Comments Received During the Comprehensive Plan Open Houses
Held on May 24th, 25th, 30th and June 1st, 2006

May 24, 2006 Open House, Lower County, Hal Holmes Center, Ellensburg, WA

Nice to preserve farmland but what happens when the present farmers are too old to farm
and there is no one to take over nor are the interested in doing so.

By government limiting grower’s options is a taking- don’t presume to tell us what to do
with our lifetime investment.

-unknown

If we want to preserve farmland for agriculture, and we must, then keep residential
development out of the Ag area. Suburban development is not compatible with Ag
Operations. They will complain.

-unknown

Splitting or dividing 20 acres?

I am told I can do only 1 split to my 20 acres. Nearby acreages is divided recently into 2
and 3 acre pieces. Is a process available to divide my property to 3 or 4 pieces? Maybe a
variance of zoning?

- Harry and Sharon Baron, 968-3850

Please put the RLAC proposed maps on the website. Thank you.

Please bring the performance based standards 16.09. Thank you.

-unknown

Why is development process started without notification on Reecer Creek land. Property
next to us split.

-Ron and Debbie Kuhn, 2941 Reecer Creek Road

In 1990 we had a choice to purchase land zoned Ag-20, Forest-20, Ag-3 and Suburban.
We made a personal and business investment decision to buy 149 acres zoned Ag-3
because of its development potential. At that time our purchased land made up 8-9% of
all the Ag-3 land in Kittitas County.

The rezone proposal would change our Ag-3 lands to Ag-5. If we want to subdivide our
land into 3 acre or 2 ½ parcels we would have to buy additional development rights from
Commercial Ag land owners. That’s ridiculous! Presently we have greater development rights than Commercial Ag. Why should we diminish our development rights and then buy them back from somebody who has less development rights than I presently.

The rezone proposal is not acceptable at this time.

-Dimitri Bader

Ellensburg UGA should stop at Berry Road. It is not good to slip urban development by a freeway if it’s not necessary. One reason is restricted movement for emergency vehicles.

-unknown

ADU and ALQ are excellent concepts that allow extended or elderly families to remain supportive and should be allowed in all areas, not just designated areas.

-unknown

**May 25, 2006 Open House, Upper County, Cle Elum Senior Center, Cle Elum, WA**

*Submitted in box (see attached):
-Upper County Vision Plan
-Letter from CTED to City of Cle Elum Mayor Charles Glondo dated October 1, 2004 re: Proposed amendments to comprehensive plan and grading ordinance.

In all planning, include provision for recreational access and facilities.

- Duane Fluert

Please put Upper County Vision Plan on County website!

-unknown

No rezone mentality is of concern to me especially in regards to a process that I am personally involved in at Snoqualmie Pass where a PUD technically is requiring a rezone to a PUD. With the controversy of “rezones” in the County I wish there were another term for this process.

-Chris Lyons, Stargazer Properties, Snoqualmie Pass, chris@stargazerprop.com

My concern is the Bullfrog Intersection. The property east of No 245th should be included in the Cle Elum UGA and the zoning standardized so that you do not have Rural-3, Sub and Commercial in the same block. Neighbors are becoming victims.

-Don Oakland
I think as the county grows and continues to experience increased visitors that motorized versus non-motorized recreation areas really needs to be looked at and planned for. We need to protect both but mixing of the two creates conflict and is detrimental to the experience of recreation that we should carefully plan for and protect. For instance snow mobiles are moving into an area that has many decades been prime ski area. We will loose what makes us wonderful if we don’t plan for both but separate uses.

-unknown

No urban sprawl!

-unknown

Don’t put the cart before the horse. Do comprehensive studies on roads, water, well log studies, aquifers, etc!!! Before you make these types of decisions. Growth should be from urban areas out “NOT FROM RURAL AND FARMLANDS”!

-unknown

Please put Upper County Vision Plan on County Website.

-unknown

We need to have a comprehensive study done on water supplies and aquifers before we continue to rezone properties. Look at well logs and number of wells drying up before continuing on with growth. Also look at roads, egress and ingress, etc. Too many mistakes have been done to date without proper studies, etc. Don’t rezone and then look at the issues. You can’t unzone!

-unknown

I believe this county needs to grow as more people are moving to Kittitas County from the greater Seattle Area. I think that growth should start in the already designated UGNs and UGAs. There needs to be a system that provides for the rural feel that us current residents already enjoy. I believe the best way to do this is through clusters which provide open space.

-unknown

Bicycle paths, trails for people, public transportation, wildlife corridors. Stop developing every inch.

-unknown

Dark skies. Get rid of R-3. No ridge top development. Make sure there’s water.
RLAC recommendation #1 on water is nice, but only for users of that (new) system. What insures that system won’t impact users in another area?

RLAC recommendation #3- why does it address sub area planning only in Teanaway? Why not all drainage areas? All wetland/drainage/low land areas? Water impacts all creeks and the rivers.

The only protection we have to preserve habitat-resource land, farm land, etc is current zoning. It should not be changed until all problems- critical areas, water issues, roads, etc. are studied and questions are answered. I support a moratorium on rezones until this happens.

I am in favor of any growth/development that will bring jobs to Roslyn/Cle Elum. People should be able to find decent well paying jobs here without driving 80 miles. The county needs to do whatever possible to increase jobs in our area.

Master Planned Resorts need to be monitored! They must adhere to local development agreements.

Still concerned with: lack of area/county wide water resource plan, fire, fire, fire, support, roads, transportation plan

Seems as if the: buffer zones disappear, zoning rules would change? If so that is BAD.

No road on Roslyn Ridge.

Keep sense of community. No sprawl and what about affordable housing? Have different price levels for folks. It is doable. We need to make it doable.
Resource lands, Ag, just need a lot more protection. R-3 zone should be abolished. The Upper County Vision Plan needs to be well incorporated in Comp Plan. SEPA needs to begin at rezone, at project action it is too late. Dark skies forever. No development on ridge tops. Decrease Ronald UGN. Water availability needs to be demonstrated up front. Please put Upper County Vision Plan on your website. Wildlife corridors. More trails and parks.

During the creation of the Upper County Vision Plan public meeting were held in Ronald, Cle Elum, Easton and Snoqualmie Pass. It was made very clear the #1 concern of citizens in Upper County is to preserve wildlife habitat, resource land, and water. It was also made clear cluster housing development is undesirable and does not fit in the rural environment. Leave zoning as is.

Still seems to maintain current high rate on loss of large tracts. Let’s clusters where they do not belong. Should only be in UGA areas, not Forest and Range/AG.

RLAC recommendation #3- TDR/PDR is good, BUT keep development as close as possible to existing towns. Not cluster in Commercial Forest or even Forest and Range/AG.

Has the county analyzed the legal ramifications of the aggressive actions being discussed? Who would pay the cost of any potential challenges/lawsuits from developers and private citizens? Will they be looking only at form or substance too? Familiar with GMA? Case law?

vickiatwork@hotmail.com

Urban Growth Nodes (UGNs) are more properly LAMRIDS. All UGNs should be redesignated LAMRIDS. The town of Ronald, which cannot provide urban services to other lands within the UGN should be taken from the UGN and designated a LAMRID as should Pine Loch Sun III. I will expand this proposal by letter to Mr. Piercy of CDS in the near future.

-James Boyle, PO Box 39, Ronald, WA 98940, 649-3171
 Extend the Bullfrog UGA to east of 903 up to N 245th Road. Current growth trends need to be looked at soon in the Bullfrog/903 intersection neighborhood.

-Jerry Morris

The county should have as a condition of development that all public access that was allowed before by Plum Creek be maintained for public access by the developer. Especially when the access road led to National Forest Land via trails or roads usable by vehicles. Blocking the access route to the public is in effect providing private hunting and recreational land for residents of future cluster plats.

-Jim Boyle, PO Box 39, Ronald, WA 98940, 649-3171

Road transportation plan. Fire and wild land fire protection. Water study. Growth in urban areas, not in rural lands. Create spaces for affordable housing and low income housing. Do not allow for cluster developments in Commercial Forest areas. Don’t build in Commercial Ag area.

-unknown

I am concerned about the water/wells. Please encourage more testing before approving more development.

-unknown

Cluster/Transfer of Development Rights is a formula for disaster. This County is growing out of control and there is a perception by the public that the developers are still running the County. The Comp Plan Update needs to written very carefully with the future of the County considered as the most important aspect. The zoning and land use maps should be tied together- when one changes the other must be amended to reflect the changes.

-unknown

The Elk Heights area should receive residential and rural zoning. Rural 3 and 5 are still valid needs. Future growth needs to include this. Especially encouraged in the sagebrush lands that aren’t great Ag lands or forest. 20 acre zoning is goofy. Too small for Commercial Forest or Ag, too big for rural residence.

-unknown

I question the public benefit rating system. How can open space on private land benefit the general public other than restrict access to recreation areas, etc.

-unknown
Thanks for the meeting! Quick summary comments:
-lots of new houses (last 10-12 years) in Peoh Point/Westside areas adjacent to Cle Elum/So. Cle Elum
-All the traffic from these rural residents funnels into Cle Elum/So. Cle Elum across one bridge, with a single very congested intersection at corner of S. Cle Elum Way/1st St in Cle Elum. We need a second bridge- Cle Elum to South Cle Elum.
-Logical place- extend Oakes Ave (Cle Elum) across Yakima River to Madison St- South side of river.
-Kittitas County needs to be involved! It is County residents which have added the traffic to these intersections.
-Looking forward to working with County/State on this.
-North of Cle Elum: for lands with recent rezones north of Cle Elum- to minimize traffic into quiet Cle Elum neighborhoods- plan for and require a Rural Arterial from Hwy 903 at the High School- also known as “Church Property” or “Alliance Road”- complete this road (by planned stages with development) all the way across the northern parcels to the east and tie with White Road on the east. This will be an immense help to traffic flow in general, and will minimize traffic impacts to existing city neighborhoods. Also, extend White Road from Airport Road to Hwy 970 at the freeway interchange. Put this project on Capital list.

-Ken Ratliff, member of Cle Elum City Council, 804 Roslyn Place, Cle Elum

I am concerned about population growth/development on R-20 and the transition to R-5. I moved out here to have space.

-unknown

Continue making decision re: rezones that are consistent with existing Comp Plan designations. If implement RLAC be sure that the zoning and land use maps are appropriate baselines. Give people an option to be in or out of Ag Lands of Long Term Significance. Give people chance to opt in/out of new development provisions. Make sure adequate TDR receiving sites are selected and market values plus more are offered. Give cities opportunity to expand UGA to meet current immediate build out demands of a community, such as commercial uses, services. Don’t prevent expansion because existing UGA is too big. Water is an issue. Promote health community concepts.

-unknown

1. Has the County applied for or received any grants from CTED to hire a consultant to assist the County’s overloaded and inexperienced staff with the Comp Plan update? If not, why not? 2. I believe the Upper County Vision statement should be considered a very important guide to the Comp Plan Updated. 3. The County must not wait to inventory its available water for domestic supplies. The current study being done by USGS and the Yakama Indians will not include a comprehensive study of the Upper County. 4. Development should take place adjacent to and within the current UGAs. Cluster development should not be allowed outside of these areas. 5. There should be
more control over exempt and Class B Wells. 6. I believe there needs to be better public access and participation in the Comp Plan updated. 7. I would like to see Comp Plan progress available on the County’s website. 8. I would like to see Public Notices posted on the County’s website.

-unknown

May 30, 2006 Open House, Lower County, Hal Holmes Center, Ellensburg, WA

Stop subdividing farmlands please. What are we doing with our future? Find some other way to help landowners make better decisions on land use.

-unknown

UGN allocations for population 2020 of 10% and 5,281 is way too optimistic given the restraints of water hook-ups available for future growth. Ellensburg had much more water and other urban services available to handle more of the population projection for 2025.

-unknown

Growth should be concentrated around cities such as Ellensburg, Cle Elum and Kittitas which have water, sewer, road systems, etc. to support the future growth. UGAs should be closely looked at to make sure they are sized properly to allow for the future population estimates, but not too large to promote sprawl.

-unknown

PLAN AHEAD

-unknown

To Resource Land Advisory: Thank you for all your work. Thank you for stirring up the issues that needed stirring. The next issue is enforcement! Please keep on stirring! Lots of us support you onward!

-unknown

It would help me make more sense of the maps if maybe there was one key that was respectively for the entire map- including the smaller outset maps. It would keep everything unified and help me become used to looking at the same keys throughout.

-unknown

Road names are so tiny print and orange color. No wonder it was impossible to read the maps in the newspaper! Please improve this.
1. Stop subdividing now until real water supply studies have been done which factor in to best of ability, snow pack and water supply projects in face of global warming. 2. Change tax structure to benefit existing farms and sock it to them tax-wise if they subdivide (which they do in Chelan County). 3. Stop rubber stamping projects like Wildhorse until you really know what’s out there. We lost a treasure, with little long-term impact on County offers. 4. Don’t be afraid to preserve for the future generations.

County must make public statement support now and continue for the need for aquifer and surface water information ASAP!

Mapping Public Meetings: Please show parcels created with zoning overlay to show what we have now! This is our baseline and crucial piece of information from which we plan.

Please follow through with COG consideration and recommendation process after public input on formula for population. Population 2025.

Too much information of each map. Try transparent overlays.

Have different dos such as red for commercial growth and blue for residential growth. Rather than one color for “growth.” I feel there is a difference.

-Jack Kelleher

I don’t know if it’s in your arena of control, but I think more attention should be paid to the type and especially the quality of homes that are being built. Walking through some homes at various stages of construction, I wonder what they will look like and how functional they will be in 7-10 years.

-Jack Kelleher

As much of an improvement as these proposals are, they are a waste of time unless they are properly administered and enforced. More qualified staff. Thank you.
-Rich Wilkins, 968-4783

#4 Vision Statement: We don’t believe that affordable housing is really in the plan. With no or very little industrial areas and no ports—people with medium income cannot survive in Ellensburg.

-unknown

I support the Resource Land Advisory Committees recommendations except change Cluster/TDR recommendation to require acquisition of development rights if fall below 20 acre minimum. Example—want 1 per 5 acres need to find development right—don’t trigger TDR’s at 2.5 acres!

I support sub basin planning recommendation for Teanaway.

Increase mixed use, pedestrian/bicycle enhancements and transit elements through TDR program in urban “receiving zone” allow smaller lot sizes in urban zone to accommodate growth. This will give us a vibrant retail atmosphere. Use Portland, Oregon as model!

-unknown

Define open space in plan update.

Define strategies for preserving open space.

Create goal for enhancing pedestrian/bicycle transport.

Make developers pay their way through fees in lieu—a straight fee that can be waived if they dedicate land for parks, schools, trails, or open space.

-Holly English, henglish@elltel.net

Seriously—this process is too difficult—doesn’t reflect real life or future likelihoods.

-unknown

What a tortured path we take, when land we try to regulate.

-unknown

If the NRCS soils data map is a representation of accuracy of other props or info provided then all of the info is meaningless.

-unknown
The cobbled together marks in Hidden Valley Road- Burke Road area does not represent prime farmland.

-unknown

County must actively and continuously coordinate plans with cities. Most important to keep transportation and utility corridors extending from cities past UGA boundary into County coordinated and clear for future, rational urban growth. Clustering is a good start.

-unknown

1) I support the cluster subdivision concept. 2) Limit or stop re-zoning in commercial forest and commercial-ag.

-unknown

I oppose any changes to the Comp. Plan. I will defend our right to stay in the UGA-south of Ellensburg.

-Mike Moeur

I support the emphasis on sub-area planning in the Teanaway drainage; this drainage is our healthiest habitat for salmonids and needs to be protected. I support a moratorium on rezones until the completion of the Comprehensive Plan.

-Rebecca Wassell, 810 Sanders, Ellensburg, WA 98926

I have studied each proposal and do not agree with it. I believe the current rules should be left as is.

-Harry Masterson

1. I support the cluster subdivision concept. 2. Moratorium should be in acted on rezones until the Comp Plan is completed. 3. Maps presented at public meetings should not be misleading. E.g.- U.S. Forest Service Land owned by the USDOD are not Commercial Ag. Wilderness lands under the Wenatchee Forest Plan are not Commercial Forest or Rural acres to be counted toward. The County has access to good Landownership maps and should use them. 4) Need a sub-area plan for Teanaway.

-Luci Bull

Development around Snoqualmie Pass and along I-90 should be very limited. WSDOT is spending millions of dollars on wildlife corridors and bridges. Development in Section II and Gold Creek will diminish greatly the value of the wildlife bridges. Section II is very close to the wilderness boundary and a large development there would be unfortunate.
-Luci Bull

Consider changing Ellensburg UGA to cut off Southern trail; (below sewage treatment plant) possibly add to North and East.

-unknown

I feel that this plan would not be the best for this County and leave it as it is.

-Gerry Gotch

In March 1994 impact fees were recommended by the Kittitas COG. Why aren’t there any?

-unknown

All UGNs should be planned in a way to retain the core for commercial activity and prohibit commercial development on the periphery.

-unknown

No Wal-Mart! Corporations have all the rights of human citizens but few of the responsibilities or ethical considerations. Some of the actions by Wal-Mart Corp. if committed by human individuals would be unconscionable. I arrived in Ellensburg from New Orleans with little but the clothes on my back. I was able to replace all my belongings shopping locally. So why are people complaining about lack of local shopping.

-Joni Pinkney

Future residential development should be channeled into the urban growth areas and nodes. There should be no more questionable re-zones for developments such as the Badger Pocket one. The maximum lot size for cluster development should be the size of a city lot, not 1 acre.

-unknown

I have seen Wal-Mart kill two towns: London, KY and Hermitage, TN and I do not want big box stores to drive the smaller shops out of business. The council needs to encourage stores to come downtown instead of building a large shopping center on the interchanges then turn downtown into a ghost town.

- Bears, 606 Manitoba, kahuna_2bears@yahoo.com
In summary, I contend that not grandfathering rezones less that 20 acres is unfair as property owners incurred or are incurring significant expenses in order to meet the county’s short plat regulations. They should be allowed to continue that process under the regulations in effect when they initiated the process. If the county wants to go with the 20-acre zone/cluster approach, it should only apply to present property zoned for 20 acres. Sorry, but areas zoned for smaller lot configurations have been done through the legal process and much of that is in the process of being short-platted. To revert to another zoning on top of this pattern is unfair, and, I would venture to say, illegal. Please drop the proposal of reversion to 20 acre zoning of any property not having a tax parcel number.

Sincerely,
William D. Schmidt
310 Mission View Drive
Ellensburg, WA 98926
sigmarr@eilltel.net

1. Encourage public private partnerships for land exchanges to protect agricultural/natural resource lands.
2. Provide some other mechanism for farmers and others who own Rural tracts to provide a retirement income other than selling off parcels.

GPO 2.144 New conflicting uses/protected by code for mining activities. Similar provisions should be made for other emerging natural resource industries such as wind power.

Agriculture lands-
1. Cluster subdivisions are a start, but I am concerned that ultimately they can be used as a defensive weapon to create a checkerboard effect throughout prime farmlands.
2. Incentives for keeping land in agricultural production by large landowners should be given.
3. Open space in cluster subdivisions should be clustered together and have incentives for keeping land in agricultural production.
4. Options and incentives for merger of previously subdivided parcels to the agricultural lands designation 20.
5. Mandatory new development drought tolerant/native landscaping on all new development. If they want grass, something should be grazing on it. GPO 2.127b

Dot Exercise
1. Growth should be centered in Ellensburg AND VANTAGE. It seems that we have a major opportunity to provide redevelopment and capture $$$ to our economy that are natural outlets for Grant County’s burgeoning tourist and manufacturing bases at Quincy and George.
2. Better planning for the city of Ellensburg, especially the north end, in terms of service grocery stores, etc. The current planning scheme which requires North
South transit on Water and Main Street is inappropriate. The County must address this issue rather than leaving it solely up to the City of Ellensburg.

3. Infill, high density housing and redevelopment of City parcels in the $100,000-$200,000 range is necessary in the cities of Cle Elum, Roslyn, Ellensburg, Kittitas. Must be historically appropriate in aesthetics.

Accessory Dwelling Units- exceptions should be made for commercial agriculture to provide on-farm high-density housing for persons employed on the farm on a permanent or seasonal basis. Housing should conform to all applicable building codes and not be substandard. Penalties should be imposed for tenant rental to non-farm labor. Should require annual verification. Tax incentives should be provided and affordability is a must. The county should engage in appropriate support of farm worker housing needs.

June 1, 2006 Open House, Upper County, Cle Elum Senior Center, Cle Elum, WA

*Submitted in box (see attached):
-RIDGE Recommendations

Affordable housing! 20-25% of any development needs to be priced to reflect median incomes in the county. Encourage or require “cottage” housing/industry in high density developments.

-unknown

Lighting- protect the night sky. Not just for new developments, but a push should begin to encourage people to change existing lighting to lest obtrusive systems.

-Hal Lindstrom

Protect resource lands. Don’t permit willy nelly non-conforming developments (housing) in. For example, prime farmland with first class water rights, as was done near where I live. The Board of Adjustment, ok’d the change from Ag-20 (for no good reason.)

-Hal Lindstrom

Access roads- all new road construction should include bicycle access or at a minimum be constructed with bicycle safety in mind.

-Hal Lindstrom

Stop using the term “Commercial Forest” for land that is wilderness- specifically the Alpine Lakes Wilderness. Makes no sense.

-Hal Lindstrom
Protect public access to existing rights-of-way. For example: when a forest trail is routed through both public and private land (happens often with Plum Creek and USFS lands) the trail access should be protected and continued if the private forest land is sold and subdivided.

-Hal Lindstrom

Don’t allow development in Gold Creek that would compromise wildlife access. An approximately $20 million bridge is in the planning stage for I-90 of near Gold Creek and any significant development would there would destroy the bridges function of providing wildlife access.

-Hal Lindstrom

There is no water for more development.

-unknown

First of all, are you actually going to listen to us? That’s a big deal you know I mean technically these residents are the ones who made this county. The residents who have been here for decades and generations. They know what this land can handle.

There is not a lot of water here. Let’s not look past that or pretend nothing is wrong. Developers can make a killing, leave town and dangle new residents high and dry. And new residents will suck the water from the older ones.

Affordable housing and rent control. 17% of the county residents (roughly) are below poverty line. Housing prices have risen over 100% in some cases in the past 5 years. Inflation is up 5%. Wages are hardly increasing. For example, the ski resort at Snoqualmie used to pay the employees at the Nordic Ski Center $10/hour. This was about 7 years ago. Now they pay minimum wage and stopped supplying a shuttle to work. Gas prices are nearly double in the past 5 years. Wages on this side of the pass are pretty low. The average income is less than $25,000 (per person). So affordable housing and rent control need consideration.

-unknown

RE: RLAC Cluster/TDR Recommendation: Make sure a TDR study and land use market analysis is completed ASAP! The concept is great for protection of Commercial Ag, but we need to create a point system that looks beyond the designated Comm Ag and captures the most productive Ag and resource lands. Give highest priority to lands that also contain CAOs, use updated PBRS.

-Kelly Larimer

General comments:
-Make sure future/upcoming CAOs and SMP updates are incorporated in the 2006 Comp Plan Update. Add language to guide these upcoming processes in order to avoid major conflict when these updates are due. Add strategies and goals to line out the process.

- Conduct a list of community services study and add additional land use/development alternatives to forecast long-term fiscal impacts future growth modeling

- Add Kittitas County staff to conduct long-range and non-reg based planning

RE: “Allow the use of the cluster subdivision code in the Commercial Forest designation.” This should be removed from the policy issues and recommendations, as it appears to read as a blanket statement on all Commercial Forest lands. The intent of that section was to address specific needs/situation of the Teanaway American Forest Resource Land. All private Commercial Forest lands need to have the scrutiny of a sub area plan before allowing development. Big issue here.

RE: RLAC Policy issues and recommendations: Review and update the public benefit rating system in order to ensure points are awarded that truly reflect public benefits including protection/enhancement of habitat and recreational corridors, ag, and high value resource lands. Use the PBRS to cumulatively conserve usable open space in perpetuity or long term.

-Kelly Larimer

Develop critical areas habitat area before any further rezones. Elk need room! Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation has lots of information on migratory patterns.

-Karen Hoban

I have a limited perspective in commenting on the planning elements because I recently retired here. (Having grown up in Roslyn, however) My impression is that technical planners have done a good job of producing comprehensive details. But to get the public aboard requires simplified, highly understandable communications. It does not appear you have given this a sufficiently high priority.

-A.J. Scott

Deer and elk occur on lands other than state and federal lands but winter range critical areas are artificially confined to only state and federal lands. Winter range critical areas should reflect reality. We should not build up the areas where snow fall and snow depth drive the animals which will lead to conflict and reduced herd health and carrying capacity.

-unknown

Put buffers on streams that accommodate floods, protect fish and allow movement of wildlife. Minimum buffer widths should accomplish.
-unknown

In this day and age, you should use correct maps. County does not zone National Forest and probably not firing center.

-unknown

Rezone currently residential properties to highway-tourist-commercial (HTC) along the off ramp near the shopping center at the west end of Cle Elum.

-Jim Helm

No cluster development in Commercial Forest. Only benefit to cluster is higher developer profit and to develop more cluster in future. Forest and Range-20, 1 unit per 20.

-unknown

There is no services, water, or code enforcement for rural developments. Please make rural zoning 20 acres with zero opportunity for rezoning with the planning commission. There should be a moratorium on all development throughout the county.

-unknown

The plan presented by the KC RLAC is very good. The BOCC should take a lesson in compromise. The voices of a few should not be the only voices heard. Plans should be made for 30-50 years, not for tomorrow only. This county needs some jobs!!! Kittitas County will become a county of only summer homes or winter homes with no income staying here commercially.

-unknown

There is a continued erosion of resource lands land base. These lands should persist for the long term and not be designated when anybody has a proposal to develop them. Critical areas and resource lands are mandatory elements and just because more money can be made by developing them does not relieve the County for designating and protecting them. The legislature was aware more money could be made by developing these areas nevertheless resource lands and critical areas are required.

-unknown

We need to control the rate of rezones. This is a rural county, and a bedroom community, as seems to be happening here should not come into place. Neither should a suburb like Issaquah. Limit the amount of rezones and growth. Keep our county rural.
-Roslyn Ridge should be kept clear of building. It's a historical ridge where much coal mining and events pertinent to the town's development have taken place.

-Stop letting money hungry developers determine the character of our county.
-PS- there is note a shortage of 3-5 acre rezones.

-unknown

Critical areas need to be identified before open-space and zoning is even considered. These areas need to be mapped and not considered part of the developable land nor open space. These lands should be top priority and stand on their own. Another BIG SUGGESTION: use the Upper Kittitas County Vision Plan and update the Public Benefit Rating System to actually reflect public benefit. What is our Land Use Policy and why does it trump zoning?

-unknown

Gold Creek developments a serious problem. This will serious conflict with WSDOT wildlife crossing structure ($20 million) and wilderness. The area of near Stampede Pass is also critical. There will be major crossing structures at Gold, Bonnie, Swamp, Hudson creeks and at Easton Hill. Please avoid developments near I-90 between Easton and Hyak. Also it is inappropriate to denote the Alpine Lakes Wilderness at Commercial Forest – not commercial harvest is allowed.

Patricia Garvey-Darda, 509-925-2776, 406 Angford Dr. L, Ellensburg, WA 98926

*Other comments received outside of the Open House submittals (see attached):*

1. Email comments received from Martin Kaatz
2. Written comments received from Paula Thompson and James Boyle dated June 2, 2006
3. Written comments received from William Barschaw dated June 6, 2006
4. Written comments received from Futurewise dated June 1, 2006
5. Written comments received from American Forest Resources, LLC date June 12, 2006
STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY,
TRADE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
128 - 10th Avenue SW * PO Box 42525 * Olympia, Washington 98504-2525 * (360) 725-4000

October 1, 2004

The Honorable Charles Glondo
Mayor of Cle Elum
119 West 1st
Cle Elum, Washington 98922

RE: Proposed amendments to comprehensive plan and grading ordinance

Dear Mr. Glondo:

Thank you for sending the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) the proposed amendments to Cle Elum’s comprehensive plan and development regulations we received on August 30, 2004. We recognize the substantial investment of time, energy, and resources these documents represent.

We especially like the following:

- We support staff’s recommendation to further examine the intersection of Bullfrog Road and State Route 903. Through a subarea plan the issues of transportation, circulation, land uses, provisions for sewer and water, needed capital improvements, and jurisdictional administration for the area could be analyzed. Our office has a grant program for these types of projects; it is called the Emerging Issues Grant (EIG). The EIG does not have a formal application process you would simply need to work with our office to establish the scope of work and a budget for the project. The Bullfrog/903 project should be joint with Cle Elum, Roslyn and the county. This could allow for the potential of additional funds. Please contact me if you have an interest in pursuing this funding.

- We commend the City of Cle Elum for establishing a grading ordinance for projects within the city limits.

We have concerns about the following you should address before you adopt your plan and development regulation amendments:

- We are concerned by three urban growth areas (UGAs) expansions totaling 490.4 acres (applicants: Nelson, Olson, and Norris Smith). This is a significant expansion to your UGA. Under the Growth Management Act (GMA), UGA expansions are to be considered only if analysis shows there is currently insufficient land to absorb population projections within the current urban growth boundaries. This analysis is generally undertaken once every five or ten years. The staff report indicates there currently is 1,200 acres of buildable lands within the city limits. In addition, analysis
should include the cumulative cost of new service extensions. As your required comprehensive plan update for compliance with the GMA is due December 2006, we recommend the UGA amendment be delayed until a full UGA analysis can be completed as a part of the entire comprehensive plan update. Enclosed are a number of our guidance materials to help you assess the proposed UGA expansions.

- We are concerned that by exempting all grading associated with building permits and the subdivision of land (15.30.030), there will be few instances when this ordinance will actually be used. As an alternative, we suggest the City of Cle Elum establish threshold(s) for when a grading permit be required. For example some jurisdictions require a grading permit when more than 50 cubic yards of dirt are moved. As another example, some jurisdictions require a grading permit when more than 7,000 square feet of surface area is proposed to be exposed. As another alternative, you could combine these two standards. We also suggest you consult with your city attorney to determine whether the city’s substantive authority under the State Environmental Policy Act can be used to require a grading permit as a mitigating condition even when it is clearly exempted under your proposed ordinance.

We have some suggestions for strengthening your grading ordinance we encourage you to consider either in these or future amendments:

- We suggest you include an “Authority” subsection giving the city planner or designee the authority to interpret the ordinance and make final decisions on permits.

- We suggest you include a “Severability” clause in the event one section of this ordinance is found invalid that the entire ordinance is not invalidated.

- We suggest you reference the “Appeals” section of your municipal code.

- We suggest you reference the “Enforcement” provisions within your municipal code. If you want to include a separate enforcement section within the grading ordinance, we suggest it cover such topics as:
  - Grading without a permit
  - Issuance of stop work orders
  - Permit revocation
  - Restoration or mitigation for violations

- As a number of other agencies (state and federal) may review grading as part of their permits, we suggest you include a section in this ordinance stating that compliance with this code does not constitute compliance with any other federal, state, or local permits that may be required.

- We suggest you move sections 15.30.060.E., F., and G to section 15.30.020.

Purpose Section
- We suggest the language in the “Purpose” section also include a statement to protect the life, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Cle Elum.

Exemptions
- Another exemption from obtaining a grading permit could be work done under an emergency action.
Permit Applications
- We suggest the permit application require the grading map to show any critical areas on site or adjacent to the site and any property lines and boundaries. If there are to be any retaining walls as part of the grading, the design of these should be part of the application submittal.

Standards
- We suggest you consider some additional standards to strengthen your ordinance:
  - Seasonal limitations for grading. Based on the weather patterns in Cle Elum, there are times of the year when erosion and run-off from grading activities could be damaging.
  - Phased grading plans. Larger phased project should be required to obtain a grading permit for each phase.
  - Minimal grading necessary. We suggest you only allow for minimal grading needed to accommodate the project and require the native vegetation be retained – especially along steep slopes.
  - Revegetation plan required. This revegetation should occur within a certain timeframe to prevent erosion.
  - Best management practices be used as part of the grading. This would include managing run-off during grading, installing sediment control, temporary holding ponds for storm run-off, and other techniques for erosion control.
  - Construction entrance access limited. We suggest you include standards that the entrances be designed to prevent earth from getting on the roads and that a limited number of access points be allowed.
  - Pre-construction meeting in the field with the contractor. This is to ensure the grading limits are clearly marked and any critical areas or trees, required to be saved as a condition of approval, are clearly identified with fencing to ensure protection.

Congratulations to you and your staff for the good work these amendments embody. If you have any questions or concerns about our comments or any other growth management issues, please call me at (360) 725-3051. We extend our continued support to the City of Cle Elum in achieving the goals of growth management.

Sincerely,

Wendy Compton-Ring, AICP
Senior Planner
Growth Management Services

WCR:lw

Enclosures

cc: Gregg Hall, City Planner
    Perry Huston, Chair, Kittitas County Board of Commissioners
    Jan Sharar, Staff Planner, Kittitas County
    Leonard Bauer, AICP, Managing Director, Growth Management Services, CTED
    David Andersen, AICP, Planning Review Manager, Growth Management Services, CTED
for reviewing proposals to authorize new fully contained communities located outside of the initially designated urban growth areas.

(1) A new fully contained community may be approved in a county planning under this chapter if criteria including but not limited to the following are met:

(a) New infrastructure is provided for and impact fees are established consistent with the requirements of RCW 82.02.030;

(b) Transit-oriented site planning and traffic demand management programs are implemented;

(c) Buffers are provided between the new fully contained communities and adjacent urban development;

(d) A mix of uses is provided to offer jobs, housing, and services to the residents of the new community;

(e) Affordable housing is provided within the new community for a broad range of income levels;

(f) Environmental protection has been addressed and provided for;

(g) Development regulations are established to ensure urban growth will not occur in adjacent nonurban areas;

(h) Provision is made to mitigate impacts on designated agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands;

(i) The plan for the new fully contained community is consistent with the development regulations established for the protection of critical areas by the county pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170.

(2) New fully contained communities may be approved outside established urban growth areas only if a county reserves a portion of the twenty-year population projection and offsets the urban growth area accordingly for allocation to new fully contained communities that meet the requirements of this chapter. Any county electing to establish a new community reserve shall do no more often than once every five years as a part of the designation or review of urban growth areas required by this chapter. The new community reserve shall be allocated on a project-by-project basis, only after specific project approval procedures have been adopted pursuant to this chapter as a development regulation. When a new community reserve is established, urban growth areas designated pursuant to this chapter shall accommodate the unreserved portion of the twenty-year population projection.

Final approval of an application for a new fully contained community shall be considered an adopted amendment to the comprehensive plan prepared pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070 designating the new fully contained community as an urban growth area. [1991 sp.s. c 32 § 16.]

RCW 36.70A.360 Master planned resorts. (1) Counties that are required or choose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 may permit master planned resorts which may constitute urban growth outside of urban growth areas as limited by this section. A master planned resort means a self-contained and fully integrated planned unit development, in a setting of significant natural amenities, with primary focus on destination resort facilities consisting of short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of developed on-site indoor or outdoor recreational facilities.

(2) Capital facilities, utilities, and services, including those related to sewer, water, storm water, security, fire suppression, and emergency medical, provided on-site shall be limited to meeting the needs of the master planned resort. Such facilities, utilities, and services may be provided to a master planned resort by outside service providers, including municipalities and special purpose districts, provided that all costs associated with service extensions and capacity increases directly attributable to the master planned resort are fully borne by the resort. A master planned resort and service providers may enter into agreements for shared capital facilities and utilities, provided that such facilities and utilities serve only the master planned resort or urban growth areas.

Nothing in this subsection may be construed as: Establishing an order of priority for processing applications for water right permits, for granting such permits, or for issuing certificates of water right; altering or authorizing in any manner the alteration of the place of use for a water right; or affecting or impairing in any manner whatsoever an existing water right.

All waters or the use of waters shall be regulated and controlled as provided in chapters 90.03 and 90.44 RCW and not otherwise.

(3) A master planned resort may include other residential uses within its boundaries, but only if the residential uses are integrated into and support the on-site recreational nature of the resort.

(4) A master planned resort may be authorized by a county only if:

(a) The comprehensive plan specifically identifies policies to guide the development of master planned resorts;

(b) The comprehensive plan and development regulations include restrictions that preclude new urban or suburban land uses in the vicinity of the master planned resort, except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth under RCW 36.70A.110;

(c) The county includes a finding as a part of the approval process that the land is better suited, and has more long-term importance, for the master planned resort than for the commercial harvesting of timber or agricultural production, if located on land that otherwise would be designated as forest land or agricultural land under RCW 36.70A.170;

(d) The county ensures that the resort plan is consistent with the development regulations established for critical areas; and

(e) On-site and off-site infrastructure and service impacts are fully considered and mitigated. [1998 c 112 § 2; 1991 sp.s. c 32 § 17.]

Intent—1998 c 112: "The primary intent of this act is to give effect to recommendations by the 1994 department of community, trade, and economic development’s master planned resort task force by clarifying that master planned resorts may make use of capital facilities, utilities, and services provided by outside service providers, and may enter into agreements for shared facilities with such providers, when all costs directly attributable to the resort, including capacity increases, are fully borne by the resort." [1998 c 112 § 1.]

RCW 36.70A.362 Master planned resorts—Existing resort may be included. Counties that are required or choose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 may include existing resorts as master planned resorts which may constitute urban growth outside of urban growth areas as limited by this section. An existing resort means a resort in existence on July 1, 1990, and developed, in whole or in part, as a
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Introduction

I. Purpose

a. Overall...
A community’s vision should be the foundation for the development of comprehensive plan goals and policies for the local governments that are charged with implementing that vision. A Vision Plan is one tool that can be used to paint a picture of a community’s desired future, expressing the hopes and aspirations of the citizens within that community. With a clear and concise description of the community’s vision, better decisions and actions can be made and taken to ensure that the desired future outcome is achieved.

The purpose of the Upper Kittitas County Vision Plan is to describe what the citizens in the Upper County see as important qualities in their area that need to be preserved and maintained over the course of time. The Vision Plan is the first step in the overall continuous planning process for both the County and its cities. This Vision is intended to be the foundation upon which comprehensive plans and development regulations covering the Upper County are structured. This Plan serves as the guide for both long-term and short-term decisions made at the City and County levels. The foundation statements and key recommendations described in this Vision Plan should be referenced for guidance and direction when local officials are establishing policies or considering proposals. This will ensure that the needs and desires of the Upper County communities are taken into account and that the Upper Kittitas County area grows and develops through a better decision making process.

The first three sections of this document are the most substantive as it regards the vision planning process and identifying the tools with which to implement the Vision. The Introduction provides information on the background and conception of the Regional Land Use Committee that performed the work on this Plan. The second section describes the public process, where local residents were given the opportunity to freely express their opinions and views regarding important emerging issues. The information gathered from that process was reviewed and incorporated into the substance of this Vision Plan within the Foundation Statements and Key Recommendations.

The Next Steps section is a critical component of this document and will ultimately determine the success of this visioning exercise. It is in this section where specific instructions are provide that will assure the needs and desires of the Upper Kittitas communities are incorporated into local government planning if followed. As the Vision Plan is the first step, the next step is for each community to develop its own comprehensive land use plan. The visioning process clearly documented the need for Kittitas County to continue its comprehensive land use planning process through sub-area planning.

The Appendices document the material gathered from the public and is the un-synthesized information that provides the basis for the Vision Plan.
b. Coordination of County, City and Community Comprehensive Plans...

"The legislature finds that ... It is in the public interest that citizens, communities, local governments, and the private sector cooperate and coordinate with one another in comprehensive land use planning.” RCW 36.70A.010

Within the context of planning under the Growth Management Act, intergovernmental coordination and cooperation is seen as a paramount feature. Section 36.70A.100 RCW states:

"The comprehensive plan of each county or city that is adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 shall be coordinated with, and consistent with, the comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 of other counties or cities with which the county or city has, in part, common borders or related regional issues."

Because many components of the growth and development of a community overlap political and jurisdictional boundaries, it is vital that there is a coordinated process among adjoining jurisdictions to address these issues. Transportation facilities, critical areas, utilities and capital facilities are examples of items making up our communities, the planning for which cannot be done in isolation: the decisions made in the City of Cle Elum or the City of South Cle Elum regarding transportation facilities have the potential to affect not only each of the cities, but also Kittitas County. Through coordination and consistency, each jurisdiction gains benefit through economies of scale achieved when pooling resources, lowering unit costs and avoiding duplication of tasks. The primary, underlying purpose to coordination and consistency is to provide a predictable atmosphere for the development community, as well as the respective local governments: knowing what is expected from them upfront provides valuable costs savings to land developers.

To further the practice and implementation of the ideas behind coordination and consistency, the GMA requires Counties and their cities to have developed and adopted county-wide planning policies. These policies are to be the framework for the development of city and county comprehensive plans. The topics required to be covered in the county-wide planning policies include such things as implementing urban growth boundaries, promoting the orderly provision of urban services into developing areas, providing for county-wide transportation and affordable housing, and to encourage county-wide economic development.

Another tool for ensuring coordination and consistency is through a detailed Vision Plan, as is presented in this document. Where the county-wide planning policies are a plan for how local governments will coordinate, a Vision Plan, crafted through an intense public process, is a statement by the citizens about how they would like growth and development to occur in their area. By considering and implementing the key recommendations provided later in this document, as well as adhering to the foundation statements, each of the local governments in the Upper County will be helping to realize the vision voiced by the citizens of this community.
2. Process

a. Regional Land Use Committee...
In the late summer and fall of 2004, in response to a considerable amount of citizen concern related to rapid growth and development in the Upper County area, the Kittitas County Conference of Governments (COG) determined that it was important to form a citizen's advisory committee. This citizen's committee, titled the Regional Land Use Committee, and made up of citizens with diverse interests and from different areas of the Upper County, was created to influence and guide the future amendment of comprehensive plans. To assist and facilitate the process of amending comprehensive plans, the COG received a grant from the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED), Growth Management Services, to create a draft Vision Plan for the Upper County area.

The Regional Land Use Committee was the driving force behind the Vision Plan. As a group, they interviewed and selected a consultant to implement the grant from CTED, reviewing, revising and approving a scope of work that included public meetings, outreach and questionnaires, in addition to their committee meetings. Based on detailed input and reviews the Committee crafted the format for the public meetings, the flyers announcing those meetings, as well as creating the questionnaire that was extensively distributed to gather input. Committee members generated information and interest in the meetings, as well as in the overall process, and can be credited with the extensive degree of public participation that went into the development of the Vision Plan.

b. Community Meetings...
The key component to the drafting of this Vision Plan is the public participation that occurred to direct the general outcomes and key recommendations. This participation occurred in two main ways: through community outreach meetings and through a questionnaire that was distributed both at these meetings as well as through a number of other sources. Four community outreach meetings were held throughout the Upper County Area during the last two weeks in March, 2005. The meetings were all very well attended, with a total of approximately 152 residents participating, as seen in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2005</td>
<td>Ronald Community Club</td>
<td>33 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2005</td>
<td>Easton School</td>
<td>42 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 2005</td>
<td>Cle Elum USFS Meeting Room</td>
<td>64 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2005</td>
<td>Hyak Lodge Snoqualmie Pass</td>
<td>13 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At these meetings, the participants were asked two main questions: What do you believe are your community's positive qualities? What do you believe are potential threats to those positive qualities in the future? Through both of these avenues (meetings and questionnaire), a significant amount of information was generated about how the Upper County residents feel about growth and development in their communities.
Community Outreach Meetings- The Foundation

1. Overview

The community outreach meetings were very successful from a number of different standpoints. The attendance can be characterized as outstanding: in many jurisdictions, it is difficult to get people interested in talking about issues that don’t seem immediate or pressing. Additionally, the amount and quality of input received at each of the meetings was substantial, making the Committee’s work crafting detailed key recommendations much easier.

The success of these meetings is directly attributable to the support and cooperation from a number of different sources, particularly in providing notice of the meetings. Committee members, the County, the Cities as well as the three newspapers covering the Upper County area all assisted in printing, copying and distributing the flyers so a wider audience was reached, at a relatively low cost.

The following sections describe both common themes that were identified at the different meetings, as well as identifying issues that were particular to each area (detailed documentation of input is included in the appendices). This information, in conjunction with the information contained in the questionnaires, is the basis for the foundation statements and key recommendations that constitute the substance of the Vision Plan presented later.

2. Outcomes

a. General...
The high turnout at each of the community meetings was reflective of the Upper County’s one hundred fifty plus year tradition of self-sufficiency and independence. Though each community involved in this visioning exercise is distinct and separate, certain similar experiences yielded common themes and concerns from each of the public forums. The following topics were consistently articulated in each community of Upper Kittitas County:

- A great appreciation for the natural environment;
- Enjoyment of the proximity and access to many recreational opportunities;
- A deep concern that the desirable features that make up the region are threatened by rampant and unchecked development;
- A perception that county and city officials are resistant to planning and related activities such as establishing policies and regulations; implementing existing environmental review requirements; and assessing cumulative impacts prior to land use decisions;
- A strong desire to protect the diverse natural resources, wildlife and natural amenities of the area;
- A wish to engage the local governments in cooperative sub-area planning, to meet the diverse and distinct needs of the Upper County;
- There is a recognition that growth will occur. There is a preference that new growth be “Smart Growth”. Proposed developments must demonstrate that responsible, well planned
development will balance the needs of existing residents with those of the new developments;

- A tangible connection to local histories and traditions;
- A solid sense of community.

Rather than waiting until the features that make up the quality living in the Upper County disappear, (they do not have to look very far down the road to understand how easily it can be lost) the residents have conjured up the pioneer spirit of cooperation and a “get ‘er done” attitude. They are determined to preserve the clean air and water, the outdoor recreational opportunities, all of which embodies the rural character of the county, and even the dark night skies.

The Upper County residents envision a future that accommodates all of its residents through well thought-out planning. Planning that identifies the amount of growth and the rate of growth that can be sustained by the Upper Kittitas environments. The plans will also project deficiencies in capital facilities before they are made deficient by rapid development. The goal is to achieve a balance between growth and development with the community’s values of rural character and the tradition of independence.

In addition to the above concerns found to be common throughout the region, communities identified issues that were of particular concern within sub-areas.

b. Cle Elum: March 30, 2005 - Sixty four persons in attendance.
   Unique Outcomes...
   - The Yakima River plays a vital role in Cle Elum. The community is interested in preserving it and the amenities that go along with it.
   - Cle Elum wishes to retain the commercial services that meet local needs while discouraging the large national chain retail stores.
   - There’s a significant increase in the number of exempt wells and septic systems to support residential development. As there appears to be no limitations to this type of development the aquifer continues to be at risk of exposure to contamination.
   - The inevitable growth will continue to strain the road system that is functioning at capacity.
   - The Cle Elum residents support exploring public forms of transportation and energy to accommodate future growth.
   - Preserve public access to trails, trail heads, and other recreation opportunities in the face of new development.
   - The community has a strong sense of its history

c. Easton: March 24, 2005 - Forty two persons in attendance.
   Unique Outcomes...
   - The Easton area currently enjoys a supply of clean water that meets its drinking and fire suppression needs. There is concern that should growth rates continue, the water supply will be degraded, threatening the community’s health and safety;
   - The community values the open space and treed areas between neighbors and would like to retain this large-lot residential development pattern consistent with a rural area;
• Preserve the rural character of the land;
• Protect wildlife.

d. Ronald/Roslyn: March 21, 2005 - Thirty three persons in attendance
Unique Outcomes...
• Residents in the Ronald/Roslyn communities noted that subdivisions were being developed well in advance of the need for additional housing and the availability of jobs;
• The community expressed concerns that new subdivisions are gaining approval without analysis and determination that the existing infrastructure will adequately support the development;
• Protection of private property rights are a high priority.

e. Snoqualmie Pass: March 31, 2005 - Thirteen persons in attendance.
Unique Outcomes...
• Snoqualmie pass enjoys a unique position located in close proximity to metro King County and rural Kittitas County, enjoying both urban and rural amenities.
• While higher densities in other parts of the Upper County have increased discomfort levels, in the Snoqualmie Pass area, the planned neighborhoods have contributed to an increased sense of community.
• A favorite winter playground, Snoqualmie endures a slower economy during the rest of the year. This imbalance contributes to the need for affordable housing, year round employment and more diversity in the economic structure.
• Accommodations need to be made for commercial services and truck traffic, and additional facilities for community needs.
• The community maintains a strong sense of history, and connection to the past.
• This area has examples of appropriate clustered housing and ski resort development.
• Businesses support development of water and sewer systems.

3. Questionnaire Summaries

Another important tool for recording residents’ input was a community questionnaire that asked a series of questions related to existing and future growth and development. A copy of the actual Community Questionnaire and complete summary of the results can be found in the Appendices; however the following is a brief review.

Questions one through four were related to location of residence of participants. Ninety four responses indicated they were full time residents of the County, while five were not. Thirty one responded they lived within an incorporated city: Cle Elum (7), Roslyn (20), Ellensburg (4), while 70 participants responded they were not located within an incorporated city.

Survey Question # 5 asked about the overall feeling of the rate of growth and development. Seventy respondents indicated that the rate of growth was too much, while fifteen indicated that the overall growth rate was just right.
Survey Question # 6 asked what type of land uses were important to have in the Upper County. The top five were:

1. Recreational Activities
2. Wildlife habitat areas
3. Parks
4. Forestry /logging
4. Rangeland
4. Rural Residential
5. Tourist facilities

*The responses for these lands uses were the same.

Survey Question # 7 asked participants to list three things they value most about the Upper County. This open ended question yielded an array of comments, some of the most often cited included:
- Wildlife and amenities related to the natural environment
- Rural atmosphere
- Recreation

Survey Question # 8 asked participants to list three things that may threaten the quality of life in the Upper County. Some of the most often cited issues included:
- Uncontrolled/unplanned growth
- Traffic congestion
- Crime

Question # 9 listed 17 statements related to future growth and development. Participants were asked to rank the statements in order of most importance. The top six were as follows:

1. Safeguard wildlife areas and corridors.
2. Protect the area’s “Dark Skies” from sky glow/light pollution.
3. Preserve areas for forest resource activities.
3. Preserve important view sheds.
4. Preserve areas for agricultural activities, including small acreage lifestyles and animal keeping.
5. Preserve and expand public trail recreation access to areas with significant natural features.
6. Protect private property rights.
*These issues tied in the count.

Page four of the survey provided an opportunity for participants to share other thoughts in a narrative. In general, the statements supported the priorities listed in the other survey questions. Essentially there is concern about the way growth and development is occurring in the Upper Kittitas County. There is an uncertainty as to whether or not the growth can be accommodated by the available existing services, especially water. Many expressed a desire to find solutions to the issues, and provided suggestions.
Community Direction

1. Foundation Statements

Based on the input received from the many participants in the community outreach meetings and the questionnaires, the following statements are intended to provide a clear, concise record of the fundamental quality of life values found in the Upper County area. These are statements of core values that must be maintained as the County and its cities implement policies and regulations to guide future growth and development.

a. Rural Character...

The people of Upper Kittitas County value the existing qualities of the rural environment. The treasured rural characteristics are first recognized by the dominance of the natural environment over the built environment. The result is areas for human coexistence with wildlife and opportunities for outdoor activities and recreation. The rural environment has naturally clean water and fresh air; the amount of industrial development is light to non-existent. The land is sparsely populated and the traffic, with few exceptions, is light and neighborly. The open spaces, forested areas, and spectacular views (day and night) of the rural environment produce a sense of awe in the observer.

There is strong support for maintaining wildlife habitat and migration routes as well as maintaining access to and opportunities for outdoor recreation such as trails, hunting, gathering and fishing. As development policies are created or amended, consideration must be given to the impacts on wildlife, habitat, and water quality and availability. Policies should preserve, enhance and protect the quality of the existing rural environment and its rural character without infringing on private property rights.

Kittitas County officials are enthusiastically urged to be proactive on this issue. A number of private organizations seek areas to establish land conservation opportunities. Acquiring a partner with expertise in designating the areas that should be preserved in the natural environment would be extremely valuable and advance retention of the desired rural character of the region.

Additionally, the County and cities should correlate the comprehensive plan land use designations map with the implementing zoning map. This will ensure greater predictability with respect to potential impacts of future development, allowing decisions to be based on sound planning principals and in consideration of a particular area's infrastructure and physical features. Re-designation of lands, either uses or density, will then be required to be reviewed through the comprehensive plan amendment process, once a year, allowing for a greater level of analysis of the cumulative impacts of all proposed re-designations/rezones, and a greater degree of public involvement.

1 Organizations such as the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Mule Deer, Ducks Unlimited, Alpine Lakes, and Cascade Agenda are a few that have been successful in identifying and promoting land conservation.
b. Public Involvement...
The people of Upper Kittitas County expect to be involved in development of land use policies and decisions. They see the need for development standards to be implemented in order to accommodate the inevitable growth. By involving the public when developing standards and policies, conflicts will be addressed early on in the development process. Local governments are charged with keeping the Upper Kittitas County residents apprised of proposals and actions that may affect the quality of life. Historically, the people of Upper Kittitas have been engaged stewards of the region. The Upper County was built on the traditions of public service and civic responsibility. Given the proper information and notification, the people of Upper Kittitas County will responsibly participate in decisions that may permanently affect the quality of the developed and natural environment.

c. Forest Resources...
Forested lands are a valuable asset to the County. They protect watersheds as well as providing jobs, wildlife habitat and numerous opportunities for recreation activities, all of which contribute to the quality of living that County residents appreciate. Visitors and residents of Upper Kittitas County have historically enjoyed access to public recreation areas and wish to maintain this feature. The potential still exists for forested lands to be commercially viable in the future. Comprehensive Plan amendments to rezone forests should be discouraged. These lands need to be recognized as the valuable resource that they are, not land available for development.

d. Sub-area Planning...
The vision and desires of the people of Upper Kittitas County are as diverse as its terrain, which transitions from mountains to valleys. Applying a single vision to this diversity will be effective only to a degree and in generalities. There are differences in the values and expectations of future land uses in the various areas of the Upper County. For example, the people in the Snoqualmie Pass area appreciate their proximity to Metro King County and view their rural area as a small town community. Nearby Easton on the other hand, values its rural character as realized through the spaciousness and large lots of the current land development pattern. In order to create a real vision for the Upper County, the County needs to cultivate public involvement and visioning by developing and adopting sub-area plans within distinct areas. The first step in implementing sub-area planning is to establish committees within the sub-areas and have them review the existing sub-area plans that were drafted in the 1990's but not officially adopted.

e. Prepare for Growth...
Development should be analyzed for the overall impact to the carrying capacity of the natural and built environments. Existing non-project actions should be evaluated for impacts to these environments prior to any approval for actual development. The County needs to implement a variety of financial tools, such as SEPA mitigation and/or impact fees, to ensure growth pays for growth’s impacts. The County can improve development review and the fiscal impact on capital facilities and services, transportation infrastructure and natural and environmental resources by requiring a higher exemption level for subdivisions of land than the current twenty acres.
2. Key Recommendations

Building on the Foundation Statements, the following are specific recommendations for ways to forward the intent of the Foundation Statements. Many of the important issues identified in the Vision Plan are interconnected between categories. Just because one topic may be identified under a particular subject title, it should not be viewed as applicable to only that subject title.

a. Public Involvement...
Kittitas County officials need to be more progressive in meeting public notice requirements. When opportunities are available for public comment on proposals and decisions, Kittitas County can go beyond the minimum state requirements for public notification. In turn, Upper County residents with an interest in land use planning and development need to be cognizant of the established procedures for public notice and proposing amendments.

The following are essential public involvement tools that Kittitas County can implement immediately:

- Post property that is subject to a land use application:
  - Use a minimum size sign of 16 sq ft;
  - Include public hearing date on posting;
  - Post all sides of property that front a public right of way;
  - Minimum two signs per parcel larger than one acre;
  - Include contact name for specific information;
  - Require sign to be erected upon issuance of Notice of Application;

- Give written notice to property owners within 500' of property subject to proposal.
- For non-project actions, issue press releases (in addition to required legal notices) to all local print and broadcast media. Use the press release as a tool to educate the public on how the non-project action will change allowable uses.
- Publish legal notice in Upper County newspaper as well as newspaper of record.
- Hold public hearings in the Upper County when a proposal is located in the Upper County;
- Keep the website up-to-date, and include pending actions, Notice of Applications issued, SEPA review distribution;
- Provide weekly email notification (per request) of Notice of Applications issued and receipt of request for non-project action;
- Increase developer fees as applicable to cover costs of improved public notification.
- Designate an Upper County location where residents will be able to review project and proposal files.
- Write notices that are clear, concise and easily understood.
- Revise the administration of the current SEPA review process. Improve the analysis regarding the probable impact a proposal may have on the environment.

b. Land Use...
Changes occurring in all categories of land uses and the permanent effects to the built and natural environments are of great concern in Upper Kittitas County. More advanced levels of
analysis need to be implemented to address the increasingly complex issues with proposed
development.

- **Residential ~**
Encourage higher density residential development to locate in Urban Growth Areas.
Base the amount of land designated for residential use on the amount needed to accommodate
the County's rural share of population growth;
  - Update the County population growth projections and allocations;
  - Inventory existing land available for residential use and determine the amount of
    additional population that can be served;
  - Designate residential lands in a way that preserves useful and contiguous open space,
    wildlife migration routes and habitat;
  - Implement development incentives to foster open space preservation through:
    o Density bonuses leading to open space preservation.
    o Cluster development preserving usable open space.
    o Incorporate critical areas into preserved areas.
    o Use of conservation easements to maintain open space in perpetuity.
    o Transfer of development rights.
    o Agriculture and Forest land protection programs.
  - Implement impact fees and other mitigation tools to ensure growth and new
development pays for itself.

- **Commercial/Industrial ~**
Unless associated with resource lands, commercial and industrial lands are assumed to be urban
in character. Commercial developments are particularly onerous as far as dispersing light
pollution.
  - Ensure that an adequate supply of commercial and industrial land is designated
    county-wide.
  - Create development standards for commercial areas that:
    o Minimize artificial lighting in commercial and industrial areas;
    o Direct artificial lighting downward;
    o Develop light standards that encourage shared parking and paved areas;
    o Preserve natural drainages;
    o Encourages natural landscaping and screening;
  - Designate commercial and industrial lands within Urban Growth Areas and Urban
    Growth Nodes.

- **Resource lands ~**
The rich natural resources have historically been the lifeblood of Upper Kittitas County.
Beyond timber and wood products production, resource lands support watersheds, wildlife
habitat, recreation opportunities and more, as discussed earlier.
  - Land use practices should secure the sustainability of these resources for future
    economic benefit.
  - Forest lands should be designated at a minimum of 80 acres, and preserved in as
    much volume as possible.
- Encourage and implement incentives to discourage forest and agricultural lands out of resource designations. Resource lands should be held in perpetuity and available for resource uses.
- Provide incentives to property owners to develop land conservation areas.

- Rural Areas ~
In the Upper County, the rural areas are where life happens. In other regions, rural areas are typically referred to as “left over lands”; the lands that are not designated for urban growth, resource lands or critical areas. The Upper County residents are adamantly determined to preserve their rural lifestyle. In order to achieve this, the following is recommended:
  - Create development standards that permit clustering of building sites. The purpose of clustering is to retain large areas of open space, in perpetuity, to accommodate wildlife corridors and migration routes.
  - Refine the county-wide rural residential designation so that it does not create urban or rural sprawl that is overwhelming the rural character of the Upper Kittitas County.
  - Balance the designation of residential lands with the projected population distribution so that concentrations of population move from primarily rural to primarily urban county-wide.
  - Recognize and address the impacts of second home development on rural areas during the required 2006 comprehensive plan/development regulation update process.

- Critical Areas ~
Critical Areas such as wildlife corridors and habitat, wetlands, flood plains, aquifer recharge and geological hazardous areas are vital components of the functioning ecosystem. Development standards regarding critical areas should be crafted to protect and retain these mechanisms.
  - Identify and map all types of critical areas including flood hazards, wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, geologically hazardous areas and fish and wildlife habitat.
  - Review update, and implement critical area regulations for all types of the critical areas listed above.
  - Protection and preservation of wildlife and its habitat tops the priority list for Upper Kittitas residents.

c. Housing...
Rural areas are prime targets for the second home and the high end housing market. While a certain amount of this is desirable, housing policies and residential land designations should promote housing that is affordable to all income levels.
- In particular, consideration needs to be given to employees of recreation and tourism industries. These are growth industries in Upper Kittitas County that produce a number of low to moderate income jobs. Land use, housing, and transportation policies need to consider the income potential of residents employed by these and other service sector industries.
- Policies that encourage affordable housing dispersed throughout the community, rather than clustered in specific neighborhoods. Density bonuses are a common tool used to achieve this goal.
d. Transportation...
The current transportation system is inadequate to accommodate recent developments and approved subdivisions that have yet to be developed. In order to avoid common urban traffic issues; steps must be taken now to require new development to pay for its fair share of impacts to the transportation system.

- Develop standards that require impact fees or other means of requiring new development to pay for its impact on the transportation system.
- Assure that an adequate road system is in place before permitting new development.
- Provide avenues and amenities for non-motorized modes of transportation. This may include:
  - Improvements to street lighting, assuring that lights are down lit.
  - Designating and constructing walking and biking trails.
  - Decrease the number of egress and ingress lanes on the highway.
- Determine current level of service for arterials. Compare to adopted level of service to determine breadth of deficiencies.
- Revive passenger rail service to improve transportation options and tourism.

e. Utilities and Capital Facilities...
Include utility and capital facilities planning that:

- Facilitates the development of all utilities at the appropriate levels of service to accommodate projected growth;
- Identifies service boundaries within which utility services will be provided;
- Encourages infilling of areas already served by utilities;
- Addresses the proliferation of exempt wells and on-site septic systems;
- Inventories existing lots with rights to install exempt wells.
- Coordinates future water system planning with the comprehensive plan of the city, county and other planning efforts pertaining to land use, other utilities and other community facilities.
- Ensures Kittitas County undertakes watershed planning, including an inventory of the aquifer.
- Revises water policy to require more substantial proof of potable water before subdivision approval.
- Ensures that capital facility planning is consistent with the comprehensive plan;
- Ensures that the location and design of capital facilities creates minimal adverse impacts on the surrounding land use;
- Provides that capital facilities are in place, or can be in place at the time of development;
- Ensures that new development does not lower the level of service standard for capital facilities.
- Seeks efficiencies through coordinated planning among local city and county governments and special purpose, junior taxing districts.

f. Recreation...
Opportunities for and access to outdoor recreation are the foundation of life as well as economic drivers in Upper Kittitas County. Non-consumptive recreation is an essential
component of the Upper County's future. Officials must be active players in identifying, promoting, and preserving these opportunities. Creative or standard tools such as mitigation or purchasing as necessary, can be used to offset the increased negative impact development is having on the public's ability to access outdoor recreation areas.

- Local city and county governments must identify corridors and trails where the public will continue to have access to recreation facilities.
- The County should permit commercial recreation facilities through a Conditional Use Permit process. The purpose is to insure site specific evaluation is complete and that impacts of the specific development are addressed.
- Local jurisdictions can ensure the public continues to have access to public lands by identifying, mapping, and signing the access points.

**g. Economic Development...**

Policies regarding economic development should be geared to developing a sustainable economy. The natural beauty and features of the area are building blocks on which to establish and expand the region's tourism and outdoor recreation industries. Implementation of well-thought-out plans will protect these very qualities at risk of being overused.

- Communities and region-wide organizations must actively work together to promote the area.
- Efforts must be made to seek complementing industries to balance and diversify the local economy.

**h. Aesthetics...**

Development regulations must be implemented that will preserve the natural outdoor assets that the people of the Upper County so value.

- Maintain rural character by limiting building heights.
- Preserve the dark night skies through the development of standards for neighbour-friendly lighting, reducing up lighting in the Upper County.
- Provide education about lighting options.
- Reduce the visual impact of parking facilities.
- Empower code enforcement efforts; assign authority and resources especially for removing hazards caused by dilapidated buildings and abandoned vehicles, numerous inoperable/unlicensed vehicles (including cars, trucks, boats, RV's, trailers) in open storage in residential areas.

**i. State Environmental Policy Act/Growth Management Act**

County and City officials must use SEPA to its fullest potential. SEPA is designed to carry the substantive authority to mitigate issues and potential negative impacts to the environment that

---

2 The goal of community sustainability is to establish local economies that are economically viable, environmentally sound and socially responsible. Achieving this goal requires participation from all sectors of the community, both to determine community needs and to identify and implement innovative and appropriate solutions. Source: Sustainable Communities Network
may not already be covered by specific local regulations. The Growth Management Act also provides the authority for local governments to establish land use designations and resolve issues at a non-project level. Through implementation of the tenants of GMA - critical areas identification and protection, comprehensive planning based on projected growth, adoption of development regulations that are consistent with the comprehensive plans - much of the animosity and ill will that has developed with recent land use activity will be improved.

- Assure Comprehensive Plan Maps and Zoning Maps are consistent, with a one-to-one correlation between land use designations and zoning districts.
- Review existing land use patterns and systems and designate appropriate land use and zoning categories that are respectful of those existing patterns.
- Implement SEPA throughout the planning process to ensure all impacts to the natural and built environments are adequately addressed at each level.
Next Steps- Where do we go from here?

Each member of the Regional Land Use Advisory Committee (RLUAC) brought their own perspective and motivation to the process, however, each also came with a common concern—the future of land use decisions and the impacts on their homes. Each also wanted to insure that this Vision Plan is not added to the stack of previous planning exercises that have no teeth or the political will to be implemented and put into place. To that end, the RLUAC recommends the Kittitas County Conference of Governments, and the representative local governments implement the following strategies:

- COG must officially adopt and recognize the Vision Plan as the guiding document for future planning in the Upper County area. Additionally, the COG representatives from the Upper County area should present the Vision Plan to their respective jurisdictions with a strong recommendation that each of those local governments officially adopt and ratify the Vision Plan as the guiding document for future planning in the Upper County area.
- Appoint the RLUAC as a standing committee of the COG with at least these initial, specific tasks:
  - Encourage Upper County local governments to appoint RLUAC members to actively participate in the review and update of their comprehensive plans and development regulations, particularly during the 2006 process. This will help the local governments to include the Vision Plan in their process, and the RLUAC members can periodically meet to discuss how implementation of the Vision Plan is progressing.
  - The RLUAC will develop reports on implementation of the Vision Plan. It is their intent to keep the Vision Plan alive and in the forefront of the public, media, and especially the decision makers.
  - The County needs to promote regional public involvement and visioning by reviewing existing draft sub-area plans and update as necessary. The RLUAC is committed to supporting this process.

Certain elements of the Vision Plan can be implemented in advance of the 2006 comprehensive plan review and update cycle. COG should recommend that Kittitas County consider policies and regulations during the 2005 amendment cycle to address issues that were highly supported among all of the communities both during the public meetings and on the survey result
- Adopt development standards that will protect the dark night skies;
- Implement policies and incentives that will protect wildlife habitat and corridors;
- Adopt expanded notification requirements as recommended in this document;
- Perform cumulative impact assessments on non-project actions, especially in consideration of water issues.

Immediate action should be taken to ensure these priority quality of life issues are not further degraded.
June 1, 2006

RIDGE recommends the following aspects of good planning for the future be explicitly incorporated into the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan, the Kittitas County Planning Policies, and related County zoning and land use maps.

In addition, the County's zoning and land use maps and the zoning regulations must be updated so they are consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan.

We also think the Regional Land Use Advisory Committee's final recommendations should be explicitly incorporated.

Explicitly incorporate into the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan, the Kittitas County Planning Policies, and related County zoning and land use maps the following matters:

1. Encourage affordable housing in cities and towns through adequate zoning and incentives. Affordable Housing addressed in a manner that is in keeping with actual working incomes in the County.
2. UGN policies need to be revised and updated.
3. Enhanced public notice requirements for long and short plats, as per the Regional Land Use Advisory Committee's final recommendations.
4. Protect quality of life, water quality, water sources, working farms, and working forests by not allowing densities on rural and resource lands greater than one dwelling per five acres and by providing a variety of rural densities.
5. Adopt criteria to guide the comprehensive plan designations and zoning. Currently there are no explicit criteria for where agricultural, forestry, or rural designations will be applied, leading to a lack of predictability and resulting in adverse effects on neighboring property owners and our quality of life.
6. Kittitas County shall perform its activities and make capital budget decisions in conformity with the adopted Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan.
7. Comprehensive Plan Policy shall be amended to direct the County to use KCOG findings and planning policies, rather than ignore them.
8. Encourage conservation and preservation of existing open space, farmland and forest and support conservation and protection of connected corridors and public access to open space as mitigation for any development that is proposed or approved in converted forestlands.
9. Modify the Comprehensive Plan to explicitly support conversions of private land to public ownership. Such purchases or donations of private land can enhance the tax base by increasing the value of other property in the County. They can promote tourism while at the same time realizing other important public benefits.
10. Implement a County Wide Dark Sky ordinance.
11. Require the County to issue a determination of significance as per the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) for specific types of land use decisions (including rezones or subdivisions) that permit a significant increase in density OR conversion of use from commercial resource land.
12. No rezone shall be approved except as part of a comprehensive plan amendment.
13. Proposed rezones and subdivisions shall consider and demonstrate the need for additional residential lots in particular regions of the County in order to accommodate projected population growth assigned or projected for the applicable jurisdiction.

14. The County shall undertake and conclude a public process by which important rural landscape sub-region(s) are identified and policies adopted by which development shall be discouraged or managed in such a way as to preserve those rural landscape features found to be worthy of protection. “Overlay Districts” such those being considered by the City of Ellensburg are a specific planning tool that should be used to provide good planning for areas such as freeway interchanges, the 903 corridor, and various scenic areas.

15. Subdivisions shall be clustered, and connected open space shall be reserved with appropriate easements for public access, habitat and recreational use. The County shall encourage and require such features in any approved rezone or subdivision within the designated area(s).

16. The County planning policies should support and enable such fiscal instruments as voluntary payments, the levying of impact fees and/or a real estate excise taxes that placed on first sale of new lots and new homes and commercial enterprises.

17. In connection with any new development Kittitas County shall require construction of sidewalks and pathways to enable safe, non-motorized transportation alternatives and motorized wheelchairs. As future transportation plans are prepared or existing infrastructure upgraded such projects shall include insertion of trails and pedestrian pathways to accommodate non-motorized transportation modalities such as walking or bicycling. Kittitas County shall also undertake a process of assessing and upgrading existing transportation plans and infrastructure to address increased safety concerns of non-motorized transport as levels of traffic increase.

18. The County shall give particular emphasis to establishment of trail systems that connect with existing public and private trail systems and that provide public access to public and private open space. These efforts may be carried forward in cooperation with incorporated cities and or park and recreation districts within Kittitas County.

19. As growth continues to occur both in the urban and rural areas of Kittitas County, there are/will be increased impacts on existing library services and an increasing demand for additional library services. In order to address the potential demands and impacts, Kittitas County shall undertake responsibility for developing and financing the coordination of existing and new library services that serve all areas of Kittitas County, using recommendations from the County Library Board.

20. County Planning Policies shall be made consistent with preservation of the historic features of the City of Roslyn (designated a National Historic District) especially including Roslyn’s forested perimeter.
Joanna F. Valencia

From: Darryl Piercy
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 11:12 AM
To: Joanna F. Valencia
Subject: FW: GMA & interchanges
Attachments: County_interchanges.doc

Please put into the comment record for the Comp Plan update

From: Mandy Weed On Behalf Of CDS User
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 11:10 AM
To: Darryl Piercy
Subject: FW: GMA & interchanges

From: Martin Kaatz [mailto:marcar@elltel.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 10:23 AM
To: CDS User
Cc: mmorton@cityofcleelum.com
Subject: GMA & interchanges

Dear Mr. Piercy,

There are 11 or 12 interchanges from L. Easton to Vantage which lie outside of incorporated areas. Currently, county interchanges have been largely spared from significant commercial development. The County Code, as I interpret it, it does not not permit major retail development such as big box stores or malls at interchanges.

Commercial development should be encouraged to take place within the core of the county's incorporated communities or UGNs. The desired result is to help maintain the economic health of urbanized areas while at the same time avoiding sprawl.

We should keep the aesthetics of the valley as intact as is reasonable. That, among other things, requires strict sign controls at interchanges in order to prevent visual pollution.

We should retain and strengthen current development and sign restrictions at our interchanges to insure that inappropriate land use does not occur. With that in mind I have attached a document for your consideration that addresses interchange issues.

Thank you for giving it your attention.

Martin
Recommended Goals and Policies for all Kittitas County Interchanges
(Adapted from the language found in interchange ordinances from other communities)

The following goals and policies are recommended for consideration and use by all of the cities in Kittitas County as well as all interchanges in unincorporated parts of the county.

Financial Impact to Towns
Goal: To ensure that interchange development does not adversely impact a community’s ability to pay for required infrastructure improvements.
Policies:
1. Developers should pay the cost of additional traffic control devices or improvements in the existing transportation facilities resulting from new development.
2. New developments within adjacent to the region’s interchanges should conduct a traffic impact assessment quantifying the proposed traffic impacts on adjacent roadways.
3. Developers should mitigate any predicted change in the flow of traffic as a result of a new development.

Interchange Function
Goal: To prevent the degradation of the interchange function as a result of new development.
Policies:
1. Regardless of project size or traffic generation, measured sight distances at access/egress locations shall, at a minimum, meet state of Washington standards for safe stopping sight distance at the marked speed limit.
2. New developments should use interior roads to limit the number of direct access points (curb cuts) on roads.
3. Development should not be allowed near entrance and exit ramps to prevent additional turning movements and potential points of conflict between vehicles.

Multimodal Transportation
Goal: The needs of pedestrians and bicyclists should be accommodated in developments adjacent to the region’s interchanges, with additional efforts made to coordinate development in relation to existing public transit routes.
Policies:
1. Proposed developments should provide facilities for pedestrians and bicycles. New developments should connect facilities with adjacent sidewalks and bike paths.
2. Commercial and industrial developments that employ more than 15 employees per shift should make efforts to coordinate and cooperate with local transit providers.

Strip Development

*Goal:* To minimize the effects of strip development through the coordination of transportation and land use planning activities at the city, and county levels.

*Policies:*  
1. The Planning Department should continually review local land use and transportation plans to ensure that the goals, policies, strategies, and objectives established are consistent with one another and mutually supportive.  
2. The Planning Department should sponsor a collaborative planning process involving the affected landowners, municipalities, and the Planning Department when dealing with land use adjacent to the region’s interchanges.  
3. Planning Department should work with the county to implement access management strategies through zoning and subdivision regulations for transportation corridors influenced by interchange development.

Smart Growth

*Goal:* Reduce the demand to develop lands near the region’s interchanges by reducing barriers to, and providing incentives for, infill development and transit-oriented, pedestrian/bicycle-friendly development in close proximity to village centers.

*Policies:*  
1. Towns should cooperate with regional economic development entities and Chambers of Commerce to match appropriate retail and commercial businesses with vacant properties in the region’s downtowns and village centers.  
2. Developments that diversify the local and regional economy and assimilate within the existing economic and aesthetic environment should be given priority.  
3. Retail and commercial uses best suited for the city downtown should be discouraged from locating near the region’s interchanges.

Sensitive Development and Open Space

*Goal:* Proposed developments adjacent to the region’s interchanges should preserve the aesthetic nature and open space that typifies Vermont.

*Policies:*  
1. The Planning Department will work to develop appropriate design standards for development adjacent to the city’s interchanges that address lighting, parking, aesthetics, signage, building size, shape, etc.  
2. The Planning Department will continue to work to identify and protect “critical lands” near the city’s interchanges  
3. Development adjacent to interchanges should be encouraged to provide tourist and information facilities for visitors to the region.
TO: Kittitas County Community Development Services

Re: Proposed Amendments for Comprehensive Plan Update

June 2, 2006

In a letter dated November 2, 2004 from the Dept. of Community, Trade and Economic Development to the Kittitas County Board of County Commissioners the comment was made:

"Both the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan and county-wide planning policies indicates several urban growth nodes have been designated and mapped because they exhibit urban characteristics. This language indicates that these urban growth nodes are Category 1 LAMIRD's - Easton, Snoqualamie, Thorp, Vantage and Ronald."

In Ordinance No. 2005-40 the Kittitas County Board of County Commissioners have stated on Page 13, 23(D):

"The Board of Commissioners finds that the policies for dealing with land use issues in the Urban Growth Nodes (UGN's) needs review during the 2006 updating of the Comprehensive Plan to determine the actual land use capacity, taking into account the availability of urban services, including but not limited to, sanitary sewer, potable water and emergency services to better resolve growth related issues in UGN's and Urban Growth Areas (UGA's)."

In light of the above we recommend the following changes in the Comprehensive Plan during the 2006 update as follows:

• All references to Urban Growth Nodes should be deleted from the plan.
• On page 26 of the Comprehensive Plan is stated:

"No special goals or policies have been developed for UGN's. It is assumed that these areas would function in much the same way an UGA".

At the time UGN's were formed not enough attention was given to their ability to provide urban services. Because the town of Ronald is contractually restricted as to the area it can supply urban services (water and sewer) it is unable to provide these services outside the boundaries of it's water district (Kittitas County Water District #2). Ronald cannot thereby "function in much the same way as an UGA".

We recommend that the town of Ronald and the community of Pine Loch Sun III, which abuts Ronald, has it's own water system but cannot expand it, be classified as Category 1 LAMIRD's. Both communities qualify as LAMIRD's under the Growth Management Act [RCW 36.70]. Other communities within the UGN (Evergreen Ridge, Evergreen Valley and Bakers Acres) which are served by the Evergreen Water System (a Class A system) can be classified as New Fully Contained Communities under RCW 36.70.350.

• The Thorp UGN, which currently has about 93 water hookups in it's water district, and has another 60+ available based on existing usage levels and water rights, is
approximately one-third (1/3) larger than it's water district boundaries. Thorp should also be classified as a Category 1 LAMIRD and it's limits set at the current water district boundary. Proper infilling will probably utilize the 60+ potential water hookups.

- Easton UGN is served by a water district but has no sewer system. Each residence is served by an individual septic system. The Boundaries of the Easton UGN are much too large and without a sewer system additional development will cause too much waste to be introduced into the soil creating health hazards.

- Snoqualamie Pass and Vantage have both sewer and water systems. Vantage is serviced by a private sewer operator. Do they have enough capacity to serve the projected population for the next 20 years without upgrades that may be too expensive for the areas residents and taxpayers to absorb?

- A separate section of the Comprehensive Plan should be created for LAMIRD’s. This section should have appropriate GPO’s, one of which must reflect the realities of the urban services currently available. Water resources in Ronald, Thorp and possibly other UGN’s is a limiting factor, as are sewers and roads. LAMIRD’s should not be so large that if built out they would require extension of urban services such as sewer or upgraded roads [ibid. letter from CTED Nov. 2, 2001 to BOCC]. Another GPO should be written stating LAMIRD’s should have logical outer boundaries [LOB] which cannot be expanded and urban services cannot be extended beyond the LOB in order to prevent urban sprawl.

_The logical outer boundary is delineated predominantly by the “built environment” that existed on July 1, 1990, or the date when the county was first required or chose to fully plan under the GMA [RCW 37.70A.070(5)(d)(iv)]. The “built environment” includes man-made structures located above and below ground, such as existing buildings, sewer lines, and other urban level utilities or infrastructure [City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, Feb. 6, 2001] The extent of the infrastructure or the service area that existed in 1990 or the date when the county was first required to chose to fully plan under the GMA may be used to set the logical outer boundary. [Burrow v. Kitsap County, Mar. 29, 2000]_

- A GPO should perhaps be created directing the formation of a local citizens council within the LAMIRD,s to provide for representation of the people in decisions made by county government concerning LAMIRD’s.

We hope that you will seriously consider our recommendations and make the necessary changes as the Comprehensive Plan is updated.

Thank you,

Paula Thompson, DVM, Thorp

James Boyle, Ronald
411 N Ruby St, Ste 2
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Re: TAX PARCEL 12636

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Please accept this written communication as a formal request/application to utilize 1087 Hidden Valley Rd; Cle Elum, WA 98922 as it is presently zoned as AG3 such that we are allowed the opportunity to divide the existing parcel of 24.27 acres into 9 individual parcels none less than the 3 acre minimum presently required.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. William K. Barachuk
1087 Hidden Valley Rd
Cle Elum, WA 98922
Kittitas County Assessor

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 12636
Map Number: 20-17-31000-0015
Situs: 01087 HIDDEN VALLEY RD CLE ELUM
Legal: ACRES 29.27, CD. 7750-1-3; SEC. 31, TWP. 20, RGE. 17; PTN. NE1/4 (LOT 3A, B23/P9-10)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: BARSCHAW, WILLIAM ETUX
Address: 1087 HIDDEN VALLEY RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Assessment Data
Tax District: 44
Open Space:
Open Space Date:
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 29.27
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 248,320
Imp: 278,510
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 526,830

Taxable Value
Land: 248,320
Imp: 278,510
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 526,830

Sales History
Date Book & Page # Parcels Grantor Grantee Price
06-01-1999 8087 1 IRWIN FAMILY LTD LIABILITY CO BARSCHAW, WILLIAM ETUX 174,995
10-01-1997 4529 22 FIRST INTEREST BK TRUST IRWIN FAMILY LTD LIABILITY CO 1,376,760

Building Permits
Permit No. Date Description Amount
2004-06069 6/17/2004 95% RNEW SFR 4328 SQFT 259,998

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>BARSCHAW, WILLIAM ETUX</td>
<td>248,320</td>
<td>278,510</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>526,830</td>
<td>526,830</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>BARSCHAW, WILLIAM ETUX</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>BARSCHAW, WILLIAM ETUX</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>BARSCHAW, WILLIAM ETUX</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>BARSCHAW, WILLIAM ETUX</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>132,220</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>BARSCHAW, WILLIAM ETUX</td>
<td>166,350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>166,350</td>
<td>166,350</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://gimli/taxsifter/t-assessor.asp?pid=12636

6/6/2006
June 1, 2006

Mr. Darryl Piercy
Kittitas County Community Development Services
411 N Ruby ST, Suite 2
Ellensburg WA 98926

Subject: Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan Update Open House and Community Charette Comments

Dear Mr. Piercy:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Kittitas County comprehensive plan update. Futurewise is a statewide citizens' group working to protect working farms, forests and open space, while making cities and towns great places to live. Futurewise has members across Washington State, as well as in Kittitas County.

We appreciate that you are undertaking the update of your comprehensive plan. The Growth Management Act requires regular seven year updates of comprehensive plans for a variety of reasons. Consider three:

- Communities change. According to the Census, Kittitas County’s population has growth by 6,637 people between 1990 and 2000. This is a growth rate of 24.83%, and it is important to anticipate and plan for future change and growth. The full population growth numbers can be found at: http://www.censusscope.org/us/s53/c37/chart_poppl.html
- We know more. In the years since Kittitas County adopted its comprehensive plan, we have learned much about how to make communities better.
- The Growth Management Act changes. The Growth Management Act has been amended every year since it was adopted.

The comprehensive plan updates are opportunities for counties to evaluate their plans to make sure we are getting the kind of community Kittitas County residents want. It is also a great opportunity to incorporate the new knowledge of how to make communities better and to make sure the plan is in compliance with the Growth Management Act.

The Growth Management Act, in RCW 36.70A.130(1), requires each city and county in Washington State that fully plans under the Growth Management Act “to take legislative action to review and, if needed, revise its comprehensive land use plan and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter ....” This means that each county and city must review their entire comprehensive plan and development regulations to ensure they comply with the Growth Management Act.\(^1\)  If Kittitas County’s comprehensive plan or development regulations

\(^1\) 1000 Friends of Washington and Pro-Whatcom v. Whatcom County; Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB) Case No. 04-2-0010 Order on Motion to Dismiss p. 7 of 16
do not fully comply with the GMA, they must be revised by an ordinance or resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners.\textsuperscript{2}

The legislature adopted this requirement in 1997 and the original deadline was September 1, 2002.\textsuperscript{3} The plans and development regulations were to be updated every five years.\textsuperscript{4} In 2002, the deadline for Kittitas County and the cities in Kittitas County was extended four years to December 1, 2006 and the update interval increased to seven years.\textsuperscript{5}

We appreciate that you are undertaking your update. Futurewise has been working closely with a group of local individuals and organizations to prepare suggested comprehensive plan amendments. We support their recommendations in addition to our own.

Futurewise has serious concerns about a few elements of your plan and urge you to include them in your update.

**Densities Greater Than One Dwelling Unit per Five Acres are Prohibited in Rural Areas with Limited Exceptions**

The Growth Management Act in RCW 36.70A.110(1) prohibits urban growth outside urban growth areas. The Growth Management Act (GMA) created three state agencies to interpret the GMA and to hear appeals alleging that cities, counties, or state agencies are in violation of the GMA. Kittitas County is in the jurisdiction of the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board.

The Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board, in defining what is urban growth and what is allowable rural development, has held that in rural areas, no more than one housing unit per five-acres is allowed.\textsuperscript{6} This decision is based on the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA prohibits urban growth outside the urban growth area, including rural areas.\textsuperscript{7} The GMA, in RCW 36.70A.030(17), defines urban growth as "...growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible

\textsuperscript{2} RCW 36.70A.130(1) \& 1000 Friends of Washington and Pro-Whatcom v. Whatcom County; WWGMHB Case No. 04-2-0010 Order on Motion to Dismiss p. *14 of 16 (August 2, 2004).
\textsuperscript{3} 1997 Session Laws, Chapter 429 § 10.
\textsuperscript{4} Id.
\textsuperscript{5} 2002 Session Laws, Chapter 320 § 1.
\textsuperscript{6} City of Moses Lake v. Grant County, EWGMHB Case No. 99-1-0016 Final Decision and Order pp. *5 – 6 of 11 (May 23, 2000). See also Diehl v. Mason County, 94 Wn. App. 645, 655-57, 972 P.2d 543, 547-49 (1999) (Residential densities of one housing unit, or more, per 2.5 acres "would allow for urban-like development" and are prohibited outside urban growth areas including in rural areas).
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. .... When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services.”

The Census of Agriculture shows that the average Kittitas County farm in 2002 totaled 248 acres. The smallest category of farm reported by the Census of Agriculture is farms from one to nine acres in size. In Kittitas County in 2002 there were 120 farms in that category and they consisted 682 acres. So the average size of these farms was 5.86 acres. This data certainly supports the Eastern Board’s holding on rural densities.

Further, the Rural Element of the Comprehensive Plan is required to protect “critical areas, as provided in RCW 36.70A.060, and surface water and ground water resources....” Critical areas include wetlands and streams.

In a recent review of these studies, Schueler [] concludes that “this research, conducted in many geographical areas, concentrating on many different variables, and employing widely different methods, has yielded a surprisingly similar conclusion – stream degradation occurs at relatively low levels of imperiousness (10-20%)” []. Recent studies also suggest that this threshold applies to wetland health. Hicks [] found a well-defined inverse relationship between freshwater wetland habitat quality and imperious surface area, with wetlands suffering impairment once the imperviousness of their local drainage basin exceeded 10%.

Densities of one housing unit per acre have 13 percent of the lot in imperious surfaces. Three to five acre lots have imperious surfaces of 8.3 percent. Five acre lots have imperious surfaces of 5.4 percent.

So, imperious surfaces above ten percent adversely affect streams and wetlands. Over the long-term, a five acre rural density is the highest density that can effectively maintain a ten percent effective imperious surface maximum. This is especially true

---

9 Id.
10 RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(iv).
11 RCW 36.70A.030(5).
14 Id.
15 Id.
given that many subbasins will include urban growth areas with much higher percentages of impervious surfaces. Indeed, some rural uses, such as agricultural product processing plants have higher imperious surfaces. Higher densities, such as one unit per acre densities, mean that impervious surfaces will exceed this percentage in Kittitas County, resulting in significant adverse environmental impacts and adverse impacts on surface water quality.

The State of Washington Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED) also recommends against this type of sprawling, low-density development. The CTED recommends rural residential densities of one housing unit per five and 10 acres. For rural agricultural and forest uses outside of agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, CTED recommends densities of one dwelling unit per 20 acres.  

Densities of one dwelling unit per three acres, one dwelling per acre, and one dwelling unit per acre have the following additional adverse impacts:

- Increase costs to taxpayers by allowing land development that will require urban services where they will expensive to provide.\(^7\)

- Put drinking water supplies at risk by allowing high density development in areas that contribute to drinking water for county property owners, residents, and businesses.\(^8\)


Harm the character of Kittitas County by allowing urban style developments in rural areas.

Increase traffic because more people drive alone and must drive longer distances to work and to meet the needs of their families. Sprawling places are likely to have more traffic fatalities per capita than more compact regions due to higher rates of vehicle use.

Harms critical areas and other environmentally sensitive areas. Sprawl results in fish and wildlife habitat losses and habitat fragmentation, the separation of habitats by development. Sprawl’s dispersed development pattern leads to the degradation of water quality by increasing runoff volume, altering regular stream flow and watershed hydrology, reducing groundwater recharge, and increasing stream sedimentation.

It is important to have a maximum density of one dwelling unit per five acres in the rural areas outside of limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRDs) in order to maintain the rural character of Kittitas County, to protect drinking water supplies for both urban and rural residents, to protect water quality, and to protect rural residents.

We have great concerns that Kittitas County allows development in the rural area with a density of up to one unit per acre, due to clustering provisions. Clustering allows densities of up to one unit per acre in the AG-20, F&R-20, AG-3, AG-6 and CA zones. Many of these zones can increase densities up to one unit per half acre if served by sewer and water.

For example, Rural 3 allows three acre lots, with a density of up to one unit per acre with clustering provisions, and densities up to on unit per half acre through clustering with water and sewer. Additionally, the Rural 5 allows clustering at one unit per acre or up to one unit per half acre through clustering with water and sewer. Finally, in the forest and range zone, densities are one unit per twenty acres, but densities up to one unit per half acre is allowed for any lot within an approved platted cluster subdivision served by sewer and water.

These densities and clustering provisions are out of compliance with the Growth Management Act, and we urge you to bring them into compliance as part of your comprehensive plan update. The language in the rural element of your comprehensive plan describing rural sprawl is inconsistent with the scientific literature we cited above, we urge you to revise it to be consistent with the studies and law cited above.

21 *Id.*
22 *Id.*
To address this and other rural issues, enclosed please find a Futurewise report on *Planning for Sustainable Rural Areas*.

**Resource Lands Advisory Committee Comments**

We do support the overall findings of the RLAC, and appreciate the hard work done on this update process. We do, however, have a few concerns which are as follows:

- We do not support cluster development in forest resource lands of long-term commercial significance. Housing, even clustered housing, is not consistent with the continued management of commercial forest land.
- Clustering provisions allowing densities of up to one unit per 2.5 acres should not be allowed. This density in the rural area is too high and out of compliance with the GMA. Clustering can be a valuable tool in the rural area as it allows smaller lots while preserving critical areas, forested land, and open space, however the maximum clustered density should be one dwelling unit per five acres for the reasons set out above.
- Finally, we have great concerns about the overall lack of a range of densities in the rural area. Due to clustering provisions in Kittitas County, the rural area can all be developed at a density of one unit per acre, and sometimes up to one unit per five acres. The GMA calls for a range of rural densities, and Kittitas County needs to ensure that a range of densities exist. The maximum cluster density should also vary by zone so that there is a variety of rural densities as required by the Growth Management Act.

**Lack of Criteria for Land Use Designations**

The Kittitas County comprehensive plan does not have clear provisions outlining what land use designations should apply to what location. It is important to set clear guidelines outlining appropriate zones for comprehensive plan updates and proposed rezones. There has been much controversy over rezones in the past, and a clear set of guidelines will make the decision process much more fair and smooth. We urge you to adopt a set of guideline as part of your comprehensive plan update.

**Sewers in the Rural Area**

Rural Element GPO 8.49 states that lot size should be determined by provision for water and sewer. As discussed above, clear guidelines should be set to determine zoning and consequently lot size. Additionally, sewers and other urban services should not be provided in the rural areas. This policy should be changed to reflect that urban services should be not be extended outside urban growth areas. This is discussed further in *Planning for Sustainable Rural Areas*. 
Mr. Darryl Piercy  
Kittitas County Community Development Services  
June 1, 2006  
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Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the comprehensive plan update. We appreciate your work on this important issue, and we urge you to include our concerns in the scope for the update. Please include this letter and attachments in the record for the update, and please notify me of any public involvement opportunities and decisions regarding this update. You can send those notices by e-mail to Sydney@futurewise.org or to our above mailing address.

If you require additional information, please contact me at 206-343-0681 or Sydney@futurewise.org.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sydney McComas  
Urban Policy Director

Enclosures
June 12, 2006

Kittitas County Board of Commissioners
Perry Huston
David Bowen
Alan Crankovich
205 West 5th Ave, Suite 108
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Dear Mssrs. Huston, Bowen and Crankovich:

I want to thank the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners for the opportunity to be a member of the Natural Resource Lands Advisory Committee ("Committee"). The experience was an interesting and informative process working with such a diverse and dedicated group of individuals on the Committee. However, the task to fully review the many natural resource and land use issues facing the County and make recommendations to the Board was extremely difficult. Given the short time frame in which to complete this process, some critical issues were brushed over or not fully scrutinized with the attention they deserve. Though the Committee members all voted for the recommendations, there were a few that voted with great reservation, including myself. Since that vote, I feel that some of the recommendations the Committee decided on do not meet the overall goal and vision of the Committee: to provide landowners flexibility and creative solutions for addressing significant land use issues. Flexible planning tools that promote a property's economic viability are especially needed by both small and large landowners of lands zoned Commercial Forestry.

As a forest land manager, I have concerns that we are trying to protect forest land without looking at the economic viability of those lands in Kittitas County, especially with the announced closure of the Layman mill and Yakima Resources mill in Yakima. These closures will significantly affect the continuing viability of the forest products industry in Kittitas County. The Committee ignored the issue of continued viability of private timberlands, hoping that commercially zoned forest land will always remain a sustainable industry. Forest land will not remain viable unless the owners are allowed to sell part of their ownership to meet current liabilities. If the people of Kittitas County want to preserve the forested landscapes for multiple use activities, along with timber production, we need to build in flexibility to survive for the future. We need to develop meaningful incentives to ensure that large and small landowners are able to preserve certain portions
of their holdings by allowing development to occur where appropriate. With alternate income sources available, the majority of these lands can continue in long term forestry use throughout Kittitas County.

As an active member of the Committee, I am committed to continue the work needed to achieve excellent planning and solutions for growth in Kittitas County. The forest landscape ownership in this country is changing. If Kittitas County wants to embrace the future, we need to provide the flexibility and incentives that allows the forest landowner to survive. In order to have a viable long term forest resource industry, we must allow forest landowners to sell some of their property and reserve some property for long term commercial forest land.

In addition to this letter, I have attached for your review specific comments on the recent policies and recommendations attributed to the Committee, now posted at the Kittitas County Planning office and submitted to the County Board of Commissioners and Planning Commission. On behalf of American Forest Resources and other forested land owners, I ask the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners to consider these comments, and explore ways to keep the long term viability of the forest and agriculture industry in Kittitas County. If you think it helpful, I would welcome reconvening the Committee to assist the Board and Planning Commission with these issues.

Sincerely

Jeff Jones
General Manager

Cc: Darryl Piercy, Director of Community Development
RLAC Committee Members
John Rudey, CEO, American Forest Resources, LLC
Tom Ludlow, CFO, American Forest Resources, LLC
June 12, 2006

Below are the specific comments by American Forest Resources, LLC, to the Final 5/18/06 Vision Statement and Policy Recommendations, Final 5/18/06 Comp Plan Update Recommendations, and the Resource Lands Advisory Committee Suggested Changes to the GPOs within the existing Comprehensive Plan. The comments, in bold and underlined, are inserted directly into the text of the document for your convenience.

Final 5/8/06

Resource Lands Advisory Committee (RLAC)
Policy Recommendations

RLAC Vision Statement

Vision Statement

We will continue to manage Kittitas County to ensure long-term environmental and economic sustainability. This means a landscape that supports the full range of human uses, from natural resource management, community development and recreational opportunities, while maintaining the rural setting and quality of life that Kittitas County is known for. The vision will be accomplished by:

1. Creating and implementing management policies and principles based on careful, well thought out planning that provide incentives, assistance and flexibility to landowners.
2. Working in collaboration with knowledgeable and involved parties, industry, the business community and other stakeholders.
3. Recognizing the historical, aesthetic and recreational values while improving the economic base of the County.
4. Providing the opportunities for new businesses, cottage industry and services as well as affordable housing.
5. Promoting open space in strategically identified areas that provide public benefit.
6. Identify, develop and implement economically viable strategies to support agriculture, forest and mineral resource activities.

Policy Issues and Recommendations.

Water for domestic use.
The RLAC recognizes that water availability will be among a handful of issues that will determine how and where growth will occur in Kittitas County. Decisions regarding the areas where growth will be encouraged and directed should include discussion on the availability of adequate water supplies. The RLAC recommends:

A viable and demonstrated water supply shall be required prior to all final plat approvals. No plat shall receive final approval without a connection to an
approved water source or a well in place producing water in sufficient quality and quantity for domestic use.

**Requiring a connection to an approved water source or a well already in place producing water prior to final plat approval is unnecessary and unreasonable. A water availability determination by a water purveyor or significant data that evidences available ground water in sufficient quantity and quality for an exempt well should be adequate for final plat approval.**

**Boundaries of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designations.**
The RLAC does not recommend changing the current boundaries of the land use designations on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map with the exception of the following situations:

Where it is determined that the Urban Growth Areas or Urban Growth Nodes should be modified due to change in the population forecast or refinement of urban services information.

The addition of a “Rural Transition Overlay” designation (this will be discussed with further detail later in this report)

The addition of a “Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development” (LAMIRD) designation where deemed appropriate.

Encourage Urban Growth Areas and Rural Transition Overlay designations to areas that minimize conversion of prime agricultural farm land.

The Ellensburg Urban Growth Area south of Interstate 90 should be reconsidered to recognize potential impacts to the Yakima River and flood hazards to development.

**We would add an additional exception: when there is not enough buildable land available for at least twice the needed population, then the urban line or designated urban area will be expanded.**

**Further, the proposed Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD) designation has no definition, and thus no informational standards to guide the public’s review. We ask the designation be defined.**
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Recognize the need for parity in Land Use designations. Develop incentives for those lands that are contained in the Commercial Agriculture and Commercial Forest designations so that property owners will want to remain in those designations. The RLAC recommends:

The implementation of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) and Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) programs to allow the transfer and purchase of development rights from the Commercial Agriculture and Commercial Forest designations following a TDR, PDR analysis and program development. A provision for this program is identified in the land use element preferred alternative found later in this report.

Require sub area planning in the Teanaway Drainage Basin prior to development other than at one unit per 80 acres. Sub area plan to be developed within two years of the adoption of this plan.

Allow the use of the Cluster Subdivision Code in the Commercial Forest designation. Develop a Forest Practices Ordinance that identifies the process for conversion of land currently in forestry to other uses.

It is simply not reasonable to halt development within these zones until the TDR and PDR programs are developed and approved. Moreover, these programs should be based on similar processes and programs that have worked successfully in other parts of the country.

Similarly, allowing only one unit per 80 acres within the Teanaway Drainage Basin until the subarea plan is developed and approved is unworkable. Existing zoning and the ability to non-comprehensive plan amendment rezones under the Forest and Range 20 should stay and continue to be viable zoning.

Finally, we appreciate allowing the use of the Cluster Subdivision Code in the Commercial Forest designation and see it as the type of creative planning needed by large and small landowners with lands in this designation.

Create consistency between the Land Use map and Zoning map. The RLAC recommends:

The Land Use Map and Zoning Map should be consistent. Rezones should be limited to occur only when a comprehensive plan land use map designation change is approved within the context of the yearly review cycle.

Keep the current ability to rezone a 20 acre zoning down to 5 acre zone without requiring an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
June 12, 2006

Density in the Rural land use designation should be based on a public benefit rating system.
The RLAC recommends:

Base density in the rural designations should be 1 unit per 20 acres. Densities between 1 unit per 20 acres and 1 unit per 5 acres should be based on a public benefit rating system and determined using the public benefit rating system at the time of parcel creation. Density of 1 unit to 2.5 acre may be obtained through a density transfer from Commercial Agriculture.

This should not eliminate the existing ability to create a 5 acre lot without clustering. Also, a density transfer from Commercial Forest lands should be included.

The overall footprint of development in the rural designations should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
The RLAC recommends:

All parcel creation in the rural designation below a density of 1 unit per 20 acres shall use the public benefit rating system and shall use clustering to maximize the retention of open space and minimize the development footprint.

We disagree. The standard five acre lot should be preserved without undergoing heightened review by the County and any clustering should be encouraged by incentives.

Consider how the county will develop not just within the 20 year planning period but within the next 100 years.
The RLAC recommends:

Development and Implementation of a “Rural Transition Overlay Zone” in the Rural designations that will identify areas of the county for growth beyond 20 years. This overlay zone will allow for orderly development for growth beyond the 20 year planning period and will provide a receiving area for development rights from the Commercial Agriculture Zone.

This should include Commercial Forest area. Further, the TDR and PDR programs need to be completed before this zoning designation is put in place.

Comments Submitted by Jeff Jones, AFR
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Loss of Agricultural land with good soils and irrigation, regardless of land use designation, should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

The RLAC recommends:

An element of the public benefit rating system should give high recognition to development that maintains agricultural land with good soils and irrigation by clustering development on the least productive of these lands and provides for large (greater than 40 acres) intact acreages suitable for agricultural use.

We would also add as an element to any "public benefit rating system" a similar recognition when a change of use promotes economic viability for the subject lands.
Cluster / Transfer of Development Rights Recommendation

General boundaries of the existing Land Use map remain for Commercial Ag and Commercial Forest. Rural boundary remains similar except for the introduction of the Rural Transition Zone. 80 acre density for Commercial Forest, 20 acre density for Commercial Agriculture, a 20 acre base density for Rural and 5 acre base density for Rural Transition.

Any development within the rural zone below one unit per 20 acres requires Cluster Development using the public benefit rating system. Up to one unit per 5 acres with minimum 50% open space. Minimum development size is 20 acres. Density may be increased to allow one unit per 2.5 acres however the acquisition of development rights from the Commercial Agriculture land use designation is required for each unit in excess of one unit per 5 acres.

Development within the rural transition overlay zone is to provide for and accommodate urban levels of development in the 20 to 100 year planning period. Development must be by cluster subdivision, base density of 1 unit per 5 acres at a 100% bonus density. Minimum 25% open space and minimum 50% urban redevelopment area (identified by a pre-plat). Development of the urban redevelopment area requires the acquisition of development rights transferred from the Commercial Agriculture Land Use designation. Mixed use development is allowed for the purpose of supporting future urban levels of development.

The minimum density allowed in the Urban Growth areas is established at 4 units per acre. Additional density may be allowed with the acquisition of development rights from Commercial Ag land use designation.

Due to the consistency of the Land Use Map and the Zoning Map, no rezones would be allowed except in conjunction with a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

We would: (1) add to the above list the acquisition of development rights from Commercial Forest land use designation; (2) preserve existing land use opportunities and expectations, and keep the 3, 5 and 20 acre existing zoning along with the incentive to cluster; and (3) if rezones will be prohibited under the Forest & Range 20 without a comp plan amendment, then the County should allow the land owners a reasonable time period to change to 5 acre zoning if they desire.
Resource Lands Advisory Committee suggested text changes to the GPOs within the context of the existing Comprehensive Plan

(Portions of pages 23-36 of the Comp Plan)

2.3 LAND USE PLAN

The Land Use Plan shown on the maps in this chapter provides an official guide for the orderly growth of residential, business and industrial areas in the County. The Plan shows the relationship of these and other land uses to each other, to major parks and to existing and proposed arterials. The Comprehensive Plan Map is generalized and not intended to be precise or permanent. It should not, above all, be interpreted as a zoning map.

The following land use designations are used to establish general locations for different types of activities throughout the County.

2.3(A) Urban Land Use

Urban Residential Land Use

This designation contains those lands within urban growth areas and urban growth nodes which appear to be most suitable and likely for future development and city utilities. The areas are, for the most part, highly suited to orderly street systems and land subdivision. Residential densities and housing types are the subject of this Plan and should be based on the expansion of the Ellensburg Comprehensive Plan or other cities' comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances.

GPO 2.92a The future urban residential areas may be both residential and agricultural. Ongoing agriculture should be supported in development regulations.

GPO 2.92b The current use of future urban residential areas may be both residential and agricultural. Meanwhile, ongoing agriculture should be supported as the lands are in transition.

GPO 2.92c Encourage and accommodate future expansion of utilities and roadways for urban densities.

GPO 2.93 Innovations in housing development such as cluster developments, rmaster planned developments, shadow platting and planned unit developments will be encouraged.

We would add Fully Contained Communities (FCC's) and Master Planned Resorts (MPR's) to GPO 2.93.

Comments Submitted by Jeff Jones, AFR
Urban Growth Areas and Urban Growth Nodes

Though the areas included within the urban growth area boundaries are intended to urbanize and become annexed in the proceeding 20 years, these lands will continue to be under County jurisdiction. To ensure both consistency and coordination, the planning for these areas will be done in concert with the respective cities. In addition, interlocal agreements with the individual cities may be necessary to provide the necessary administrative guidance and services to these unincorporated areas.

Two major issues arise in the discussion of urban growth area boundaries. These include phased growth and transitional land uses. Most communities preparing plans for the urban growth area have elected to plan under a phased growth scenario. The overall concept of phased growth indicates that growth will occur in “phases.” The first phase usually includes those areas that are already served by public water and/or sewer, and where the second phase of growth will occur in areas where services do not presently exist but are eventually. The inclusion of land within an urban growth area indicates that the land will be developed at an urban density within the next 20 years. Therefore, the existing Agricultural Land Use or Rural Residential Land Use within the urban growth areas will eventually transition from Agricultural Land Use to Urban Residential Land Use which serves the 20-year forecasted population. This transition from Agriculture Land Use to Urban Residential Land Use within the urban growth area will require land uses and densities which allow this change to occur in as efficient a manner as possible.

As portions of the urban growth areas develop, it is assumed that these areas will be annexed to the adjacent city. Intergovernmental agreements will need to be created in order to deal with the allocation of financial burdens that result from the transition of land from county to city jurisdiction. Similarly, agreements will need to be drafted to coordinate planning efforts for the unincorporated areas of the urban growth areas and with facility providers in the urban growth nodes. Kittitas County has offered the opportunity to prepare an interlocal agreement with the cities for the preparation of a draft urban growth area plans. This agreement and the work resulting from it are expected to be completed in the end of 2008. The following are additional issues that must be resolved by the cities and Kittitas County for the preparation and implementation of goals, objectives and policies contained in this comprehensive plan:

*Joint interlocal agreements:
1) Unified or consistent subdivision code;
2) Municipal utility extension agreement for water, sewer and gas;
3) Intergovernmental service agreements for libraries, fire, EMS, parks and recreation;
4) Unified or consistent zoning code with provisions for urban zoning, transitional zoning, and other transitional uses;
5) Density and land use mapping;
6) Airport Facility-flight safety zones, density, land uses, expansion of the airport and services provided for the City of Ellensburg;
7) Extension and acquisition of Rights-of-Way;
8) Unified or consistent road standards, stormwater standards and level of service; and,
9) Annexation agreements.
10) Shorelines development plan

*This list is not intended to be all inclusive of issues to be addressed through interlocal agreements with the cities but specific issues which may affect the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan.

The individual cities within Kittitas County are responsible for developing a final urban growth area boundary, future land use plans for the unincorporated portion of their respective urban growth areas, and facility or service needs to accommodate the 20-year population growth. These plans are to be submitted to Kittitas County for consideration and ultimately adoption as a portion of the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan. RCW 36.70A.110(5) states, "Final urban growth areas shall be adopted at the time of comprehensive plan adoption under this chapter..." and RCW 36.70A.110(6) states, "Each county shall include designations of urban growth areas in its comprehensive plan."

GPO 2.94a A consideration for all future development should be the adaptability of a proposal to urban water, sewer, and road systems.

We would include both public and private to the utilities / infrastructure list in GPO 2.94a.

GPO 2.94b Expansion of the UGA should be encouraged in areas least suited for agriculture and areas not impacted by Critical Areas

GPO 2.94c Development of a subarea plan to investigate expansion north of the City of Ellensburg.

GPO 2.94d Allow for the flexibility of minimum density standards in urban growth areas where Critical Areas are present in order to provide the highest level of protection

GPO 2.95 Within the UGAs and UGNs, in the absence of urban utilities, a system of subdivision and development should be encouraged which would produce a pattern capable of re-division to a higher density at such time when utilities are available.

GPO 2.96 Adopt urban growth node (UGN) and urban growth area (UGA) boundaries to accommodate residential and employment increases projected within the boundaries over the next 20 years.

GPO 2.97 The UGNs and/or UGAs shall be consistent with the following criteria:
   a. Each UGN and/or UGA shall provide sufficient urban land to accommodate future population/employment projections through the designated planning period.
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b. Lands included within UGNs and/or UGAs shall either be already characterized by urban growth or adjacent to such lands.

**We would add FCC's to GPO 2.97b.**

c. Existing urban land uses and densities should be included within UGNs and/or UGAs.

d. UGNs and/or UGAs shall provide a balance of industrial, commercial, and residential lands.

e. Each UGA shall have the anticipated financial capability to provide infrastructure/services needed in the areas over the planning period under adopted concurrency standards.

f. Protect natural resource and critical areas

g. Encourage the conversion of undeveloped lands into urban densities.

h. Provide for the efficient provision of public services;

i. Promote a variety of residential densities; and,

j. Include sufficient vacant and buildable land for future urban densities.

GPO 2.98 Per RCW 36.70A.06094) forest land and agricultural land located within urban growth areas shall not be designated by a county or a city as forest land or agricultural land of long-term commercial significance under RCW 36.70A.170, unless the city or county has enacted a program authorizing transfer or purchase of development rights.

GPO 2.99 Reserved

**Commercial Land Use**

The present and long established land use pattern in Kittitas County is the basis for planning future business development. That pattern finds most business located in established communities and/or business districts.

GPO 2.100 Kittitas County will act to preserve the viability and integrity of existing business districts within the incorporated and unincorporated county.

GPO 2.101 Most comparison shopping (general merchandise, clothing, appliance, auto, sporting goods) should be located in or near existing business districts.

GPO 2.102 Neighborhood "convenience" business outside urban areas serving rural districts or demonstrated motorist needs should be encouraged in appropriate areas.

GPO 2.103 Home occupations which result in accumulations of vehicles, appliances, or other materials should be regulated, licensed and required to provide sight screening from adjacent properties and roadways.

GPO 2.104 Highways and roads should not be developed with new commercial sites without compelling reasons and supporting economic data. Expansion and full development of existing business districts is encouraged.
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GPO 2.105 I-90 exits shall not be considered as new business sites unless an Interchange Zone Classification is developed.

GPO 2.106 Kittitas County recognizes home occupations and cottage industries as valuable additions to the economic health of the community. In addition, where distances from other employment warrants, limited-dispersed rural business activities (LD-RBAs) of low impact and with necessary infrastructure will be encouraged on a case by case basis as long as these sustain or are compatible with the rural character of their area in which they locate.

GPO 2.107 Limited-dispersal rural business activities (LD-RBAs), not necessarily resource-based, including but not limited to information, legal, office and health services, arts and crafts, clothing, small manufacture and repair may be located as an overlay zone in all rural and resource lands in the county as long as they are compatible with the rural character of the area in which they locate.

GPO 2.107A Designate sufficient available land for specialized commercial uses that are by their nature compatible with residential, agricultural, recreational, and other general land use types.

GPO 2.107B Promote large scale commercial development within the UGAs and UGNs by encouraging infrastructure improvements and new business recruitment.

GPO 2.107C Promote small scale commercial development outside of UGAs and UGNs when compatible with adjacent land uses.

GPO 2.107D Encourage an adequate inventory of developable property to accommodate the siting of new, and the expansion of existing, commercial uses.

GPO 2.107E Identify areas where mixed commercial and industrial uses can be sited if compatibility is evident.

*Industrial Land use*

It is the objective of this plan and the policy of the County to improve conditions, insofar as possible, to attract industry.

GPO 2.108 Location of Industrial Land. There should be sufficient industrial land in the county located in areas convenient to utilities, fire protection and to major transportation facilities (air, rail, freeway). Industrial developments may be permitted beyond urban growth areas.

GPO 2.109 Compatibility. Industry located adjacent to residential areas or along scenic routes should be situated so as to minimize impacts on those areas and should provide screening and other measures to achieve compatibility.

Comments Submitted by Jeff Jones, AFR
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GPO 2.109A Designate sufficient available land for specialized industrial uses that are by their nature compatible with residential, agricultural, recreational, and other general land use types.

GPO 2.109B Promote industrial development within the UGAs and UGNs by encouraging infrastructure improvements and new business recruitment.

GPO 2.109C Encourage an adequate inventory of developable property to accommodate the siting of new, and the expansion of existing industrial uses.

GPO 2.109D Identify areas where mixed commercial and industrial uses can be sited if compatibility is evident.

2.3(B) Public Lands

_Yakima Training Center_

This designation contains those lands within the boundaries of the Yakima Training Center, an area acquired by the Federal Government for military personnel training. The Yakima Training Center has been assigned a unique land use category due to the inaccessibility of the lands by the public and inability to access these lands for range purposes. Under the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, this area was designated as Range Land Use, however, as such use is not permitted by federal authorities (unlike U.S. Forest Service lands in Kittitas County), the Yakima Training Center has been removed from the Range Land Use designation. There are no goals or policies related to the management or development of these lands.

The Department of Defense maintains a Cultural Natural Resources Committee of public officials and private organizations representatives who suggest goals and policies for management of the Yakima Training Center. Kittitas County recognizes this committee and the goal and policy statements that result from it. In the event any portion of the Yakima Training Center was to revert to another ownership, the County reserves the right to establish land use planning goals, policies and designations prior to such transfer being effective.

_Other Public Lands_

Approximately fifty-nine percent (59%) of Kittitas County is managed by State and Federal Agencies. In addition to those lands owned by the U.S. Department of Defense, there are also lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, W.S. Department of Natural Resources, W.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife, etc.

GPO 2.109E Kittitas County shall notify all state and federal agencies or other governmental entities that the county has developed land use regulations. Any planning...
activities by any other agency or governmental entity within Kittitas County shall be preceded by notification to the Board of County Commissioners. Other plans shall, unless specifically prohibited by statute, conform to and be consistent with Kittitas County planning ordinances, procedures and policies.

GPO 2.109F It is the policy of Kittitas County to recognize the water rights of citizens and entities within its borders as determined in the Yakima basin general adjudication and not to impair or adversely affect the water rights of its citizens by any action of county government.

GPO 2.109G Kittitas County will consider creating a wildfire protection policy tied to land use zoning that will protect both the private landowner and public lands from wildfire. When the use of forested lands is changed, the party doing the changing is responsible for providing a fire resistant buffer around the property.

GPO 2.109H Kittitas County will to the extent possible create a policy to preserve the grandfathered rights of private landowners to build roads on public lands under statute RS 2477.

GPO 2.109I Kittitas County will consider establishing a board to coordinate with the federal and state fish and wildlife agencies to provide local input into decisions about wildlife introduced into the area.

GPO 2.109J All agencies and jurisdictions shall recognize the area’s traditions, customs, cultures and economy.

GPO 2.109K Kittitas County recognizes that local tax burden on private lands is increased when private land is changed to public ownership. Such changes should be discouraged.

2.3(C) Resource Lands

Commercial Agriculture Land Use

The purpose and intent of this designation is to comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Act [RCW 36.70A.060]. The county has considered the Minimum Guidelines [WAC 365-190] in the classification, designation and conservation of commercial agricultural lands in Kittitas County. It is the county’s intent to meet these requirements by establishing a Commercial Agricultural designation. Based on the review criteria established by Kittitas County, land located in the Commercial Agricultural Zone [CAZ] has been formally designated as Agricultural Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance.

Agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance have been identified by considering the following criteria:
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- The current zoning and parcel sizes of the area.
- The availability of an adequate and dependable water supply.
- The soil types (prime, unique, local, and statewide) of the area.
- The criteria contained under WAC 365-190-050.

Upon review of these considerations, Kittitas County determined that there were two different categories of land appropriate for designation: irrigated crop lands and non-irrigated grazing lands. Irrigated croplands identified for designation were lands located within the Agricultural 20 zone, within an irrigation district, consisting primarily of prime or unique soils, and complied with the other criteria under the GMA. Non-irrigated grazing lands were lands that lacked adequate water for crop growing purposes, but have a capacity for and historic use for grazing, and are lands that are predominately a section of land in size with contiguous blocks of ownership of those lots.

Kittitas County was able to identify large, contiguous areas containing parcels which met the review criteria. Kittitas County then reviewed the areas, which were consistent with the review criteria, taking into consideration topography and natural designation boundaries. The lands designated as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance depict the final review of all the factors considered for designation.

GPO 2.110 Support laws and regulations which enhance agriculture
GPO 2.111 Continue and expand support for right-to-farm ordinances.

GPO 2.112 Distribute and utilize the "Code of the West" handout and require signature of having read it for any permits issued to non-farmers in agricultural areas.

GPO 2.113 Support efforts to see that productive lands receive an adequate water supply.

GPO 2.114a Identify and implement a feasible look at solutions to the problems of needing to sell house lots without selling farm ground.

GPO 2.114b Economically productive farming should be promoted and protected. Commercial agricultural lands includes those lands that have the high probability of an adequate and dependable water supply, are economically productive, and meet the definition of "Prime Farmland" as defined under 7 CFR Chapter VI Part 657.5.

For the purpose of this chapter, "Adequate and dependable water supply" means enough water as outlined in those engineering reports available on most commercial farmlands in the Kittitas Valley, from Adjudication records (i.e. Aquavella et al) that detail the water duty necessary for each parcel to remain viable as commercial agricultural lands.

For the purpose of this chapter, "Economically productive" means the ability to provide and continue to provide sufficient return on investment to allow present and future
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farmers to continue using the designated commercial agricultural land. This would include but not be limited to being economically realistic as Ag lands with respect to land value, property taxes, market conditions, water costs and other economic factors.

GPO 2.115   Reserved

GPO 2.116   Support an information campaign to educate our non-farm populace on agricultural activities.

GPO 2.117   Encourage non-farmers in agricultural areas to meet farm performance standards.

GPO 2.118   Encourage development projects whose outcome will be the significant conservation of farmlands.

See proposed new GPO 2.142 below.

GPO 2.119   Identify and designate agriculture transportation corridors that facilitate farm use.

GPO 2.120   Set road standards in agricultural areas which discourage non-farm use and do not present problems to agricultural users.

GPO 2.121   Cooperate in sound voluntary farm conservation or preservation plans (i.e., be recipients and overseers for conservation easements and/or assist with transferable development rights programs).

See proposed new GPO 2.143 below.

GPO 2.122   Look into additional tax incentives to retain productive agricultural lands.

GPO 2.123   Value agricultural lands for tax purposes at their current agricultural land use.

GPO 2.124   The Resource Land Advisory Committee shall review and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners on at least an annual basis over the coming 20 years on:
   a. the status of agriculture and forestry in Kittitas County,
   b. county agriculture and forestry policies and regulations,
   c. local agriculture marketing and economic planning, and
   d. review and make recommendations regarding zoning and development regulations.

GPO 2.125   If any lands are reclassified out of the Commercial Agricultural designation, then the land reverts to the Agricultural designation.

Comments Submitted by Jeff Jones, AFR
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**GPO 2.125 is not clear, and we are therefore not sure of its meaning. We recommend clarifying this GPO.**

*Incentives for Commercial Agriculture Land Use*

It is the policy of Kittitas County to encourage and support agricultural uses of lands within the Commercial Agricultural designation. The county will continue to explore additional incentives for conserving both rural and resource lands. These incentives may be developed through the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan and subsequent implementation mechanisms.

GPO 2.126 Where appropriate, Kittitas County will exert its influence to help provide the delivery of water to all lands within the county whether the deliveries are through Bureau of Reclamation, Districts, or private facilities.

GPO 2.127a Irrigation delivery facilities shall be managed and maintained by adjacent landowners to facilitate the unimpeded delivery of waters to agricultural lands in Kittitas County. No existing contractual agreement pursuant to any water system shall be impaired by this ordinance. Kittitas County shall ensure the unimpeded delivery of irrigation waters to agriculture lands.

GPO 2.127b Encourage all new development to incorporate drought tolerant or native vegetation as a major component of their landscaping plan (i.e. xeriscaping)

GPO 2.128 To the extent possible the Board of County Commissioners shall promote processing facilities for the products produced upon those lands designated as Commercial Agricultural under this Chapter.

GPO 2.129 In determining the current use value of open space land, the County Assessor shall consider only the use to which such property and improvements is currently applied and shall not consider potential uses of such property. In determining the current use value of farm and agricultural land the County Assessor shall consider the earning or productive capacity of comparable lands from crops grown most typically in the area averaged over not less than five years.

**Commercial Forest Land Use**

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.

Forestlands represent an important 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.

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 should be 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.

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.

We agree that land use activities which are not compatible with resource management should be discouraged within this land category unless they are part of clustering plan, a master plan development, FCC or MPR as a multiple land use strategy.

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

GPO 2.130  Kittitas County will promote and encourage 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; economic viability; 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 2.134  To encourage multiple use concepts of forest management of the greatest lasting benefit to present and future generations.

We would include FCC and MPR as the part of these multiple use concepts in GPO 2.134.
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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 Kittitas County shall recognize Engrossed Substitute House Bill (ESHB) 2091 also known as the Forest and Fish Law.

GPO 2.138 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 2.139 Use clustering residential developments on adjacent non-commercial forest lands. The open space in clustered development should buffer adjacent forest land from development.

**We would also include forest land that is no longer economical to GPO 2.139.**

GPO 2.140 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 2.140 is unclear. Who will develop the standards, what is the timeframe, and what will be the substantive elements of the standards?**

GPO 2.141 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,
   b. working with forest managers to identify and develop other incentives for continued forestry (Ord. 93-42).

GPO 2.142 Encourage development projects whose outcome will be the significant conservation of forest lands. [We would add this new GPO, reflecting a similar policy as GPO 2.118]

GPO 2.143 Cooperate in sound voluntary forest land conservation or preservation plans (i.e., be recipients and overseers for conservation easements and/or assist with transferable development rights programs). [We would add this new GPO 2.143, reflecting a similar policy as GPO 2.121]

GPO 2.144 Reserved
June 12, 2006

Commercial Mineral Resource Lands

The State Growth Management Act (Section 17) states that "...each county...shall designate where appropriate... mineral resource lands that are not already characterized by urban growth and that have long-term significance for extraction of minerals." The Act defines minerals as sand, gravel and valuable metallic substances. Section 6 of the Act states that each county shall adopt development regulations to assure the conservation of mineral resource lands.

Kittitas County approved Resolution No.95-37 in April 1995, a declaration regarding GMA interim classification and designation for natural resource mineral lands of long-term commercial significance. The resolution meets the requirements of the Growth Management Act. The resolution declares that Kittitas County recognizes mineral resources as a property right and the utilization of new and finished mineral products as an important factor in the social and economic stability of the County. In addition, the County recognizes that mineral resource lands provide economic and social foundations, historical, present and future for the growth and development of the County.

The resolution defines minerals to include "metallic and non-metallic minerals of commercial value such as sand, gravel, coal, oil, natural gas, gold, silver gem stones, clay, building stone, etc." Based on a public hearing process, the County has outlined nine designation criteria for the classification of Mineral Resource Lands of long-term commercial significance. These include the following:

1. Physical properties of the resource, including a quality and type;
2. Depth of resource;
3. Depth of overburden;
4. Accessibility and proximity to the point of use or market;
5. Physical and topographical characteristics of the mineral resource site;
6. Life of resource;
7. Availability of public roads;
8. General land use patterns in the area; and
9. Surrounding parcel sizes and surrounding uses.

Areas meeting the criteria for Mineral Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance and classified as such, including future discoveries, are designated on the final Comprehensive Plan map and included in the final Comprehensive Plan. The map shows the location of Mineral Lands of Long-Term Significance and will be updated and amended as new mining sites, meeting the designation criteria, are approved.

GPO 2.143 When the County reviews proposed new land uses that have the potential to conflict with commercial mining activities, such as residential subdivisions, consideration of both surface and mineral rights ownership should be included in the review.
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GPO 2.144 New conflicting uses, such as residential and commercial uses, may be required by the County to locate, site, and/or be screened away from designated commercial mining activities.

Maps

The Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Maps are included in the Kittitas County GIS data and are maintained by the Kittitas County Planning Department.