STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY,
TRADE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CHECKLIST
A Technical Assistance Tool From Growth Management Services

Name and address of city or county:

Staff contact, phone, and e-mail address:

Instructions:
This checklist is intended to help jurisdictions conduct the process of updating their comprehensive plan, as required by RCW 36.70A.130(4). Although jurisdictions are not required to complete the checklist and return it to Growth Management Services (GMS), it is encouraged as a useful tool. This checklist is for local governments with a full set of requirements under the Growth Management Act (GMA), not for those planning for resource lands and critical areas only.

Note: **Bold items are a GMA requirement.** Other items may be requirements of other state or federal laws, best practices, or ideas to consider. Highlighted items are links to Internet sites.

Submit proposed plans or amendments to Growth Management Services (GMS) for review 60-days prior to adoption [RCW 36.70A.106(1)]. Adopted items, including a copy of the signed adopting ordinance, are to be submitted to GMS within 10 days of adoption [RCW 36.70A.106(2)]. Submit review items to:

reviewteam@cted.wa.gov  
or  
Growth Management Services  
Attn: Review Team  
P.O. Box 42525  
Olympia, WA 98504-2525  

If you have questions, call GMS at (360) 725-3000.

Note: Grant deliverables need to be sent to the Technical and Financial Assistance Team at gmsgrants@cted.wa.gov.

Enclosures to submit to GMS:

☐ Two copies of proposed plan or amendment (electronic format encouraged);

☐ Outline of the established procedures for the public participation process (completed and scheduled);

☐ Outline of State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) compliance process (enclosing any SEPA documents generated to date and not previously submitted to GMS), including cumulative effect analysis;

☐ Outline of coordination efforts with adjacent jurisdictions to ensure interjurisdictional consistency; and

☐ For adopted items, the signed ordinance with the following findings of fact: the public participation opportunities, and for updates, that the entire plan has been reviewed, and the plan has been updated per RCW 36.70A.130(4). For more information on update requirements, refer to the Planning Director’s Newsletter.
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### 1. County-wide Planning Policies (CWPPs)

All plan elements should be consistent with relevant county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and the GMA, and should consider Washington Administrative Code (WAC) provisions. [RCW 36.70A.100 and 210 and WAC 365-195-300(2)(c) and 520] GMS suggests CWPPs be referenced in each element, or be appended to the plan to clearly show consistency. Some jurisdictions use a table to show consistency.

- **☐ CWPPs**

### 2. The Land Use Element should be consistent with CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(1), and should consider WAC 365-195-305, 335, 400, 410, and 430.

#### a. Does the element include goals and policies relating to land use, urban growth and population growth, stormwater and critical areas (unless in separate element), natural resource lands (if applicable), and lands for public purposes?

- **☐ Goals and policies**

#### b. Does the element include a future land use map (or maps)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note: Maps could fulfill the requirement to clearly show the general distribution of land, where appropriate, for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open space, open space corridors, public utilities, public facilities, and other land uses. [RCW 36.70A.070(1)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: Future land use maps should clearly show city limits and urban growth area (UGA) boundaries. [RCW 36.70A.110(6)] A table showing which zones implement land use designations could be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the element consider planning approaches that increase physical activity, such as neighborhood commercial nodes to allow walking and cycling to local services, linear parks, and schools located within neighborhoods to allow easy walking to school? [RCW 36.70A.070(1) (AMENDED in 2005)]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **☐ Planning for physical activity**

#### c. Does the plan indicate the population for which it is planning and is this projection used consistently in the plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the population growth projected in the comprehensive plan consistent with the Washington Office of Financial Management forecast for the county or the county’s sub-county allocation of that forecast? [RCW 43.62.035] If not, what is the rationale for using another figure?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For counties: What is the percentage of county-wide population growth allocated for urban growth areas? Is this allocation consistent with GMA goals of encouraging urban growth in urban areas, reducing sprawl, and ensuring public facilities and services are efficiently provided?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **☐ Population projection uses latest census**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive plan provisions</th>
<th>Page # and how addressed in plan</th>
<th>Update action, if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. As required by RCW 36.70A.070(1), does the Land Use Element include population densities, building intensities, and estimates of future population growth in UGAs?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Note: GMS suggests including the range of dwelling units per acre allowed in each land use designation and/or implementing zones as a projection of existing and projected development capacity. Review WAC 365-195-305(2)(a-k) for a recommendation of how to meet the requirement.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>If a buildable lands analysis has been completed, are measures needed to ensure appropriate densities will result? Have such measures been adopted?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Note: Buildable lands analysis was required by RCW 36.70A.215 in the 6 counties, with 2004 update deadlines. Review Buildable Lands Program Guidelines, CTED has a list of measures.</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑ Reasonable measures adopted if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. As required by RCW 36.70A.130(3), have urban densities and UGAs been reviewed every 10 years?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Note: This may be done as part of an update under 130(4). Review WAC 365-195-335 and WAC 365-195-630(3) for suggestions on how to make the determination that the UGA is appropriately sized for the population projection within the planning period. Supporting information should include: selected population growth forecast scenario [RCW 43.62.035]; population allocation and percentage of land devoted to urban, rural, and resource uses (counties) [RCW 36.70A.070(1)]; land capacity analysis for UGAs, and changes to UGAs with reasons for change. [RCW 36.70A.110 and RCW 36.70A.130] By definition, urban growth areas are all unincorporated areas so designated by a county and all incorporated cities and towns. [RCW 36.70A.110 and WAC 365-195-335]</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑ UGA review (required every 10 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other issues to consider:

Can the jurisdiction adequately provide urban services to an expanded UGA? Look to the CWPPs as possible guidance to determine whether a UGA expansion is needed and how this process should be conducted.

Is there a coordinated approach to planning for development in urban growth areas, especially among adjacent jurisdictions?

Do urban growth areas (incorporated or not) provide for achieving urban densities, services, and uses? Do policies and regulations encourage urban growth in urban areas and reduce sprawl?

Note 1: It is recommended that UGAs not be expanded into areas where urbanization may have a significant adverse impact on critical areas.

Note 2: If a county designates a fully contained community (FCC), part of the county’s population allocation should be reserved for FCC. [RCW 36.70A.350(2)]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive plan provisions</th>
<th>Page # and how addressed in plan</th>
<th>Update action, if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Does the plan identify lands useful for public purposes such as utility corridors, transportation corridors, landfills, sewage treatment facilities, stormwater management facilities, recreation, schools, and other public uses? [RCW 36.70A.150 and WAC 365-195-430]</td>
<td>☐ Public use lands</td>
<td>☐ List of acquisitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a list of acquisitions been developed with a timeline and budget for acquiring lands useful for public purposes under RCW 36.70A.150? [The list need not be part of the comprehensive plan.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Does the plan identify open space corridors within and between urban growth areas, including lands useful for recreation, wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas? [RCW 36.70A.160]</td>
<td>☐ Open space corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. If there is an airport in the jurisdiction, or adjacent to its boundaries, does the plan include policies, land use designations, and zoning to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports? [RCW 36.70.547 (NEW REQUIREMENT in 1996)]</td>
<td>☐ No incompatible uses near airports</td>
<td>☐ Plan filed with WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the plan and regulations been filed with the Aviation Division of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)? [RCW 36.70.547 (NEW REQUIREMENT in 1996)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan allow the siting and expansion of general aviation airports according to local provisions for siting essential public facilities and state requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: See the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)'s Publication, Airports and Compatible Land Use Planning, RCW 35A.63.270 and RCW 36.70A.510 for guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Is there a U.S. Military Base within or adjacent to the jurisdiction, employing 100 or more personnel, and operated by the U.S. Department of Defense? See Map of U.S. bases to help make this determination.</td>
<td>☐ No incompatible uses near bases</td>
<td>☐ Base commander notified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, does the plan include policies, land use designations, and zoning to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to military bases? [RCW 36.70A.530 (3) (NEW REQUIREMENT in 2004)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the commander of the base been informed of amendments to comprehensive plan and development regulations on lands adjacent to the base? [RCW 36.70A.530 (4)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold items and checkboxes are a requirement of the GMA. Other items are other state or federal laws or examples of best practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive plan provisions</th>
<th>Page # and how addressed in plan</th>
<th>Update action, if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **j. Does the Land Use Element review drainage, flooding, and stormwater run-off in the area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state?** [RCW 36.70A.70(1)] RCW 90.56.010(26) includes definition for waters of the state. Do stormwater policies and regulations incorporate the appropriate State Department of Ecology’s Stormwater Manual for Eastern or Western Washington or the equivalent? This could be one way to demonstrate compliance with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) [Section 402] Phase 2 permit requirements. Note: Examples of best practices for stormwater include:  
- Provisions to retain natural hydrology and processes, such as limiting effective impervious surfaces, clustering, preserving open spaces and forests, and promoting low impact development practices. See Puget Sound Action Team (PSAT) low impact development (LID) guidance.  
- Provisions to allow and promote clustering where green space, wetlands, habitat, and hydrologic processes need protection.  
- Policy to adopt a clearing and grading ordinance if not already existing (See GMS’s Technical Guidance Document for Clearing and Grading in Western Washington). | ☐ Stormwater planning |                          |
| **k. Does the comprehensive plan include policies that give guidance to critical areas regulations, and are those policies based on the best available science (BAS) with “special consideration” to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries?** [RCW 36.70A.060(3), RCW 36.70A.030(5), WAC 365-190-080, and WAC 365-195-900 through 925 (BAS is NEW Requirement in 1995)] Plan policies should address the five critical areas and seek comprehensive protection of functions and values. [RCW 36.70A.172(1)] See CTED’s Critical Areas Assistance Handbook for assistance in designating and protecting each of the five areas. CTED recommends that jurisdictions follow the process in WAC 365-195-915 to document decisions as they are made. | ☐ BAS used to designate and protect critical areas |                          |

Note: **Bold** items and checkboxes are a requirement of the GMA. Other items are other state or federal laws or examples of best practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l.</th>
<th>Are there policies to designate and protect wetlands and their buffers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are wetlands defined using</strong> RCW 36.70A.030(20)?</td>
<td>□ Wetlands defined under GMA definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: See Ecology’s resources on wetlands for assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m.</th>
<th>Does the plan include provisions for protection of the quality and quantity of ground water used for public water supplies? [RCW 36.70A.070(1)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: This is required if jurisdictions draw groundwater for potable water or need to manage threats to exempt wells. Policies should limit impervious surfaces and regulate hazardous uses in critical aquifer recharge areas (CARAs), protect wellhead areas, and consider watershed plans. See Ecology’s guidance on <strong>Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs) and Water Resource Inventory Assessment (WRIA) plans.</strong></td>
<td>□ CARAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n.</th>
<th>Are policies and land use designations for frequently flooded areas consistent with FEMA guidance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the link between flooding and ecological functions, such as groundwater recharge, wetlands, etc, been considered?</td>
<td>□ Frequently flooded areas regulated using FEMA guidance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| o. | Is the range of uses limited in geologically hazardous areas, especially excluding critical facilities such as emergency response, hospitals, etc.? | □ Geohazards |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Are significant fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and corridors designated for protection, such as streams and wetlands, for example?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note 1: See <a href="http://www.wa.gov/wdfw/hab/phspage.htm">http://www.wa.gov/wdfw/hab/phspage.htm</a> for lists of species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 2: Has the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR)’s proposed new stream typing system been considered? [WAC 222-16-030 <a href="http://www.dnr.wa.gov/forestpractices/watertyping">http://www.dnr.wa.gov/forestpractices/watertyping</a> ?]</td>
<td>□ Fish and wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Is the jurisdiction is affected by an Endangered Species Act (ESA) 4(d) rule? Are requirements of the rule, if applicable, incorporated into comprehensive plan policies? Have species listings affected land use assumptions, capital facilities planning, and permit processes? Will new capital facilities (e.g., new infrastructure, water, and wastewater utilities) be needed to comply with ESA? Have they been included in the Capital Facilities Element of the plan? Will stormwater regulations or clearing and grading ordinances need to be updated to protect fish habitat? Should new policies be added to the plan? If monitoring programs have been adopted to ensure that habitat is being maintained, is there adequate funding for monitoring?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. If there is inadequate scientific information about critical areas, has the jurisdiction adopted an “adaptive management” policy and program for addressing this situation? Note: WAC 365-195-920 and Critical Areas Assistance Handbook provides guidance on criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Are the criteria for designating natural resource lands consistent with CTEC’s Minimum Guidelines to classify agricultural, forest, mineral lands and critical areas? [RCW 36.70A.050 and 060, WAC 365-190, and WAC 365-195-400]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. If forest and agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance are designated inside UGAs, is there a transfer and/or purchase of development rights (TDR, or PDR) program? [RCW 36.70A.060(4)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Are there policies encouraging conservation of forest and agricultural lands and limiting the allowable range of zoning techniques and accessory uses to those allowed under RCW 36.70A.177 (AMENDED in 2004)? [RCW 36.70A.020(8)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Are there policies discouraging incompatible uses with resource lands and directing appropriate development in and near resource lands? [RCW 36.70A.060(1), RCW 36.70A.020(8), and RCW 36.70A.177 (AMENDED in 1997)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Have designated mineral resource lands and development regulations for mineral resource lands been reviewed? Note: RCW 36.70A.131 requires use of new information from DNR for review of mineral lands of long-term commercial significance designations. Minerals include sand, gravel and various metallic substances. [RCW 36.70A.030(11)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resource lands designation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDRs for agricultural lands inside UGAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit accessory uses on agricultural lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourage incompatible uses on agricultural lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review mineral resource lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive plan provisions

| x. If the county is eligible and has designated a major industrial development or master planned location outside of the UGA, is the area consistent with the criteria in RCW 36.70A.365 and 367? [NEW in 1995; AMENDED in 2004] | □ Major industrial area |
| y. If the county has permitted a master planned resort, have the requirements of RCW 36.70A.360 been met? | □ Master planned resort |

3. The Housing Element is intended to ensure the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods. It should be consistent with relevant CWPPs, RCW 36.70A.070(2), and should consider WAC 365-195-310

<p>| a. Is there a statement of goals, policies, and objectives for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing? [RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)] | □ Strategy for housing |
| What strategy and mechanisms are there for achieving these targets? | |
| b. Does the element include an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs as a result of population growth over the planning period? [RCW 36.70A.070(2)(a)] | □ Housing needs analysis using latest population projection |
| Review CTED’s Assessing Your Housing Needs for assistance. | |
| c. Does the element identify sufficient land for housing, including but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, group homes, and foster care facilities? [RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c)] | □ Special housing planned for and not subject to discrimination |
| Note: No city or county planning under the GMA may enact an ordinance, development regulation, or administrative practices which treat a residential structure occupied by persons with handicaps differently than a similar residential structure occupied by a family or other unrelated individuals. [RCW 36.70A.410; RCW 70.128.140; Washington Laws Against Discrimination, RCW 49.60.222-225; Federal Fair Housing Act, as Amended, 42 USC 3602 et seq, and WAC 365-195-310(k)] | |
| d. Does the plan make adequate provisions for existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community? [RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d)] | □ Affordable housing planned |
| Note: WAC 365-195-310 recommends an evaluation of how the existing and projected market can provide housing at various costs and for various income levels, and an estimation of the present and future populations that would require assistance to obtain housing. This section should also identify existing programs and policies to provide affordable housing and evaluate their effectiveness. CTED has guidance on this topic. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing when a household spends no more than 30 percent of income on housing, including rent and utilities. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive plan provisions</th>
<th>Page # and how addressed in plan</th>
<th>Update action, if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Are there policies on manufactured housing so that it is not regulated differently than site built housing? [RCW 35.21.684, 35.63.160, 35A.21.312, and 36.01.225 (All AMENDED in 2004)]</td>
<td>□ No discrimination against manufactured housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: A local government may (1) allow only new manufactured homes, (2) require the manufactured home to be set on a permanent foundation, or (3) require manufactured homes to comply with local design standards applicable to other homes in the neighborhood, but not may discriminate against consumer choice in housing. [National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401, et reg.)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. If the city has a population of over 20,000, or the county has a population of over 125,000, does the jurisdiction allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in single family residential areas? [RCW 36.70A.400 and RCW 43.63A.215(3)]</td>
<td>□ ADUs allowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Are family daycare providers [12 or fewer children RCW 74.15.020(f)] in a residential dwelling allowed in all residential and commercial zones? [RCW 36.70.450]</td>
<td>□ Family daycares allowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element needs to be consistent with CWPPs, RCW 36.70A.070(3), and WAC 365-195-315 and should serve as a check on the practicality of achieving other elements of the plan. This element should cover all the services planned, provided, and paid for by the jurisdiction. For clarity, services provided by other providers could be included in the Utilities Element, or as a subsection of the CFP.

<p>| a. Does the element include goals and policies relating to capital facilities to guide decisions? [RCW 36.70A.120] | □ Goals and policies |
| b. Does the element include an inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities? [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(a)] | □ Inventory of existing facilities |
| Note: The inventory could include water, sanitary sewer and stormwater facilities, schools, parks and recreation facilities, solid waste management, police and fire protection facilities. The element should include references to water or other system plans, include a brief summary of these plans, indicate location of the facilities, and should show where systems currently have unused capacity. Public services and facilities defined in RCW 36.70.030(12 and 13). |
| c. Is a forecast of the future needs for existing capital facilities included in the element? [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(b)] | □ Forecast of future needs |
| Note: The forecast should be based on projected population and adopted levels of service (LOS) [urban LOS for cities, rural LOS for counties], population densities, and distribution of growth over the planning period. WAC 365-195-315(2)(b) suggests that jurisdictions include a strategy for providing capital facilities over the 20-year life of the plan. Consider whether the jurisdiction has sufficient water rights or sewage treatment capacity to support the plan’s projected 20-year growth, or a strategy to obtain them. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive plan provisions</th>
<th>Page # and how addressed in plan</th>
<th>Update action, if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. <strong>Does the element indicate proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities?</strong> [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(c)]</td>
<td>[ ] Planning for future needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC 365-195-315(2)(e) suggests that a phasing schedule in the Land Use Element should dictate when and where capital facilities will be needed. Consider if the concurrency ordinance or other mechanisms have been effective in providing public facilities and services concurrent with development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <strong>Is a six-year plan (at least) included that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and that clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes? Is the CFP consistent with rest of the comprehensive plan?</strong> [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(d) and RCW 36.70A.120]</td>
<td>[ ] Six-year funding plan consistent with comp plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC 365-195-315(2)(d) suggests that the plan be updated at least biennially so that financial planning remains sufficiently ahead of the present for concurrency to be evaluated. For a list of funding sources, see <a href="http://www.infrafunding.wa.gov/">http://www.infrafunding.wa.gov/</a>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there plan provisions establishing policies, levels of service, and regulatory strategies for concurrency as applied to public facilities other than transportation? [WAC 365-195-510(2) and(3)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the plan provide adequate facilities in a timely manner? [WAC 365-195-200(2)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Is there a policy to reassess the Land Use Element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and any other measures to ensure that the Land Use Element, Capital Facilities Element, and financing plan within the Capital Facilities Element are coordinated and consistent?</strong> [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e)]</td>
<td>[ ] Reassessment policy included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC 365-195-315(2)(e) suggests that the plan set forth how pending applications for development will be affected while such a reassessment is being undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. <strong>If impact fees are used, are the public facilities for which money is to be collected and spent on, included in this element?</strong> [RCW 82.02.060 through 100]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**5. The Utilities Element** should relate to all services provided, planned for, paid for, and delivered by providers other than the jurisdiction. This should be consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(4), and should consider WAC 365-195-320.

a. **Does the element include goals and policies relating to service arrangements with other providers?** | [ ] Goals and policies | |

---

**Note:** Bold items and checkboxes are a requirement of the GMA. Other items are other state or federal laws or examples of best practices.
b. Does the element show the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, natural gas lines, etc.? [RCW 36.70A.070(4)]

Note: When services such as solid waste, water, or sewer are provided by separate districts or commercial service providers, a discussion should be included in this element.

WAC 365-195-320(2)(a) states that proposed utilities are understood to be those awaiting approval when the CFP is adopted. WAC 365-195-320(2) suggests:

- Coordinating with non-municipal service providers to include an analysis of capacity needs for various utilities over the planning period. [WAC 365-195-320(2)(b)]
- Evaluating whether any utilities should be identified and classified as essential public facilities (EPF) subject to the separate siting process of difficult to site EPFs. [WAC 365-195-320(2)(d)]
- Policies should be considered calling for joint use of transportation rights-of-way and utility corridors, where possible, coordination between road construction and utility trenching activities, and coordination of utility planning among adjacent jurisdictions. [WAC 365-195-320(2)(g) and (h)]

6. The Rural Element (counties only) should be consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(5), RCW 36.70A.011, RCW 36.70A.030(15 and 16), and should consider WAC 365-195-330]. Rural lands are lands not included in urban growth areas, or designated as agricultural, forest, or mineral resource lands.

a. Are there goals and policies relating to rural land use and services?

b. Does the element define rural character following the guidance of RCW 36.70A.030(14), (15), and (16)? RCW 36.70A.070(5) requires that the Rural Element provide for rural development, forestry, and agriculture; a variety of rural densities, uses, essential public facilities and rural governmental services.

CTED suggests that jurisdictions consider hearings board cases for guidance on appropriate rural densities and levels of governmental services and compile a written record as decisions are made as required by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(a).

Does the element identify the portion of county population growth to live and work in rural areas? [WAC 635-195-330(2)(b)] Is the population density low enough to limit demands on rural services and preserve rural character? Are urban services limited in rural areas? [RCW 36.70A.110(4)]

The plan may include optional techniques such as limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRDS), clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, and conservation easements to accommodate rural uses not characterized by urban growth as specified in RCW 36.70A(5)(d)[AMENDED in 2004].
### Comprehensive plan provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page # and how addressed in plan</th>
<th>Update action, if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7. The **Transportation Element** should be consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(6), and should consider WAC 365-195-325.

- **a.** Does the element include goals and policies for roadways, fixed route and demand response public transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel, port and intermodal facilities, passenger and freight rail, and truck, rail, and barge freight mobility?  
  - **Goals and policies**

- **b.** Is there an inventory of air, water, and land transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments, state-owned transportation facilities, and general aviation airports to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning?  
  - **Transportation inventory**
  
  Note: WAC 365-195-325(2)(c) provides recommendations for meeting requirements to describe facilities.

- **c.** Does the element include regionally coordinated LOS standards for all arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system, LOS for highways of state-wide significance, and LOS for other state highways consistent with the regional transportation plan?  
  - **Levels of service for all facilities; local, regional, and state**
  
  [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) NEW REQUIREMENT IN 1997]

  LOS set by WSDOT for highways of statewide significance should be incorporated into the model, and these links should be eliminated from the concurrency management system. LOS on highways that are not of statewide significance should be designated through the regional transportation planning organization. Local LOS should be defined, such as describing what levels A-F look like, or other ways of measuring LOS.

- **d.** Does the element include the land use assumptions used in estimating travel?  
  - **Land use assumptions**
  
  [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i)]

- **e.** Does the element identification of specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance any facilities and services that are below an established LOS standard?  
  - **Concurrency**
  

  Are concurrency policies consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) (AMENDED in 2005)? Strategies such as increased public transit, ride sharing programs, and other multimodal strategies may be used to ensure that development does not cause service to decline on a locally owned facility below adopted levels of service.

- **f.** Does the element describe existing and planned transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, such as HOV lanes, parking policies, high occupancy vehicle subsidy programs, etc.?  
  - **TDM Program**
  
  [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)]

---

Note: **Bold** items and checkboxes are a requirement of the GMA. Other items are other state or federal laws or examples of best practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive plan provisions</th>
<th>Page # and how addressed in plan</th>
<th>Update action, if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>g. Does the element include a pedestrian and bicycle component?</strong> According to RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii) (AMENDED in 2005), this should identify and plan improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors to encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles. Note: Example bicycle and pedestrian plans are available from GMS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h. Does the element include a forecast of traffic for at least 10 years, based on the Land Use Element, to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth?</strong> [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(E)]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i. Does the element identify state and local system expansion needs to meet current and future demands?</strong> [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(F)] Are identified needs on state-owned facilities consistent with the Washington Transportation Plan required under chapter 47.06 RCW?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>j. Is the transportation funding program coordinated with the CFP, and does it address the deficiencies identified in the system?</strong> Does the element analyze the funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources? [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)] Is a multiyear financing plan included in the element based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program required by RCW 35.77.010 for cities, RCW 36.81.121 for counties, and RCW 35.58.2795 for public transportation systems? [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)] If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, is there a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that LOS standards will be met? [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(C)]</td>
<td>Funding analysis</td>
<td>Funding program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>k. Does the element include a discussion of intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions?</strong> [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(v)]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intergovernmental coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>l. Does the element include a discussion regarding the relationship between the regional transportation plan, Transportation Element, and Capital Facilities Element?</strong> [WAC 365-195-325(2)(b)]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan certified by RTPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>m. Is the plan certified by the regional transportation planning organization?</strong> [RCW 47.80.23 and 026 and WAC 365-195-325(2)(b)]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan certified by RTPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Bold** items and checkboxes are a requirement of the GMA. Other items are other state or federal laws or examples of best practices.
8. The **Economic Development Element** is not a required element as the state has not provided funding to assist in developing this element. However, desired levels of job growth, commercial and industrial expansion should be identified in the plan, and supporting strategies should be integrated with the land use, housing, utilities, and transportation elements. A city that has chosen to be a residential community is exempt from this requirement. [WAC 365-195-060(2) and RCW 36.70A.070(7)(c)] An Economic Development Element should include:

   a. A summary of the local economy such as population, employment, payroll, sectors, businesses, and sales. [RCW 36.70A.070(7)(a)]
   

   b. A summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the local economy defined as the commercial and industrial sectors and supporting factors such as land use, transportation, utilities, education, workforce, housing, and natural/cultural resources. [RCW 36.70A.070(7)(b)]

   c. Identification of policies, programs, and projects to foster economic growth and to address future needs. [RCW 36.70A.070(7)(c)]

9. A **Park and Recreation Element** [RCW 36.70A.070(8)] is not a required element as the state has not provided funding to assist in developing this element. However, park, recreation, and open space planning are among GMA goals, and it is important to plan for and fund these facilities. CTED’s Guidebook *Planning for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in your Community,* can provide a step-by-step assistance. A Parks and Recreation Element should include:

   a. Goals and policies to guide decisions regarding facilities.

   b. An estimate of park and recreation demand for at least a ten-year period based on adopted levels of service and population growth. [RCW 36.70A.070(8)(a)]

   c. An evaluation of facilities and service needs over the planning period. [RCW 36.70A.070(8)(b)]

   d. An evaluation of intergovernmental coordination opportunities to provide regional approaches for meeting park and recreational demand. [RCW 36.70A.070(8)(c)]
   
   Note: This element should be consistent with the Capital Facilities Element as it relates to park and recreation facilities. [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e)]

10. The **Shoreline Element** of the comprehensive plan is the goals and policies of Shoreline Master Program (SMP). [RCW 36.70A.480] The SMP goals and policies may also be included in an Environmental Element. The comprehensive plan and SMP goals and policies should be consistent.

---

Note: **Bold** items and checkboxes are a requirement of the GMA. Other items are other state or federal laws or examples of best practices.
### Are SMP goals and policies included in the comprehensive plan? [RCW 36.70A.480]

Note: Currently, critical areas along shorelines are to be designated and protected by the critical areas ordinance (CAO). When a jurisdiction updates its SMP consistent with Ecology’s new guidelines (Chapter 173-26 WAC), and according to a schedule in RCW 90.58.080, protection for critical areas within shorelines is transferred from the critical areas ordinance to the SMP. Protection must be at least equal to that from the CAO under the GMA. Since the SMP is required after the GMA update, jurisdictions are advised to consider consistency between the comprehensive plan and shoreline master plans. *(NEW IN 2003)* See Questions and Answers on ESHB 1933 for assistance.

| Update action, if needed | SMP goals and policies. |

### 11. Provisions for sitting essential public facilities (EPFs) should be consistent with CWPPs, RCW 36.70A.200, and should consider WAC 365-195-340 and 840. This section can be included in the Capital Facilities Element, Land Use Element, or in its own element. Sometimes the identification and siting process for EPFs is part of the CWPPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Does the plan include a process or criteria for identification and siting of essential public facilities, including those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, state or regional transportation facilities, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, transportation facilities of state-wide significance defined according to RCW 47.06.140, and secure community transition facilities? [RCW 36.70A.200(1)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPF identification and siting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: WAC 365-195-340 suggests a potential process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Have state or regional transportation facilities and services of state-wide significance and secure community transition facilities (defined in RCW 71.09.020) been added to list of EPFs? [RCW 36.70A.200 (AMENDED in 1997 and 2001)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation facilities of statewide significance and secure community transition facilities added to list of essential public facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Are there policies which address the statutory requirement that no comprehensive plan may preclude the siting of essential public facilities? [RCW 36.70A.200(5)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No preclusion policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d. Did the jurisdiction consider the Office of Financial Management’s list of essential state public facilities that are required or likely to be built within the next six years? [RCW 36.70A.200(5)] (Instructions to find the list are available from GMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive plan provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Has the best available information and data been used to determine that regionally important public facilities (hospitals, schools, landfills, etc.) are not allowed to locate in known hazardous areas (wildfire hazard areas, tsunami inundation zones, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **Optional plan elements and sub-area plans** may be included in the comprehensive plan.

Are additional elements included in the plan, such as energy conservation, historic preservation, natural hazards, or community design? [RCW 36.70A.080 and WAC 365-195-345] These elements should be consistent with all other elements of the plan. Resources: *Historic Preservation: A Tool for Managing Growth, CTED, 1994, revised in 2005, Optional Comprehensive Plan Element for Natural Hazard Reduction, CTED, 1999.*

Are any sub-area plans included in the plan, and are they consistent with the other plan elements? [RCW36.70A.080(2)]

13. **Consistency** is required by the GMA.

| a. Does the plan describe how all elements fit together, such as consistency of plan elements and future land use map, and consistency of land use and capital facilities elements [RCW 36.70A.070 (preamble)] | ☐ Internal consistency |
| b. Are there policies directing that capital budget decisions be made consistent with the comprehensive plan? [RCW 36.70A.120] | ☐ Budget decisions consistent with plan |
| c. Does the plan fit together with plans of adjacent jurisdictions? [RCW 36.70A.100, and WAC 365-195-530] | ☐ External consistency |

Note: Adjacent jurisdictions should be provided with proposed plan and SEPA documentation.

14. **Public participation, plan amendments and monitoring**

| a. Does the plan ensure public participation in the comprehensive planning process? [RCW 36.70A.020(11), .035, and .140] | ☐ Public participation |
| b. Does the plan describe the process for making amendments? Is this process coordinated among the county and cities within a county? [WAC 365-195.630(2), and 865] | |
| c. Does the plan set out a procedure for adopting emergency amendments and does it define emergency? [RCW 36.70A.130(2)(b)] | ☐ Process for plan amendments |

Note: **Bold** items and checkboxes are a requirement of the GMA. Other items are other state or federal laws or examples of best practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive plan provisions</th>
<th>Page # and how addressed in plan</th>
<th>Update action, if needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| d. **Are amendments to be considered no more often than once a year not including the exceptions described** in RCW 36.70A.130? | ☐ Plan amendments no more than once a year. | }
| e. Is there a plan or program for monitoring how well comprehensive plan policies, development regulations, and other implementation techniques are achieving the comprehensive plan’s goals and the goals of the GMA? | | }
| f. Is there a plan or program for monitoring how well natural resource lands and critical areas ordinances and other implementation techniques are protecting critical areas? | | }
| g. Does the comprehensive plan and development regulations define a process for amending regulations as new information and data becomes available? | | }

Note: **Bold** items and checkboxes are a requirement of the GMA. Other items are other state or federal laws or examples of best practices.
September 18, 2006
Kittitas County Planning Commission

Lipstick on a pig.

In 1996 the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan was approved. Since then, the only changes to the plan have come as a result of Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board appeals and from comp plan annual amendments concerning individual personal requests for piecemeal site specific land use designation changes. Over the past ten years no concerted "housekeeping" effort has been made by the County to keep the comp plan policies relatively current with changing issues and concerns of the citizens. No studies or comprehensive review of designations in the light of scopes of rezones over the past 3 years has occurred. In 1996 a water study was identified as necessary....where is this study now that we are at the update stage? It was not done and we still have no useful information on water issues concerning growth in the rural area. Whether this is benign neglect, willful lack of taking appropriate action, lack of budgeting and staffing, the result is the same....this County is attempting to "update" a comprehensive plan which is so out of date as to make the process meaningless and fruitless. A major over haul of the comp plan is necessary because the County has allowed the comp plan to mold, resulting in a comp plan which is seriously out of touch with current situation in the County and which no simple update will correct.

Many "to do" items in the current comp plan have been ignored to date and thus not accomplished in the past ten years. Now Community Development Services is suggesting a "Plan to Plan" so major decisions will continue to be put off into the future for further study. Obviously these decisions must be made now at this stage. The county has known for years that this update process was due in 2006 but has not planned to allow adequate time, dollars and effort in accomplishing this task. The county has a poor track record in following through in finishing items identified in the comp plan,...what makes us think that this will change in the future? The County has chosen to use current staffing levels to do this update process while still processing the increasing load of applications for rezones and plats with a relatively new staff. Perhaps that Moratorium on Rezones and Lot Creations requested by the Kittitas County Conservation Coalition last June looks like a good suggestion now, too bad the County is too shortsighted to concentrate their effort to correctly update the comp plan rather than being understaffed and over booked by processing extraneous work at the expense of the update.

The solution is simple. The County must make a formal request to the Department Community Trade and Economic Development (CTED) for an extension NOW. Having received that extension the County must budget the necessary resources for the study and fact gathering necessary to adequately address the Scope and Mandatory Elements required of an update process. I have included the list of mandatory elements directly off of the CTED website below. This list contains numerous items that must be satisfactorily addressed for a completed update. Thus far, can anyone say that what has been presented thus far appears to be adequate for a complete update? Where is the discussion and recommendations for the Rural Lands Element that will allow us to answer for instance under Land Use "f. Does the plan identify lands useful for public purposes such as utility corridors, transportation corridors, landfills, sewage treatment facilities, stormwater management facilities, recreation, schools, and other public uses? [RCW 36.70A.150 and WAC 365-195-430]."

This County is not even close to achieving the necessary information on which to produce an update. The County has made a start and more time, a real focus on the update process and
resources solely dedicated to the process is what is needed and has been needed for the last year or more since work has proceeded.

This update of the current comp plan is like putting lipstick on a pig and also promising the pig in a tutu in the future... at the end of the day the comp plan is still a pig. Please recommend to the Board of Commissioners that no amendment to the current comp plan be approved and that the extension on the update be formally made to CTED.

THIS PLAN IS TOO IMPORTANT TO OUR FUTURE TO DO OTHERWISE!

Sincerely,

Paula J. Thompson DVM
Chair, Kittitas County Conservation Coalition (KCCC)

Attachment

In addition to the Scope of the Comp Plan Update the following abridged list of Mandatory Elements are required to be updated as well:

1. **County-wide Planning Policies** (CWPPs)

2. The **Land Use Element** should be consistent with CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(1), and should consider WAC 365-195-305, 335, 400, 410, and 430. Answer items a. through y.

3. The **Housing Element** is intended to ensure the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods. It should be consistent with relevant CWPPs, RCW 36.70A.070(2), and should consider WAC 365-195-310. Answer items a through g.

4. The **Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element** needs to be consistent with CWPPs, RCW 36.70A.070(3), and WAC 365-195-315 and should serve as a check on the practicability of achieving other elements of the plan. This element should cover all the services planned, provided, and paid for by the jurisdiction. For clarity, services provided by other providers could be included in the Utilities Element, or as a subsection of the CFP. Answer items a through g.

5. The **Utilities Element** should relate to all services provided, planned for, paid for, and delivered by providers other than the jurisdiction. This should be consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(4), and should consider WAC 365-195-320. Answer items a and b.

6. The **Rural Element (counties only)** should be consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(5), RCW 36.70A.011 RCW 36.70A.030(15 and 16), and should consider WAC 365-195-330]. Rural lands are lands not included in urban growth areas, or designated as agricultural, forest, or mineral resource lands. Answer items a and b.

7. The **Transportation Element** should be consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(6), and should consider WAC 365-195-325.
CHAPTER FOUR: TRANSPORTATION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is organized into the following sections which correspond to major issue areas identified throughout the comprehensive planning process. Each section contains proposed goals, policies, and implementation measures for consideration and inclusion in the final
comprehensive plan:
- Inventory of Existing Facilities and Services
- Land Use, Environment and Economic Development
- Level of Service and Concurrency
- Finance
- Intergovernmental Coordination and Public Participation

The complete Transportation Plan is maintained by the Kittitas County Department of Public Works. The Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan includes the Transportation Plan by reference. The Transportation Plan is adopted through a separate process than the annual amendment plan. Any changes made are adopted by reference to the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan at adoption.

4.2 INVENTORY OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Kittitas County's road system in the lower valley is roughly based on a one-mile grid system which is intended to follow section lines or reasonable fractions of a section subdivision (i.e. quarter sections, 1/16th lines, etc.). The upper reaches of the county are mountainous and roads lend themselves more to terrain and other physical conditions than to survey features.

There are five main categories of roads within Kittitas County: Federal, State, County, "public" and private.

Federal. Federal roads, such as US Forest Service roads, access federal lands and are administered by federal agencies.

State. Local roads which provide direct access to state lands are administered by the same state agencies which administer the properties (i.e. Dept. of Natural Resources).

State routes, such as freeways and state highways, provide connections between cities, counties and other state facilities. State routes are administered by Washington State Dept. of Transportation.

County. County roads that are officially adopted onto the Kittitas County Road system by the Board of County Commissioners are also known as "on-system" roads. The county is responsible for maintenance and improvements to these roads.

Public. Roads which are open for public use but are not maintained or improved by Kittitas County are also known as public "off-system" roads. These are roads which have been dedicated
to the “public” through a platting process or have been used by the public for over 10 years, but have not been accepted as part of the county road system by the Board of County Commissioners. These roads cannot be gated or obstructed.

Private. Private roads are usually created by developments. They are owned, controlled, and/or maintained by private property owners. There is presently no inventory of these facilities.

4.2(A) County Roads

The Transportation Plan, adopted by reference, provides a summary of the county road log inventory of existing conditions for all county on-system roads. They are grouped according to functional classification and include mileage for each road and then a total for each classification. The “Urban” and “Rural” classifications refer to the federal urban area around Ellensburg. Also included in the Transportation Plan is an inventory of existing conditions including pavement width, pavement type, a history of Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes, roadway capacity, and roadway level of service (LOS).

4.2(B) Changes To Road Inventory

Some of the existing county roads may be vacated or annexed in any given year. Road vacations take the mileage off the inventory through a public transfer of the property. Annexations of properties into city limits can involve transferring ownership and maintenance responsibilities of adjacent roads to a city. Road vacations and annexations remove road mileage from the county road log inventory.

Just as annexations and vacations remove roads from the inventory, construction of new county roads adds mileage to the inventory. New roads can be constructed either by County resources or as part of developments. Usually, new local access roads are constructed as part of developments and arterials and collectors are constructed by the County, but as development continues, there may be higher classifications of roadways being constructed by developers.

4.2 (C) Intercity Bus Service

TO BE UPDATED or reference the Transportation Plan.

4.2 (D) Rail Transport

TO BE UPDATED or reference the Transportation Plan.

4.2 (E) Air Transport

Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field)

Located north of Ellensburg about one and a half miles, on Bowers Road, Bowers Field is classified as a General Utility - Stage I airport capable of serving most single-engine, and turboprop aircraft. The airport offers VOR and DME navigation aids and VASI on the primary runway. Currently there are no commercial air carriers for either freight or passenger service.
There is one charter service, an agricultural spraying operation and the CWU training center which operate out of Bowers Field. Estimated operations in 1995 are 74,800 (operation = one take-off or landing).

There are several planned improvements including expansion of the adjacent industrial area, improvements to fuel facilities, water system and adding a washdown facility for agriculture spray aircraft.

Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field) is the largest airport in the County and is a valuable transportation commodity. The airport is the main access point for air transportation from Kittitas County to the nation.

The Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field) provides a vital transportation link, servicing all of Kittitas County with access to modern transportation options for emergency services, commercial operations, commuter transportation, and recreational flying. The airport advisory committee is dedicated to preserving this valuable asset by recommending the enactment of appropriate ordinances and policies to accomplish the following:

- Enhance the airport as a transportation hub and asset for economic development.
- Encourage compatible development at the airport to generate revenue streams to decrease subsidy of airport operations and facilities from tax revenue.
- Protect the airport and surrounding land users and owners from conflicting uses through careful and compatible land use planning. Such planning should include, but not be limited to, density reductions and land use and building restrictions designed to protect the take-off and landing and approach corridors, and areas adjacent to and under existing traffic patterns.

In order to promote land use compatibility on lands within and adjacent to and in the vicinity of the Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field), certain safety zones are recommended. Such safety zones are shown on Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field) Overlay District Map “B”. Within each of the safety zones certain land use limitations, development standards, land uses and development recommendations are recommended. The recommended safety zones are defined in chapter 17.58.040B of the Kittitas County Code.

**DeVere Field**

DeVere Field is a privately owned commercial airport built by Mr. DeVere approximately 35 years ago. It is located at 5210 Airport Road, about three miles east of Cle Elum. There are several single engine aircraft based at the airfield and several hangars on site. The airfield is closed during periods when snow covers the runway.

**Cle Elum Municipal Airport**

Cle Elum Municipal Airport is a single runway, predominately recreational airport. Its one runway is approximately 40 ft. wide, paved strip with a paved main taxi-way. It can handle single engine light aircraft and some light twins. It is located east of the city of Cle Elum at 1990 Airport Road. The city of Cle Elum has adopted a Master Plan for the development of the Cle Elum Municipal Airport which,
by reference, is included in this document. Planned improvements include widening and building taxiways, building new hangars, lengthening the runway, adding a fuel supply and providing residential housing on the north side of the runway.

It is the goal of Kittitas County to work in cooperation with the City of Cle Elum to preserve this asset by developing appropriate ordinances and policies to accomplish the following:

- Enhance the airport as a transportation hub and asset for economic development.
- Encourage compatible development at the airport to generate revenue streams to decrease subsidy of airport operations and facilities from tax revenue.
- Protect the airport and surrounding land users and owners from conflicting uses through careful and compatible land use planning. Such planning should include, but not be limited to, density reductions and land use and building restrictions designed to protect the take-off and landing and approach corridors, and areas adjacent to and under existing traffic patterns.

**Easton Airfield**

Located northwest of the town of Easton on Sparks Road, the Easton airfield is owned and operated by the Washington State Department of Transportation. The airfield was originally built as a relief airstrip for U.S. Mail aircraft in the 1940’s. Today, it is primarily used as a recreational airport but serves as an emergency landing strip in case of severe weather in the Cascade Mountains. The airstrip is a turf runway only in operation during the dry seasons. It is often closed during the entire winter due to deep snow.

**4.2(F) Truck Transport**

TO BE UPDATED or reference the Transportation Plan.

**4.2(G) Non-Motorized Transportation**

TO BE UPDATED or reference the Transportation Plan.

**4.2(H) Transportation System Maintenance**

Preserving and maintaining the public’s investment in transportation infrastructure is an important expenditure of public funds. Kittitas County prioritizes maintenance activities as follows: first priority is for emergencies, immediate action is taken to repair damage and correct problems as soon as they are reported; second priority is for items that are scheduled on a yearly basis, including but not limited to: crack sealing, preleveling, sealcoating, and roadway striping; and the third priority is for preventive maintenance activities that are scheduled on a seven-year maintenance cycle to keep the pavement conditions above a level that would require corrective maintenance or other major repairs.

**4.3 LAND USE, ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
Many of the decisions related to transportation have an effect on land uses, the environment and economic development. Different land uses have different transportation needs and impacts. Transportation improvement projects need to address the environmental impacts of the proposed actions. Similarly, many economic development strategies include the need for transportation facilities. These areas are all inter-related and their relationships need to be recognized.

4.3(A) Land Use

The final comprehensive plan will contain a land use element with a land use plan and policies which will need to be consistent with the transportation element. In the event that the land uses proposed cannot be supported by the existing transportation system and there are no identified means to fund the necessary improvements, there needs to be a mechanism in place to review both plans and either revise the land use plan or otherwise change the level of service standard or project priorities and funding in the transportation element. This needs to be an iterative process in which both plans are routinely reviewed for consistency and compatibility.

Presently, the transportation-related assumptions used in the alternative draft land use plans have been developed as part of the SEPA process.

4.3(B) Environment

Transportation decisions are not, and should not be, exempt from environmental review. Impacts to the natural and built environment need to be taken into consideration before any major transportation decisions are made. Most local transportation improvement projects are subject to state and federal environmental regulations as well as any local environmental laws that apply. County road projects (CRPs) routinely follow SEPA regulations unless they are specifically exempted under WAC 197-11-305, 800 through 880. Some large transportation improvement projects are also subject to NEPA -- the National Environmental Policy Act. Other environmental reviews are part of permitting for work over or adjacent to streams. Agencies with permitting and/or reviewing authority include the US Army Corps of Engineers, Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, as well as the Washington State Department of Transportation and local agencies.

4.3(C) Economic Development

Transportation facilities are an important consideration to a business or industry making location decisions. The decision whether or not to locate in a particular jurisdiction can rest solely in the balance of access to transportation facilities. Businesses look at their need to get customers and supplies to their location with ease. Industrial developments need access to transportation facilities for shipping and receiving. Many local jurisdictions have to balance their desires to attract new businesses and industries against the obligation to provide transportation services.

4.4 LEVEL OF SERVICE / CONCURRENCY

Kittitas County measures level of service (LOS) for arterial roadways utilizing the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) LOS methodology. The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method of measuring LOS...
is recognized as a national standard and is currently being utilized by other jurisdictions throughout the state and within Kittitas County including the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the City of Ellensburg.

4.5 EXISTING DEFICIENCIES

The adopted LOS methodology and threshold determinations are stated in Section 4.8 Goals, Policies and Objectives, specifically Level of Service (LOS) and Concurrency GPO 4.25 through GPO 4.33.

4.5(A) Twenty-Year Forecast

As the population grows within the county, the number of registered vehicles and drivers will also increase. Where those vehicles travel will depend, in large part, on where the drivers reside, shop and work. Determining the likely increases in traffic along transportation facilities will need to be based on the land uses which will be permitted and even encouraged in various parts of the county.

TO BE UPDATED or reference the Transportation Plan.

4.5(B) Planned Improvements

Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

The County’s Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is reviewed, updated, and adopted every year. Washington State law requires counties to develop six-year transportation improvement programs as provided under RCW 36.81.121.

In addition to state laws, federal laws also dictate transportation improvements. It is our objective to meet as many of the needs of the traveling public, county residents, visitors, and service providers, in order to provide a safe and efficient transportation system while recognizing the fiscal realities of funding for construction and maintenance of the transportation system.

The Six-Year TIP is updated every year by the Department of Public Works and changes are made to reflect funding secured or shifts in priorities. The Annual Construction Program, adopted with the county’s budget, provides an accurate picture of the first year of the TIP.

New Roads and Planned Extensions

The Transportation Plan has a list of proposed new roads or extensions which have been identified through various planning processes to date.

4.6 FINANCING TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

4.6(A) Revenue Sources

Tax Revenues
Grants and Loans

TO BE UPDATED or reference the Transportation Plan.

4.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Discussions and decisions related to transportation are not made without active consultation with the public. A variety of forums are used to solicit quality input from a broad cross-section of interests.

TO BE UPDATED or reference the Transportation Plan.

4.8 GOALS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

Multi-Modal Transportation System, Arterial System, and System Maintenance

GPO 4.1 To develop and maintain a safe, efficient and environmentally sound multi-modal transportation system in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements.

GPO 4.2 Kittitas County shall promote a variety of transportation modes through the selection of transportation improvement projects and review of development proposals in the Urban Growth Areas, by considering alternative modes when reviewing development applications, incorporating multiple modes into transportation improvement projects, and by establishing development standards to support the use of alternative transportation modes.

GPO 4.3 To create a transportation system that provides reasonable circulation for all users throughout the County.

GPO 4.4 Kittitas County shall provide a transportation system that enhances the safety of the community and which maximizes the use of the existing road system by maintaining a system of arterials, collectors and local access roads that forms an interconnected network for vehicular circulation.

GPO 4.5 To provide all-weather, all-season use of the arterial system for the movement of goods and services.

GPO 4.6 Kittitas County shall strive to maintain an arterial system that can accommodate legal weights year-round by developing a program for identifying and prioritizing maintenance and reconstruction projects for roads which are used primarily for freight and good movement.

GPO 4.7 To ensure an efficient regional system of arterials is functional, safe and consistent with regional priorities and comprehensive plans.

GPO 4.8 Kittitas County shall work with WSDOT, cities and neighboring counties to develop and maintain a system of arterials, collectors and local access roads that forms an interconnected network.
network for the efficient movement of goods and people, by prioritizing arterials improvements and maintenance activities based on the function a facility serves, by providing for local vehicular access to arterials while minimizing conflicts with through traffic, and by participating in regional coordination efforts such as QuadCo RTPO.

GPO 4.9 To identify and encourage preservation of transportation corridors for future rights-of-way by identifying corridors to be preserved as part of the overall transportation plan, by requiring right-of-way dedication or easements as part of development approval, and by acquiring right-of-way for future needs through purchase from willing sellers.

GPO 4.10 Kittitas County will place the appropriate emphasis on maintenance activities in order to preserve the capital investment in the transportation system by dedicating maintenance funding through the annual budgeting process and by developing performance measures to demonstrate the cost savings associated with appropriately scheduled maintenance activities.

GPO 4.11 Encourage and initiate Road Improvement Districts and arterial road building projects with the capital facilities six-year plan to meet Concurrency requirements of anticipated growth.

GPO 4.12 Encourage a grid system in the UGAs and UGNs where practical.

GPO 4.13 Kittitas County shall require new development that reduces County road LOS below the LOS standards to mitigate their impacts.

GPO 4.14 To recognize non-motorized travel as a viable transportation mode by developing a county-wide non-motorized system plan and by improving and maintaining existing non-motorized facilities.

GPO 4.15 To maintain a Non-Motorized Transportation System Plan that clearly reflects the direction for Kittitas County.

GPO 4.15A To work with other entities to identify viable options and projects for a connection of the John Wayne Pioneer Trail through, adjacent to, or around the City of Ellensburg.

GPO 4.15B Kittitas County discourages new public trail systems in farming areas.

GPO 4.15C To recognize air transport and airports as an important element.

*Land use, Environment and Economic Development*

GPO 4.16 To provide a transportation system that corresponds to and is consistent with patterns of land development in accordance with the adopted land use plans.

GPO 4.16A To adopt plans and regulations in compliance with RCW 36.70.547, or as amended thereafter, to protect airport operations.
GPO 4.17 Kittitas County shall ensure consistency between the land use and transportation plans through an iterative process for adjusting either or both plans by developing a process for reviewing plans for consistency and developing a policy for resolving inconsistencies or incompatibilities through an identification of needs and alternatives.

GPO 4.18 To ensure the transportation system can support new development and that development TO BE UPDATED.

GPO 4.19 Kittitas County shall evaluate the merits of a proposed land use action against the potential impacts on the transportation system by reviewing development proposals for potential impacts to the transportation system and requiring developments to identify and mitigate their transportation impacts through SEPA or other local regulatory actions.

GPO 4.20 To provide a transportation system that is safe, reliable and financially feasible while providing for the future needs of Kittitas County by evaluating system improvements with current and future needs in mind and by providing system improvements which reduce conflicts between passenger, freight, and agriculturally related transportation modes.

GPO 4.21 Kittitas County shall consider the environmental impacts of any proposed transportation decisions by proposing alternative transportation improvements which minimize environmental impacts, by complying with all application federal, state, and local environmental rules, and by integrating environmental review through the transportation decision making process.

GPO 4.22 To provide a transportation system which supports economic growth and vitality by developing policies related to capital improvements to support economic development.

GPO 4.23 Kittitas County shall develop and maintain a transportation system which provides access to and from centers identified in the comprehensive plans.

GPO 4.24 Kittitas County shall consider the traffic volumes, type of use, adjacent land uses, and maintenance costs before approving any new county-maintained gravel roads.

Level of Service (LOS) and Concurrency

GPO 4.25 To implement LOS standards that evaluate the adequacy of transportation facilities which are measurable, understandable, and appropriate to the services and/or facilities being considered under local conditions.

GPO 4.26 Kittitas County shall utilize the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology to measure the effectiveness of the arterial system at arterial intersections by evaluating all arterial/arterial intersections (including state highways) to identify existing service levels and by developing a transportation model to evaluate the impacts of future land use alternatives on arterial/arterial intersections. Intersections which fall below level of service “C” in rural areas and “D” in federal urban areas shall be considered deficient.
GPO 4.27 To ensure that necessary transportation facilities and services to maintain adopted level of service standards are available when the impacts of development occur.

GPO 4.28 Kittitas County shall develop and implement a concurrency management system which identifies existing deficiencies, funded improvements, and system capacity balances.

GPO 4.29 To develop a LOS standard that corresponds to land development goals and policies as expressed in the overall Comprehensive Plan for Kittitas County.

GPO 4.30 To encourage land use development patterns and support technologies which reduce the demand for increased capacity on roadways.

GPO 4.31 Kittitas County shall promote demand management strategies in areas which are experiencing increased congestion by encouraging transit, non-motorized transportation, telecommuting, flexible work hours and other demand management strategies where practical.

GPO 4.32 To develop a variety of performance measurements to evaluate the transportation system and prioritize improvements.

GPO 4.33 Kittitas County shall establish appropriate performance measurements which reflect the rural character of Kittitas County by developing and implementing a Pavement Management System (PMS) to measure pavement conditions and to prioritize maintenance or improvement projects, and by developing and implementing a Safety Management System (SMS) to identify potentially hazardous locations and to prioritize mitigation measures.

**Financing Transportation Improvements**

GPO 4.34 To maximize local funds by pursuing outside funding sources for transportation improvement projects.

GPO 4.35 Kittitas County shall pursue grant funding for appropriate transportation improvement projects by identifying possible funding sources for specific transportation improvement projects, by submitting grant applications to the appropriate reviewing agencies during the grant cycle, by developing grant proposals with realistic cost estimates and by following-up on grant applications denials to seek advice to become more competitive.

GPO 4.36 To consider all local revenue options for financing transportation improvements by evaluating the potential revenues against the political costs of imposing additional taxes and by seeking advice from other local agencies who have successfully implemented optional revenues.

GPO 4.37 To maximize benefits from expenditures of transportation funds

GPO 4.38 Kittitas County shall seek partnerships with other public or private agents when mutual benefits and significant cost savings are anticipated as a result of a coordinated transportation improvement project by coordinating transportation improvement projects with other jurisdictions, utilities and adjacent property owners to maximize benefits while minimizing costs.
GPO 4.39 To reduce administrative costs associated with transportation improvements.

GPO 4.40 Kittitas County shall encourage efforts to reduce the costs associated with administration of transportation improvement projects by identifying opportunities to consolidate or coordinate administration responsibilities throughout a transportation improvement project as well as provide training on grant accounting and project administration.

GPO 4.41 To fund transportation improvement projects which meet the identified needs of the community.

GPO 4.42 Kittitas County shall prioritize transportation improvement projects without identified funding sources based on community needs.

GPO 4.43 To re-evaluate the land-use plan if transportation improvements cannot be reasonably funded.

GPO 4.44 Kittitas County shall develop an ongoing process for evaluating transportation impacts of different land use proposals to ensure financial feasibility of the land use plan by developing a transportation model which can assign and distribute additional vehicle trips to the transportation system based on alternative land use assumptions and by evaluating alternative funding sources if transportation system improvements are anticipated as a result of proposed land uses.

**Intergovernmental Coordination and Public Participation**

GPO 4.45 To identify, review and resolve interjurisdictional transportation concerns within or affecting Kittitas County.

GPO 4.46 Kittitas County shall coordinate transportation planning, construction and maintenance efforts with all affected agencies by developing joint transportation standards for UGAs with the adjoining city or town, by identifying stakeholders and including them in the decision-making process and jointly develop a process for resolving conflicts between jurisdictions.

GPO 4.47 To ensure coordination among federal, state, regional, and local transportation agencies related to laws, policies and plans in order to seek consistency and ensure compatibility with regional priorities.

GPO 4.48 Kittitas County shall actively participate on selected state, regional and local transportation committees by encouraging County representation on state, regional and local transportation committees, by actively participating in coordination efforts, and by reviewing County plans and policies for consistency with other plans and policies within the region.

GPO 4.49 Provide a variety of opportunities for quality public input on transportation decisions from a representative cross section of the community.
Preventive pavement maintenance is defined as those treatments or applications that extend the service life of pavements in good structural conditions. The goal of a preventive pavement maintenance program is

The charts in the Transportation Appendix illustrate the increased costs of delaying maintenance for different types of pavements.

The most common grant sources are federal and state. The federal grants are administered by various agencies within the US Dept. of Transportation (USDOT) such as Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Authority (FTA). Most state transportation grants are administered by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), County Road Administration Board (CRAB), and the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB). Small grants and loans are also available from the Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (DCTED) through the Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF) and Community Economic Revitalization Board (CERB) primarily for economic development projects. Small safety-related “mini-grants” are also available from the Washington State Traffic Safety Commission (WSTSC).

Most grants require a portion of the grant to be matched with local or other “non-grant” funds. Common percentages are 10 - 20% matching funds. Local funds used to match grant funds maximize the local tax dollars. This benefit is two-fold. First, local tax dollars that have gone into large state or federal grant fund accounts are coming back to benefit Kittitas County. For instance, a $200,000 project receives approval for an 80% grant ($160,000). Local match requirements are only $40,000. Local taxpayers have, of course, contributed to the grant through other taxing sources, but now they’re seeing the benefits of their tax dollars coming back to Kittitas County. If the grant wasn’t awarded here, it would have been awarded some place else and the dollars would not have gone to directly benefit Kittitas County taxpayers.

A second benefit that comes from maximizing the local “road fund” dollars by matching grant funds for large projects, is that there is more “road fund” left for other transportation improvement activities such as maintenance and small improvement projects that were either not eligible or not competitive for grants. Since most maintenance activities are not eligible for grants, this can be a tremendous boost to the maintenance budget which can only draw from the local “road fund”.

Cautions to be heeded when pursuing grants and loans include the costs of administering the funds. There is no such thing as “free money” and, for some agencies, the cost of administering a grant is reason enough not to pursue it. Future restrictions associated with grants can also make them too restrictive or costly to pursue. There are many record-keeping, form-signing, reporting and auditing requirements associated with grants that have to be considered when applying for outside funding. There are ways to reduce
these administrative costs by having trained, experienced staff handling the finances. Having a centralized "grant officer" who is familiar with the record-keeping of a variety of funding sources can be a tremendous savings both during the projects and during the audits following project completions.

The GMA provisions requiring consideration of Intergovernmental Coordination and Public Participation were accomplished, and there was review and deliberation for consistency in the adoption of the transportation section considering the Quad County Regional Transportation Planning Organization plan, the County-wide Planning Policies, and the work conducted by the Surface Transportation Planning group. In addition, the transportation section considered all the work of the subarea committees, testimony at the Transportation Improvement Program open houses and testimony at public hearings.
CHAPTER FOUR: TRANSPORTATION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is organized into the following sections which correspond to major issue areas identified throughout the comprehensive planning process. Each section contains proposed goals, policies, and implementation measures for consideration and inclusion in the final comprehensive plan:

- Inventory of Existing Facilities and Services
- Land Use, Environment and Economic Development
- Level of Service and Concurrency
- Finance
- Intergovernmental Coordination and Public Participation

The complete Transportation Plan is maintained by the Kittitas County Department of Public Works. The Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan includes the Transportation Plan by reference.

4.2 INVENTORY OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Kittitas County’s road system in the lower valley is roughly based on a one-mile grid system which is intended to follow section lines or reasonable fractions of a section subdivision (i.e. quarter sections, 1/16th lines, etc.). The upper reaches of the county are mountainous and roads lend themselves more to terrain and other physical conditions than to survey features.

There are five main categories of roads within Kittitas County: Federal, State, County, “public” and private.

Federal. Federal roads, such as US Forest Service roads, access federal lands and are administered by federal agencies.

State. Local roads which provide direct access to state lands are administered by the same state agencies which administer the properties (i.e. Dept. of Natural Resources).

State routes, such as freeways and state highways, provide connections between cities, counties and other state facilities. State routes are administered by Washington State Dept. of Transportation.

County. County roads that are officially adopted onto the Kittitas County Road system by the Board of County Commissioners are also known as “on-system” roads. The county is responsible for maintenance and improvements to these roads.

Public. Roads which are open for public use but are not maintained or improved by Kittitas County are also known as public “off system” roads. These are roads which have been dedicated to the “public” through a platting process or have been used by the public for over 10 years, but have not been accepted as part of the county road system by the Board of County
Commissioners. These roads cannot be gated or obstructed. There is presently no inventory of these facilities.

Private. Private roads are usually created by developments. They are owned, controlled, and/or maintained by private property owners. There is presently no inventory of these facilities.

4.2(A) County Roads

Tables in the Transportation Appendix constitute a summary of the county road log inventory of existing conditions for all county on-system roads. They are grouped according to functional classification and include mileage for each road and then a total for each classification. The “Urban” and “Rural” classifications refer to the federal urban area around Ellensburg. Designation of final Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and joint city-county development standards may alter the urban and rural classifications. Also included in the inventory is pavement width, type, and Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes and years. The “Source” column indicates whether or not the ADT figure was an actual count (3) or an estimate (4). The “Capacity” column is a calculated field using Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methods based on pavement width and number of lanes. The “LOS” is also calculated based on the HCM.

4.2(B) Changes To Road Inventory

Some of the existing county roads may be vacated or annexed in any given year. Road vacations take the mileage off the inventory through a public transfer of the property. Annexations of properties into city limits can involve transferring ownership and maintenance responsibilities of adjacent roads to a city. Road vacations and annexations remove road mileage from the county road log inventory.

Just as annexations and vacations remove roads from the inventory, construction of new county roads adds mileage to the inventory. New roads can be constructed either by County resources or as part of developments. Usually, new local access roads are constructed as part of developments and arterials and collectors are constructed by the County, but as development continues, there may be higher classifications of roadways being constructed by developers.

4.2 (C) Intercity Bus Service

Kittitas County is served by regularly scheduled departures and arrivals by Greyhound, Empire Bus Lines, Northwest Stage Lines, and Kittitas county Action Council, and their service appears to be adequate for the area.

4.2 (D) Rail Transport

The railroad track runs from Yakima to Cle Elum on the old Northern Pacific Line. Burlington Northern has reopened its Stampede Pass line from Auburn to Cle Elum. This brings regular train traffic down the railroad line and through Kittitas County to either Pasco or Lind opening up an alternative mode of transport for heavy freight.
4.2 (E) Air Transport

Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field)

Located north of Ellensburg about one and a half miles, on Bowers Road, Bowers Field is classified as a General Utility - Stage I airport capable of serving most single-engine, and turboprop aircraft. The airport offers VOR and DME navigation aids and VASI on the primary runway. Currently there are no commercial air carriers for either freight or passenger service. There is one charter service, an agricultural spraying operation and the CWU training center which operate out of Bowers Field. Estimated operations in 1995 are 74,800 (operation = one take-off or landing).

There are several planned improvements including expansion of the adjacent industrial area, improvements to fuel facilities, water system and adding a washdown facility for agriculture spray aircraft.

Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field) is the largest airport in the County and is a valuable transportation commodity. The airport is the access point to the major mode of transportation for the nation.

The Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field) provides a vital transportation link, servicing all of Kittitas County with access to modern transportation options for emergency services, commercial operations, commuter transportation, and recreational flying. The airport advisory committee is dedicated to preserving this valuable asset by recommending the enactment of appropriate ordinances and policies to accomplish the following:

- Enhance the airport as a transportation hub and asset for economic development.
- Encourage compatible development at the airport to generate revenue streams to decrease subsidy of airport operations and facilities from tax revenue.

Protect the airport and surrounding land users and owners from conflicting uses through careful and compatible land use planning. Such planning should include, but not be limited to, density reductions and land use and building restrictions designed to protect the take-off and landing and approach corridors, and areas adjacent to and under existing traffic patterns.

DeVere Field

DeVere Field is a privately owned commercial airport built by Mr. DeVere approximately 35 years ago. It is located at 5210 Airport Road, about three miles east of Cle Elum. There are several single engine aircraft based at the airfield and several hangars on site. The airfield is closed during periods when snow covers the runway.

Cle Elum Municipal Airport

Cle Elum Municipal Airport is a single runway, predominately recreational airport. Its one runway is an approximately 40 ft. wide, paved strip with a paved main taxi-way. It can handle
single engine light aircraft and some light twins. It is located east of the city of Cle Elum at 1990 Airport Road. The city of Cle Elum has adopted a Master Plan for the development of the Cle Elum Municipal Airport which, by reference, is included in this document. Planned improvements include widening and building taxiways, building new hangars, lengthening the runway, adding a fuel supply and providing residential housing on the north side of the runway.

**Easton Airfield**

Located northwest of the town of Easton on Sparks Road, the Easton airfield is owned and operated by the Washington State Department of Transportation. The airfield was originally built as a relief airstrip for U.S. Mail aircraft in the 1940’s. Today, it is primarily used as a recreational airport but serves as an emergency landing strip in case of severe weather in the Cascade Mountains. The airstrip is a turf runway that is 2,640 feet long and 100 feet wide. The airport has a Medium-Intensity Runway Lighting System (MIRL) and navigation aids include a wind cone and rotating beacon. The airport is typically open from June 1 to October 1 each year. Ground transportation is provided by a private dirt road.

**4.2(F) Truck Transport**

Kittitas County appears to be adequately served by truck transport businesses as there are a number of commercial and natural resource trucking companies based in the county. There appears to be no way to accurately determine travel levels generated by truck transport activity within Kittitas County.

**4.2(G) Non-Motorized Transportation**

Widened shoulders on Umtanum Road from Ellensburg city limits to Irene Rinehart Park provide a shared bike/walkway adjacent to the travel lanes used by motorized vehicles. Recently, the John Wayne Trail along the old Milwaukee rail road was transferred from Washington State Parks and the Department of Natural Resources (DIR) to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). The future of this corridor is uncertain, but it presently provides a multiple user path through most of Kittitas County. The trail has been used primarily for recreation uses. An abandoned Burlington Northern right-of-way between Cle Elum and Roslyn is a recent addition to the trail system.

Parametrix, Inc. has prepared a draft Non-Motorized Transportation System Plan dated June 1996. It was funded entirely by a grant. The plan should be reviewed by the Planning Commission, before review and approval by the Board of County Commissioners. No county wide trail program will be adopted without being reviewed by the Planning Commission, reviewed by the public through a public hearing forum and adopted by the Board of County Commissioners.

**4.2(H) Transportation System Maintenance**

Preserving and maintaining the public’s investment in transportation infrastructure is an important expenditure of public funds. Presently, maintenance activities account for
approximately 30% of the County’s road budget. Kittitas County has different priority levels for maintenance activities. The first priority is for emergencies. Immediate action is taken to repair damage and correct problems as soon as they are reported. The next maintenance priority level is for items that are scheduled on a yearly basis, including but not limited to: crack sealing, preleveling, sealcoating, and roadway striping. Many of the preventive maintenance activities for individual facilities are scheduled on a seven to nine year maintenance cycle.

Preventive pavement maintenance is defined as those treatments or applications that extend the service life of pavements in good structural conditions. The goal of a preventive pavement maintenance program is to keep the pavement conditions above a level that would require corrective maintenance or other major repairs. The charts in the Transportation Appendix illustrate the increased costs of delaying maintenance for different types of pavements.

4.3 LAND USE, ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Many of the decisions related to transportation have an effect on land uses, the environment and economic development. Different land uses have different transportation needs and impacts. Transportation improvement projects must include emergency services accessibility as a priority need. Transportation improvement projects need to address the environmental impacts of the proposed actions. Similarly, many economic development strategies include the need for transportation facilities. These areas are all inter-related and their relationships need to be recognized.

4.3(A) Land Use

The final comprehensive plan will contain a land use element with a land use plan and policies which will need to be consistent with the transportation element. In the event that the land uses proposed cannot be supported by the existing transportation system there must be an identified means to fund the necessary improvements, there needs to be a mechanism in place to review both plans and either revise the land use plan or impose development fees that will support the change in the level of service created by proposed land use plans. This needs to be an iterative process in which both plans are routinely reviewed for consistency and compatibility.

Presently, the transportation-related assumptions used in the alternative draft land use plans have been developed as part of the SEPA process.

4.3(B) Environment

Transportation decisions are not, and should not be, exempt from environmental review. Impacts to the natural and built environment need to be taken into consideration before any major transportation decisions are made. Most local transportation improvement projects are subject to state and federal environmental regulations as well as any local environmental laws that apply. County road projects (CRPs) routinely follow SEPA regulations unless they are specifically exempted under WAC 197-11-305, 800 through 880. Some large transportation improvement projects are also subject to NEPA — the National Environmental Policy Act. Other environmental reviews are part of permitting for work over or adjacent to streams. Agencies
with permitting and/or reviewing authority include the US Army Corps of Engineers, Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, as well as the Washington State Department of Transportation and local agencies.

4.3(C) Economic Development

Transportation facilities, or the lack of them, are an important consideration to a business or industry making location decisions. The decision whether or not to locate in a particular jurisdiction can rest solely in the balance of access to transportation facilities. Businesses look at their need to get customers and supplies to their location with ease. Industrial developments need access to transportation facilities for shipping and receiving. Many local jurisdictions have to balance their desires to attract new businesses and industries against the obligation to provide transportation services.

4.4 LEVEL OF SERVICE / CONCURRENCY

Kittitas County considered several methodologies for measuring level of service for arterial roadways including the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), an “operation” and “condition” level of service methodology used by Douglas County, and a “minimum tolerable conditions” methodology.

The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method of measuring level of service is recognized as a national standard and is currently being utilized by other jurisdictions throughout the state including the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the City of Ellensburg.

4.5 EXISTING DEFICIENCIES

Although there has not been an official LOS methodology or threshold determination made, Table 4.10 is a listing of all the arterial/arterial intersections and their current LOS using the HCM methodology. Kittitas County does not presently have any capacity related deficiencies on these facilities.

4.5(A) Ten-Year Forecast

As the population grows within the county, the number of registered vehicles and drivers will also increase. Where those vehicles travel will depend, in large part, on where the drivers reside, shop and work. Determining the likely increases in traffic along transportation facilities will need to be based on the land uses which will be permitted and even encouraged in various parts of the county.

1. The ten year travel forecast will be determined using:

2. Calculate 10-year average annual growth factors for each functional classification using traffic count data for the previous 10-year period.
3. Apply the appropriate growth factor to the base year approach volumes depending on classification.

4. Use 15% of the approach volumes for peak hour.

5. Calculate 10-year LOS using the Highway Capacity Software for unsignalized intersections using the same movement distribution (left, through, right, turn) as base year.

Assumptions should include:

- 10-year travel growth will be similar to previous 10-year period.
- Growth on arterials will correspond with functional classification growth rates.
- No changes to intersection controls except those that are already planned, funded, and/or are likely to be completed within ten years.

4.5(B) Planned Improvements

Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
The County’s Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is reviewed and updated every year in order to be adopted by the end of June. Washington State Law requires counties to develop six-year transportation improvement programs as provided under RCW 36.81.121.

In addition to state laws, federal laws also dictate transportation improvements. The intermodel Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) changed the way transportation agencies - Federal, State and local - do business. It is our objective to meet as many of the needs of the traveling public - county residents, visitors, and service providers - in order to provide a safe and efficient transportation system while recognizing the fiscal realities of funding for construction and maintenance of the transportation system.

The Six-Year TIP is updated every year by the Department of Public Works and changes are made to reflect funding secured or shifts in priorities. The Annual Construction Program, adopted with the county’s budget later in the year, is a still more accurate picture of the first year of the TIP.

New Roads and Planned Extensions

The Transportation Plan has a list of proposed new roads or extensions which have been identified through various planning processes to date.

4.6 FINANCING TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

4.6(A) Revenue Sources
Tax Revenues

There are a variety of revenue and funding sources available for transportation improvements. Portions of the moneys collected from property taxes, motor vehicle fuel tax (gas tax), and motor vehicle excise tax (MVET) are redistributed back to local agencies based on formulas which factor in total population and numbers of miles of certain arterial classifications. Only a small portion of property taxes collected go directly into the local “road fund”. Current road mileage rates for Kittitas County are $1.8238 per $1000 assessed valuation. This value reflects the 1996 levy shift of $1.1485/thousand to the County’s general fund as well as the $.0664/thousand to law enforcement.

Other local option taxes available but currently not being utilized by Kittitas County include a vehicle license fee and additional fuel tax. The local vehicle license fee provision (RCW 82.80.020) would need to be approved by the County legislative authority but would be subject to repeal by a referendum. The fee limit is $15.00 per registered vehicle and could generate approximately $150,000 annually. A local option gas tax (RCW 82.80.010) would need to be approved by both the County legislative authority and by a majority of registered voters in the County. The tax is limited to 10% of the state gas tax ($0.023 per gallon), but could generate approximately $200,000 annually.

Grants and Loans

The most common grant sources are federal and state. The federal grants are administered by various agencies within the US Dept. of Transportation (US DOT) such as Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Authority (FTA). Most state transportation grants are administered by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), County Road Administration Board (CRAB), and the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB). Small grants and loans are also available from the Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (DCTED) through the Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF) and Community Economic Revitalization Board (CERB) primarily for economic development projects. Small safety-related “mini-grants” are also available from the Washington State Traffic Safety Commission (WSTSC).

Most grants require a portion of the grant to be matched with local or other “non-grant” funds. Common percentages are 10 - 20% matching funds. Local funds used to match grant funds maximize the local tax dollars. This benefit is two-fold. First, local tax dollars that have gone into large state or federal grant fund accounts are coming back to benefit Kittitas County. For instance, a $200,000 project receives approval for an 80% grant ($160,000). Local match requirements are only $40,000. Local taxpayers have, of course, contributed to the grant through other taxing sources, but now they’re seeing the benefits of their tax dollars coming back to Kittitas County. If the grant wasn’t awarded
here, it would have been awarded some place else and the dollars would not have gone to
directly benefit Kittitas County taxpayers.

A second benefit that comes from maximizing the local “road fund” dollars by matching
grant funds for large projects, is that there is more “road fund” left for other
transportation improvement activities such as maintenance and small improvement
projects that were either not eligible or not competitive for grants. Since most
maintenance activities are not eligible for grants, this can be a tremendous boost to the
maintenance budget which can only draw from the local “road fund”.

Cautions to be heeded when pursuing grants and loans include the costs of administering
the funds. There is no such thing as “free money” and, for some agencies, the cost of
administering a grant is reason enough not to pursue it. Future restrictions associated
with grants can also make them too restrictive or costly to pursue. There are many
record-keeping, form-signing, reporting and auditing requirements associated with grants
that have to be considered when applying for outside funding. There are ways to reduce
these administrative costs by having trained, experienced staff handling the finances.
Having a centralized “grant officer” who is familiar with the record-keeping of a variety
of funding sources can be a tremendous savings both during the projects and during the
audits following project completions.

Impact Fees

Impact or Development fees must be imposed on new development at the time any new
Plat, PUD, Master Planned Resort or Cluster Development is processed which will cause
the level of service on any local transportation facility to decline below levels planned for
in the Counties Six Year Transportation Plan or the Ten Year Forecast. Including but not
limited to the impacts of additional traffic, additional egress and ingress traffic,
emergency services access and operations, additional traffic control devices and traffic
lanes, street lighting, walking and biking trails.

4.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Discussions and decisions related to transportation are not made without active
consultation with the public. Some forums are more successful than others at soliciting
quality input from a broad cross-section of interests, so a variety of forums are available
at many levels of the transportation planning process. The GMA provisions requiring
consideration of Intergovernmental Coordination and Public Participation were
accomplished, and there was review and deliberation for consistency in the adoption of
the transportation section considering the Quad County Regional Transportation Planning
Organization plan, the County-wide Planning Policies, and the work conducted by the
Surface Transportation Planning group. In addition, the transportation section considered
all the work of the subarea committees, testimony at the Transportation Improvement
Program open houses and testimony at public hearings.
4.8 GOALS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

Multi-Modal Transportation System, Arterial System, and System Maintenance

GPO 4.1 To develop and maintain a safe, efficient and environmentally sound multi-modal transportation system in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements.

GPO 4.2 Kittitas County shall promote a variety of transportation modes through the selection of transportation improvement projects and review of development proposals in the Urban Growth Areas, by considering alternative modes when reviewing development applications, incorporating multiple modes into transportation improvement projects, and by establishing development standards to support the use of alternative transportation modes.

GPO 4.3 To create a transportation system that provides reasonable circulation for all users throughout the County.

GPO 4.4 Kittitas County shall provide a transportation system that enhances the safety of the community and which maximizes the use of the existing road system by maintaining a system of arterials, collectors and local access roads that forms an interconnected network for vehicular circulation.

GPO 4.5 To provide all-weather, all-season use of the arterial system for the movement of goods and services.

GPO 4.6 Kittitas County shall strive to maintain an arterial system that can accommodate legal weights year-round by developing a program for identifying and prioritizing maintenance and reconstruction projects for roads which are used primarily for freight and good movement.

GPO 4.7 To ensure an efficient regional system of arterials is functional, safe and consistent with regional priorities and comprehensive plans.

GPO 4.8 Kittitas County shall work with WSDOT, cities and neighboring counties to develop and maintain a system of arterials, collectors and local access roads that forms an interconnected network for the efficient movement of goods and people, by prioritizing arterials improvements and maintenance activities based on the function a facility serves, by providing for local vehicular access to arterials while minimizing conflicts with through traffic, and by participating in regional coordination efforts such as QuadCo RTPO.

GPO 4.9 To identify and encourage preservation of transportation corridors for future rights-of-way by identifying corridors to be preserved as part of the overall transportation plan, by requiring right-of-way dedication or easements as part of
development approval, and by acquiring right-of-way for future needs through purchase from willing sellers.

GPO 4.10 Kittitas County will place the appropriate emphasis on maintenance activities in order to preserve the capital investment in the transportation system by dedicating maintenance funding through the annual budgeting process and by developing performance measures to demonstrate the cost savings associated with appropriately scheduled maintenance activities.

GPO 4.11 Encourage and initiate Road Improvement Districts and arterial road building projects with the capital facilities six-year plan to meet Concurrency requirements of anticipated growth.

GPO 4.12 Encourage a grid system in the UGAs and UGNs where practical.

GPO 4.13 Kittitas County shall adopt a LOS standard below which new development must mitigate its impacts.

GPO 4.14 To recognized non-motorized travel as a viable transportation mode by developing a county-wide non-motorized system plan and by improving and maintaining existing non-motorized facilities.

GPO 4.15 To review and modify the Parametrix draft dated June 1996 and to adopt a Non-Motorized Transportation System Plan that clearly reflects the direction for Kittitas County.

GPO 4.15A To work with other entities to identify viable options and projects for a connection of the John Wayne Pioneer Trail through, adjacent to, or around the City of Ellensburg.

GPO 4.15B Kittitas County discourages new public trail systems in farming areas.

GPO 4.15C To recognize air transport and airports as an important element. Kittitas County recognizes that public-use airports are essential public facilities. Bowers Field, Cle Elum Municipal, DeVere Field and Easton State must be protected from adjacent incompatible land uses and/or activities that could impact the present or future use of the airports as essential public facilities.

A notice to title or disclosure statement should be required for new or substantial redevelopment of lots, buildings, structures and activities located adjacent to public-use airports. The notice should indicate that the property is located adjacent of the airport and may experience low overhead flights, odors, vibrations, noise, and other similar aviation impacts.
Public-use airports must be protected from height hazards by developing a height overlay district that will prohibit buildings or structures from penetrating the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR Part 77) "Imaginary Surfaces".

Airport land use compatibility maps must be adopted. Three maps for each public-use airport will be created showing FAR Part &amp; Imaginary Surfaces, Accident Safety Areas and airport traffic patterns. The maps must include other information that is pertinent to land use compatibility such as existing land uses, zoning and topography.

**Land use, Environment and Economic Development**

GPO 4.16 To provide a transportation system that corresponds to and is consistent with patterns of land development in accordance with the adopted land use plans, and emergency service requirements.

GPO 4.16A To adopt plans and regulations in compliance with RCW 36.70.547, or as amended thereafter, to protect airport operations.

GPO 4.17 Kittitas County shall ensure consistency between the land use and transportation plans through an iterative process for adjusting either or both plans by developing a process for reviewing plans for consistency and developing a policy for resolving inconsistencies or incompatibilities through an identification of needs and alternatives.

GPO 4.18 To ensure the transportation system can support new development and prohibit development if the development causes the level of service on a locally owned transportation facility to decline below the standards adopted as a part of the Comprehensive plan, unless the as a condition of development the additional impacts are funded by the developer.

GPO 4.19 Kittitas County shall evaluate the merits of a proposed land use action against the potential impacts on the transportation system by reviewing development proposals for potential impacts to the transportation system and requiring developments to identify and mitigate their transportation impacts through SEPA or other local regulatory actions.

GPO 4.20 To provide a transportation system that is safe, reliable and financially feasible while providing for the future needs of Kittitas County by evaluating system improvements with current and future needs in mind and by providing system improvements which reduce conflicts between passenger vehicles and agricultural equipment and enhance emergency services access.

GPO 4.21 Kittitas County shall consider the environmental impacts of any proposed transportation decisions by proposing alternative transportation improvements which
minimize environmental impacts, by complying with all application federal, state, and local environmental rules, and by integrating environmental review through the transportation decision making process.

GPO 4.22 To provide a transportation system which supports economic growth and vitality by developing policies related to capital improvements to support economic development.

GPO 4.23 Kittitas County shall develop and maintain a transportation system which provides access to and from centers identified in the comprehensive plans.

GPO 4.24 Kittitas County shall consider the traffic volumes, type of use, adjacent land uses, emergency services access, and maintenance costs before approving any new county-maintained gravel roads.

**Level of Service (LOS) and Concurrency**

GPO 4.25 To develop and implement LOS standards to evaluate the adequacy of transportation facilities which are measurable, understandable, and appropriate to the services and/or facilities being considered under local conditions.

GPO 4.26 Kittitas County shall utilize the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology to measure the effectiveness of the arterial system at arterial intersections by evaluating all arterial/arterial intersections (including state highways) to identify existing service levels and by developing a transportation model to evaluate the impacts of future land use alternatives on arterial/arterial intersections. Intersections which fall below level of service “C” in rural areas and “D” in urban areas shall be considered deficient.

GPO 4.27 To ensure that necessary transportation facilities and services to maintain adopted level of service standards are available when the impacts of development occur.

GPO 4.28 Kittitas County shall develop and implement a concurrency management system which identifies existing deficiencies, funded improvements, and system capacity balances.

GPO 4.29 To develop a LOS standard that corresponds to land development goals and policies as expressed in the overall Comprehensive Plan for Kittitas County.

GPO 4.30 To encourage land use development patterns and support technologies which reduce the demand for increased capacity on roadways.

GPO 4.31 Kittitas County shall promote demand management strategies in areas which are experiencing increased congestion by encouraging transit, non-motorized transportation, telecommuting, flexible work hours and other demand management strategies where practical.
GPO 4.32 To develop a variety of performance measurements to evaluate the transportation system and prioritize improvements.

GPO 4.33 Kittitas County shall establish appropriate performance measurements which reflect the rural character of Kittitas County by developing and implementing a Pavement Management System (PMS) to measure pavement conditions and to prioritize maintenance or improvement projects, and by developing and implementing a Safety Management System (SMS) to identify potentially hazardous locations and to prioritize mitigation measures.

Financing Transportation Improvements

GPO 4.34 To maximize local funds by pursuing outside funding sources for transportation improvement projects.

GPO 4.35 Kittitas County shall pursue grant funding for appropriate transportation improvement projects by identifying possible funding sources for specific transportation improvement projects, by submitting grant applications to the appropriate reviewing agencies during the grant cycle, by developing grant proposals with realistic cost estimates and by following-up on grant applications denials to seek advice to become more competitive.

GPO 4.36 To consider all local revenue options for financing transportation improvements by evaluating the potential revenues against the political costs of imposing additional taxes and by seeking advice from other local agencies who have successfully implemented optional revenues.

GPO 4.37 To maximize benefits from expenditures of transportation funds

GPO 4.38 Kittitas County shall seek partnerships with other public or private agents when mutual benefits and significant cost savings are anticipated as a result of a coordinated transportation improvement project by coordinating transportation improvement projects with other jurisdictions, utilities, and adjacent property owners to maximize benefits while minimizing costs.

GPO 4.39 To reduce administrative costs associated with transportation improvements.

GPO 4.40 Kittitas County shall encourage efforts to reduce the costs associated with administration of transportation improvement projects by identifying opportunities to consolidate or coordinate administration responsibilities throughout a transportation improvement project as well as provide training on grant accounting and project administration.
GPO 4.41 To fund transportation improvement projects which meet the identified needs of the community

GPO 4.42 Kittitas County shall prioritize transportation improvement projects without identified funding sources based on community needs

GPO 4.43 To re-evaluate the land-use plan if transportation improvements cannot be reasonably funded

GPO 4.44 Kittitas County shall develop an ongoing process for evaluating transportation impacts of different land use proposals to ensure financial feasibility of the land use plan by developing a transportation model which can assign and distribute additional vehicle trips to the transportation system based on alternative land use assumptions and by evaluating alternative funding sources such as Impact or Development fees if transportation system improvements are anticipated as a result of proposed land uses.

**Intergovernmental Coordination and Public Participation**

GPO 4.45 To identify, review and resolve interjurisdictional transportation concerns within or affecting Kittitas County

GPO 4.46 Kittitas County shall coordinate transportation planning, construction and maintenance efforts with all affected agencies by developing joint transportation standards for UGAs with the adjoining city or town, by identifying stakeholders and including them in the decision-making process and jointly develop a process for resolving conflicts between jurisdictions.

GPO 4.47 To ensure coordination among federal, state, regional, and local transportation agencies related to laws, policies and plans in order to seek consistency and ensure compatibility with regional priorities.

GPO 4.48 Kittitas County shall actively participate on selected state, regional and local transportation committees by encouraging County representation on state, regional and local transportation committees, by actively participating in coordination efforts, and by reviewing County plans and policies for consistency with other plans and policies within the region.

GPO 4.49 Provide a variety of opportunities for quality public input on transportation decisions from a representative cross section of the community.

GPO 4.50 Kittitas County shall promote public information and communication with businesses, organizations, and individual citizens as part of the transportation planning and decision-making process by exploring innovative means to promote public dialog on transportation issue, and by encouraging meaningful public input throughout the decision-making process.
GPO 4.51 Kittitas County shall recognize the grandfathered rights of private landowners to use roads built on public lands under federal statute RS 2477.

GPO 4.52 To ensure concurrency of transportation planning and infrastructure in areas of high settlement patterns, Kittitas County will establish a formal bi-annual review process for levels of service (LOS) and land use settlement patterns.
July 25, 2006

Joanna Valencia
Kittitas County Community Development Services
411 N. Ruby St., Suite 2
Ellensburg, WA 98926

RE: Airport Land Use Compatibility, Easton State Airport

Dear Ms. Valencia:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on Kittitas County’s comprehensive plan update and recommendations for addressing airport land use compatibility adjacent to Easton State Airport. The Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Division (WSDOT Aviation) is pursuing land use protections for each of the state owned and operated airports in Washington. We recommend that the county adopt comprehensive plan policies and development regulations to protect this and other public-use airports located in Kittitas County from development of incompatible land uses.

In 1996, the Washington State Legislature passed land use legislation (RCW 36.70.547, RCW 36.70A.510) that requires all cities and counties to adopt comprehensive plan goals, policies and regulations to discourage development of incompatible land uses adjacent to public use airports. GMA also identifies airports as essential public facilities. Communities must address airport land use compatibility as part of their scheduled GMA updates, which are designated by state law.

The role of WSDOT Aviation is to advocate for the preservation of public-use airports and to provide decision makers with the best available information and research about airport land use compatibility. The state’s program emphasizes airspace protection and discourages residential development, schools, hospitals and other medical facilities adjacent to airports, especially in the extended centerline of the airport runway. The program identifies most industrial and commercial land uses as airport-compatible.

We recognize that while Easton State is currently surrounded by many compatible uses, recent subdivision activity has occurred in close proximity to the airport. Our objective is to maintain the favorable conditions that currently exist near the airport to help maintain it as an essential public facility. To this end, we are offering our technical assistance to help Kittitas County adopt comprehensive plan goals, policies and regulations to protect the airport from future encroachment by incompatible land uses. In addition, we understand that Cle Elum Municipal and DeVere Field, like Easton State, are currently included in the transportation system inventory of the comprehensive plan but not protected from encroachment through adoption of policies and development regulations. Our recommendations also suggest land use protections for those public-use airports.

Please find attached a report that provides an evaluation of existing conditions at and adjacent to Easton State and the other public-use airports in Kittitas County. The report also makes specific recommendations, which are outlined below:
Expand on the description of Easton State Airport in the transportation inventory by adding the following text:

_The airstrip is a turf runway that is 2,640 feet long and 100 feet wide. The airport has a Medium-Intensity Runway Lighting System (MIRL) and navigation aids include a wind cone and rotating beacon. The airport is typically open from June 1 to October 1 each year. Ground transportation is provided by a private dirt road._

Adopt the following policies to protect Easton State and other public-use airports from incompatible land uses:

- **Recognize public-use airports as essential public facilities.**
- **Protect Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field), Cle Elum Municipal, Devere Field and Easton State airports from adjacent incompatible land uses and/or activities that could impact the present or future use of the airports as essential public facilities.**
- **A notice to title or disclosure statement should be required for new or substantial redevelopment of lots, buildings, structures, and activities located adjacent to public-use airports. The notice should indicate that the property is located adjacent to the airport and may experience low overhead flights, odor, vibrations, noise and other similar aviation impacts.**
- **Protect public-use airports from height hazards by developing a height overlay district that will prohibit buildings or structures from penetrating the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 “Imaginary Surfaces.”**

Adopt airport land use compatibility maps as part of the comprehensive plan. Create three maps for each airport showing FAR Part 77 Imaginary Surfaces, Accident Safety Areas, and airport traffic patterns. The maps should include other information that is pertinent to land use compatibility such as existing land uses, zoning and topography.

Adopt an appropriate zoning classification for the airport such as “Airport” or “Industrial” and permit aviation activities as a primary use.

Revise existing airport overlay zone as suggested (see attached) and apply to all public-use airports in Kittitas County.
We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal, and offer our continued assistance with aviation issues facing the county. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 360.651.6312 if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Kerri Woehler
Aviation Planner

Cc: Joyce Phillips, Growth Management Services, CTED
Airport Land Use Compatibility Program
Easton State Airport, Kittitas County

INTRODUCTION

Washington State's public-use airports are important to the state's transportation system and economy and are defined by the Growth Management Act as Essential Public Facilities. The role of WSDOT Aviation is to advocate for the preservation of public-use airports and to provide decision makers with the best available information and research about airport land use compatibility. GMA also directs WSDOT Aviation to provide a technical assistance program and review comprehensive plan goals, policies and development regulations.

In 2005, the Aviation Division set out to accomplish a series of business objectives that would better facilitate air transportation in the state and protect existing airport facilities through coordination with local jurisdictions and state and federal agencies. One of these objectives is to protect each of the state airports from encroachment by incompatible land uses.

WSDOT Aviation owns and operates 17 public-use airports. The majority of these airports are located near the Cascade Mountains; additional airports are also located along the Snake River. The primary purpose for these facilities is to provide emergency landing areas in key locations. They are also used for fire-fighting operations, emergency medical access, disaster emergency management and recreation. Easton State Airport is located in Kittitas County west of Cle Elum on I-90.

We recognize that while Easton State is currently surrounded by many compatible uses, recent subdivision activity has occurred in close proximity to the airport. Our objective is to maintain the favorable conditions that currently exist near the airport to help maintain it as an essential public facility. To this end, we are offering our technical assistance to help Kittitas County adopt comprehensive plan goals, policies and regulations to protect the airport from future encroachment by incompatible land uses. In addition, we understand that Cle Elum Municipal and DeVore Field, like Easton State, are currently included in the transportation system inventory of the comprehensive plan but not protected from encroachment through adoption of policies and development regulations. Our recommendations also suggest land use protections for those public-use airports.

WHAT IS AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY?

Through the technical assistance program, we help communities plan for appropriate development adjacent to public-use airports through adoption of policies and regulations that promote compatibility. The "adjacent" area is also known as the "over-flight" area, which is defined by the airport traffic pattern. This may extend up to one mile in all directions from the airport runway.

Airspace obstructions of any kind present a safety hazard and are a concern in areas adjacent to the airport. This includes structures that penetrate the airspace surrounding an airport, but also include other activities that affect airspace such as dust and smoke, electronic signals, lighting, and wildlife attractants that contribute to the potential for bird strikes. Federal regulations define airspace for airports of all sizes and operation levels.

Location of certain land uses adjacent to airports are also a concern. These land uses may include: residential development, "high-intensity" land uses and "special function" land uses. Noise, smell, vibration and other nuisances generated by normal airport operations are a concern throughout the over-flight area. Safety and the risk of aircraft accident is also a concern. Among the resources provided by

Kerri Woehler, Aviation Planner
360.651.6312 or woehlek@wsdot.wa.gov
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WSDOT Aviation is a nationwide study of accident data that provides a guide for planning development adjacent to airports to account for safety concerns.

EVALUATION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

Comprehensive Plan Policies

The Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan includes Easton State Airport in its transportation system inventory. The more detailed policies and development regulations adopted to protect Bowers Field from encroachment by incompatible land uses have not been extended to Easton State.

Development Regulations

At least four zoning districts are present within one mile of Easton State Airport: Rural 3, General Commercial, Commercial Forest and Forest and Range. While the uses permitted in each of these zones appear to generally be compatible with airport operations, several types of uses currently allowed in the zones may not be compatible.

Agricultural uses that attract wildlife: Operation of agricultural uses that attract wildlife is a concern in areas adjacent to airports because the presence of birds creates a safety hazard for aircraft. The zoning districts identified above allow a range of agricultural activities, some of which may serve as wildlife attractants.

"High-intensity" land uses: Land uses that attract high concentrations of people are a safety concern when located in certain areas adjacent to airports. Such uses may include fairgrounds, stadiums and arenas and temporary events that attract dense concentrations of people including fairs, circuses and carnivals. Zoning districts located within one mile of Easton State Airport currently permit similar uses. Residential cluster developments should be discouraged within the extended runway centerline.

"Special function" land uses: These are defined as land uses for which the significant common element is the relative inability of the people occupying the space to move out of harm's way. Such uses may include K-12 schools, daycare centers, hospitals and nursing homes. Zoning districts located within one mile of Easton State Airport currently permit some of these uses.

Dense residential development: Airport operations generate noise, smell, fumes, smoke vibrations and other activities that are an annoyance to neighbors and are not conducive to quality neighborhoods. Areas adjacent to airports are not appropriate locations for residential development. WSDOT Aviation provides a variety of resources to guide communities in determining appropriate residential density levels for areas under the airport traffic pattern; suggested ranges extend from no residential development to 1 unit per 5 acres, depending on proximity to the airport runway. Allowed density in the zoning districts adjacent to Easton State exceed levels described in WSDOT’s program and should be reevaluated.

Structure Height: The "Commercial Forest" and "Forest and Range" zones limit structure height to 35 feet or two and one-half stories; the other zones do not provide a structure height limit. The zones do not prohibit penetration of Part 77 Imaginary Surfaces that define the airspace at Easton State Airport, and structure height may be a concern within the approach surface.

Runway Protection Zone: WSDOT’s program recommends against residential uses in the runway protection zones located at each runway end and suggests that communities allow only minimal development in these areas.

Kerri Woehler, Aviation Planner
360.651.6312 or woehlerk@wsdot.wa.gov
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RECOMMENDATIONS

WSDOT Aviation recommends that the county conduct additional evaluation of existing land uses and zoning to assess airport land use compatibility at public-use airports. The evaluation can be used to identify needed amendments to the comprehensive plan and development regulations.

- Amend the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan to better address airport land use compatibility.
  - Expand on the description of Easton State Airport in the transportation inventory by adding the following text:

    The airstrip is a turf runway that is 2,640 feet long and 100 feet wide. The airport has a Medium-Intensity Runway Lighting System (MIRL) and navigation aids include a wind cone and rotating beacon. The airport is typically open from June 1 to October 1 each year. Ground transportation is provided by a private dirt road.
  - Adopt the following policies to protect Easton State and other public-use airports from incompatible land uses:
    - Recognize public-use airports as essential public facilities.
    - Protect Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field), Cle Elum Municipal, DeVere Field and Easton State airports from adjacent incompatible land uses and/or activities that could impact the present or future use of the airports as essential public facilities.
    - A notice to title or disclosure statement should be required for new or substantial redevelopment of lots, buildings, structures, and activities located adjacent to public-use airports. The notice should indicate that the property is located adjacent to the airport and may experience low overhead flights, odor, vibrations, noise and other similar aviation impacts.
    - Protect public-use airports from height hazards by developing a height overlay district that will prohibit buildings or structures from penetrating the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 "Imaginary Surfaces."
  - Adopt airport land use compatibility maps as part of the comprehensive plan. Create three maps for each airport showing FAR Part 77 Imaginary Surfaces, Accident Safety Areas and airport traffic patterns. The maps should include other information that is pertinent to land use compatibility such as existing land uses, zoning and topography.
- Amend the county’s development regulations to discourage incompatible land uses.
  - Adopt an appropriate zoning classification for the airport such as “Airport” or “Industrial” and permit aviation activities as a primary use.
  - Revise existing airport overlay zone as suggested (see attached) and apply to all public-use airports in Kittitas County.

Kerri Woehler, Aviation Planner  
360.651.6312 or woehlerk@wsdot.wa.gov  
July 25, 2006
Kittitas County

Chapter 17.58
AIRPORT ZONE*
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17.58.010 Purpose and Intent.
The purpose and intent of this chapter is to establish an airport overlay zoning district on properties located on, adjacent to, and in the vicinity of public-use airports including Easton State, Cle Elum Municipal, DeVere Field and Bowers Field at Ellensburg, Washington, in order to protect the health, welfare, safety, and quality of life of the general public, property owners, airport operators, and aviation community; and also to ensure compatible land uses in the vicinity of the affected environments of the airport overlay zoning district. With regulations set forth in the Adopted 14 CFR Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77. (Ord. 2001-10.(part), 2001.)

17.58.020 Statutory authority.
This chapter is adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.547 and 36.70A.200 which requires a county, city or town to enact development regulations, to discourage the siting of incompatible land uses adjacent to general aviation, public-use airports. (Ord. 2001-10 (part), 2001.)

17.58.030 Definitions.
As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Airport" means public-use airports including Easton State, Cle Elum Municipal, DeVere Field and Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field).
2. "Airport elevation" means 1,766 feet above mean sea level.
3. "Airport overlay zoning district" shall include the runway protection zone, inner safety zone, inner turning zone, outer safety zone, sideline zone, and the airport operation zone as depicted on Map "B" - "Airport Safety Zones" and numbered zones 1 through 6, respectively, and shall also encompass the area identified within 14 CFR Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77, as amended and depicted on Map "A" - "Part 77." Map "B", referenced throughout this chapter, is on file with the Kittitas County public works department.
4. "Map "A", referenced throughout this chapter, is on file with the Kittitas County public works department.
5. "Airport surface" means a surface longitudinally centered on the extended runway centerline, extending outward and upward from the end of the primary surface and along the same slope as the approach zone height limitation slope set forth in KCC 17.58.050. The perimeter of the approach surface coincides with the perimeter of the approach zone.
5. Approach, Transitional, Horizontal, and Conical Zones. These zones are set forth and defined in KCC 17.58.040.
6. "Conical surface" means a surface extending outward and upward from the periphery of the horizontal surface at a slope of 20 feet upward to one foot outward for a horizontal distance of 4,000 feet.
7. "Flammable and combustible liquids" shall be defined as the type and design of underground and aboveground liquid storage tanks; the location and design of the fuel dispensers and dispenser nozzles; the design and specifications for related piping, valves and fittings; the location and classification of electrical equipment, including emergency fuel shutdown devices; and specifications for fuel storage and pressure-relief components, and shall be in accordance with Article 52 (5201.3.2(#1) Motor Vehicle Fuel - Dispensing Stations), Article 79 (Flammable and Combustible Liquids, specifically Special Options 7904), Standard 52-1 of the Uniform Fire Code (1997) and all applicable codes.
8. "Hazard to air navigation" means an obstruction determined to have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace.
9. "Height" for the purpose of determining the height limits in all zones set forth in this chapter and shown on the airport overlay zoning district map "A", the datum shall be mean sea level elevation unless otherwise specified.
10. "Horizontal surface" means a horizontal plane 150 feet above the established airport elevation.
11. "Larger than utility runway" means a runway that is constructed for and intended to be used by propeller driven aircraft of greater than 12,500 pounds maximum gross weight and jet-powered aircraft.
12. "Nonconforming use" means any preexisting structure, object of natural growth, or use of land, which is inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter.
13. "Nonprecision Instrument runway" means a runway having an existing instrument approach procedure utilizing air navigation facilities with only horizontal guidance, or area type navigation equipment, for which a straight-in nonprecision instrument approach procedure has been approved or planned.
14. "Obstruction" means any structure, growth, or other object, including a mobile object, which exceeds a limiting height set forth in KCC 17.58.050.
15. "Person" means an individual, firm, partnership, corporation, company, association, joint stock association or government entity. "Person" includes a trustee, a receiver, an assignee, or a similar representative.
16. Precision Instrument Approach. The precision instrument approach is designed to provide an approach path for exact alignment and descent of an aircraft on final approach to a runway.
17. Precision Instrument Runway 29. The precision approach is a 50,000-foot-long trapezoid that is 1,000 feet wide at the point where it meets the primary surface. It has a 50:1 slope for the first 10,000 feet and a slope of 40:1 for the remaining 40,000 feet. The approach surface is 16,000 feet wide at the outermost point.
18. "Primary surface" means a surface longitudinally centered on a runway. When the runway has a specially prepared hard surface, the primary surface extends 200 feet beyond each end of that runway. For military runways or when the runway has no specially prepared hard surface, or planned hard surface, the primary surface ends at each end of that runway. The width of the primary surface is set forth in KCC 17.58.040. The elevation of any point on the primary surface is the same as the elevation of the nearest point on the runway centerline.
19. "Runway" means a defined area on an airport prepared for landing and takeoff of aircraft along its length.
20. "Structure" means an object, including a mobile object, constructed or installed by man, including but without limitation, buildings, towers, cranes, smokestacks, earth formation, and overhead transmission lines.
21. Transitional Surfaces. These surfaces extend outward at 90-degree angles to the runway centerline and the runway centerline extended at a slope of seven feet horizontally for each one foot vertically from the sides of the conical surfaces. Transitional surfaces for those portions of the precision approach surfaces, which project through and beyond the limits of the
conical surface, extend a distance of 5,000 feet measured horizontally from the edge of the approach surface and at 90-degree angles to the extended runway centerline.


23. “Utility runway” means a runway that is constructed for and intended to be used by propeller-driven aircraft of 12,500 pounds maximum gross weight or less.


17.58.040 Airport overlay zoning district.

In order to carry out the provisions of this chapter, there is hereby created an airport overlay zoning district that is composed of the following surface and safety zones. The zones cover a geographic area that is affected by airport activities and are defined on the basis of factors including, but not limited to, aircraft noise, aircraft flight patterns, airport safety zones, local circulation patterns and area development patterns. The boundaries of the airport surface and safety zones are shown on airport overlay zoning district Map “A” - “Part 77” and Map “B” - “Airport Safety Zones”, which are attached hereto and incorporated by reference, and which shall also be on file and open for inspection in the Kittitas County planning department, Kittitas County public works department, and the city of Ellensburg community development department. The surface and safety zones are overlaid on top of the existing underlying zoning, which remains in full force and effect. Where the requirements imposed by the surface and safety zones conflict with the requirements of the underlying zoning, the more restrictive requirement shall be enforced. With the exception of those necessary and incidental to airport operations, no uses shall be permitted that allow buildings, structures, vegetation or other development that penetrates the imaginary air surfaces described below.

1. Surface Zones. In order to carry out the provisions of this chapter, there are created and established certain surface zones which include all of the land lying beneath the approach surfaces, transitional surfaces, horizontal surfaces, and conical surfaces as they apply to Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field). Such zones are shown on Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field) overlay zoning map “A”, as amended. Within each of the surface zones there are hereby established certain height restrictions for structures and trees. The surface zones are established and defined as follows:

   a. **Approach Zone.** A surface longitudinally centered on the extended runway centerline.

      Visual Runways. The 500-foot inner edge coincides with the width of the primary surface and slopes 20 feet outward for each one foot upward beginning at the end of and at the same elevation as the primary surface and expands to a width of 1,250 feet at a horizontal distance of 5,000 feet along the extended runway centerline.

      Runways 07, 25, and 11, Larger than Utility with a Visibility Minimum Greater than Three-Quarter Mile. Nonprecision Instrument Approach Zone. The 500-foot inner edge coincides with the width of the primary surface and slopes 34 feet outward for each one foot upward beginning at the end of and at the same elevation as the primary surface and expands to a horizontal distance of 3,500 feet at a horizontal distance of 10,000 feet along the extended runway centerline. Its centerline is the continuation of the runway centerline as depicted on map “A”.

      Height Restrictions: No object shall penetrate the imaginary line created by a slope-34 feet outward for each one foot upward beginning at the end of and at the same elevation as the primary surface and extending to a horizontal distance of 10,000 feet along the extended runway centerline.

   b. Runway 20, Larger than Utility with a Visibility Minimum Lower than Three-Quarter Mile Precision Instrument Approach Zone. The 1,000-foot inner edge of this approach zone coincides with the width of the primary surface and slopes 50 feet outward for each one foot upward for the first 10,000 feet of this zone and 40 feet outward for each one foot...
upward for the remaining 40,000 feet of this zone. The zone begins at the end of and at
the same elevation as the primary surface. The approach zone expands uniformly to a
width of 16,000 feet at a horizontal distance of 50,000 feet from the primary surface. Its
centerline is the continuation of the centerline of the runway as depicted on map "A".
--- Height Restrictions: No object shall penetrate the imaginary line created by a slope-50
feet outward for each one-foot upward for the first 10,000 feet of this zone and 40 feet
outward for each one-foot upward for the remaining 40,000 feet of this zone.

c.b. Transitional Zones. This zone is defined by a slope seven feet outward for each one
foot upward beginning at the sides of and at the same elevation as the primary surface
and the approach surface, and extending to a height of 150 feet above the airport
elevation which is 139 feet above mean sea level.
--- Height Restrictions: No object shall penetrate the imaginary line created by a slope
seven feet outward for each one-foot upward beginning at the sides of and the same
elevation as the approach surface, and extending to where they intersect the conical
surface. Further, where the precision instrument runway approach zone projects
beyond the conical zone, no object shall penetrate the imaginary line created by a
slope seven feet outward for each one foot upward beginning at the sides of and the
same elevation as the approach surface, and extending a horizontal distance of 5,000
feet measured at 90 degree angles to the extended runway centerline.

c. Horizontal Zone. The zone is established at 150 feet above the airport elevation or at a
height of 1,916 feet above mean sea level by swinging arcs of 5,000 feet radial for all
runways designated utility or visual and 10,000 feet for all other runways from the
centers of the primary surface of each runway and connecting adjacent arcs by drawing
tangent lines to these arcs. The horizontal zone does not include the approach and
transitional zones.

The established airport elevations for airports in Kittitas County are as follows:
- Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field) - 1,916 feet above mean sea level
- Easton State Airport - X feet above mean sea level
- Devere Field - X feet above mean sea level
- Cle Elum Municipal - X feet above mean sea level

--- Height Restrictions: No object shall penetrate the imaginary horizontal line created at 150
feet above the airport elevation or at a height above the airport of 1,916 feet above mean sea
level.

d. Conical Zone. The conical zone is established as the area that commences at
the periphery of the horizontal zone and extends outward therefrom for a horizontal
distance of 4,000 feet as depicted in map "A".
--- Height Restrictions: No objects shall penetrate the imaginary line created by a slope
20 feet outward for each one foot upward beginning at the periphery of the horizontal
zone and at 150 feet above the airport elevation and extending to a height up to 3,500
feet above the surface of the land.

2. Safety Zones. In order to carry out the provisions of this chapter and to promote land use
compatibility on lands within and adjacent to and in the vicinity of the Kittitas County Airport
(Bowers Field), there are created and established certain safety zones. Such safety zones are
shown on Kittitas County Airport (Bowers Field) overlay zoning district map "B", as amended.
Within each of the safety zones, certain land use limitations are established and certain
development standards are imposed in addition to the land uses and development standards of
the underlying zoning. Where the requirements imposed by these safety zones conflict with the
requirements of the underlying zoning, the more restrictive requirement shall be enforced. The
safety zones are established and defined as follows:
a. Runway Protection Zone 1. An area extending beyond the centerlines of runways 11, 29, 07, and 25 as depicted on map "B" (shaded area #1). This zone begins from the outer boundaries of the primary surface, 200 feet from the ends of the runways and extends out 1,700 feet to its widest point, which measures 1,010 feet across, 505 feet on either side of the runway centerline.

b. Inner Safety Zone 2. An area extending beyond the centerlines of runways 11, 29, 07, and 25 as depicted in map "B" (shaded area #2). This zone begins at the end of the runway protection zone 1 and extends out 2,800 feet. The zone measures 1,010 feet across, 505 feet on either side of the runway centerline.

c. Inner Turning Zone 3. A fan shaped area extending beyond the centerlines of runways 11, 29, 07, and 25 as depicted on map "B" (shaded area #3). This zone begins at the primary surface, 200 feet from the end of the runway centerline and extends out with a 60-foot radius arc on either side of the runway centerline to 4,500 feet and connects to the centerline of the inner safety zone with sweeping arcs.

d. Outer Safety Zone 4. Area extending beyond the centerlines of runways 11, 29, 07, and 25 as depicted on map "B" (shaded area #4). This zone begins at the end of the inner safety zone and extends out 3,000 feet. The zone measures 1,000 feet across, 500 feet on either side of the runway centerline.

e. Sideline Zone 5. An area adjacent to runways 11, 29, 07, and 25 as depicted on map "B" (shaded area #5). This zone begins from the outer boundaries of the primary surface, and extends out 1,000 feet perpendicular to the primary surface and connects to the 60-degree sector of the inner turning zone.

f. Airport Operations Zone 6. This zone is depicted on map "B" (shaded area #6) and begins from the outer boundaries of the sideline zone and extends out 5,000 feet perpendicular to the primary surface and connects to the 60-degree sector of the inner turning zone: (Ord.: 2001:30 (part); 2001).

17.58.050 Uses, development requirements and restrictions.


a. Underlying Zoning Requirements. In addition to the airport overlay zoning district development requirements and restrictions set forth in subsections (A)(2) through (9) of this section and in the table in subsection B of this section, all uses and activities are at all times subject to the requirements of the underlying zoning district. Where the requirements and restrictions imposed by the airport overlay zoning district surface and safety zones conflict with the requirements of the underlying zoning district, the more restrictive requirement shall be applied.

b. Pre-annexation/Annexation. Once the parcel is annexed into the Ellensburg city limits, the parcel shall adopt by reference the density requirements of the city of Ellensburg.

c. Height. All uses shall be subject at all times to the height restrictions set forth in KCC 17.58.040(A).

d. Signal and Radio Communication Interference. Electrical interference with navigational signals or radio communication between the airport and aircraft is prohibited and will be regulated in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated and enforced by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations.

e. Lighting and Glare. Activities or uses that create lighting which make it difficult for pilots to distinguish between airport lights and non-airport lights or that create glare in the eyes of pilots using the airport are prohibited. All outdoor lighting fixtures shall be arranged and shielded so that area lighting shall not shine into the sky.

f. Visibility. Activities or uses that create excessive amounts of dust, smoke, or other emissions that may result in impairment of visibility in the vicinity of the airport are discouraged and will be regulated in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated and enforced by the Washington State Department of Ecology under the Clean Air Act and other state and federal regulations.
g. Large Bodies of Water. Activities or uses that create large areas of standing water are discouraged and shall be reviewed and regulated in accordance with the provisions set forth in the county's State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) regulations as set forth in Chapter 15.04 KCC.

h. Flammable and Combustible Material. Flammable and combustible liquids and specifications for fuel storage shall be in accordance with the Uniform Fire Code and all applicable codes as adopted in KCC Title 14, Buildings and Construction.


j. Subdivision. When any division of land including short plats, plats, cluster subdivisions, and planned unit developments, occur on any land within the airport overlay zoning district safety zones 1 through 6, a note located on the first page of the plat, shall be recorded with the county auditor as follows:

This property is located within the Airport Overlay Zoning District in which a variety of airport aviation activities occur. Such airport aviation activities may impact the use of your property.

2. Use Table.
Note: All aviation uses are acceptable only on airport property.
| Zone 1  
| (Runway Protection Zone) | 1. Land uses, which by their nature will be relatively unoccupied by people should be encouraged (mini-storage, small parking lots, etc.) |
| | 2. Schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, and churches are prohibited. |
| Zone 2  
| (Inner Safety Zone) | 1. Schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, and churches are prohibited. |
| | 2. Outside of the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) the average density will be one dwelling unit per three acres on the property at the date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001]. |
| | 3. Inside the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) the average density will be one dwelling unit per one acre on the property at the date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001]. |
| Zone 3  
| (Inner Turning Zone) | 1. Schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, and churches are prohibited. |
| | 2. Flammable and combustible liquids and specifications for fuel storage shall be in accordance with Articles 52 and 79, the Uniform Fire Code (UFC) standard 52-1, and applicable codes. |
| | 3. Outside of the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) the average density will be one dwelling unit per three acres on the property at the date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001]. |
| | 4. Inside the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) for lands zoned Agricultural - 3 the average density will be one dwelling unit per three acres on the property at the date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001]. |
| | 5. Inside the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) for lands zoned Suburban the average density will be one dwelling unit per one acre on the property at the date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001]. |
| Zone 4  
| (Outer Safety Zone) | 1. Schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, and churches are prohibited. |
| | 2. Outside of the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) the average density will be one dwelling unit per three acres on the property at the date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001]. |
| | 3. Inside the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) for lands zoned Suburban the average density will be one dwelling unit per one acre on the property at the date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001]. |
| Zone 5  
| (Sideline Zone) | 1. All aviation related uses are permitted. |
| | 2. Schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, and churches are prohibited. |
| Zone 6  
| (Airport Operations Zone) | 1. All aviation related uses are permitted within airport property. |
| | 2. Outside of the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) the average density will be one dwelling unit per three acres on the property at the date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001]. |
| | 3. Inside the existing Ellensburg Urban Growth Area (UGA) the average density will be one dwelling unit per one acre on the property at the
date of adoption of this ordinance [July 17, 2001].

(Ord. 2001-10 (part), 2001).

17.58.060 Permits.

1. Future Uses. Except as specifically provided in subsections (A)(1), (2), and (3) of this section, no material change shall be made in the use of land, no structure shall be erected or otherwise established, and no tree shall be planted in any zone created unless a permit therefore has been applied for and granted. Each application for a permit shall indicate the purpose for which the permit is desired, with sufficient particularity to permit it to be determined whether the resulting use, structure, or tree is consistent with the provisions of this chapter. No permit for a use inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter shall be granted unless a variance has been approved in accordance with subsection D of this section.

a. In the area lying within the limits of the horizontal zone and conical zone, no permit shall be required for any tree or structure less than 75 feet of vertical height above the ground except when, because of terrain, land contour, or topographic features, such tree or structure would extend above the height limits prescribed for such zones.

b. In areas lying within the limits of the approach zones but at a horizontal distance of not less than 4,200 feet from each end of the runway, no permit shall be required for any tree or structure less than 75 feet of vertical height above the ground, except when such tree or structure would extend above the height limit prescribed for such approach zones.

c. In the areas lying within the limits of the transition zones beyond-the-perimeter of the horizontal zone, no permit shall be required for any tree or structure less than 75 feet of vertical height above the ground, except when such tree or structure, because of terrain, land contour, or topographic features, would extend above the height limit prescribed for such transition zones.

d. As a condition for approval of new development within the approach surfaces or safety zones a notice shall be recorded with the county auditor prior to final approval of new subdivisions, short subdivisions, building permits, conditional use permits, special use permit or other similar permits, unless said notice is already recorded on the property. Said notice shall state: "This property is located adjacent to an airport and routinely subject to overflight activity by aircraft using the airport; and residents and tenants may experience inconvenience, annoyance, or discomfort from noise, smell or other effects of aviation activities."

2. Existing Uses. No permit shall be granted that would allow the establishment or creation of an obstruction or permit a nonconforming use, structure, or tree to become a greater hazard to air navigation, than it was on the effective date of the ordinance codified in this chapter or any amendments thereto or than it is when the application for a permit is made.

3. Nonconforming Uses Abandoned or Destroyed. Whenever the airport manager, or his or her designee, determines that a nonconforming or structure has been abandoned or more than eighty percent torn down, physically deteriorated, or decayed, no permit shall be granted that would allow such structure to exceed the applicable height limit or otherwise deviate from the zoning regulations.

4. Variances. Any person desiring to erect or increase the height of any structure, or permit the growth of any tree, or use property, not in accordance with the regulations prescribed in this chapter, may apply to the board of adjustment for a variance from such regulations. The application for variance shall be accomplished by a determination from the Federal Aviation Administration as to the effect of the proposal on the operation of air navigation facilities and the safe, efficient use of navigable airspace. Such variances shall be allowed where it is duly found that a literal application or enforcement of the regulations will result in unnecessary hardship and relief granted, will not be contrary to the public interest, will not create a hazard to air navigation, will do substantial justice, and will be in accordance with the spirit of this
chapter. A copy of the variance application shall be forwarded to the Kittitas County airport
manager by the Kittitas County planning department consistent with the notification
procedures under KCC Title 15A.
5. Obstruction Marking and Lighting. Any permit or variance granted may, if such action is
deemed advisable to effectuate the purpose of this chapter, be so conditioned as to require
the owner of the structure or tree in question to install, operate, and maintain, at the owner’s
expense, such markings and lights as may be necessary. (Ord. 2001-10 (part), 2001).
6. Nothing in this chapter shall diminish the responsibility of project proponents to submit a
Notice of Construction or Alteration to the Federal Aviation Administration if required in
accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77, “Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace”.

17.58.070 Nonconforming use - Regulations not retroactive.
The regulations prescribed in this chapter shall not be construed to require the removal, lowering, or
other change or alteration of any structure or tree not conforming to the regulations at the effective
date of the ordinance codified in this chapter, nor shall such be construed to require any change in the
construction or alteration of any structure or tree which was begun prior to the effective date of the
ordinance codified in this chapter, and which is diligently being prosecuted. (Ord. 2001-10 (part),
2001).

17.58.080 Violations and enforcement.
It shall be the duty of the code enforcement official of the Kittitas County building department to
administer and enforce the regulations prescribed in this chapter. (Ord. 2001-10 (part), 2001).

17.58.090 Appeals.
Any person aggrieved, by any order, requirement, decision or determination made by an administrative
official in the processing of any application made under this chapter or in the actual decision made as
required by this chapter may appeal to the board of adjustment as provided in RCW 14.12.190. (Ord.
2001-10 (part), 2001).

17.58.100 Judicial review.
Any person aggrieved, or any taxpayer affected, by any decision of the board of adjustment, may
appeal to the circuit court as provided in Section III of Chapter 12 of the Public Laws of the State. (Ord.
2001-10 (part), 2001).

17.58.110 Conflicting regulations.
Where there exists a conflict between any of the regulations or limitations prescribed in this chapter
and any other regulations applicable to the same area, whether the conflict be with respect to the
height of structures or trees, and the use of land, or any other matter, the more stringent limitation or
requirement shall govern and prevail. (Ord. 2001-10 (part), 2001).
## Accident Safety Zones and Capture Rates
### for Aircraft Accidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUNWAY LENGTH</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Zone Size (acres)</th>
<th>ARRIVALS</th>
<th>DEPARTURES</th>
<th>TOTAL ACCIDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Accidents (per Zone)</td>
<td>% Accidents (per Zn/acre)</td>
<td>% Accidents (per Zone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 4,000'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>935</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-5,999'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000' or Greater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Computations based upon NTSB Data, 1984-1993. Totals may not directly sum to 100% due to mathematical rounding.
## Accident Safety Zones, Land Use Guidelines and Planning Strategies for New Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Safety Zone</th>
<th>Land Use Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Use Guidelines</th>
<th>Land Use Planning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Zone 1** (See Special Note) | Population Density | Avoid land uses which concentrate people indoors or outdoors. | 1. 0-5 people/acre  
2. Airport sponsor should purchase property if possible.  
3. Zone land uses, which by their nature, will be relatively unoccupied by people (i.e.: mini-storage, small parking lots) |
| | Residential vs Non-Residential Land Use | Prohibit all residential land uses. All non-residential land uses permitted outright subject to the Population Density and Special Function Land Use guidelines. | 1. Create a height hazard overlay ordinance around the airport.  
2. Airport sponsor should purchase property if possible.  
3. Airport sponsor should obtain avigation and obstruction easements.  
4. During site development process, shift all structures away from the runway centerlines if possible.  
5. Landscaping requirements shall establish only low growing vegetation.  
6. Prohibit high overhead outdoor lighting.  
7. Require downward shading of lighting to reduce glare.  
8. Evaluate all possible permitted conditional uses to assure compatible land use. |
| | Special Function Land Use | Prohibit all Special Function Land Uses. | 1. Prohibit overhead utilities and all noise sensitive land uses.  
2. Zone land for uses other than for schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, daycare facilities and churches.  
3. Limit storage of large quantities of hazardous or flammable material.  
4. Ensure permitted uses will not create large areas of standing water, or generate smoke/steam, etc. |

**Special Note:** Since the dimensions of Zone 1 correspond to the dimensions of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ), those airports receiving federal grant dollars from the FAA’s Airport Improvement Program, should strongly consider purchasing the RPZ or otherwise acquire rights to the property for the RPZ.
# Compatible Land Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Safety Zone</th>
<th>Land Use Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Use Guidelines</th>
<th>Land Use Planning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Zone 2               | Population Density       | Avoid land uses which concentrate people indoors or outdoors. | 1. 0-5 people/acre  
2. Zone land uses, which by their nature, will be relatively unoccupied by people (i.e.: mini-storage, small parking lots) |
|                      | Residential vs Non-      | Prohibit all residential land uses. All non-residential land uses permitted outright subject to the Population Density and Special Function Land Use guidelines. | 1. Create a height hazard overlay ordinance around the airport.  
2. Obtain avigation and obstruction easements.  
3. During site development process, shift all structures away from the runway centerlines if possible.  
4. Prohibit mobile home parks.  
5. Landscaping requirements shall establish only low growing vegetation.  
6. Prohibit high overhead outdoor lighting.  
7. Require downward shading of lighting to reduce glare.  
8. Evaluate all possible permitted conditional uses to assure compatible land use. |
|                      | Residential Land Use     | Special Function Land Use | 1. Prohibit overhead utilities and all noise sensitive land uses.  
2. Zone land for uses other than for schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, daycare facilities and churches.  
3. Limit storage of large quantities of hazardous or flammable material.  
4. Ensure permitted uses will not create large areas of standing water, or generate smoke/steam, etc. |
|                      | Special Function Land Use| Prohibit all Special Function Land Uses. | 1. <25 people/acre  
2. Zone land uses, which by their nature, will be relatively unoccupied by people (i.e.: mini-storage, small parking lots) |
| Zone 3               | Population Density       | Avoid land uses which concentrate people indoors or outdoors. | 1. Create a height hazard overlay ordinance around the airport.  
2. Obtain avigation and obstruction easements.  
3. During site development process, shift all structures away from the runway centerlines if possible.  
4. Prohibit mobile home parks.  
5. Landscaping requirements shall establish only low growing vegetation.  
6. Prohibit high overhead outdoor lighting.  
7. Require downward shading of lighting to reduce glare.  
8. Evaluate all possible permitted conditional uses to assure compatible land use. |
|                      | Residential vs Non-      | Runway <4,000 feet – Prohibit all residential land uses.  
Runway 4,000 to 5,999 feet – Limit residential development to 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres.  
Runway >6,000 feet – Limit residential development to 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres.  
All non-residential land uses permitted outright subject to the Special Function Land Use guidelines. | 1. Prohibit overhead utilities and all and avoid noise sensitive land uses.  
2. Zone land for uses other than for schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, daycare facilities and churches.  
3. Limit storage of large quantities of hazardous or flammable material.  
4. Ensure permitted uses will not create large areas of standing water, or generate smoke/steam, etc. |
|                      | Residential Land Use     | Special Function Land Use | 1. Prohibit overhead utilities and all and avoid noise sensitive land uses.  
2. Zone land for uses other than for schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, daycare facilities and churches.  
3. Limit storage of large quantities of hazardous or flammable material.  
4. Ensure permitted uses will not create large areas of standing water, or generate smoke/steam, etc. |
# Compatible Land Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Safety Zone</th>
<th>Land Use Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Use Guidelines</th>
<th>Land Use Planning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone 4</strong></td>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Limit population concentrations.</td>
<td>1. &lt;40 people/acre in buildings, &lt;75 persons/acre outside buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential vs Non-Residential Land Use</td>
<td>Runway ≤6,000 feet – maximum 1 du/acre in rural or urban area. Runway 4,000 to 5,999 feet – maximum 1 du/acre in rural area, 1 du/2.5 acre in urban area. Runway ≥6,000 feet – maximum 1 du/acre in rural area, 1 du/2.5 acre in urban area. All non-residential land uses permitted outright subject to the Special Function Land Use Guidelines.</td>
<td>1. Create a height hazard overlay ordinance around the airport. 2. Obtain avigation easements. 3. Clustered development to maintain density as long as open space remains unbuilt. Place clustered development away from extended runway centerline. 4. Prohibit mobile home parks. 5. Require downward shading of lighting to reduce glare. 6. Evaluate all possible permitted conditional uses to assure compatible land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Function Land Use</td>
<td>Prohibit all Special Function Land Uses.</td>
<td>1. Evaluate noise sensitive land uses in light of aircraft noise contour lines (if available) when establishing new zoning. 2. Prohibit high overhead utilities and all noise sensitive land uses. 3. Zone land for uses other than for schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, daycare facilities and churches. 4. Limit storage of large quantities of hazardous or flammable material. 5. Ensure permitted uses will not create large areas of standing water, or generate smoke/steam, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone 5</strong></td>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Avoid land uses which concentrate people indoors or outdoors.</td>
<td>1. 0-5 people/acre 2. Zone land uses, which by their nature, will be relatively unoccupied by people (i.e.: mini-storage, small parking lot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential vs Non-Residential Land Use</td>
<td>Prohibit all residential land uses. All non-residential land uses permitted outright subject to the Population Density and Special Function Land Use guidelines.</td>
<td>1. Airport sponsor should purchase property if possible. 2. Create a height hazard overlay ordinance around the airport. 3. Obtain avigation and obstruction easements. 4. During site development process, shift all structures away from the runway centerlines if possible. 5. Landscaping requirements shall establish only low growing vegetation. 6. Prohibit high overhead outdoor lighting. 7. Require downward shading of lighting to reduce glare. 8. Evaluate all possible permitted conditional uses to assure compatible land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Function Land Use</td>
<td>Prohibit all Special Function Land Uses.</td>
<td>1. Prohibit overhead utilities and all noise sensitive land uses. 2. Zone land for uses other than for schools, play fields, hospitals, nursing homes, daycare facilities and churches. 3. Limit storage of large quantities of hazardous or flammable material. 4. Ensure permitted uses will not create large areas of standing water, or generate smoke/steam, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Compatible Land Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Safety Zone</th>
<th>Land Use Characteristics</th>
<th>Land Use Guidelines</th>
<th>Land Use Planning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone 6</strong></td>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Limit large concentrations of people.</td>
<td>1. (&lt;100 \text{ people/acre in buildings, } &lt;150 \text{ persons/acre outside buildings})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential vs Non-Residential Land Use</td>
<td>Runway (&lt;4000 \text{ feet}) – maximum 1 du/5 acre in rural areas or 1 du/5 acre in urban area. Runway 4000 to 5999 feet – maximum 1 du/5 acre in rural area, 1 du/2.5 acre in urban area. Runway &gt;6000 feet – maximum 1 du/5 acre in rural area, 1 du/2.5 acre in urban area. All non-residential land uses permitted outright subject to the Special Function Land Use Guidelines.</td>
<td>1. Prohibit mobile home parks near runways longer than 4000 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Function Land Use</td>
<td>Prohibit all Special Function Land Uses.</td>
<td>2. Create a height hazard overlay ordinance around the airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Obtain avigation and obstruction easements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Clustered development to maintain density as long as open space remains unbuilt. Place clustered development away from extended runway centerline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Prohibit mobile home parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Require downward shading of lighting to reduce glare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Evaluate all possible permitted conditional uses to assure compatible land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Prohibit all Special Function Land Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Evaluate noise sensitive land uses in light of aircraft noise contour lines (if available) when establishing new zoning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

RCW 36.70.547 AND RCW 36.70A.510

RCW 36.70.547 General aviation airports — Siting of incompatible uses.
Every county, city, and town in which there is sited a general aviation airport that is
operated for the benefit of the general public, whether publicly owned or privately
owned public use, shall, through its comprehensive plan and development regulations,
discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to such general aviation airport.
Such plans and regulations may only be adopted or amended after formal consultation
with: Airport owners and managers, private airport operators, general aviation pilots,
ports, and the aviation division of the department of transportation. All proposed and
adopted plans and regulations shall be filed with the aviation division of the department
of transportation within a reasonable time after release for public consideration and
comment. Each county, city, and town may obtain technical assistance from the aviation
division of the department of transportation to develop plans and regulations consistent
with this section.

Any additions or amendments to comprehensive plans or development regulations
required by this section may be adopted during the normal course of land-use
proceedings.

This section applies to every county, city, and town, whether operating under chapter
35.63, 35A.63, 36.70, [or] 36.70A RCW, or under a charter. [1996 c 239 § 2.]

NOTE: RCW 36.70A510 (Growth Management Act) refers to this site for
implementation.
### RUNWAY DATA

**Runway Ident:** 09/27  
**Length:** 2,640  
**Width:** 100  
**Surface Type Cond:** TURF-F  
**Gross Wt (IN THOUSANDS):**  
  - SW  
  - DW  
  - DTW  
  - DDTW  
**Pavement Class. No. (PCN):**  

### LIGHTING/APPRAOCH AIDS

**Edge Intensity:** MED  
**RWY Mark Type Cond.:** /  
**VGS:** /  
**THR Crossing hgt:** /  
**Visual Glide Angle:** /  
**CNTRL-TDZ:** /  
**RVR-RW:** /  
**REIL:** /  
**Approach Lights:** /  

### OBSTRUCTION DATA

**FAR 77 Category:** A(V)/A(V)  
**Displaced Threshold:** /  
**Controlling Obstruction:** TREES/TREES  
**Obstruction Marked/Lighted:** /  
**Height Above RWY End:** 46/62  
**Distance From RWY End:** 261/309  
**Centerline Offset:** 7R/53R  
**Obstruction CLNC Slope:** 5/4  
**Close In Obstruction:** N/N  

### DECLARED DISTANCES

**Take Off Run Avbl. (TORA):** 0/0  
**Take Off Dist. Avbl. (TODA):** 0/0  
**Actl. Stop Dist. Avbl. (ASDA):** 0/0  
**Lndg. Dist. Avbl. (LDA):** 0/0  

### RUNWAY END COORDINATES

**Runway End 09**  
- **Latitude:** 47-15-21.2680N  
- **Longitude:** 121-11-24.7370W  
- **Elevation:** FT. (MSL)  

**Runway End 27**  
- **Latitude:** 47-15-08.8560N  
- **Longitude:** 121-10-51.0910W  
- **Elevation:** FT. (MSL)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
<th>Services &amp; Facilities</th>
<th>Based Aircraft &amp; Operations</th>
<th>Runway Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD to Airport(NM)</td>
<td>02 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>KITTITAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG/ADO</td>
<td>ANM SEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECT AERO CHT</td>
<td>SEATTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>WASH STATE AVIATION DIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3704 172ND STREET NE, SUITE K2, P.O. BOX 3367 ARLINGTON, WA 98223-6336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No</td>
<td>360-651-6300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>WASH STATE AVIATION DIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3704 172ND STREET NE, SUITE K2, P.O. BOX 3367 ARLINGTON, WA 98223-6336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No</td>
<td>360-651-6300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Schedule</td>
<td>UNATNDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Use</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Latitude:</td>
<td>47-15-15.0620N ESTIMATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Longitude</td>
<td>121-11-07.9140W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Elevation:</td>
<td>2226 ESTIMATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Traffic</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Commercial Landing Fee</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPIAS/Federal Agreement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR 139 Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Inspection Date</td>
<td>04/04/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway Data</td>
<td>Obstruction Data</td>
<td>Declared Distances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway Ident</td>
<td>07/25</td>
<td>FAR 77 Category</td>
<td>A(V)/A(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>Displaced Threshold</td>
<td>130/130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Controlling Obstruction</td>
<td>TREES/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Type Cond</td>
<td>ASPH-P</td>
<td>Obstruction Marked/Lighted</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Wt (IN THOUSANDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Height Above RWY End</td>
<td>71/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance From RWY End</td>
<td>1065/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centerline Offset</td>
<td>110L/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obstruction CLNC Slope</td>
<td>12/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDTW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Close In Obstruction</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lighting/Approach Aids</th>
<th>Runway End Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edge Intensity</td>
<td>Runway End 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWY Mark Type Cond.</td>
<td>47-11-38.8300N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGSI</td>
<td>120-53-18.7720W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWR Crossing hgt</td>
<td>1944.0 FT. (MSL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Glide Angle</td>
<td>Runway End 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNTRL-TDZ</td>
<td>47-11-39.8370N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVR-RW</td>
<td>120-52-41.8490W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIL</td>
<td>1938.0 FT. (MSL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Lights</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.gcr1.com/5010web/airport.cfm?Site=S93
Runway Data

Runway Ident  08/26
Length  2,055
Width  30
Surface Type Cond  ASPH-G
Surface Treatment  
Gross Wt (IN THOUSANDS)
  SW
  DW
  DTW
  DDTW

Pavement Class. No. (PCN)

Lighting/Approach Aids

Edge Intensity  LOW
RWY Mark Type Cond.  /
VGSI  /  
THR Crossing hgt  /  
Visual Glide Angle  /  
CNTRL-TDZ  /  
RVR-RW  /  
REIL  /  
Approach Lights  /  

Obstruction Data

FAR 77 Category  A(V)/A(V)
Displaced Threshold  /
Controlling Obstruction  TREES/TREES
Obstruction Marked/Lighted  /
Height Above RWY End  9/31
Distance From RWY End  200/399
Centerline Offset  54R/89R
Obstruction CLNC Slope  0/6
Close In Obstruction  Y/Y

Declared Distances

Take Off Run Avbl. (TORA)  0/0
Take Off Dist. Avbl. (TODA)  0/0
Actl. Stop Dist. Avbl. (ASDA)  0/0
Lndg. Dist. Avbl. (LDA)  0/0

Runway End Coordinates

Runway End 08
Latitude  47-10-40.8130N
Longitude  120-51-24.2840W
Elevation  FT. (MSL)

Runway End 26
Latitude  47-10-37.7710N
Longitude  120-50-54.8730W
Elevation  FT. (MSL)
Airport Name: DE VERE FIELD
FAA Site: 26159.1*A
Associated City Location Identifier: CLE ELUM 2W1

Data Effective Date: 08/03/2006
Provided By GCR & Associates, Inc.

General Information

CBD to Airport(NM): 03 E
County: KITITAS
REG/ADO: ANM SEA
SECT AERO CHT: SEATTLE
Ownership: PRIVATE
Owner: JAMES DE VERE
Address: PO BOX 336 CLE ELUM, WA 98922
Phone No: 509-674-2442
Manager: JAMES DE VERE
Address: PO BOX 336 CLE ELUM, WA 98922
Phone No: 509-674-2442

Attendance Schedule

Airport Use: PUBLIC
Airport Latitude: 47-10-39.2920N ESTIMATED
Airport Longitude: 120-51-09.5790W
Airport Elevation: 1800 ESTIMATED
Acreage: 12
Right Traffic: 08
Non-Commercial Landing Fee: NO
NPIAS/Federal Agreement: 
FAR 139 Index: 
Last Inspection Date: 03/31/2003

http://www.gcr1.com/5010web/airport.cfm?Site=2W1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
<th>Services &amp; Facilities</th>
<th>Based Aircraft &amp; Operations</th>
<th>Runway Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD to Airport(NM)</td>
<td>01 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>KITTITAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG/ADO</td>
<td>ANM SEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECT AERO CHT</td>
<td>SEATTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>CITY OF CLE ELUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>119 WEST 1ST STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLE ELUM, WA 98922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No</td>
<td>509-674-2262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>JIM LEONARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>119 WEST 1ST STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLE ELUM, WA 98922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No</td>
<td>509-674-2262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Use</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Latitude:</td>
<td>47-11-39.3340N ESTIMATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Longitude</td>
<td>120-53-00.3100W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Elevation:</td>
<td>1944 SURVEYED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Traffic</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Commercial Landing Fee</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPIAS/Federal Agreement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR 139 Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Inspection Date</td>
<td>03/04/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aviation Land Use Compatibility Program Information

Who is required to adopt comprehensive plan policies and regulations to protect general aviation airports from adjacent incompatible land use activities?

The law requires every county, city and town to adopt comprehensive plan policies and development regulations that will discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports that are operated for the benefit of the general public, whether publicly owned or privately owned public use airports. The law applies to each public-use airport within a jurisdiction operating under chapter 35.63, 35A.63, 36.70 or 36.70A RCW, or under a charter.

The law does not apply to on-airport properties. The program only applies to lands adjacent to the airport.

Are local jurisdiction required to designate public use airports as Essential Public Facilities (EPF)

RCW 36.70A.200 imposes a duty on counties, cities, and towns not to preclude EPF’s. Jurisdictions are required to develop a siting process for locating EPF’s and can not prohibit the siting, expansion, or continuation of EPF’s within their comprehensive plan.

Airports identified as EPF’s include aircraft, airport operations, safety, and aircraft noise, aviation dependent uses, airport related uses and associated/incidental support airport operations/activities.

What uses or activities are considered incompatible when located adjacent to an airport?

Depending on airport characteristics, location and amount of key open space adjacent to a general aviation airport, incompatible land uses may include public assembly/large concentrations of people (number of person attracted by a use), residential density, intensity of nonresidential development, structure height, hazardous/explosive material, wildlife hazards, light/glare, air quality and electronic signals.

Are jurisdictions required to adopt comprehensive plan policies and development regulations if the airport is not located within their jurisdictional boundaries?

State law requires every jurisdiction to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to a general aviation airport. Incompatible land use activities can affect areas up to 5,000 feet from an airports with a runway length of less than 6,000 feet and up to 10,000 feet for airports with runway lengths greater than 6,000 feet. Height obstructions to navigable airspace can affect properties two or more miles from an airport. The distance from an airport is dependent on the size of the airport.

What is the role of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)?

The FAA is responsible for the administration of aircraft, aircraft operations, safety and noise.
Federal law preempts local regulations in the area of aircraft safety, navigable airspace, flight operations and noise control, which are defined as: Airport operations, safety and noise are defined as follows:

- **Airport operations** relates to issues in the air and on the ground, including takeoff, flight patterns, air traffic corridors, volume of air traffic, altitudes of air traffic, flight schedules, types, sizes, and purpose of aircraft and related issues.
- **Safety** relates to issues in the air and on the ground, including the placement of runways, taxiways, air navigation facilities, airport design, runway protection areas, and related issues.
- **Noise** relates to abatement of aircraft noise and emissions, in the air, during takeoffs and landings, and on the ground, including regulations on aircraft design and size, types of aircraft permitted at a particular airports, curfews on flight operations and other related issues. "Nor can zoning interfere with the rights of airport sponsors authorized by state law".

The preemption doctrine does not affect the local government's ability to use its police powers, particularly land use controls, to anticipate, abate, mitigate and otherwise respond to other land use concerns provided they are reasonable permitting and mitigation requirements, which includes incompatible uses on and off the airport.

**Will new regulations affect existing development?**

No, existing land uses and activities are not affected.

**How do I know if an airport is a privately owned public use airport?**

There are several sources where this information can be retrieved. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), WSDOT Aviation Division's WSASP Airport System Database, and from the 5010 database.

**Where should goals and policies be incorporated into planning documents?**

Several different strategies for achieving full general plan consistency are available to counties, cities and towns. These include:

- Incorporating policies within the Land Use, Transportation, Economic Development and other applicable chapters within the comprehensive plan elements;
- Adopting a general airport element;
- Adopting and/or incorporating as a reference the Airport Master Plan and/or Airport Layout Plan (ALP).
- Adopting an airport zoning district, industrial district that permits airports, airport operations, airport overlay zoning district, and/or a combination of zoning districts or criteria within local zoning development regulations of the jurisdictions.
- Coordinate and adopt consistent policy and implementation language of adjacent jurisdictions within the airport influence area.

**What constitutes consistency within the airport influence area between adjacent jurisdictions?**

Consistency does not require being identical. It means that concepts, standards, physical characteristics, and resulting consequences of a proposed action must not conflict with the intent of the law or the plan/implementing regulations that the plan comparison is being made.

**When should we notify WSDOT Aviation Division of proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and/or development regulations?**

http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/aviation/Planning/LandUseCompProg.htm 8/25/2006
As soon as possible. Plans and regulations may only be adopted or amended after formal consultation with airport owners and managers, private airport operators, general aviation pilots, ports, and WSDOT Aviation. Formal consultation should occur early in the process during the land use inventory, background analysis and policy development stages in order to ensure that residential density, intensity and use criteria are internally consistent and comprehensively addressed with other plan elements. Additionally, jurisdiction planning under GMA are also required to submit their plans to WSDOT Aviation during the required 60-day review process as set forth in 36.70A.106.

How should compatibility policies and regulations for a particular airport be determined?

Compatibility policies and regulations will vary from airport to airport and community to community. Nevertheless, common objectives and strategies can be employed to reduce adverse consequences to human life, health, and property within potential high-risk areas adjacent to an airport and to protect airports as essential public facilities. All uses and activities allowed, reduced in size, density, or intensity should be assessed by the local jurisdiction using "Best Available Data and Management Practices".

What technical assistance is provided by WSDOT Aviation?

The Department has many resources available and is on hand to meet with the public, community organization, city and county jurisdictions, and state/federal agencies upon request. Technical resources can be found here at our Web site. Some of these resources include:

- Economic Impacts of Washington Airports: Latest Findings -- Airports Create Job and Money
- WSASP Airport Data Conditions Assessment Database: Information on the airport that includes owner and manager, length of runway, approach plate, obstructions etc
- WSDOT Aviation Division - Airport and Compatible Land Use Guidelines (pdf 760 kb)
- California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, 2002
- Overview of FAR Part 77 "Imaginary Surfaces" -- Video
- Washington State Aviation Policy
- Height Hazard Model, Model Land Use Compatibility Regulations and other WSDOT resources
- Other documents and reference sources are also available at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Web site and here at the Aviation Web site as well.

When are jurisdictions required to update or revise their comprehensive plans and regulations to address the siting of incompatible land uses adjacent to general aviation airports?

GMA jurisdictions may amend and/or adopt comprehensive plan or development regulations during the normal course of land use proceedings. However all counties, cities, or towns whether planning under the Growth Management Act or not are required to review and update their comprehensive plans every seven years to ensure compliance with new or amended provisions of the Growth Management Act. The first updates are required to be completed by the following dates:

December 1, 2004 – Clallam, Clark, Jefferson, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Thurston, and Whatcom counties.

December 1, 2005 – Cowlitz, Island, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit and Skamania counties.

http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/aviation/Planning/LandUseCompProg.htm
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December 1, 2006 – Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Spokane, and Yakima counties

December 1, 2007 – Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties

(Jurisdictions may complete the review prior to the above dates)

GMA and Non-GMA jurisdictions are required to update their plans during the normal course of land-use proceedings. Land use compatibility should be reviewed when a jurisdiction is amending their comprehensive plan or development regulations when properties adjacent to an airport will be affected.

What happens if a jurisdiction does not meet its initial statutory deadline?

If a jurisdiction's initial review and update is not completed by the deadline specified in RCW 36.70A.130(4), it would be listed in the OCD database as not in compliance with the GMA Update requirement and would be vulnerable to a “failure to act” determination by the growth management hearings board. It would also be subject to the provisions of RCW 43.155.070(2) and not eligible to apply for funding from the Public Works Trust Fund, and subject to RCW 70.146.070(2) and not eligible to receive funding from the Centennial Clean Water Fund. Other state funding agencies also would consider its non-compliance status in making decisions on whether to provide funding to that jurisdiction.

It should be pointed out that “failure to act” appeals to the growth management hearings boards are open-ended; they may come at any time following the statutory deadline. However, if the jurisdiction's legislative body takes action prior to the deadline to review and update its plan and development regulations, that action is presumed valid and any challenge to that action must come within 60 days after the action has been taken (RCW 36.70A.290).
RCW 14.12.010
Definitions.

As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

(1) "Airports" means any area of land or water designed and set aside for the landing and taking-off of aircraft and utilized or to be utilized in the interest of the public for such purposes.

(2) "Airport hazard" means any structure or tree or use of land which obstructs the airspace required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking-off at an airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking-off of aircraft.

(3) "Airport hazard area" means any area of land or water upon which an airport hazard might be established if not prevented as provided in this chapter.

(4) "Political subdivision" means any county, city, town, port district or other municipal or quasi municipal corporation authorized by law to acquire, own or operate an airport.

(5) "Person" means any individual, firm, copartnership, corporation, company, association, joint stock association or body politic, including the state and its political subdivisions, and includes any trustee, receiver, assignee, or other similar representative thereof.

(6) "Structure" means any object constructed or installed by man, including, but without limitation, buildings, towers, smokestacks, and overhead transmission lines.

(7) "Tree" means any object of natural growth.

[1945 c 174 § 1; Rem. Supp. 1945 § 2722-15.]
RCW 14.12.020
Airport hazards contrary to public interest.

It is hereby found that an airport hazard endangers the lives and property of users of the airport and of occupants of land in its vicinity, and also, if of the obstruction type, in effect reduces the size of the area available for the landing, taking-off and maneuvering of aircraft thus tending to destroy or impair the utility of the airport and the public investment therein. Accordingly, it is hereby declared: (1) That the creation or establishment of an airport hazard is a public nuisance and an injury to the community served by the airport in question; (2) that it is therefore necessary in the interest of the public health, public safety, and general welfare that the creation or establishment of airport hazards be prevented; and (3) that this should be accomplished, to the extent legally possible, by exercise of the police power, without compensation. It is further declared that both the prevention of the creation or establishment of airport hazards and the elimination, removal, alteration, mitigation, or marking and lighting of existing airport hazards are public purposes for which political subdivisions may raise and expend public funds and acquire land or property interests therein.

[1945 c 174 § 2; Rem. Supp. 1945 § 2722-16.]
RCW 14.12.030
Power to adopt airport zoning regulations.

(1) In order to prevent the creation or establishment of airport hazards, every political subdivision having an airport hazard area within its territorial limits may adopt, administer, and enforce, under the police power and in the manner and upon the conditions hereinafter prescribed, airport zoning regulations for such airport hazard area, which regulations may divide such area into zones, and, within such zones, specify the land uses permitted and regulate and restrict the height to which structures and trees may be erected or allowed to grow.

(2) Where an airport is owned or controlled by a political subdivision and any airport hazard area appertaining to such airport is located outside the territorial limits of said political subdivision, the political subdivision owning or controlling the airport and the political subdivision within which the airport hazard area is located may, by ordinance or resolution duly adopted, create a joint airport zoning board, which board shall have the same power to adopt, administer and enforce airport zoning regulations applicable to the airport hazard area in question as that vested by subsection (1) in the political subdivision within which such area is located. Each such joint board shall have as members two representatives appointed by each political subdivision participating in its creation and in addition a chairman elected by a majority of the members so appointed.

RCW 14.12.050
Relation to comprehensive zoning regulations.

(1) Incorporation. In the event that a political subdivision has adopted, or hereafter adopts, a comprehensive zoning ordinance regulating, among other things, the height of buildings, any airport zoning regulations applicable to the same area or portion thereof, may be incorporated in and made a part of such comprehensive zoning regulations, and be administered and enforced in connection therewith.

(2) Conflict. In the event of conflict between any airport zoning regulations adopted under this chapter and any other regulations applicable to the same area, whether the conflict be with respect to the height of structures or trees, the use of land, or any other matter, and whether such other regulations were adopted by the political subdivision which adopted the airport zoning regulations or by some other political subdivision, the more stringent limitation or requirement shall govern and prevail.

RCW 14.12.070

Procedure for adoption of zoning regulations.

(1) Notice and hearing. No airport zoning regulations shall be adopted, amended, or changed under this chapter except by action of the legislative body of the political subdivision in question, or the joint board provided for in RCW 14.12.030 (2), after a public hearing in relation thereto, at which parties in interest and citizens shall have an opportunity to be heard. At least fifteen days’ notice of the hearing shall be published in an official paper, or a paper of general circulation, in the political subdivision or subdivisions in which is located the airport hazard area to be zoned.

(2) Airport zoning commission. Prior to the initial zoning of any airport hazard area under this chapter, the political subdivision or joint airport zoning board which is to adopt the regulations shall appoint a commission, to be known as the airport zoning commission, to recommend the boundaries of the various zones to be established and the regulations to be adopted therefor. Such commission shall make a preliminary report and hold public hearings thereon before submitting its final report, and the legislative body of the political subdivision or the joint airport zoning board shall not hold its public hearings or take other action until it has received the final report of such commission. Where a city plan commission or comprehensive zoning commission already exists, it may be appointed as the airport zoning commission.


Notes:

Public meetings: Chapter 42.30 RCW.
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RCW 14.12.090
Airport zoning requirements.

(1) Reasonableness. All airport zoning regulations adopted under this chapter shall be reasonable and none shall impose any requirement or restriction which is not reasonably necessary to effectuate the purposes of this chapter. In determining what regulations it may adopt, each political subdivision and joint airport zoning board shall consider, among other things, the character of the flying operations expected to be conducted at the airport, the nature of the terrain within the airport hazard area, the character of the neighborhood, and the uses to which the property to be zoned is put and adaptable.

(2) Nonconforming uses. No airport zoning regulations adopted under this chapter shall require the removal, lowering, or other change or alteration of any structure or tree not conforming to the regulations when adopted or amended, or otherwise interfere with the continuance of any nonconforming use, except as provided in RCW 14.12.110(3).

RCW 14.12.180
Administration of airport zoning regulations.

All airport zoning regulations adopted under this chapter shall provide for the administration and enforcement of such regulations by an administrative agency which may be an agency created by such regulations or any official, board, or other existing agency of the political subdivision adopting the regulations or of one of the political subdivisions which participated in the creation of the joint airport zoning board adopting the regulations, if satisfactory to that political subdivision, but in no case shall such administrative agency be or include any member of the board of adjustment. The duties of any administrative agency designated pursuant to this chapter shall include that of hearing and deciding all permits under RCW 14.12.110(1), but such agency shall not have or exercise any of the powers herein delegated to the board of adjustment.

[1945 c 174 § 9; Rem. Supp. 1945 § 2722-23.]
RCW 14.12.140
Board of adjustment.

(1) All airport zoning regulations adopted under this chapter shall provide for a board of adjustment to have and exercise the following powers:

(a) To hear and decide appeals from any order, requirement, decision, or determination made by the administrative agency in the enforcement of the airport zoning regulations, as provided in RCW 14.12.190.

(b) To hear and decide any special exceptions to the terms of the airport zoning regulations upon which such board may be required to pass under such regulations.

(c) To hear and decide specific variances under RCW 14.12.110(2).

(2) Where a zoning board of appeals or adjustment already exists, it may be appointed as the board of adjustment. Otherwise, the board of adjustment shall consist of five members, each to be appointed for a term of three years by the authority adopting the regulations and to be removable by the appointing authority for cause, upon written charges and after public hearing.

(3) The concurring vote of a majority of the members of the board of adjustment shall be sufficient to reverse any order, requirement, decision, or determination of the administrative agency, or to decide in favor of the applicant on any matter upon which it is required to pass under the airport zoning regulations, or to effect any variation in such regulations.

(4) The board shall adopt rules in accordance with the provisions of the ordinance or resolution by which it was created. Meetings of the board shall be held at the call of the chairman and at such other times as the board may determine. The chairman, or in his absence the acting chairman, may administer oaths and compel the attendance of witnesses. All hearings of the board shall be public. The board shall keep minutes of its proceedings, showing the vote of each member upon each question, or, if absent or failing to vote, indicating such fact, and shall keep records of its examinations and other official actions, all of which shall immediately be filed in the office of the board and shall be a public record.

RCW 14.12.190

Appeals.

(1) Any person aggrieved, or taxpayer affected, by any decision of an administrative agency made in its administration of airport zoning regulations adopted under this chapter, or any governing body of a political subdivision, or any joint airport zoning board, which is of the opinion that a decision or [of] such an administrative agency is an improper application of airport zoning regulations of concern to such governing body or board, may appeal to the board of adjustment authorized to hear and decide appeals from the decisions of such administrative agency.

(2) All appeals taken under this section must be taken within a reasonable time, as provided by the rules of the board, by filing with the agency from which the appeal is taken and with the board, a notice of appeal specifying the grounds thereof. The agency from which the appeal is taken shall forthwith transmit to the board all the papers constituting the record upon which the action appealed from was taken.

(3) An appeal shall stay all proceedings in furtherance of the action appealed from, unless the agency from which the appeal is taken certifies to the board, after the notice of appeal has been filed with it, that by reason of the facts stated in the certificate a stay would, in its opinion, cause imminent peril to life or property. In such cases proceedings shall not be stayed otherwise than by order of the board or notice to the agency from which the appeal is taken and on due cause shown.

(4) The board shall fix a reasonable time for the hearing of appeals, give public notice and due notice to the parties in interest, and decide the same within a reasonable time. Upon the hearing any party may appear in person or by agent or by attorney.

(5) The board may, in conformity with the provisions of this chapter, reverse or affirm wholly or partly, or modify, the order, requirement, decision, or determination appealed from and may make such order, requirement, decision, or determination as ought to be made, and to that end shall have all the powers of the administrative agency from which the appeal is taken.

[1945 c 174 § 8; Rem. Supp. 1945 § 2722-22.]
RCW 14.12.200

Judicial review.

(1) Any person aggrieved, or taxpayer affected, by any decision of the board of adjustment, or any governing body of a political subdivision or any joint airport zoning board which is of the opinion that a decision of a board of adjustment is illegal, may present to the superior court of the county in which the airport is located a verified petition setting forth that the decision is illegal, in whole or in part, and specifying the grounds of the illegality. Such petition shall be presented to the court within thirty days after the decision is filed in the office of the board.

(2) Upon presentation of such petition the court may allow a writ of review directed to the board of adjustment to review such decision of the board. The allowance of the writ shall not stay proceedings upon the decision appealed from, but the court may, on application, on notice to the board and on due cause shown, grant a supersedeas.

(3) The board of adjustment shall not be required to return the original papers acted upon by it, but it shall be sufficient to return certified or sworn copies thereof or of such portions thereof as may be called for by the writ. The return shall concisely set forth such other facts as may be pertinent and material to show the grounds of the decision appealed from and shall be verified.

(4) The court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside the decision brought up for review, in whole or in part, and if need be, to order further proceedings by the board of adjustment. The findings of fact by the board, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be accepted by the court as conclusive, and no objection to a decision of the board shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the board, or, if it was not so urged, unless there were reasonable grounds for failure to do so.

(5) Costs shall not be allowed against the board of adjustment unless it appears to the court that it acted with gross negligence, in bad faith, or with malice, in making the decision appealed from.

(6) In any case in which airport zoning regulations adopted under this chapter, although generally reasonable, are held by a court to interfere with the use or enjoyment of a particular structure or parcel of land to such extent, or to be so onerous in their application to such a structure or parcel of land, as to constitute a taking or deprivation of that property in violation of the Constitution of this state or the Constitution of the United States, such holding shall not affect the application of such regulations to other structures and parcels of land.

[1945 c 174 § 11; Rem. Supp. 1945 § 2722-25.]
RCW 14.12.210
Enforcement and remedies.

Each violation of this chapter or of any regulations, orders, or rulings promulgated or made pursuant to this chapter, shall constitute a misdemeanor, and each day a violation continues to exist shall constitute a separate offense. In addition, the political subdivision or agency adopting zoning regulations under this chapter may institute in any court of competent jurisdiction, an action to prevent, restrain, correct or abate any violation of this chapter, or of airport zoning regulations adopted under this chapter, or of any order or ruling made in connection with their administration or enforcement, and the court shall adjudge to the plaintiff such relief, by way of injunction (which may be mandatory) or otherwise, as may be proper under all the facts and circumstances of the case, in order fully to effectuate the purposes of this chapter and of the regulations adopted and orders and rulings made pursuant thereto.

[1945 c 174 § 12; Rem. Supp. 1945 § 2722-26.]
RCW 14.12.220
Acquisition of air rights.

In any case in which: (1) It is desired to remove, lower, or otherwise terminate a nonconforming structure or use; or (2) the approach protection necessary cannot, because of constitutional limitations, be provided by airport zoning regulations under this chapter; or (3) it appears advisable that the necessary approach protection be provided by acquisition of property rights rather than by airport zoning regulations, the political subdivision within which the property or nonconforming use is located or the political subdivision owning the airport or served by it may acquire, by purchase, grant, or condemnation in the manner provided by the law under which political subdivisions are authorized to acquire real property for public purposes, such air right, avigation casement [easement], or other estate or interest in the property or nonconforming structure or use in question as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this chapter.

[1945 c 174 § 13; Rem. Supp. 1945 § 2722-27.]
As a retired electrical utility contractor with years of experience dealing with impact fees, I have thoughts that should be considered when placing items in the comprehensive plan regarding developments.

When the new road(s) from a development comes into conjunction with an existing arterial road, there will be a substantial increase in traffic requirements should include;

1. Lighting on a minimum of two corners
2. A blinking amber signal to the existing arterial with a red blinking light at the new road
3. Ingress, egress wide enough to enter with a long truck, school bus, or fire fighting apparatus
4. Turnarounds inside developments to accommodate these vehicles
5. Curbs & catch basins adequate for 100 yr. flood
6. Fire hydrants with 8' fire mains & adequate water

Following sketch typifies this problem using the prospective Champlain rezone in Thorp with the future prospect of 30+ homes.
Proposal of Public Fire Safety Items for Comp Plan Update:

The lands of Kittitas County have been analyzed by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources as they rate in wild fire severity. Kittitas County has in the past placed into ordinance a Fire Proof Roof restriction due to fire danger. The rest of the public safety protection has been determined by the WADNR and the FIREWISE proponents of added restrictions for building structures in these fire danger areas. Kittitas County has chose not to use the latest code for fire protection in theses rural areas. The International Wildland Interface Code takes all of the recognized latest knowledge and puts it into a form to be followed. Kittitas County must adopt this code before and further development is allowed or property classification changed.

Kittitas County must force developers to be part of a fire district before the property is subdivided. Without fire protection the chance of a fire moving into the wildland interface are great. When the developers have the first dream of a project they should be moving to having the property annexed in to the fire district and or signing fire protection agreements while the annexations are proceeding. No fire protection-no development!!!

When the developers are moving to annexation to fire districts those fire districts should have fire mitigation fees available to them paid by the developers to allow the development to fund the needed increase of equipment, apparatus and training or more personnel. Development must pay for the increases of services not the taxpayers who have funded and been paying for the fire districts funding. The fees can be per acre, per square foot, or home site. Fire mitigation fees are a more politically correct term than that of development fees. Again development shall pay for the increase of services.

Kittitas County has adopted the International Fire Code and in its appendices including the fire flow part. The problem is that in the zoning requirement there is no teeth were it is a requirement of any division of property. The developers are not made to include a fire flow system within their planning. By adopting the Wildland Interface Code and by placing the requirements for the teeth of the code and the needed fire flow at least we will allow the Fire Department a chance.

Without major changes in Kittitas County development requirement regarding public safety/fire protection within our county we will have a major wildland fire and only those who are our elected officials will be to blame for the head in the sand attitude they have taken for many years, maybe not this year but in the future and we will be a case to study on how to do development incorrectly.

In that need to protect the areas the Fire District must be allowed the time to review the development. Since most of the Fire Districts are all volunteer a fee should be part of each and every application that would be paid by the developer and the fire districts would determine the reviewer of said application. The developer pays for the development increase per fire district. At this time Kittitas County charges fees for subdivisions, fire districts should be given the same ability as to not impact the taxpayers
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of the fire district. Developers shall pay for the increase not taxpayers. Just as was done with the MPR project of the past.

Roads shall be a big part of the public services need on all new development. At this time Kittitas County has road standards but the zoning loopholes allow substandard, unacceptable, unprotectable, over developed areas without proper emergency vehicle access.

The main focus of the needed fire protection plan for the comp plan update shall be the:

> Apportion of Wildland Interface code in full.
> Requirement of all development to be protected by fire districts. Annexation and or contract for services for fire protection before any further division of the property is sold.
> Verbiage in the zoning code with the requirement in black and white. All of this done with input from fire professionals, not planning staff. They are not fire fighters and have no understanding of these needs, they can do lots of things but fire is a subject no one on staff is understanding of.
> Fire Mitigation fees per size of the development as a requirement.
> Fees to pay for the review of the application payable to the fire districts for professional review with the developers footing the bill allowing districts to regroup costs and making the developers pay for the costs.

Derald Gaidos
August 21, 2006

Mr. Darryl Piercy, Director
Kittitas County Community Development Services
411 North Ruby Street, Suite 2
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

RE: Proposed 2006 comprehensive plan amendments and update

Dear Mr. Piercy:

Thank you for sending the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) the proposed amendments to Kittitas County's comprehensive plan and development regulations that we received on August 8, 2006. We recognize the significant amount of time and energy these proposals represent.

When cities and counties work with citizens to discuss their priorities for the future, they must balance important considerations—using land wisely, providing the foundation for economic vitality, and protecting environmental and natural resources. In crafting your comprehensive plan and development regulations to meet the unique needs of your community, you, along with other local governments planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA), have made important and long-lasting choices. These choices can sustain the quality of life that makes Washington a remarkable place to live and create the predictability needed for economic investment.

We have begun to review the many comprehensive plan amendments proposed as well as the comprehensive plan update materials. However, as the submittal was just recently received, and the hearings begin August 21, 2006, we respectfully request that this testimony for the public hearings be considered as preliminary comments. CTED intends to submit additional testimony prior to close of the 60-day review period, once the proposals have been reviewed in greater detail. Therefore, we request the Planning Commission, at a minimum, leave the public testimony portion of the hearings open until close of the 60-day review period.

Our comments will be separated in two parts. First, our comments will focus on the 2006 annual docket of comprehensive plan amendments, which consist of 19 proposals. Second, our comments will address the amendments to the comprehensive plan proposed as part of the update process.

**Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket Items:**
The annual docket comprehensive plan amendment items submitted to CTED for review and comment consisted of the 19 applications (as posted on the Kittitas County CDS website on August 8, 2006) and the staff report prepared by Ms. Joanna Valencia, Planner II, dated August 16, 2006, which we received on August 18, 2006.

**Natural Resource Lands De-designation**
We are concerned because several of the requests include the de-designation of forest and agricultural resource lands of long-term significance to a designation of rural. Together, the applications comprise over 7,400 acres
of designated resource lands in Kittitas County. We are concerned about the citizen-initiated proposals to de-designate commercial forest and agricultural lands to higher intensity land uses. We recognize that Kittitas County is experiencing some unique development pressures from people who live in other parts of the state who want to take advantage of the many outdoor recreational opportunities that Kittitas County can offer. Suncadia Resort and Central Washington State University are also big draws for people who are looking for alternatives to more urban lifestyles.

Resource lands and critical areas were designated first so that they could be protected and conserved. This is a fundamental application of the principle that “the land speaks first”.¹ We are concerned that adoption of this proposal could substantially interfere with the county’s duty under Goal 8 of the GMA to conserve forest resource lands of long-term commercial significance.

We recognize that market pressures have greatly inflated land prices and that, when combined with the lack of water rights, are enticing property owners of properties of resource lands of long-term significance to convert their resource lands into rural, single-family development. However, we would request you consider the following while reviewing these applications:

- The designation of natural resource lands (agriculture, forest, and mineral lands) was the first step Kittitas County took in developing its comprehensive plan. This step is key to determining where appropriate rural development can take place while still protecting important natural resource lands. These designations were made at the county-wide basis. We are concerned with removing natural resource land designations on a parcel-by-parcel basis. This approach is not comprehensive; it does not look at the cumulative effects of this decision, and it has the ability of affecting other resource land designations and the industries these lands support. We suggest a better approach to reviewing the natural resource land designations is to look at the entire county, as part of the update process.

- Both the Washington State Supreme Court and the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (EWGMHB) have considered the issue of de-designation of natural resource lands. Several key themes have emerged from these reviews. The Washington State Supreme Court finds evidence of a legislative mandate to conserve natural resource lands [King County v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, 142 Wn.2d 543, 562 (2000)]. The EWGMHB found a rigorous record justifying any de-designation as an essential component of the de-designation action [2-1-0008 – Wenatche Citizens Association v. Yakima County]. From the information submitted, and given the fact that many of these applications were not submitted until the end of May of this year, it does not appear that this sort of an analysis was conducted.

- When deliberating these comprehensive plan amendments and rezone requests, we suggest Kittitas County review the criteria originally used to categorize agricultural and forest lands and consider if conditions have changed to warrant approval of this amendment or if the earlier decision to designate these lands was made in error. In addition, you may want to consider the Minimum Guidelines to Classify Agriculture Forest, Mineral Lands and Critical Areas (WAC 365-190-050) to further assess whether these lands no longer qualify as natural resource lands. Finally, when making your decision, it will be crucial to develop a rigorous record detailing the reasoning behind your decision.

The record should, at a minimum, include items such as:

1) A review of how and why the properties involved were designated as agricultural or forest resource lands of long-term significance originally,

¹ Bremerton vs. Kitsap County, CPSGMHG Case no. 95-3-0039, Final Decision and Order.
2) An analysis of the applicable factors that have changed since the original classification,
3) The existing criteria for designation of resource lands,
4) A statement of whether or not the proposed properties do or do not meet the designation criteria today,
5) A specific recommendation and findings of fact to support the recommendation.

The subject properties were originally deemed to be resource lands of long-term commercial significance. The existing record does not show that a reassessment process has been conducted. Without evidence to support that changed circumstances or new information regarding the original designations, CTED cannot support the de-designation of resource lands of long-term commercial significance. We recommend the county not pursue redesignation of designated resource lands until it can conduct the analysis necessary to support its decision.

**Urban Growth Area (UGA) Expansions**

Several of the proposals involve expansions to the UGA for various communities in the county. We are concerned that the record does not contain any of the information necessary to support the expansion of the UGA. We did not see any discussion in the staff report or the individual applications of how much population is needed in these communities, how much additional residential or commercial capacity will be provided by these expansions or what the proposed development densities will be. These are usually part of a Land Capacity Analysis. Prior to expanding the UGA, the record must contain a land capacity analysis showing how much additional land is needed to accommodate the project population.

Once it has been determined that new land is needed, the county should use the location criteria found in RCW 36.70A.110 to determine which parcels are most suitable for new urban growth. We did not see in the staff report or in the individual applications any discussion of how these locations meet the location criteria for a UGA expansion. Prior to making determinations regarding expansion of an urban growth boundary, information should be provided demonstrating the proposals do or do not meet the criteria outlined in RCW 36.70A.110 for urban growth areas. The GMA also requires that the expansion of a UGA be accompanied by a financially realistic capital facilities plan. We did not see in the staff report or the individual applications we reviewed any discussions of what the demand for urban services will be and how adequate public facilities will be provided. Prior to an expansion of the UGA, the record must contain a plan for providing adequate public facilities.

**Urban Growth Node Expansions**

Over the years there have been questions regarding the Urban Growth Nodes (UGNs). It is my understanding the county developed them in their initial comprehensive planning efforts as a means to identify areas where clusters of development had located in more rural areas over the years, outside of existing cities or towns. Later, the Growth Management Act was amended to include criteria for Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development, known as LAMIRDs.

At this point, it is not entirely clear whether these urban growth nodes are more like unincorporated Urban Growth Areas or more like LAMIRDs. One of the issues the county will need to address in the update is whether these areas are UGAs or LAMIRDs. Before Urban Growth Nodes are considered for expansion, CTED recommends the county identify which category they fall into so it is more clear which designation standards will apply. CTED believes it is premature to expand the Ronald UGN without benefit of an analysis to demonstrate need, appropriate zoning designation, and ability to provide adequate facilities and services.

**Mapping of Proposed Amendments**

Each of the applications appear to be under consideration separately, at least for the purpose of providing locational maps of the subject properties. The maps we saw were maps showing each individual application. For the purpose of taking public comment and reviewing the applications, it is critical that they are viewed in
context. CTED suggests that mapping be prepared that depicts the properties for similar proposals. For example, applications 06-05, 06-06, and 06-13 are adjacent to each other. The decision for the request to expand the Ellensburg UGA may affect the decision to de-designate agricultural resource lands and vice-versa. The same can be said for the three proposals to expand the City of Kittitas UGA or the three proposals to expand the Ronald UGN. Other applications are clustered near the Suncadia property between the Cities of Roslyn and Cle Elum. CTED also recommends that the county prepare tables totaling the acreage of the expansions and identifying how much additional development capacity is being proposed in total and for each UGA.

**Comprehensive Plan Update Process**
The information submitted for the comprehensive plan update recommendations is currently being reviewed. CTED applauds the efforts of the staff and citizens of Kittitas County to update the comprehensive plan and will provide comments under separate cover, prior to close of the 60-day comment period.

If you have any questions or concerns about our comments or any other growth management issues, please contact me at (360) 725-3045 or joycep@cted.wa.gov. We extend our continued support to Kittitas County in achieving the goals of growth management.

Sincerely,

Joyce Phillips, AICP
Senior Planner
Growth Management Services

JP:lw

cc: Joanna Valencia, Staff Planner
The Honorable Robert Cousart, Mayor, City of Kittitas
The Honorable Charles Glondo, Mayor, City of Cle Elum
The Honorable Jeri Francisco-Porter, Mayor, City of Roslyn
The Honorable James Devere, Mayor, Town of South Cle Elum
Chris Parsons, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Leonard Bauer, AICP, Managing Director, Growth Management Services, CTED
David Andersen, AICP, Plan Review and Technical Assistance Manager, Growth Management Services, CTED