

August 2015 Special Meeting Minutes

Special meeting of the GMVUAC held at the Maple Valley Fire Station was called to order by Chair Hiester at 7:00 PM on August 24, 2015.

Roll Call: Present: Neuner, Rimbos (and as proxy for Harvey and Long), Haynes, Iverson, Blacklock, and Sterling (and as proxy for Morris and Duckering). Absent: Mitchell, Mahoney.

Minutes of Last Meeting: None presented.

Agenda: No comments. Blacklock moved to accept. Seconded by Rimbos. Passed.

Public Comments:

1. Gwyn Vukich, Southeast King County CSA (Green Valley/Lake Holm Association). Expressed support for Committee work on Chapter 8 of the King County Comprehensive Plan update; especially noteworthy was support for GMVUAC Concerns and Recommendations on F-274 regarding stormwater facilities. Rimbos presented a brief explanation of issue.
2. Citizen reported on neighborhood noise issue on which she is working with County officials.

Rural Economic Strategy – Ivan Miller and John Taylor

Reported on progress and schedule for King County Comprehensive Plan update, including updates to subarea plans (to be done over a 7 year period consistent with CSA boundaries). Spoke about RES and goals to bring into annual production more than 400 acres of agricultural land and add more than 25 new farmers to King County. Reported on progress to better utilize agricultural land by cleaning more than 11,000 linear feet of drainage ditches annually. Haynes brought up issue that water drained from agricultural lands should be put to use for wildlife improvement rather than simply discharged into streams. Local Food Initiative was discussed as possible rural economic strategy to provide marketplace for agricultural commodities, in line with the original purpose of Pike Place Market. Taylor expressed hope that such programs will protect and enhance rural land use and keep the rural area, rural – rather than be overrun with residential development.

King County Comprehensive Plan Update

Rimbos reported on progress made by all GMVUAC Committees. Both Miller and Taylor expressed appreciation for all of the hard work put in to the KCCP update review, including all of the well thought recommendations that are being reviewed by staff. Docket items were briefly discussed, including facts that such were composed mainly of site specific line items (e.g., specific rezone requests; East Hill of Renton annexation; Duthie Hill; Snoqualmie Interchange). Rimbos inquired whether comments may be offered at this time regarding specific Docket items; answer was that yes, staff will consider and respond as may be appropriate; however, time is getting very short and it's getting to be crunch time for staff to prepare for the release of the Public Review Draft, now scheduled for November 4.

KCCP Chapter 4 Review

All Committee "Recommendations" (in Chapter 4 document highlighted in RED) were presented en masse "as is" for approval: Moved to approve by Iverson; Seconded by Haynes; Passed. Discussion was then had regarding approval to send to KC staff the "Concern" (highlighted in BLUE) set forth on Page 2 of Rimbos' August 23, 2015, email to Council members regarding buffer zones. Iverson moved to approve this Concern as a Recommendation to be made as part of the GMVUAC Chapter 4 review; Seconded by Rimbos; Passed. Discussion was then had regarding the "Question" (highlighted in PURPLE) set forth on Page 2 of Rimbos' August 23, 2015, email to Council members regarding critical area and mapping database maintenance and availability to public. Blacklock moved to present this Question to DPER for consideration; Seconded by Haynes; Passed. Iverson discussed E-408 and wanted to add property rights groups to list of stakeholders. Rather than have such a specific group added, discussion was had to add a more generic "community groups" to the list of consulted stakeholders. Motion to add "community groups" to list of stakeholders in Chapter 4, E-408, made by Haynes; Seconded by Blacklock; Passed. Iverson then presented amendment to add to end of Chapter 4, E-499A, the words "and assume liability" by King County relating to its placement of wood in streams to improve habitat. Moved to make this addition as a Recommendation by Iverson; Seconded by Blacklock; Passed (with Haynes voting No).

KCCP Chapter 3, Part II(A), R-201 Amendment

Sterling Moved to approve the amendatory language to Chapter 3, Part II(A), R-201, as set forth on Page 3 of Rimbos' August 23, 2015, email (highlighted in RED); Seconded by Blacklock; Passed. The approved amendatory language reads as follows:

“Therefore, King County’s land use regulations and development standards shall be designed, intended and applied to appropriately protect and enhance family farms, forestry, fisheries, mining, home occupations, and cottage industries suitable for the Rural Area; and in so doing, State water quality standards for both surface water and ground water, including environmentally sensitive areas ordinances, will be observed and reasonably enforced to protect and enhance the natural environment, wildlife, fisheries, and aquifers used for potable water. Furthermore, land use regulations and development standards will protect and enhance archaeological and cultural sites important to tribes, as well as historic resources, historical character and continuity important to neighborhood groups. Land use regulations and development standards will not be designed, intended or applied to deny residents of the Rural Area, or in any manner or way diminish, the attributes and enjoyment associated with a rural lifestyle.”

KCCP Chapter 4, Discussion re: Payment In Lieu Of Fees

General discussion with Miller and Taylor regarding KCCP Chapter 4, Part I(A) “Concern” and “Recommendation” regarding use of fees in lieu of project wetland mitigation. This appears to favor large developers over small property owners. Taylor explained that the use of such “in lieu of” fees provides funds termed Mitigation Reserve Dollars that were available on a general basin purpose for restoration and habitat protection and enhancement wetland and stream projects on, for example, the Cedar River (used mitigation fees from the 520 Bridge project). King County has hired a consulting firm to review economic development policies and direction of programs, with eye towards providing help to small landowner vs large developers. Both Miller and Taylor expressed interest in ensuring the rural area stays rural and that the County provide appropriate assistance to citizens and agriculture.

Final Note

In answer to a query whether GMVUAC’s Questions will be answered by staff, Miller said to send him a compilation of all KCCP review Questions, and staff will “try” to respond – based on availability of time and resources.

Chair Hiester adjourned the Special Meeting promptly at 9:30 PM.

Minutes by Sterling.