for long-term commercial timber production, and the testimony offered at the remand hearing from representatives of Trendwest was to the effect that such property was not, and would not in the future be, primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production. Testimony from representatives of Trendwest was to the effect that the Cle Elum River Property could not be economically and practically managed for long-term commercial timber production. Rather, the testimony presented was to the effect that the Cle Elum River Property would likely be developed in accordance with the 1994 lot segregation in the event the MPR did not go forward. Trendwest has already invested more than $16 million in the Cle Elum River Property for its development as a resort.

17. In prior proceedings in connection with this designation issue, testimony and evidence was offered by the former owner of the Cle Elum River Property, the Plum Creek Timber Company, that the property could not be practically and economically managed over the long-term as commercial forest lands.

18. As previously indicated, the proximity of the remand areas to existing urban, suburban and rural settlements; and the incompatibility of, and negative consequences associated with, commercial forest activities directly adjacent to such settlements in the absence of substantial transition zones was well established at the remand hearing.

19. The cities and towns surrounded by the remand areas have been segregated into hundreds of parcels, the clear majority of which are significantly smaller than one acre in size. In the rural areas, parcel size varies, but many parcels run as small as one acre in size.

20. The County has generally established Forest and Range 20 zoning in transition zones between Commercial Forest Lands and other types of zoning. The Forest and Range 20 zone allows forestry, but also gives property owners other options for the use of their property. The County has found, as shown by exhibits in the record, that the Forest and Range 20 designation in transition zones often causes the preservation of substantial forested areas. This is a benefit to everyone and satisfies many County goals, including aesthetics, economic diversification, and the protection of both property rights and
commercial forest lands. For all of the reasons stated in the record, including overwhelming public testimony, the County’s policy is that it will not force property owners to cut their trees right down to the boundaries of the Commercial Forest Lands zone. The County does not agree with the position taken by the RIDGE organization that commercial forest zones should extend right down to the city limits of Roslyn and Cle Elum and the urban, suburban and rural settlements in and around the remand areas. The designation of commercial forest zones right down to the edge of the Upper County’s towns and settlements, as well as to the right-of-ways along Interstate 90 and State Route 903, would also frustrate the laudable goals of the Mountains to Sound Greenway program.

21. More than half of the County has already been designated as forest lands of long-term commercial significance under the Comprehensive Plan, including roughly 98 percent of the County’s forested lands. The forest lands of long-term commercial significance which have already been set aside in the Comprehensive Plan, conserve a land base sufficient in size and quality to maintain and enhance natural resource forestry uses in the County.

22. The Comprehensive Plan and many other County policies also seek economic diversification in the County. The County has been too dependent in the past on natural resource industries that are inherently cyclical and whose overall economic value to the County can diminish over time. Mining is one example, and forest products is another. Having set aside a land base sufficient in size and quality to maintain and enhance natural resource forestry uses in the County, it is necessary and consistent with other important County policies goals to seek every reasonable opportunity to promote economic diversification in the County by adopting Comprehensive Plan policies that encourage more intense and beneficial uses of the land, including the remand areas.

23. Even if found to have long-term commercial significance, the remand areas, including the Cle Elum River Property, are not “primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on lands that can be economically and practically managed for such production” within the meaning of the Act.

24. The Board of County Commissioners hereby adopt, and incorporate herein by this reference, the statement of Commissioner Hinkle made in open session in connection with this matter on November 10, 1997. (See attached)

25. Based on the record that has been developed, the present designation of the remand areas in the Comprehensive Plan comports with the requirements of the Act and does not substantially interfere with GMA Planning Goals 1-3, 5, 8-10 and 12 found at RCW 36.70A.020. In fact, those and other Planning
Goals are on balance well served by the present designation of the remand areas.

26. "Long-term" in Kittitas County means a re-generation period of 80 to 140 years.

27. The Growth Management Act states that the natural resource land owners and operators are to be protected from intrusion by incompatible uses, and not the other way around.

28. The intensity of potential land uses, important in review for compatibility, is based on the current zoning districts which include rural, agriculture, commercial, and suburban in the three analysis areas.

29. Alternative lands uses to long-term commercial forestry are already present in all three of the analysis areas.

30. Transition buffer zones were considered necessary to protect forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

31. An "island" or isolated commercial forest designation would hinder property owners' ability to manage for long-term forestry and is therefore undesirable.

32. Isolated parcels of commercial forestry within urban and suburban areas and rural settlements can not be expected to continue commercial forestry in the long-term.

33. Kittitas County has already taken substantive steps towards forest land conservation when in 1992 it decreased the density allowed in existing Forest & Range zone (85% of county) from 1 acre to 20 acres and in 1994 the density was further reduced from 20 acres to 80 acres in the new Commercial Forest zone for 45% of the county. Forest Practices are still an allowed and encouraged use with the Forest & Range-20 zoning. Location within the Forest & Range-20 zone does not automatically mean conversion to other uses, however such commercial operations are already located directly adjacent to incompatible uses and should not be expected to continue for 80-140 years.

34. Five comprehensive plans have been or are being written within the analysis areas (Easton Subarea, Swank-Teanaway Subarea, Ronald Urban Growth Node, City of Roslyn, City of Cle Elum).
SECTION VI - FINDINGS FOR ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS WITHIN REMAND AREA

Whereas, in order to address the Order of Invalidity and zoning for the sections within the remand area, the Board of County Commissioners make the following findings.

1. According to the County Zoning map, there is some Suburban and Agricultural-3 zoning located in portions of Section 20 and 21, Township 20, Range 15, W.M. Portions of these areas are part of the remand order, but not all. Any change in zoning for this area would create inconsistent and piece-meal zoning classifications within the SR 903 corridor (or adjacent to the City of Roslyn).

2. Approximately ½ of Section 18, Township 20, Range 15, is zoned as Rural-3, but only a portion of the area is part of the remand order. Any change in zoning for this area would create inconsistent and piece-meal zoning classifications within the SR 903 corridor or adjacent to the City of Roslyn.

3. Approximately ½ of Section 11, Township 20, Range 14, is zoned as Rural-3 and is immediately adjacent to the Ronald UGN, as approved by KCCOG. Also, the area zoned as Rural-3 is physically separated by the Cle Elum River from the neighboring Forest and Range-20 zone.

4. The remaining areas of the remand were zoned as Forest and Range-20 prior to the order of invalidity and provide transitional areas between urban, suburban, and rural settlements/zoning and commercial forestry uses.

5. According to the Kittitas County Zoning Map there was an area within the remand area which was zoned as Rural-3, prior to the order of invalidity, which contains all of Section 29 and portions of Section 28, 30, 31, and 32, of Township 20, Range 15, W.M., and is bisected by Bullfrog Road. The Board of County Commissioners find that this area would be better suited with Forest and Range zoning, which would provide for consistent zoning in the area.
SECTION VII - FINAL DECISION AND SIGNATURES

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED that the Board of Kittitas County Commissioners, in response to the Order of Invalidity, hereby approves the attached Zoning Maps to establish the zoning within the remand area and the same is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Board of Kittitas County Commissioners, after due deliberation, hereby concludes that it is in the best interest of Kittitas County, and its citizens, to readopt the Commercial Forest land use designation boundary at that previously adopted by Kittitas County.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED by the Board of Kittitas County Commissioners, that the Zoning Map amendments and re-adopt of the Commercial Forest land use designation boundary are effective immediately.

ADOPTED this 25th day of November, 1997, at Ellensburg, Washington.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
KITTITAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Mary Seubert, Chairperson
Max A. Golladay, Vice-Chairman
Bill Hinkle, Commissioner

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Gregory L. Zempel,
County Prosecuting Attorney
WSBA #19125

Ordinance 97
Statement made by Commissioner Bill Hinkle - November 10, 1997

The record we've reviewed over the last two months has a lot of information, much of which is new from what the prior board had. We now have differences in the GMA itself and the standard of review, there have been changes to the land, there's a pending MPR application, there is a study area for the city of Cle Elum for the Bullfrog area, potentials for an equestrian center, community centers and the like. And what we are looking at here is the designations that should be made in our comp plan regarding the designation of forest lands of long term commercial significance, not the interim designation of forest lands as was originally undertaken by the board at the beginning of the GMA.

The hearings Board invited us to make a showing as to why some or all of the remand lands should not be designated as commercial forest lands. In reviewing all of the information, the facts and the law, I can find no portion of the remand area that should be or is required under the GMA to designated as forest lands of long term commercial significance.

I've looked at the criteria for forest lands designation, the factors to be considered in the balancing of interests in developing a comprehensive and the prior decisions of the hearing board regarding the forest lands issues. Although I've considered all of the factors I'm not going to try to talk about all of the factors and considerations I've looked at to reach this decision. I do want to share with you an outline of major factors in my analysis and concept, and will be making a motion to not designate the remand lands as commercial forest designated lands.

A few key factors stick out in reaching the conclusion I've come to. First I would note that our Commercial Forest zoning has 80 acre lot size minimums. This has been approved by the hearings board. The reason for having larger size lots like this is for management for commercial industrial forestry. As the individual from fish and wildlife noted, the bigger the better, for such management practices. In fact he even noted the difficulty with management where ownership alternates from section to section. As such, is seems to make no sense at all to designate for long term commercial timber production where lots don't even meet the minimum lot size for that zoning. Even if lots may now be owned by the same person or company, if they
are currently separate lots they can be sold off separately and create a patchwork of lots and ownerships. The lots would be too small for management purposes and don't meet the purpose of the zoning lot size if they are too small.

Another key factor which I think needs to be stressed is the clear direction from the law that transitional areas, buffers, whatever you want to call them are an integral part of good planning. Just because some lands has some trees does not mean that it should be designated as commercial forest lands. There are seven general criteria under 36.70A.030(8) and (10) which are used to determine whether particular lands even meet the initial question of whether they meet the definition of forest lands. Three of the seven factors specifically deal with proximity and compatibility with nearby lands - we are directed to look at much more than whether there are trees on a particular piece of land. We must look at the proximity of the land to urban suburban and rural settlements, we must look at surrounding parcel size and compatibility and intensity of adjacent and nearby land uses, and we must look at the lands proximity to population areas. These specific criteria in the definition itself make it clear to me that the legislature not only wants, but requires us, to consider and implement transition or buffer areas. And those sorts of transition or buffer areas are, quite simply, good planning. You don’t want commercial industrial forest practices and urban growth colliding. We need to minimize the inherent conflicts between those uses. To require commercial forest lands and urban areas to collide would be folly.

One additional factor or conclusion which I have reached is that part of good planning calls for the preservation or at least incentives to protect our scenic vistas and views. During this hearing I heard a number of people testifying that they wanted to save the beautiful views that the forest provide and then urge the designation of lands a commercial forest lands of long term commercial significance. I see these as completely inconsistent points of views. The designation of lands as forest lands of long term commercial significance means that the county is eliminating the flexibility in use of lands and forcing the land owner to clear cut the property since that is the only financial use we've allowed. Designation of commercial forestry doesn't save our scenic views, they will destroy it. I found one of the areal photographs particularly enlightening. In section 24 of T20/R14 exhibit #44 the only land in that photo that haven't already been clear cut are the smaller parcels. We have to make a considering balancing of
factors in our designation. Forestry is an important part of our local economy and we want forestry to continue here. To date the county has already designated 98% of the land in this county which even arguably should have been designated as commercial forestry. Such a large designation clearly meets the requirements of GMA to preserve commercial forestry for long term use. We need as a county to have flexibility to balance all of the factors in GMA in our overall comprehensive plan to allow for considerations other than just maximizing the land that will be financially be forced to be clear cut or harvested.

With those major considerations and the others factors of GMA in mind, let me share with you my analysis, thoughts and comments on what we should do in this matter. There are basically four or five general areas that I have broken out my considerations into - These include the lands north of the Trendwest MPR proposal area, the MPR area west of Bullfrog Road, the Bullfrog area (the area between Bullfrog Road and Cle Elum/South Cle Elum), the areas north of and between Roslyn and Cle Elum and the areas east of Cle Elum. All of the remand area is in township 20, range 14, 15 and 16.

First lets look at 20/14. The first thing I'll address is the remand area in section 4. The remanded land is divided up into five different parcels, none of which meet the minimum lot size for commercial forest zoning. It is between commercial forest areas and rural areas. Given the lot sizes, I don't see how it is manageable as commercial forest of long term commercial significance. I also note that to the southeast there are a number of rural lots already in existence in less than ten acres in size. This land should not be designated commercial forest, but instead should be designated rural. Given the invalidity order which invalidated the underlying zoning, I would also suggest that the zoning for that rural area be forest and range 20.

The next general area I'd like to address is the Trendwest property which is West of Bullfrog Road. I segregate out the land between Bullfrog and Cle Elum, (the Cle Elum Study area) because even though that land is also part of the MPR application, that area has additional issues of concern. The west portion of the Trendwest lands has a number of issues to review. First I looked at the parcels which are less that the minimum lot size in the commercial forest zone and
would in general feel that excluding those parcels from designation is the most prudent course of action as far as reasonable of management units for long term commercial forestry. By my rough count there are around 80 lots which don’t meet the minimum lot size of 80 acres for commercial forest zoning. More than half of those could not be divided further with the twenty acre lot size minimum of the forest and range twenty zoning. The next consideration I have about this area is the concept of buffers or transitional areas or whatever other term you would to use. As I noted before, three of the seven criteria to determine if a particular piece of land meets the definition of zoning deal with proximity and adjacency to population areas, and urban and suburban development. I found nothing in the law that sets out some sort of magical or definite width that one would use as a buffer width. The lack of such a standard seems to make a lot of sense to me. What may be an appropriate buffer in one area may be bigger than needed or not big enough in another area for the needs of that particular area. This concept of topographical continuity as was coined by one of our planners John Rourbaugh says it all. You need to look at the topography and see what makes sense. From a long range planning concept the use of topographical features when possible for planning instead of section lines also makes sense. What I did was look at the areas we have here and rough sketched in a buffer line averaging about a half mile to a mile to see what I came up with. In drawing this line I also looked at the topographical maps that we had and the sections and lot lines. I doing that I found some pretty clear geographical marks which easily help serve to delineate good transitional buffer areas and retain some topographical continuity. Along the south west edge of the property you find that the ridge line runs roughly parallel to I-90 and there needs to be some transition from the development is section 22 of T20/R14. I would exclude those areas as proper buffer transition areas. I would also note that this buffer area is within the mountain to sounds greenway corridor which is basically designed to help protect these corridors from clear cutting and the designation of lands as commercial forest certainly seems to be contrary to that goal. To the north of the property from Roslyn through Ronald and into the Bakers Acres area the Cle Elum River makes a logical dividing line for a buffer or transition area until you reach section 19 of t20/R15 at which point a buffer line would probably need to follow along a lot lines. When you then take into consideration the combination of the smaller lot sizes and our overriding policy of wanting buffers around our urbanize areas, there is a crazy quilt of lots
which remain. We need to have continuity and consistency. To designate isolated pockets of commercial forest lands would result in inconsistent and incompatible areas. As noted by the fish and wildlife representative, you need continuity. This precludes the designation of such pockets and of fingers of land which extend out as in section 11. As you look at our overall plan you see that we have not created any isolated pockets of commercial forest lands. This is a solid concept that I believe we need to continue with. The only area that even comes to my mind for consideration of additional inclusion as commercial forest lands would be the areas in section 15 of t20/r14 based upon their size. Given the sizes of the lots immediately north and immediately south of this section it doesn't seem appropriate to try to squeeze even those to lots into the commercial forest zone. In looking at this, in fact, my preference would be to have excluded all of section 15 from commercial forest, but that would take it outside of the remand area so isn't something I feel I have the authority to do in this hearing. Therefore, just looking at the current division of the land and its proximity to population and urban and suburban areas, and continuity of commercial forest designations, I would not add any of the Trendwest land west of Bullfrog Road.

On top of all those considerations, we also have obviously the Trendwest application which has been filed with the county. The possibility of such an MPR development was never previously considered by the commissioners as a factor as to whether the land should be designated commercial forest. The possibility of such a development looms much larger. There is an actual application before the county. When that proposal will be ultimately presented to this Board for its consideration and possible approval or denial is unclear, but the possibility of such a use is no longer pure speculation. Such possible more intense usage is a factor which we are required to consider is evaluating whether the lands would meet the definition of forest lands of long term commercial significance. This factor standing alone would, in my opinion, be justification enough on its own to not designate this area as forest lands of long term commercial significance. Given the fact that the hearings board has invalidated the zoning in this area, I feel that we must also address the appropriate zoning for this area. I suggest that we all of this area in the Trendwest proposal be designated as forest and range twenty. Such a zoning would be consistent with the current lot sizes and be the largest lot size minimum in our zoning code for lands which are not designated as commercial forest.
The next area I'd like to look at is the Bullfrog area - the area between bullfrog road and Cle Elum. This area also includes lots less than eighty acres, would be part of a logical transition or buffer areas for Cle Elum, South Cle Elum and Roslyn. Inclusion of this land would also create islands of commercial forest lands, which we do not want to have occur for continuity of planning. In addition this area has multiple possible alternative and more intense alternative uses. These include the Trendwest MPR, plus possible community center, equestrian center, school expansion and the like. On top of that, this is a Cle Elum study area for potential future expansion or development of Cle Elum and possible expansion of their UGA once they have completed this planning. Taking all of these factors, I feel it would poor planning to designate any part of this area as commercial forest lands of long term commercial significance. The purpose of a comprehensive plan is to have the ability to look at the long term and plan for the future. To designate this land as long term commercial forest would be tantamount to saying the county see no possibility of use for this land in the long term as anything more than a clear cut or selective harvesting. That's not my vision. We need to balance the considerations under GMA and make reasoned decisions. Retaining this area as a rural area retains that flexibility for such potential growth. I would also propose that all of the land in this area be zoned forest and range 20.

The next area I would like to address are the lands surrounding Ronald, Roslyn and Cle Elum which have not already been addressed. These areas include lots of less than the 80 acre lot sizes for the commercial forest zone. But the biggest driving factor for this area is the need for these buffers or transition areas. GMA calls for them. To not provide for transition or buffer areas would be a violation of GMA requirements that we consider these issues. I would also note that as you look around the other areas in our comprehensive plan we have used such a transitional buffer approach with forest lands everywhere in the county. We need to be consistent. We are directed by GMA to be consistent and consider such factors when modifying our resource lands designation in our comprehensive plan. We must, in our comprehensive plan picture look at the big picture. We need buffers and we need transitions.

I would add on this point that frankly I feel that the buffers we currently have aren't big enough, but I can't touch those outside of the remand area. Given the topographic features along
there I would have preferred to move the buffers back to the ridge lines but we can't do that so I won't. An additional comment I'd like to make is that Plum Creek did testify that it would be OK with them if we designated a considerable portion of the land they in within the remand area as commercial forest. I am declining to do so. I'm sure that they said this in an attempt to put this issue to rest, and appreciate that. But, Plum Creek isn't the one who needs to plan for an overall coherent, and consistent land use vision for this county which we need. We absolutely need to stick with this transitional buffer concept that we have used consistently with our forest land designation throughout the county. I recognize that the non-designation of lands as commercial forest will not prevent logging if that is what the owner of that land wants to do. I believe, though, that we have to be consistent and that we have to try to minimize the conflicting use of industrial logging in close proximity to urbanized areas. The only way we can do this is by giving some incentive to the landowner, regardless of who they are, to look at alternative uses. In those buffer and transition areas I would also propose that we designate the land there as forest and range twenty.

The final area I need to address is the land generally east of Cle Elum. As I've talked about before, this topographical continuity, attempting to preserve our scenic views calls for not designating these lands as commercial forest. As I've said about a lot of other areas, I would probably want to move back the commercial forestry designation further back to the ridge line, but I can't in the context of this remand. We need to provide some incentive to the owners of this land to not destroy the scenic nature of this land by industrial logging in this area which is the view you see from Cle Elum and the freeway. This too is part of the mountains to sound greenway areas whose whole purpose was to preserve the beauty of this area which was being spoiled by the numerous clear cuts. As I noted before, by not designating land as commercial forest we are creating incentive to preserve the forests rather that eliminate them.

With that, I move that the county not designate the remand lands as commercial forest lands. I further move that we designate these lands as rural lands and that the zoning for these lands be forest and range 20.
Shaded Area represents change in zoning from Rural-3 to Forest and Range-20.
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
COUNTY OF KITTITAS
STATE OF WASHINGTON

RESOLUTION

NO. 93-41

ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERIM CLASSIFICATION AND DESIGNATION SYSTEM FOR NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS OF LONG-TERM COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE -FOREST LANDS.

WHEREAS, agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands provide the basic economic and social foundation accounting for the historical growth and development of Kittitas County and provide a desirable living environment;

WHEREAS, a technical resource advisory committee was organized to assist in the classification and designation process pursuant to 36.70A RCW and WAC 365.190;

WHEREAS, public hearings were held February 4, February 11, and April 14, 1992 and March 23, 1993 regarding classifications and designations pursuant to Chapter 365.190 WAC; and these classifications and designations were recommended by the Kittitas County Planning Commission;

WHEREAS, the classification and designation process will in no way preclude any existing use, or alteration in use of these lands;

WHEREAS, The Board of Kittitas County Commissioners find the standards and procedures set forth in this Resolution to be essential to the protection of the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of Kittitas County and the adoption thereof to be in the public interest;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED: The Board of County Commissioners hereby approves the attached INTERIM CLASSIFICATION AND DESIGNATION SYSTEMS FOR NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS OF LONG-TERM COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE - FOREST LANDS
ADOPTED this 14th day of April, 1993.

BOARD OF KITTITAS COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

RAY OWENS, CHAIRMAN

MARY SEUBERT

MARY SEUBERT, COMMISSIONER

ATTESTED
BY
Anita Kaiser
Clerk of the Board

DON SORENSON, COMMISSIONER

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

David Pitts,
Prosecuting Attorney
SECTION 1.0
PURPOSE AND INTENT

1.010 STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

1) To recognize natural resource lands of long-term commercial significance within Kittitas County. Therefore, future land use decisions will be supported by reliable technical data and informed decisions will be made.

2) To comply with the Washington State Growth Management Act of 1990.

3) To comply with the current Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan.

1.020 ADMINISTRATION.

The Kittitas County Planning Department is hereby appointed to administer and implement this Resolution by classifying and designating the Natural Resource Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance as so herein defined.

SECTION 2.0
DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this Resolution, the following definitions shall apply.

2.010 "Forest land" (classification) means land primarily useful for growing trees, including Christmas trees subject to the excise tax imposed under RCW 84.33.100 through 84.33.140, for commercial purposes, and that has long-term commercial significance for growing trees commercially.

2.020 "Forest lands of long-term commercial significance" (designation) are all forest lands that are not already characterized by urban growth or rural residential settlement and that have long-term significance for the commercial production of timber.

2.030 "Long-term commercial significance" includes the growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of the land for long-term commercial production, in consideration with the land’s proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more intense uses of land.

2.040 "Natural resource lands" include the following:

1. Agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance;
2. Forest lands of long-term commercial significance; and,

2.050 "Urban governmental services" include those governmental services historically and typically delivered by cities, and include storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, street cleaning services, fire and police protection services, public transit services, and other public utilities associated with urban areas and normally not associated with nonurban areas.

2.060 "Urban growth" refers to growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and permeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of such land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources. When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services. "Characterized by urban growth" refers to land having urban growth located on it, or to land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth.

2.070 "Urban growth areas" means those areas designated by a county pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110.
SECTION 3.0
CLASSIFICATION AND DESIGNATION OF FOREST LANDS OF LONG-TERM COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

3.010 Land Capability for Forest Use Classification.

The County shall use the Private Forest Land Grades of the Dept. of Revenue, WAC 458-40-530 to classify forest lands. This system incorporates consideration of growing capacity, productivity and soil composition of the land for growing timber.

Generally, forest lands will include land classified in the higher levels of the Private Forest Land Grade classification system as present within Kittitas County. The presence of relatively lower (or higher) private forest land grades within an area of predominantly higher (or lower) grades should not necessarily preclude the County from classifying these areas as forest lands. Land Grades Seven and Eight should not be considered suitable for classification as forest land.

Ch. 458-40 (WAC) Taxation of Forest Land and Timber
Washington State Private Forest Land Grades for the Eastside:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>SITE INDEX</th>
<th>LAND PER 100 YRS</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS FIR</td>
<td>140 AND OVER</td>
<td>120 - 139</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PONDEROSA PINE</td>
<td>UNDER 70</td>
<td>MFP</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 OR 8</td>
<td>7 OR 8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 - THESE ARE THE SITE INDICES FOR 100% STOCKED STANDS. STANDS W/ LOWER STOCKING LEVELS WOULD REQUIRE HIGHER SITE INDICES TO OCCUR IN THE SAME LAND GRADE.

*2 - (MFP) MARGINAL FOREST PRODUCTIVITY WILL BE LAND GRADE 8, OPERABILITY CLASS 3, IN ALL TOWNSHIPS WEST OF RANGE 15 EAST, W.M.

*3 - (NC) NONCOMMERCIAL.

The Department of Revenue Private Forest Land Grades' next step, Operability Classes, is not clear and concise indication of actual forest land as applied to the County. The higher level Operability Classes occur where slope is steepest. The assumption is that harvesting will be less expensive on areas with lesser slope. However, harvesting expense in the County is determined solely by slope. As the use of the Department of Revenue Private Forest Land Grades' Operability Classes is not sufficiently applicable, therefore, the County will not include consideration of those Operability Classes in classifying forest land.

3.020 Criteria: Designation of Forest Land Of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

The County shall also consider the combined effects of proximity of the forest land to population areas and the possibility of more intense uses of the land as indicated by the following criteria:

1. Relationship or proximity to urban growth areas, suburban areas and rural settlements: forest lands of long-term commercial significance are located outside the urban and suburban areas and rural settlements;

2. Land use and settlement patterns nearby: their intensity and compatibility with forest lands of long-term commercial significance;

3. The availability of urban public services and facilities;

4. Long-term economic and technological conditions which affect the ability to manage timberlands for long-term commercial production;

5. Predominant management unit size: forest lands of long-term commercial significance consists of predominantly large management units;

6. Suitability of alternative land uses;
7. History and use permits issued nearby; and,

8. Tax status: a parcel should be considered for designation as forest land of long-term commercial significance if assessed as open space or forest land pursuant to RCW 84.33 or RCW 84.34.

APPENDIX A

The Overall Process of Classification and Designation as Natural Resource Land of Long-term Commercial Significance

1. The Process.
When the Growth Management Act of 1990 (the Act) defines a term, that definition must be used without change when implementing the Act. The “Minimum Guidelines,” Section 5, repeat these definitions, and they must be adopted by the County in its implementation actions. Other terms have been defined through long-term use. The Guidelines give that usage considerable weight and emphasize established approaches such as that developed by the Soil Conservation Service for classifying soils. The Guidelines steer local staff towards existing state or federal programs that represent the best available models for classifying and designating natural resource lands. The use of established programs or models helps to support consistent and coordinated implementation of resource protection among the many agencies involved.

Classification is the first step in implementing Section 5 of the Act. It means defining categories to which natural resource lands will be assigned. After defining categories, natural resource lands will be inventoried according to those categories.

Pursuant to Section 17 of the Act, natural resource lands will be designated based on that inventory. Designation means, at least, formal adoption of a policy statement and may include further legislative action. Designating inventoried lands for comprehensive planning and policy definition may be less precise than subsequent regulation of specific parcels for conservation and protection.

Classifying, inventory, and designating natural resource lands should not imply a change in a landowner’s right to use his or her land under current law. Land uses are regulated on a tax parcel and innovative land use management techniques are applied when the County adopts regulations, pursuant to Section 6 of the Act, to conserve and protect designated natural resource land. The Department of Community Development (DCD) will provide technical assistance to the County on a wide array of regulatory options and alternative land use management techniques which the County shall consider.

These guidelines may result in natural resource land designations that overlay other land use classifications. That is, if two or more designations apply to a given parcel, or portion of a parcel, both or all designations apply.

2. Public Participation.
The County will prepare a specific public participation plan to include the designation process and, where required, adoption of development regulations protecting natural resource lands.

3. Adoption Process.
Statutory and local processes already in place governing land use decisions are the minimum processes required for designation and regulation pursuant to Sections 1 and 6 of the Act. Beginning with classification, the County’s decisions should incorporate public participation, including using advisory committees with representation from all interested parties, adjacent counties and cities, and the general public. At least these steps should be included in the process:

A. Accept the Act requirements
B. Consider minimum guidelines developed by DCD under Section 5.
C. Consider other definitions used by state and federal regulatory agencies.
D. Consider definitions used by the County and other counties and cities.
E. Determine recommended definitions and check conformance with minimum Act definitions.
F. Adopt definition, classification, and standards into the County land use codes.

4. Intergovernmental Coordination.
The Act requires coordination among communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts and strive for consistent definitions, standards, and designations within their region. There are two forms for an intergovernmental coordination process to take. These two are spelled out at length within “Minimum
5. **Mapping.**
Although there is no specific requirement for inventorying or mapping natural resource lands, the County may adopt additional development regulations regulating uses adjacent to natural resource lands. Logically, the only way to regulate adjacent lands is to know where the protected lands are. Therefore, mapping natural resource lands, including existing maps and sources, is a practical way to make regulation effective.

6. **Evaluation.**
When the County adopts a comprehensive plan, the Act requires that it evaluate designations and develop regulations to assure they are consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan. When considering changes to the designations or development regulations, the County should seek inter-jurisdictional coordination and public participation.

7. **Designation Amendment Process.**
Land use planning is a dynamic process. Procedures for designation should provide a rational and predictable basis for accommodating change.

Land use designations must provide landowners and public service providers with the information necessary to make decisions. This includes:

- A. Determining when and where growth will occur,
- B. What services are and will be available,
- C. How they might be financed, and
- D. What type and level of land use is reasonable and/or appropriate.

Resource managers need to know where and when conversions of natural resource lands might occur, response to growth pressures and how these changes will affect resource management.

Requests for redesignation shall only be submitted by the County, or the landowner(s) or legal representative(s). Changes to natural resource land designations should be based on consistency with one or more of the following criteria:

- A. Changes in circumstances pertaining to the comprehensive plan or public policy.
- B. A change in circumstances beyond the control of landowner pertaining to the subject properties.
- C. An error in designation.
- D. New information provided by the landowner on natural resource lands status.

For the interim period, during which time final comprehensive plans and individual elements will be developed, designation changes of commercial forest lands, made at the request of the landowner(s), shall be as follows:

- A. Directly after the date of adoption of the Forest Land of Long-term Commercial Significance Map _1993 (map not intended to be parcel-specific) by the Kittitas County Board of Commissioners, notification shall be made by legal notice of its adoption, including publication of the map and the ability to request redesignation.
- B. Landowner(s) shall have sixty (60) days from the date of legal notice publication described above to submit a written request for redesignation of their properties to the Kittitas County Board of Commissioners.
- C. Written requests shall be submitted through the Kittitas County Planning Department, including parcel number(s), physical description, and explanation of what commercial forest land classification and/or designation criteria does or does not apply to the property; including its Private Forest Land Grade; its proximity to urban growth areas, suburban areas and rural settlements; the nearby land use patterns' intensity and compatibility with commercial forest activities; the availability of urban public services and facilities; long-term economic and technological conditions; predominantly large management units in and surrounding; feasibility of alternative uses; history of land use permits issued nearby; and, its tax status.
- D. County Planning Department staff, with appropriate technical assistance, shall make specific written findings regarding approval or denial of such requests to the Kittitas County Board of Commissioners. Within sixty (60) days receipt of written requests, the County Board of Commissioners shall set a public hearing to consider all such requests and shall approve or deny the requests.
I. Renomination from Forest Land of Long-Term Commercial Significance shall be permitted upon findings that the classification and designation criteria as identified in this resolution do not apply to the subject properties.

II. Redesignation to Forest Land of Long-Term Commercial Significance shall be permitted upon a finding that the classification and designation criteria as identified in this resolution do apply to the subject properties.

E. The current Forest Land of Long-term Commercial Significance Map 1993 shall remain in effect during the request process.

F. After a decision is made regarding redesignation, no new request or appeal process for the same property will be considered. Final review of the classification and designation system and designation map for commercial forest lands will occur through the sub-area planning committees' comprehensive plans.

G. Removal from or inclusion into designation and any such resulting uses of properties shall not substantially impair the ability of adjacent properties to be managed as so designated, including but not limited to nuisance factors.

8. Goal and Policy.
The requirement to preclude incompatible uses and development in natural resource lands does not mean that all non-resource uses or development in natural resource lands should be prohibited. The County will instead:

A. Identify land uses or development that can adversely affect natural resource lands;

B. Prohibit clearly inappropriate actions; and

C. Restrict, condition, or allow other uses as appropriate.