City of Cle Elum
UGA Expansion
90 Acres Light Industrial
Central Cascade Land Company
Matt Worsham - City of Cle Elum
Anne Watanabe - CCLL

Including in UGA Makes Sense
- Surrounding Land Uses
- Lack of Industrial Lands
- Retains Commercial Core Downtown
- Great Access
- Utilities, Capital Facilities
- Population Projections

PROPERTY LOCATION

Lack of Industrial Lands
Cle Elum City Limits and UGA

Submitted by:
Anne Watanabe
11/29/07
Lack of Industrial Lands - Cic Elum City Limits

FEMA Overlay

FEMA Overlay - 100 & 500 Year Floodplain

FEMA - Built Lands

Acreage Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Floodplain Acres</th>
<th>Built In Floodplain</th>
<th>Non-Floodplain Acres</th>
<th>Built Outside Floodplain</th>
<th>Available Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td>77-127%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cic Elum effort to create River Forest Park
Existing industrial lands incompatible with surrounding residential area
Ordsre one prohibiting new water hookups in floodplain

UGA - Limited Options

West
MFR
City of Kelowna
Services
Access

North
Access
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Limited services
UGA Study

South
I-90
Yale River
Floodplain
POPULATION PROJECTIONS

- OFM = 52,810 by 2025
- KCCOG = 19% to Cle Elum
- 10,034 by 2028
- Current population is 1800
- Increase of 9200 or 460 per year
- 2.38 persons per household = 176 new units per year
- NOT RESIDENTIAL BUT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>KCCOG FORMULA</th>
<th>2025 POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellensburg UGA</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLE ELUM UGA</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittitas UGA</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reelyn UGA</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc. Cle Elum UGA</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGN</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>9771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Need "Shovel Ready" Property

- Land base – 3.4 acres not enough
- Zoning
- Infrastructure
- Access
- Scaled for long term economic viability and employment

Matt Morton
City of Cle Elum

Questions?
Thank you!
November 29, 2007

Kittitas County Board of Commissioners

RE: Comprehensive Plan Amendment 2007-07

The Kittitas County Conservation Coalition (KCCC) supports the application proposed by the City of Cle Elum and Anne Watanabe as agent for the landowner for the expansion of the Cle Elum UGA and designation of lands to industrial.

The KCCC supports addition of useable industrial lands to the current minimal inventory of such lands in Kittitas County. We recognize the need to attract clean industry with family-wage jobs to the county to better balance our employment mix and provide needed revenues to local governments.

We endorse this proposed amendment with a couple of qualifying comments. First, the landowner be encouraged by the city to provide open space in any site plan accepted for development of the property and that the city plan for a buffer of the Coal Mine Trail where it is adjacent or near the property in question.

Finally, we encourage the cities of Cle Elum and Roslyn to work with the county on a plan to keep the cities visually separated from one another on State Route 903. Development of industrial lands and associated residential at a later date will put more pressure for more development on the interface of the two cities along State Route 903. Failure to do this will result in the appearance of a highway strip development and loss of the important distinction between the two cities. We have seen this elsewhere in the state and we believe we can avoid that happening here if we plan now.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of this amendment.

Sincerely,

Janice E. Sharar  
KCCC Spokesperson

C: City of Cle Elum  
Anne Watanabe

Submitted by:  
Jan Sharar  
11/29/07
On the issue of non-compliance raised in the CDS Staff Report to the Planning Commission on this proposal, RCW 36.70A.300(4) states:

...(4) Unless the board makes a determination of invalidity as provided in RCW 36.70A.302, a finding of noncompliance and an order of remand shall not affect the validity of comprehensive plans and development regulations during the period of remand.... (Italics and bold added)

As you know the Urban Growth Nodes of Kittitas County were found to be out of compliance with the GMA by the Eastern Washington Growth Hearing Board and the issue remanded back to the County. A finding of invalidity was not imposed on the UGNs; therefore the 2006 Comprehensive Plan is a valid document and directs the current policy concerning the Thorp UGN. These policies must applied to this proposal, not what may or may not occur in the future when the County comes into compliance with the FDO in February.

The 2006 Comp Plan states: “It is suggested that the UGN designation be dropped as under the Growth Management Act this designation does not exist and with the introduction of the LAMIRD designation might be better designated as such. Further, as the planning process develops to analyze the existing Urban Growth Node, the UGN designation shall remain until analysis is completed that indicates whether the designation should be an Urban Growth Area or LAMIRD.”

The UGN designation may not exist under GMA but at this time until legislative action is taken by the BOCC, the UGN designation does exist in the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan and is a valid land designation. This Proposal must be considered using the UGN policies in the 2006 Comp Plan.

Paula J Thompson DVM
GPO 2.91L The County should develop and adopt regulations for an airport industrial zone at the Kittitas County Airport.

GPO 2.91M All aviation related land uses should be considered acceptable in the area designated as "industrial" and provided that the FAA airport design criteria are met.

GPO 2.91N The County should promote economic development and employment opportunities for the Airport Industrial Zone.

GPO 2.91O The County should establish zoning standards which will insure that the industrial uses will not impact airborne aircraft because of height structures, smoke, glare, lights which shine upward, and radio transmissions, nor any water impoundments or sanitary landfills which would create hazards from waterfowl to airborne aircraft.

2.3  LAND USE PLAN

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

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

2.3(A) Urban Land Use

Urban Residential Land Use

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

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

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

GPO 2.92C Encourage and accommodate future expansion of utilities and roadways for urban densities.
Innovations in housing development should be encouraged, this includes but is not limited to cluster developments, master planned developments/resorts, shadow platting, fully contained communities, transfer of development rights and planned unit developments.

**Urban Growth Areas and Urban Growth Nodes**

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

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

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

*Joint interlocal agreements:*

1) Unified or consistent subdivision code;
2) Municipal utility extension agreement for water, sewer and gas;
3) Intergovernmental service agreements for libraries, fire, EMS, parks and recreation;
4) Unified or consistent zoning code with provisions for urban zoning, transitional zoning, and other transitional uses;
5) Density and land use mapping;
November 29, 2007

Kittitas County Board of Commissioners
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Re: Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Lee Boodle – 07-09

Gentlemen:

This is a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from Rural to Commercial and a rezone from Agricultural-3 to Limited Commercial. The property is located at 50 No. 245 Road, Roslyn, Washington 98941.

Exhibit B of the September 26, 2007 letter submitted to the Planning Commission included color photographs of the subject property. This letter will be submitted for the record if color photographs were not made available for your review.

Very truly yours,

John H.F. Ufkes

Enclosures
### KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

#### **** PUBLIC HEARING SIGN UP SHEET ****

Public Hearings are an opportunity for citizens to give their views to the Board of County Commissioners for consideration in their decision making process. If you wish to speak, please PRINT YOUR NAME CLEARLY below.

When you are recognized:
1. STEP TO THE MICROPHONE and give your name and address.
2. Your comments will be limited to three minutes for each individual or five minutes if you are presenting the official position of a recognized organization.
3. If other speakers have made the same point, simply indicate your support or disagreement unless you have new information.

**MEETING:** 2007 COMP. PLAN AMENDMENTS  
**DATE:** NOVEMBER 29, 2007  
**TIME:** 6:00 P.M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS-</th>
<th>Who are you representing (self/other)?</th>
<th>Testifying (Yes/No)?</th>
<th>Pro/Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chad Bala</td>
<td>PO Box 1386 Cle Elum WA</td>
<td>Turn Design Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharae King</td>
<td>15920 Wallen Rd, WA</td>
<td>King Architects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Gorrey-Darda</td>
<td>US Forest Service</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Bull</td>
<td>1215 E Mt View Ave</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Watanabe</td>
<td>PO Box 637 Puyallup WA</td>
<td>LLC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Shaar</td>
<td>390 Cattail Rd</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Mann</td>
<td>119 N First St</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Thompson</td>
<td>551 Cedar Run</td>
<td>Madeleine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ufkes</td>
<td>200 E Third Elwha Leavena</td>
<td>Leavena</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>