

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

Table of Contents

<u>Briefing / Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
January 17 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 1	3
Overview, Schedule, Process [Peter]	3
SVNE Subarea Plan [Mike B.].....	3
Chapter 11: Subarea Planning [Karen].....	4
Map Amendments [Tim].....	4
January 18, Council Chambers — LSLU Special Committee Meeting	6
Public Hearing on Draft EIS [Peter, Coordinator]	6
February 7 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 2	7
Chapter 1: Regional Planning [Ken].....	7
Growth Targets & UGA Appendix [Peter].....	8
February 8, Covington — LSLU Special Committee Meeting	9
Executive's Recommended Plan [Peter, Coordinator].....	9
Executive's Recommended Plan [Karen Meador, GV/LHA]	9
Executive's Recommended Plan [Mike Birdsall, Transportation Focal].....	10
Executive's Recommended Plan [Greg Wingard, GRC].....	11
Executive's Recommended Plan [Tim O'Brien, EPCA]	11
February 21 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 3	12
Chapter 5: Environment [Terry].....	12
March 7, Duvall — LSLU Special Committee Meeting	13
General Comments [Terry, Environmental Focal].....	13
Traffic Comments [Mike B., Transportation Focal].....	13
March 20 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 5	15
Chapter 3: Rural & Natural Resource Lands [Peter, Don for Greg, Karen, Michael T., Ken, Serena, Susan B-S, Susan H., Bernie, Tim, and Mike B.]	15
April 3 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 6	23
Chapter 7: Parks, Open Space, & Cultural Resources [Karen; Tim]	23
Chapter 8: Transportation; Transportation Appendix; & TNR Appendix [Susan, Peter, Mike B.].....	24
April 4, Vashon Island — LSLU Special Committee Meeting	26
Public Comment on Executive's Recommended Plan [Only individuals spoke].....	26
April 17 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 7	27
Chapter 9: Services, Facilities, & Utilities [Don; Janet].....	27
Chapter 10: Economic Development [Serena Glover—submitted in writing]	28
Chapter 12: Implementation, Amendments, & Eval [Greg Wingard—submitted in writing]	29
Development Regulations [Peter, Mike B., Tim]	29

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

Four-To-One32

May 15 — LSLU Committee Briefing33

 Briefing on the Striking Amendment [Peter, Don, Ken, Karen, Tim, Mike B., Janet]33

June 5 — LSLU Committee Briefing38

 Striker & Line Amendments [Peter, Mike B., Karen, Don, Jeff, Tim, Michael T., & Terry]38

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies
January 17 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 1

Overview, Schedule, Process [Peter]

Good morning. My name is Peter Rimbos. I am the Coordinator for a Joint Team of ten Rural Area organizations and three Rural Technical Consultants. We endeavor to review, consult, develop, and offer solutions on issues of interest to people who live in a wide expanse of King County’s unincorporated Rural Area. Each of our organizations considers its work on the KCCP one of its most important duties and responsibilities. Indeed, our Joint Team has been through multiple successive Major Updates with some of our member organization’s work on same going back nearly 20 years and others further back to the pre-Growth Management Act days, when there were no formal KCCPs.

For this Update we began engaging with KCCP Manager, Chris Jensen, in early 2022. We have reviewed materials and submitted detailed comments throughout the process. We have reviewed the Executive’s December 7 “*Recommended Plan*” and have drafted a set of detailed comments—150 pp and counting, which should be ready to submit to you by February 7. We plan to fully participate in all of your Briefings.

Given the importance of this 10-year Update and the complexity of its many Chapters, Appendices, Reports, etc., we strongly urge the Committee to *re-consider* its schedule as follows:

(1) Meet every week. Do not combine several major topics into one meeting. For example:

(a) The February 7 meeting includes: *Chapter 1: Regional Planning; Chapter 2: Urban; and Growth Targets & UGA Appendix*. To give such important topics justice, two separate meetings are warranted.

(b) The April 3 meeting includes: *Chapter 7: Parks, Open Space, & Cultural Resources; Chapter 8: Transportation; Transportation Appendix; and TNR Appendix*. This is even tighter. In fact, the three Transportation topics *alone* warrant two separate meetings.

(2) Move up “*Development Regulations*” from its May 1 meeting to a much earlier meeting and devote the entire meeting to this topic. KC Code is simply too important to the entire process and all of us.

Thank you.

SVNE Subarea Plan [Mike B.]

My name is Mike Birdsall. I am a member of the Joint Rural Area Team of ten organizations, and I serve as its Transportation Technical Consultant. I have decades of experience helping cities and counties to prepare transportation plans under the Growth Management Act. I am here to discuss the SVNE Subarea Plan on behalf of the Joint Team.

Other Joint Team members participated with county staff in developing the land use and environmental portions of the Subarea Plan. Those elements are well done, due in part to extensive engagement of members of the Public. Findings of the Subarea Plan strongly support and echo Joint Team concerns for protection of the Rural Area, Agricultural lands, and Forest lands with a priority on sustaining a healthy rural ecosystem and lifestyle, and no increase in urban lands, or urban-serving businesses.

That said, we are disappointed in Chapter 8 (Transportation) for its lack of useful information. Although transportation conditions in the SVNE Subarea are going from bad to worse, the Public Review Draft released

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

last June was just six pages of boilerplate with no substantive information. I objected to that last summer, but this current version remains unchanged. There is still no substantive identification of tangible transportation issues let alone discussion thereof. My comments submitted last summer gave extensive direction for the type of additional substantive information needed. I don't know why no changes were made to improve the current version. The current Vashon Subarea Plan has a much more detailed Transportation Chapter, while covering a smaller, less complex area. The comparison is striking.

My extensive comments last summer remain valid. They were submitted then as an independent observer, but the Joint Team is now in full agreement. Therefore, the Joint Team will be **re-submitting** those same comments in its detailed Written Comments. We hope to see substantial expansion of this chapter *before* it is adopted later this year.

Chapter 11: Subarea Planning [Karen]

My name is Karen Meador. I am a member of the Green Valley/Lake Holm Association, one of the many organizations that comprise the Joint Rural Area Team. We also are one of three organizations that fall under the Southeast King County Community Service Area (CSA). We are concerned that completion and approval of some of the CSA *Subarea Plans* are now pushed out as far as the middle of the next decade. A number of the Joint Team organizations serve under three CSAs—Bear Creek/Sammamish; Southeast King County; and Four Creeks/Tiger Mountain. Under the current schedule, they will not have their *Subarea Plans* approved until 2031, 2032, and 2036, respectively.

We respectfully recommend the DLS Permitting Division retain sufficient Planners to conduct subarea planning simultaneously for two CSAs, thus condensing the current schedule (we believe there only are two Planners and they may have other duties.) There are a number of cultural and heritage venues within each of the CSAs, as well as limited natural resource lands. The GV/LHA and Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, both within the SE King County CSA, are each home to a King County-designated Heritage Corridor, as well as a King County-designated Agricultural Production District. Such venues are found in a number of the King County CSA's. As a writer and historian, I have researched and written about a number of them, and believe condensing the Subarea Planning Schedule would assure many of us an opportunity to assist in preserving the rural character, heritage venues, scenic qualities, and other distinct features that make King County's CSAs unique legacies for future generations to appreciate and enjoy.

Map Amendments [Tim]

My name is Tim O'Brien. I am the Chair of the Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, one of the many organizations that comprise the Joint Rural Area Team. Personally, I have a background in heavy equipment and construction. We suggest adding the following **Map Amendment**: **[NOTE: HIGHLIGHTED ITEMS BELOW NEED NOT BE STATED IN ORAL TESTIMONY, ONLY IN OUR WRITTEN COMMENTS.]**

Map Amendment XX: Countywide – P-Suffix Zoning / Development Conditions

1. Remove P-Suffix zoning (EN-P01, FC-P02, SV-P37, SV-P037, SV-P11, SV-P12, SV-P13, SV-P15, SV-P17, SV-P18, SV-P19, SV-P20, SV-P21, SV-P25, SV-P26, SV-P28, TR-P09, TR-P21, TR-P22) for commercial, industrial or mining activities in the Rural Area of unincorporated King County, if the condition is not currently met and remains out of compliance for one year, then zoning reverts back to underlying/original (non-commercial) zoning. Further, if the ownership changes, the uses would revert to underlying zoning.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

2. Repeal P-Suffix Development Conditions EN-P01, ES-P04, FC-P02, GR-P04, GR-P03, GR-P02, GR-P01, SV-P37, SV-P037, SV-P11, SV-P12, SV-P13, SV-P15, SV-P17, SV-P18, SV-P19, SV-P20, SV-P21, SV-P25, SV-P26, SV-P28, TR-P09, TR-P21, TR-P22 from Zoning Atlas.

Effect:

- ***Most of these P-Suffix development conditions are many years out of date and not transparent to the Public. This would allow parcels that do not meet the commercial development conditions to revert back to underlying zoning for more clarity and transparency in zoning, provide more land for additional housing units, reduce impact of and cost to regulate commercial business in the Rural Area and restore Rural Character and help improve tourism and more sustainable economic development in the Rural Area.***

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

January 18, Council Chambers — LSLU Special Committee Meeting

Public Hearing on Draft EIS [Peter, Coordinator]

My name is Peter Rimbo. I am the Coordinator for the Joint Team which consists of *Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, Friends of Sammamish Valley, Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council, Green River Coalition, Green Valley/Lake Holm Association, Hollywood Hill Association, Soos Creek Area Response, Upper Bear Creek Unincorporated Area Council, and Vashon-Maury Island Community Council*. We also have three Rural Technical Consultants: Ken Konigsmark—Growth Management Focal; Mike Birdsall — Transportation Focal; and Terry Lavender— Environment/Open Space Focal.

With respect to the *Draft EIS*, we support much of what is described in the ***Extensive Change Alternative*** considered, such as: “*Require cities to pay impact fees and implement traffic demand management strategies for large developments that impact unincorporated areas;*” however, we do have several concerns:

- (1) Greater land conversions in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands and urban development in the Rural Area.
- (2) “... *greater urban development within unincorporated rural areas. Tourism, resort, and economic development-oriented buildings ... allowed to a greater degree in the Rural Area, on Natural Resource Lands, and within agricultural zones...*”
- (3) “*Allow additional clearing of trees and vegetation in unincorporated King County, without a permit, for habitable structures and utilities.*”
- (4) “*Make substantive updates to the 4:1 program requirements, such as allowing for: a reduced open space ratio...noncontiguous open space...nonresidential projects...and projects not likely to be timely annexed.*”
- (5) “*Modify and expand the TDR program, such as ... allowing urban open spaces that were previously acquired using conservation futures tax funding ... to become TDR sending sites, removing specific goals for reduction of development potential outside the Urban Area, ... and allowing for payment into the TDR bank when TDRs are not available.*”
- (6) “*Make substantive updates to the existing land use designations and zoning classifications ... such as ... incentivizing agritourism...*”
- (7) “*Expand SEPA exemptions to the maximum allowed by WAC 197-11-800.*”
- (8) Several suggested “*land use designation and zoning classification changes.*”

Thank you.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies
February 7 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 2

Chapter 1: Regional Planning [Ken]

My name is Ken Konigsmark, a rural Preston resident. I'm on the Joint Rural Area Team and have served on several County committees related to rural issues, conservation, growth management, and the critical areas ordinance.

My over 30 years experience in these issues reveals that despite good plans, good policies, well-intentioned Execs and Councilmembers, and well-designed County Guiding Principles, I and large numbers of rural residents remain frustrated because often your own codes, policies, and principles are poorly followed or ignored.

The words are great, we love and support them, but it's the actions or inaction that follow that truly matter. These words ring hollow unless King County truly upholds and enforces them.

For example, we fully support all six King County Guiding Principles listed in Chapter 1 REGIONAL PLANNING. However, we too often see the County making decisions directly affecting the Rural Area that seem to defy and *circumvent* at least *three* of those principles.

Preserving and Maintaining Open Space and Natural Resource Lands
Directing Development Toward Existing Communities
Achieving Environmental Sustainability

Examples of such actions (or *non-actions*) that defeat these principles and policies and infuriate rural residents include, but are *not* limited to:

- Cedar River Asphalt Facility (Determination of Non-Significance; *no* Environmental Impact Statement [EIS])
- Cedar Hills Regional Landfill (piecemeal expansion)
- Code Enforcement (poor to none): Violators routinely win and citizens who seek to uphold County codes and policies are forced to spend enormous sums trying to protect their own property, the rural area, and the environment, often AGAINST King County!
- Illegal Clearcutting
- Illegal Event Centers allowed to continue
- Illegal "Recycling" Centers that violate multiple codes
- Pacific Raceways (piecemeal expansion without an EIS)
- Permits routinely granted for development that violates zoning laws and the principles underlying them
- Wineries / Breweries / Distilleries allowed to continue in the RA

I could go on but will end by simply imploring you to not just approve these guiding principles and the entire Comprehensive Plan, but to then fight to uphold them when needed, to support the rural residents who truly wish for King County to uphold their own policies and enforce their own laws. Take a strong stand on OUR side!

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

Growth Targets & UGA Appendix [Peter]

My name is Peter Rimbo. I am the Coordinator for the Joint Team. I will speak on Growth Targets.

Unfortunately Growth Targets cannot be enforced to keep *irresponsible* cities, such as Black Diamond, from *grossly* overgrowing *directly* impacting County roads and rural residents and *vastly* underpaying for road maintenance based on their proportional usage.

The numbers in *Figure 5: King County Jurisdiction Growth Targets ...* were adopted in the 2021 CPPs and we offered detailed written comments at the time. Black Diamond, a designated “*City in the Rural Area*,” has been allocated a 2044 Housing Target of 2,900, which its *already approved* Master-Planned Developments will *grossly* exceed. It also has major non-MPD permit applications under consideration.

To make matters worse, Black Diamond has been allocated a 2044 Job Target of *only* 690—an *anomaly* compared to the *Housing/Job Target* ratios for every other city listed! Thus, the *vast majority* of its 20,000+ new residents will commute on County roads to their jobs in the major cities, as they avoid the increasingly congested SR-169. All other cities listed are handling their *Targets* in a professional and civil manner, leaving Black Diamond alone as an *irresponsible* city that is knowingly overloading County roads and imposing an unfair and inequitable financial burden on the Rural Area taxpayers.

While the *Urban Growth Capacity Report* finds sufficient capacity available for *total* UGA projected growth, it does *not* state any concern or remedy for those cities that *grossly exceed* their projected growth and what “*reasonable measures*” they should take to correct such inconsistencies and the resulting burdens placed on their neighbors. Consequently, such inconsistencies will not be addressed by these cities in their respective 2024 Comprehensive Plans. We call for the Growth Management Planning Council to have such cities regularly report on how they are handling such inconsistencies and resulting burdens.

The current Growth Target and Allocation system is badly flawed and, by ignoring those flaws, we perpetuate them *ad infinitum*.

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

February 8, Covington — LSLU Special Committee Meeting

Executive's Recommended Plan [Peter, Coordinator]

My name is Peter Rimbos. I am the Coordinator for the Joint Team of ten Rural Area organizations and three Rural Technical Consultants. Since the beginning of 2022 we have interacted with KCCP Manager, Chris Jensen, in the Executive's Office on the 2024 KCCP Major Update. We have been through Scoping, Public Review Draft, and now the Executive's "Recommended Plan."

We conducted an in-depth review resulting in our 161-pg submittal to you on Tuesday, February 6—a set off comprehensive Comments on each Chapter, Policy Amendment, Code Amendment, Appendix, Report, Study, etc.

Throughout this process the Update has improved. King County has many excellent Policies, strong Code, and a well-thought-out Vision and Guiding Principles. Thank you.

But, we do offer recommended changes to Policies and Code. In some cases, e.g., Mineral Resources, we offer several *new* Policies. Throughout we provide supporting rationale. Please review our Comments and contact us with any questions.

The full Council assigned review and Amendments of the Update to your Committee, because you have purview over II of King County's Unincorporated area, both Urban and Rural.

In fact, a key requirement for successful *implementation* of the KCCP is a strong and well-funded Department of Local Services (DLS). DLS's Mission must flow from the KCCP. DLS must have the direction and resources to ensure the permits it issues are consistent with King County Policy. The Conditions it places on those permits must be adequately enforced through periodic inspections. Enforcement of such Policies, Conditions, and Code is King County's mechanism for continuous Quality Control [*that is coming from a retired Boeing Principal Engineer*].

Some of the Joint Team's south King County Organizations will introduce themselves and offer some brief comments tonight.

Thank you.

Executive's Recommended Plan [Karen Meador, GV/LHA]

My name is Karen Meador. I am a member of the Green Valley/Lake Holm Association, one of the three organizations that comprise the SE King County Community Service Area (CSA). Our Association is also a member of the Joint Rural Area Team.

As home to one of only five King County-designated Agricultural Production Districts, we strongly encourage policies and efforts in support of our vital local farming community. The King County-designated Green Valley Road Heritage Corridor, one of only nine such roads in the County, is the central part of our Community Area, surrounded by farmland. We are also home to a number of heritage properties, which include Neely Mansion, a National Landmark, and an 1879 barn, one of the oldest buildings in King County.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

Given our unique setting, the citizens of our Community Area have a vested interest in a wide range of concerns, all of which are addressed in the Comments submitted by the Joint Rural Area Team on February 6. These concerns include protection of the Environment, Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands, as well as Parks, Open Space and Cultural Resources. While King County generally maintains sound policy regarding these matters, implementation and funding of such policies sometimes falls short of the goals advocated.

Permitting issues regarding injudicious development as well as road capacity and maintenance have been notable issues, as have impacts from adjoining cities. The adjacent City of Black Diamond has grown considerably in the past few years, causing ill-considered effects on surrounding communities, which include the surrounding Rural Area and local Agricultural Production District.

As a showcase of King County's history and agricultural development it is vitally important that we preserve the rural character, heritage venues, scenic qualities, and other distinct features that make SE King County's CSAs unique legacies for future generations to appreciate and enjoy.

Executive's Recommended Plan [Mike Birdsall, Transportation Focal]

Good evening. My name is Michael Birdsall. I am a retired transportation planning engineer with decades of experience in comprehensive planning. I am a resident of rural Hobart, and part of the Joint Team of Rural Organizations.

The Transportation chapter needs more work to show how the known needs can be met because current finances only cover 12% of the problem. Worse, many of the needs are driven by intercity through traffic, not the access needs of rural residents. So the ones who pay county road taxes are subsidizing the ones who pay nothing. You can fix that. The Team's written comments show how. In brief, we propose six things:

1. **Name the roads and bridges that will be shut down – and when – if funds aren't found.** And right away block through traffic on two or three minor arterials that are used too much by through traffic between cities, and disturbing the locals. We'll show you where.
2. **Ask the state to take over your existing Rural Regional Arterials,** since they function like state highways. Plus a similar arterial near Black Diamond.
3. **Give priority to rural residents ahead of intercity travel.** The current level of service policy for rural roads measures the speed of through traffic. Change that to instead measure the quality of access to/from side streets.
4. **Support active transportation with low-cost "Interim" improvements.** Shoulders are missing from most county roads, to the detriment of bicyclists and pedestrians. But County Road Standards only show ideal designs at high cost. Change county code to allow "interim projects" as well that provide good benefits at low cost.
5. **Increase intercity transit.** Keep more long car trips off the road by increasing transit service between outlying cities and the urban core.
6. **Take the lead creating uniform regional funding solutions.** Such as a traffic impact fee that accounts for trips across borders.

The details are in our written comments. Thank you for listening.

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

Executive's Recommended Plan [Greg Wingard, GRC]

NO WRITTEN NOTES. Greg introduced himself and stated he was the President of the Green River Coalition (GRC), which is a member of the Joint Team. He addressed Joint Team concerns about a proposal to add the Druid Glen site as a Map Amendment to the 2024 KCCP Major Update, by designating it a *Master Plan Resort*. This would get it around the zoning requirements, which otherwise wouldn't allow this type of intense urban development in the Rural Area. He focused on the GRC's serious concerns, but that it hadn't yet taken a position on the matter, pending discussion at its upcoming board meeting.

Executive's Recommended Plan [Tim O'Brien, EPCA]

NO WRITTEN NOTES. Tim spoke on the topic of Mineral Resources and several new Policies proposed by the Joint Team. He also mentioned the very large ~1,000-acre Mine proposed along the Green River Gorge by Segale. The proposed mine (actually five *separate* mines) would extract and process aggregates, as well as construct an asphalt plant and be developed in four phases within 35-year span.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies
February 21 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 3

Chapter 5: Environment [Terry]

My name is Terry Lavender. I am a member of the Joint Rural Area Team and serve as an Environmental Technical Consultant. I have been involved in Basin Planning, Land Conservation, and Comprehensive Plan reviews for many years. I am specifically commenting on Chapter 5 of the Executive Recommended 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan.

We are pleased to see the Climate Action Plan permeates every aspect of this chapter. Almost all Climate Actions are “*shall*” making the intent strong. The language throughout is updated to match current practices and the Climate Action Plan. New to the Climate Plan is *Climate Equity* and equity language is added throughout and strengthened with “*shall*.”

There are strong statements for a multi-species approach and biodiversity. It is stated that Biodiversity refers to species, habitats and their interactions across all landscapes. There is an emphasis on preserving and restoring ecosystem processes. All of this adds up to our best opportunity to really achieve these goals.

I applaud the focus on mapping, collaboration and monitoring.

At one of the first King County meetings I went to back in 1988, the public was there to ask about Beavers. I applaud the statement that King County supports coexistence of beaver and people, but I do wonder what implementation will look like.

There is much to love about the proposed Chapter 5. However, while we find strong policies in the Executive’s “*Recommended Plan*,” they depend on how they are implemented, if and how periodic monitoring is funded and staffed, and that enforcement happens when needed. Our experience has been that each of these are problems currently and historically. Structural changes and funding issues will need to be solved before the County can truly honor and accomplish the good policies herein.

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

March 7, Duvall — LSLU Special Committee Meeting

General Comments [Terry, Environmental Focal]

My name is Terry Lavender - a member of the Joint Rural Area Team. I have volunteered in King County Basin Planning, Land Conservation and Comprehensive Plan Policies for decades.

I arrived here tonight after turning off the County Road I live on to the Woodinville Duvall Road. Making the turn is becoming increasingly challenging due to growing streams of traffic in and out of Duvall, Monroe and Sultan and going to and from the cities. My local road has seen no maintenance for years resulting in simple, small problems become much larger needed repairs. It is no secret that Rural Road funding is broken. I ask you use your leadership and find a solution before we endure significant infrastructure failure and increasing arterial gridlock at both the local and regional levels.

We are seeing many applications for Conditional Use Permits for multiple large events in the rural and Agricultural areas. These will impact rural roads, Ag's ability to operate and resident's ability to simply get anywhere. Approve one and more will follow with huge impacts.

The Joint Team is reviewing the Executive Recommended Comprehensive Plan. I focus on the rural and environmental aspects and there is much to like. Climate action permeates the plan with equity language and shalls throughout. There are strong statements on multi-species and biodiversity that preserves and connects species and habitants across the landscape. There is a focus on mapping, collaboration and monitoring.

But, these are just nice words without dedication to action and implementation. It requires funding for staff and a commitment to translate policies into action across rural neighborhoods and the landscape. Enforcement is essential when needed. My experience is these are problems currently and historically. Just like roads, leadership is needed to correct structural issues in how Permitting and Enforcement operates, is funded and puts policies and code into action.

Traffic Comments [Mike B., Transportation Focal]

Good evening. My name is Michael Birdsall. I am a retired transportation engineer with decades of experience in comprehensive plans and growth management, and a resident of rural King County. I was born in Monroe, and my relatives still live on the family homestead in the shadow of High Rock a few miles north of here.

As a professional I know that problems on county roads arise not from the rural residents who live beside them, but rather from population growth in cities – Duvall to start with, but increasingly from Monroe, Sultan, Gold Bar, Index, and Skykomish.

As a 10 year old I actually rode my bicycle from Seattle to that farm near High Rock. It was safe back then because traffic was light on Woodinville Duvall Road, West Snoqualmie Valley Road to the High Bridge and then Tualco Valley Road into Monroe. Today that same route is filled with commuter traffic from Monroe and beyond. Those commuters should use state highways 522 and 203. But they are taking farm roads instead. Thus county roads are becoming de facto state highways.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

The Comprehensive Plan says preserving farmlands is a priority. But farmers can hardly get access to their own road many hours a day. This is a problem for you because the taxes that pay for county roads only come from rural county residents – your farmers. The city dwellers who use county roads pay zero taxes for the county roads they use. And foreseeable county road funds only cover 12% of the foreseeable needs.

King County needs to conserve its limited rural county road taxes to first serve rural residents. Hold the state and cities accountable for the unfunded commuter needs between cities. And greatly increase Metro Transit commuter service out to those cities. These are regional problems across county lines. Find regional solutions.

More details have been submitted to you in writing. Thank you for listening.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies
March 20 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 5

Chapter 3: Rural & Natural Resource Lands [Peter, Don for Greg, Karen, Michael T., Ken, Serena, Susan B-S, Susan H., Bernie, Tim, and Mike B.]

Rural Area [PETER RIMBOS]

My name is Peter Rimbo. I am the Coordinator for the Joint Team of ten Rural Area organizations and three Rural Technical Consultants. The Joint Team has provided you with extensive Detailed Comments on the entire Update.

The **GMA**, **VISION 2050**, **CPPs**, **KCCP**, and **KC Code**—all seek to protect the Rural Area from sprawl, the extension of urban infrastructure, and siting of urban-serving facilities:

GMA: (RCW 36.70A.11) defines rural lands; (36.70A.020) includes planning goals for rural lands; 36.70A.070 defines the Rural element for Comprehensive plans.

VISION 2050 Multi-County Planning Policies state: (RGS 13) “... avoid the conversion of rural land into commercial uses;” (RGS 14) “Manage and reduce rural growth rates over time ...;” (DP-37) “Ensure ... development ... is rural in character; (PS-5) “Do not provide urban services in rural areas.”

CPP Development Pattern planning policies state (DP-46) “... Growth levels should not create pressure for conversion of nearby Rural or Natural Resource lands;” (DP-47) “Limit growth in the Rural Area to prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services...;” (DP-52) “... limit new nonresidential uses located in the Rural Area to those ... demonstrated to serve the Rural Area.”

KCCP: Chapter 3 policies state: (R-201) “... maintain the character of (the) Rural Area. ... development patterns that are considered rural, historical or traditional and do not encourage urban growth or create pressure for urban facilities and service. ... Traditional rural land uses of a size and scale that blend with historic rural development; and Rural uses that do not include primarily urban-serving facilities;” (R-202) “The Rural Area geography ... shall include areas that are rural in character and that...have significant environmental constraints that make the area generally unsuitable for ... urban development;” (R-203) “The Rural Area geography is considered to be permanent ...;” (R-324) “Nonresidential uses in the Rural Area shall be limited to those that: ... Require location in a Rural Area.”

The introduction to Chapter 3 states: “...sections of this chapter satisfy the GMA's mandatory rural element by designating Rural Area lands to limit development and prevent sprawl, by permitting land uses that are supportive of and compatible with ... rural character.... These sections also satisfy the mandatory land use element by indicating the population densities that are appropriate for the Rural Area.” It also states: “...the County recognizes a profound difference between the nature and character of unincorporated rural King County as compared to the urban areas....”

In conclusion, at every level of planning Rural Areas are to be designated and protected from urban sprawl—essentially the bedrock purpose of the GMA!

Overall Recommendations [DON HULING for GREG WINGARD]

My name is Don Huling. I am a member of Soos Creek Area Response (SCAR), a part of the Joint Rural Area Team. We have two major recommendations for the Committee and the full Council to consider:

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

(1) Establish a Rural Area Advisory Commission/Committee

Like the Rural Forest Commission and the Agricultural Commission described in the section **Natural Resource Lands** starting on p. 3-42, the County should consider establishing a Rural Area Advisory Commission/Committee comprised of rural residents from across the County, so that any proposals, policy changes, or code updates that affect the Rural Area may first be discussed with members and feedback provided to County staff, Council, and the Executive, as necessary. Our ten Rural Area Organizations and multiple Rural Technical Consultants would offer very qualified and experienced people to serve on such a Rural Area Advisory Commission/Committee.

(2) Establish a Rural Landowner Incentive Program

There are *Forestry and Agricultural Incentive Programs* as described in Policies **R-206** and **R-209**, respectively, and Policy **R-609**. We seek a new Policy for a *Rural Landowner Incentive Program*, such as: “King County shall expand and improve existing programs and explore new programs to incentivize rural landowners to enhance their land by creating new or expanded forestlands, farmlands, or other uses that can benefit climate change goals, the environment, and wildlife.”

With such a program Rural Area landowners would be eligible to obtain property tax breaks for enhancing their land which do not fall under the *Current Use Taxation* program.

Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands [KAREN MEADOR]

My name is Karen Meador. I am a member of the Green Valley/Lake Holm Association, a part of the Joint Rural Area Team, and a King County Writer and Historian. While we applaud the enhancements made in policy **R-101**, especially the change to the word “*shall*,” we wonder if the “*Cities in the Rural Area*” change will necessitate King County to “collaborate with” the City of Black Diamond, a “*City in the Rural Area*,” that is on its way to quintupling in population. This will result in peak-hour congestion -- more likely, gridlock -- on every King County Road in and out of the city and no obligation whatsoever to mitigate that congestion or fund improvements on those roads.

We support the description of “*rural character*” in Chapter 3 and throughout the King County Comprehensive Plan. However, we have found throughout the decades that the County does not value this definition, nor follow its own Policies to protect and preserve “*rural character*” as well as it could and should. For a recent example, there is nothing in the entire issue surrounding the County Council’s Adult Beverage Ordinance (i.e., Wineries, Breweries, and Distilleries—WBDs) that honors “*rural character*,” or “*agricultural preservation*,” both of which contribute to a vibrant and resilient community, balancing economic, environmental and cultural values.

Rural Area Designation [MICHAEL TANKSLEY]

My name is Michael Tanksley. I am the president of the Hollywood hills Association, a part of the Joint Rural Area Team.

I would like to introduce some changes that we propose for the Home Occupation codes. As the word Home suggests, these codes are intended to allow people to have small businesses in their homes, where they live, in ways that are compatible with the surrounding community and resource land protections. There are many examples of how this works well in our neighborhoods.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

Putting the issue of enforcement aside, the problems we are increasingly running into fall into two general categories. One is with code liberalizations that were adopted about 15 years ago and the other is with how the existing language has been interpreted by Permitting.

Starting with the interpretation problem, existing code language reads: *“residents of a dwelling unit may conduct one or more home occupations as accessory activities.”*

That is to say...accessory to their residential use of the property.

While the intent of this language may seem self-evident, Permitting has interpreted this to say that as long as there is a dwelling unit on a piece of property, then a business can be sited there, regardless of whether the business owners lives there or not. This has led to a number of problems from non-resident business owners, specifics upon which we can expand later. But in this update, we would like to see the language clarified to reflect the intent that Home Occupation businesses are permitted activities only on properties that are the business owner’s primary residence.

Second, about 15 years ago, the codes for HOs were significantly liberalized at the behest of our previous councilmember. This included allowances for more on-site employees, more outdoor equipment storage and a number of other changes.

We argued against adoption of those changes, unsuccessfully, and now we witness the negative consequences. Thus, we are proposing tightening some of these provisions closer to what their original codes permitted, and so, to put the Home back into Home Occupations.

Rural Public Facilities and Services [KEN KONIGSMARK]

My name is Ken Konigsmark, I live in the rural area near Preston, and have been deeply involved in King County rural and land use issues and the Comp Plan for over 30 years and am part of the Joint Rural Team. Today I will comment on Rural Public Facilities and Services.

Our Joint Team written comments offered proposed changes for Policies **R-401** thru **R-403** to ensure that only facilities truly requiring a rural location are allowed in the RA. The Rural Area must not become the site for locating urban serving facilities simply because of convenience.

It is a fundamental truth that it violates the GMA to locate urban serving facilities on rural lands and doing so would defeat the many laudable goals and policies that King County has in place to protect rural and ag lands. It’s also true that the rural area lacks the road, water, and safety infrastructure to support such facilities.

Two current examples clearly illustrate the challenge: Remlinger Farms and Carnation Farms, which I’ll categorize as facilities for this example, both seek to host mega-concert events at levels of 6000 and 4000 attendees each, dozens of times per year, using the gaping loophole of the Temporary Use Permit process or in the case of Remlingers, supposed historic, ongoing use. These massive, urban serving events should never be allowed in the rural area. They will inundate substandard rural roads with hordes of traffic and impacts due to the lack of adequate road infrastructure, there is no sewage system in place to handle such crowds, public safety will be jeopardized, surrounding rural residents will be traumatized, and adjoining King County lands to each site, purchased to protect the ecosystem and salmon, will suffer damages.

We need you and the full Council to block these attempts to locate urban serving facilities and events in the Rural Area. The Comp Plan has many good policies documented but without you holding the line to stop these kinds of facilities and events the Comp Plan’s goals will fail.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

Event Centers [SERENA GLOVER]

I am Serena Glover, Executive Director, Friends of Sammamish Valley (FoSV). FoSV is also member of the Joint Rural Area Team.

I would like to propose a striker amendment to the Comp Plan update. **Event Centers** should be a defined use in Code. By Event Center I mean any **business where the primary top line revenue comes from hosting events on an ongoing basis, either year-round or clumped in good weather months**. By events I broadly mean large parties, corporate functions, weddings, and music venues.

To be clear, Code already allows homeowners and legitimate Rural businesses to conduct 2 events per year, without any additional permits. These should be allowed and should not fall under the definition of an Event Center.

Event Centers should not be allowed in the Rural Area (RA) and Agricultural (A) zones in the land use tables in Code. Event Centers are **urban-serving businesses**, whose success is dependent on drawing in large crowds of urban residents. They require an urban level of service infrastructure such as sewer hookup, parking lots, lighting, sidewalks, improved roads, and policing, that are not available in the RA and A zones.

Comp Plan policies such as **R-201** and **R-324** clearly state that it is a fundamental KC goal to maintain Rural Character, to not create pressure for urban services, and to enhance the natural environment. Furthermore, nonresidential uses shall be limited to those that provide convenient local products for nearby residents. **Event Centers fail to meet these policies and many more that KC is required to uphold.**

Today, because Event Centers are not defined in code, they can use the TUP process as a giant loophole to legitimize their operations. By defining Event Centers in code, they will no longer be able to use the TUP process.

Furthermore, the TUP code needs revision. There is nothing “*temporary*” about allowing 60 occurrences of any activity per year. 60 occurrences is an ongoing business. **TUPs should allow 5 occurrences per year**, which would satisfy the need for any activity not defined in code that is truly “*temporary*.”

The pressure to urbanize Rural lands is increasing, particularly for Event Center uses. The number of TUP requests for Event Centers has recently escalated and we expect this trend to continue based on county-wide, on-the-ground observations from knowledgeable Rural leaders and organizations. We urge County Council to deal with this issue in the current Comp Plan update process. If King County waits for the next Comp Plan update process it will be too late for preservation of Rural Area and Agriculture lands.

Agriculture [SUSAN BOUNDY SANDERS]

My name is Susan Boundy Sanders. I am a member of the Friends of Sammamish Valley. I was a member on the Woodinville City Council.

We support the following Executive’s-proposed changes (Policies **R-656a** and **R-656b**). However, we urge that the *exception* for removal of land from one APD and replacement in another APD should *only* be exercised by a governmental entity for purposes of public/resource benefit or for essential utility needs and should not be used by private entities (individuals or non-utility businesses) for any purposes that would enable increased development on APD lands. This stipulation is particularly important to protect the APDs under the most risk of urbanization such as Lower Green Valley, Sammamish Valley, etc.

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

Rural Densities [SUSAN HARVEY]

My name is Susan Harvey. I serve on the Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council, a member of the Joint Team.

Regarding Rural Growth, we fully support the Policy **R-301** *"to limit growth in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands, such as land use designations, development regulations, level of service standards and incentives,"* but cannot emphasize enough that one of the most important tools King County has at its disposal is adequate enforcement of its Policies and Codes, which it simply does not do.

We have concerns with the Policy **R-309** regarding the RA-2.5 zone and call for the following addition: *"... These smaller lots may still be developed individually or combined, provided they satisfy the minimum lot dimensions provided in King County Code, or combined to satisfy those requirements, and provided that applicable standards for ... can be met."*

Regarding Nonresidential Uses, while we agree with the spirit of Policy **R-324**, we have big concerns with subparagraph **e.** and *what criteria* are used to determine whether *"recreational or tourism opportunities"* are *"compatible with the surrounding Rural Area."* Such criteria need to be laid out either in Policy or Code along with details on who it is that determines if any activity or proposal is compatible. The Rural Area is *not* intended to be a playground for urban residents, it is in fact the *"rural residential area."* There already are several examples (Wineries, Breweries, and Distilleries; Event Centers; etc.) that cater to urban residents, while creating severe problems related to noise, illegal/dangerous parking, congested roads, and nuisance impacts to neighbors. These facilities and venues already violate county codes, yet are allowed to continue operations. The county needs to crack down on violators and should *not* be encouraging any more of these or similar

Because non-residential uses in the Rural Area can and do have disproportionately large impacts on rural character, County road use, and safety, we propose the following addition to Policy **R-324a**: *"((These)) Nonresidential uses in the Rural Area shall be sited, sized and landscaped to complement rural character as defined in policy R-101 and R-201, prevent impacts to the environment, limit burden and maintain safety on rural roads, and function with rural services, including on-site wastewater disposal."*

We propose the following addition to Policy **R-325**: *"Golf facilities shall be permitted as a conditional use in the RA-2.5 and RA-5 zones and when located outside of Rural Forest Focus Areas, Regionally Significant Resource Areas and Locally Significant Resource Areas(, as a conditional use, in the RA-2.5 and RA-5 zones). King County will seek willing sellers to buy out Golf facilities already located in Rural Forest Focus and Regionally and Locally Significant Resource Areas with appropriate and available funds to convert into farmland, salmon habitat, new river channels, or other environmental improvements compatible with their location and resource potential."*

We propose the following changes to Policy **R-328**: *"Large airports, as well as, sSmall airfields beyond those already established in the Rural Area shall should not be permitted, due to their large and/or cumulative impacts on air traffic and nearby uses."*

Non-Resource Uses [BERNIE MCKINNEY—NOT Given]

My name is Bernie McKinney. I am a member of the Green River Coalition, a part of the Joint Rural Area Team.

Regarding Non-Resource Industrial Uses and Development Standards in the Rural Area, while we requested some of the changes currently shown in Policy **R-513**, we still have some concerns. While we understand KC Code **Title 21A.06.1014F** allows Materials Processing Facilities and Composting Facilities such as Cedar

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

Grove Compost, etc., we also note that according to KC Code Title 21A08.080--MANUFACTURING LAND USES, Materials Processing Facilities are permitted (Condition 16) "Only [on] a site that is ten acres or greater and that does not use local access streets that abut lots developed for residential use" or subject to a Conditional Use.

Given the history of Wineries / Breweries / Distilleries (WBDs) which claim to do "agricultural processing," we recommend clear definitions be established for what is meant by "agriculture and forestry product processing." Specifically, we recommend a definition that states: "Processing applies to agriculture or forestry products grown/produced within King County. It does not apply to raw materials that are trucked in from other locations to be processed at industrial facilities in the King County Rural Area." If definitions are not tightened up, potatoes grown in Eastern WA could be shipped to a potato chip factory in the Rural Area.

We support Policy **R-515** regarding "Existing industrial uses in the Rural Area outside of Rural Towns" and thank the Executive's Office for making the above changes, which we specifically requested. However, to complement them and to reinforce other Rural Area policies herein—that seek to protect fragile ecosystems and, especially, those in which the County has invested much money, effort, and time, we recommend adding the following new Policy: "To protect the Cedar River ecosystem, King County should pursue elimination of all Industrial Zones along the Cedar River by requiring redesignation of the Industrial Zones either upon sale of the properties or upon agreement of the property owners."

Mineral Resources [TIM O'BRIEN]

My name is Tim O'Brien. I Chair the Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, a member of the Joint Rural Area Team. I have a background in mining and heavy machinery.

We see an issue with mining uses being converted to *non-resource* uses (such clustered housing, etc.), rather than what the County Code and KCCP Policies intend, i.e., those lands, on completion of mining, are to revert back to the rural forest resource land base. This has resulted in *permanent* loss of our rural resources land base. It also further fragments habitat and decreases our ability to respond and adapt to climate change. In fact, mining resource land conversion to *non-resource* uses conflicts with both some of our oldest and some of our newest land-use policies for the Rural Area. Consequently, we recommend adding ten new policies, asking the County to:

- 1) **Conserve proven mineral resources in the Forest Production District.**
- 2) **Protect forest cover, working forests, salmon habitat and watershed health when siting mining and mineral and gravel extraction. Sites further away from watershed basin resources shall be considered for higher priority for development over sites that have greater impact on watershed resources. When mining ends, a high priority shall be given to mining site forest restoration to the fullest extent possible.**
- 3) **Size mines to only as large as needed; reclamation plans shall be defined before development; and any subsequent changes to the permit or plan shall not delay reclamation by more than 25% of the period allowed on the original permit.**
- 4) **Site mines closest to where extracted materials are consumed.**
- 5) **Transport of these extracted materials shall be considered in planning -both to where they will be consumed, and to deliver materials for fill and reclamation.**

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

- 6) *The County shall project the amount of mineral resources needed for medium and longer term growth, and where these materials are expected to be consumed. Such information shall be **shared with affected communities for an informed discussion of which mines are targeted for expansion, which can be targeted to close, and approximately where more new mines are needed to meet future growth.***
- 7) **Prohibit importing wood waste from land clearing (e.g., tree stumps), construction & demolition waste, or any toxic substances at any mineral extraction site.**
- 8) **Offer a monitoring and complaint process specifically designed for review of mineral extraction or rural- industrial activities.**
- 9) **Prevent and limit the privileges to apply for permits of owner/operators of mineral extraction who repeatedly fail to comply with permit conditions, county code, or state and federal laws and rulings.**
- 10) **Review non-conforming sites to reduce their potential negative impacts. Sunsets for each of these sites shall be defined. Funded reclamation plans shall not be delayed.**

Infrastructure—Roads [MIKE BIRDSALL]

Good morning. My name is Michael Birdsall. I am a retired transportation engineer who spent much of my career preparing transportation plans for cities and counties. There's been some talk about locating more new housing in the rural area to relieve pressure on the urban area. I am here to tell you what that idea looks like just from the transportation perspective.

The traffic consequences of new houses in rural area are much greater than for urban houses:

- First, commute trips to urban jobs are much longer
- Second, trips generated per home are higher due to differences in daily activities
- Third, there's no transit to speak of to reduce car travel.

These factors combine to cause as much as 3 times more travel per rural house compared to urban houses, measured by vehicle-miles added to the road system. And climate impacts go up in direct proportion. That's the complete opposite of transit-oriented development that is so important to urban planning. And there are other environmental consequences others may talk about.

How much of a shift are we talking about? I ran some numbers assuming a 5% shift of urban growth into the rural area. Is that reasonable for the urban area? The total countywide growth planned for the next two decades is about 300,000 new homes. 5% of that is 15,000 homes. Now, 5,000 homes are already baked into the growth target for rural King County. So that 5% shift would make a total of 20,000 homes added to the rural area. Is that reasonable for the rural area? Today there's just 40,000 homes in all of rural King County. So a 5% reduction of urban growth translates to a 50% increase of rural homes. That's a hard pill for rural residents to swallow, yet it's hardly a dent in the urban area's growth target.

And traffic gets a lot worse.

It takes only about 2,000 new homes to completely use up a two-lane road at full capacity, meaning highly congested. So 20,000 new rural homes would need at least the equivalent of roughly ten new two-lane roads, each many miles in length. More likely, the expansion of ten existing arterials from 2 to 4 lanes. But that's the exact opposite of what county policy, plans, and funds say about road building. Result? We'll see total gridlock in the rural area long before anyone figures out what to do about it. People looking for affordable housing will

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

prefer homes closer to work, back in the urban area. But before that happens, the rural area as we know it will be gone, smothered in congestion.

The growth pains of this region are the direct consequence of its economic prosperity. That's an urban phenomenon. Sacrificing the very nature of the rural area, to only slightly alleviate urban growing pains is a bad trade. It will end up costing the region much more for infrastructure and services. Stay the course. Solve urban problems in urban areas. Keep rural growth to a minimum.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies
April 3 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 6

Chapter 7: Parks, Open Space, & Cultural Resources [Karen; Tim]

Cultural Resources [KAREN MEADOR]

My name is Karen Meador, I am a member of the Green Valley/Lake Holm Association, a part of the Joint Rural Area Team, and a King County Writer and Historian.

Cultural resources make an important contribution to the quality of life in King County. Arts and heritage organizations, public art, historic and archaeological properties, as well as Indian tribal celebrations and traditional cultural events contribute to the region's economic vitality, play an essential role in cultural tourism, and contribute significantly to the county's overall quality of life. As King County grows, the need to protect, support and enhance cultural opportunities and resources is essential to sustain livability.

As per our KCCP Comments, we recommend King County encourage and pursue partnerships and mutually beneficial agreements with public agencies, Indian tribes, nonprofit and community organizations, and the private sector to fund, program, manage, and steward sites and facilities for public recreation and natural resource protection consistent with the classification, role, and use of said sites and facilities.

Given the unique value of heritage sites and historic buildings, as well as their value to the community, we recommend King County shall encourage preserving, reusing and recycling historic buildings in its facilities planning and other relevant actions. We suggest King County shall assist in encouraging interested parties to pursue preservation, restoration, and repurposing projects, particularly for those doing repairs and/or upgrades themselves.

In summary, cultural resources contribute to the vibrancy, economic health, and well-being of King County. By recognizing their value and investing in such resources, we can create a more equitable and thriving community.

Regional Trails Needs Report [TIM O'BRIEN]

To further expand the Regional Trail System, we encourage the County to shift its near-term focus to secure the land needed for trails, before development in the rural area makes this impossible. One specific example is the rail line through Cumberland that is the planned right of way for the Foothills Trail extension. The county should renew efforts to buy this right of way before the gravel mine proposed by Segale Properties on the adjacent land makes this no longer possible.

Consequently, we recommend the following *new* Policy:

P109a King County shall plan and further develop the Snoqualmie Valley Trail and Foothills Trail to enhance connectivity between cities in the Rural Area, as well as to trail systems in adjacent counties, and to facilitate statewide and national trail connection transportation routes. This effort includes partnering with Seattle Public Utilities to find a solution to extend the Cedar River Trail to Cedar Falls.

SE King County also wants to promote the idea of repurposing the currently unused trail along **SR-410/White River Corridor** known as the Weyerhaeuser Mainline. Using this logging road as an adventure trail would greatly expand the recreation and access to Mount Rainier National Park – needed now that entrance to the

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

park is by reservation only. This and the other connections I just noted, would transform SE King County into a recreation hub for the region. Then, this trail could later be connected with the Foothills Trail and Flume Trail in Pierce County along the lower White River for a cost-effective east west route to the Sound

Chapter 8: Transportation; Transportation Appendix; & TNR Appendix [Susan, Peter, Mike B.]

Chapter 8: Transportation [SUSAN HARVEY]

Good morning. My name is Susan Harvey. I am the chair of the transportation committee of the Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council, which is a member of the Joint Rural Area Team. In February the Joint Team provided you with written testimony proposing extensive changes to the Executive’s draft update. Today I urge you to study the 50 pages on transportation that the Joint Team sent you, which detail how King County policy and practice should change, first to protect the rural area from a slow death and second to chart a new course for road finance.

We who live in the rural area are calling for standards and policies that reflect reality in the rural area. Replace the outmoded urban-centric standards from the previous century with a new approach:

- (1) Change level of service to be multi-modal in scope and recognizing rural settings are different from urban settings
- (2) Change concurrency to measure adequacy of local access rather than speed of through travel,
- (3) Update old road standards to provide design options for pedestrians and bicyclists
- (4) Change arterial classifications to account for local access needs.
- (5) Pursue greater equity in road finance at the regional level and at the state level

This update is your one chance for ten years to right the ship and move King County in a new direction. The changes we submitted in February are very detailed. We hope very much to speak further with your staff to walk them through it. Please care enough to take our proposals to heart.

Transportation Appendix C [PETER RIMBOS]

Good morning. My name is Peter Rimpos. I am a member of the Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council and the Coordinator of the Joint Rural Area Team. In February we provided you with Detailed Comments in which we proposed changes to the Executive’s “*Recommended Plan*.”

The Joint Team’s Susan Harvey just spoke to you about reforms needed in **Chapter 8— Transportation**. Many of those reforms must be technically supported in **Transportation Appendix C**. Last summer we proposed extensive reforms to the *Public Review Draft’s Appendix C* to properly support our proposals for **Chapter 8**.

Unfortunately, we found very few changes in the Executive’s “*Recommended Plan*.” Consequently, our 20 pages of **Appendix C** comments to you last February, not only repeated our previous comments, but provided more specifics.

To be clear, **Appendix C** should contain much more information. It should be organized in the manner spelled out in the Growth Management Act to produce a document that would pass an audit.

In particular, our Comments show how to follow the GMA outline for documenting:

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

- (a) Future growth and transportation conditions,
- (b) Future deficiencies that will arise based on level of service policies,
- (c) Financial analysis of how to meet future needs, and
- (d) Revision of the Comprehensive Plan to achieve internally balanced policies, conditions, and finances.

Unfortunately, we find very little of that in **Appendix C**. To meet GMA standards we believe **Appendix C** must be totally rewritten. We stand ready to work with your staff to understand the needs and how to address them.

Transportation Needs Report (Appendix C1) [MIKE BIRDSALL]

Good morning. My name is Michael Birdsall. I am a retired transportation planning engineer with decades of experience in preparing transportation plans under the Growth Management Act. I speak today as the transportation specialist of the Joint Rural Area Teams.

Susan Harvey just explained to you what changes are needed in Chapter 8 for you to be able to apply the rural-supportive policies you've already adopted. Peter Rimbo has shown you how much more work is needed with Appendix C Transportation to comply with the Growth Management Act. Now I'd like to close with some words about data to support those reforms.

Appendix C-1 the Transportation Needs Report is the right place to assemble that data. But it's not there. There's a lot of high-level financial data but not much that helps with planning.

The Needs Report makes clear that the county can only finance 18% of its overall needs based on current law, and hints at road and bridge closures to come. But without any specifics. News flash: last week the Green River Road Bridge was weight-limited at just 5 tons, down from 22 tons. The next shoe to fall will be to close that bridge entirely. The downfall of our rural road network has now begun. But we see no real road map of how it will unfold.

This Appendix must be greatly amplified with data on how each road does or doesn't comply with design standards, pavement life, bridge safety ratings, multi-modal level of service, and so forth. The Roads Division has that data, it just isn't presented in a fashion that helps us to understand the priorities, or help you to understand the roads work program. Please pay attention to our extensive written recommendations from February to accomplish that.

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

April 4, Vashon Island — LSLU Special Committee Meeting

Public Comment on Executive's Recommended Plan *[Only individuals spoke]*

Vashon-Maury Island Subarea Plan changes
Chapter 2: Urban
Chapter 4: Housing & Human Services

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies
April 17 — LSLU Committee – Briefing 7**

Chapter 9: Services, Facilities, & Utilities [Don; Janet]

Urban-Serving Facilities [DON HULING]

My name is Don Huling. I am a board member of the Soos Creek Area Response. We are part of the Joint Rural Area Team. Urban or urban-serving facilities should not be sited in the Rural Area. Unfortunately, there are several examples that have been made under Special-Use Permits, etc.: Pacific Raceways near Auburn; Cedar Hills Regional Landfill near Maple Valley; soon-to-be sited Asphalt Facility along the Cedar River; Wineries/Breweries/Distilleries in the Sammamish Valley. Then, there are so-called Temporary-Use Permits for what can only be called “commercial businesses” such as 6,000-seat Amphitheaters, raceway garages, etc.

In general, we seek County Policies that are consistent with *not* siting urban or urban-serving facilities in the Rural Area. Such Policies would be consistent with those in **Chapter 3-RURAL AREA AND NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS**.

We seek a change in Policy **F-227**, so that it reads as follows:

F-227 ***King County and neighboring counties should share essential public facilities to increase efficiency of operation, including consideration of the overall value of the essential public facility to the region and the county and that does not further impact the community where the facility is located whether expansion of an existing essential public facility might be more economical and environmentally sound.***

We are glad to see the Executive has proposed improvements in the Policy **F-270** based partly on our July 2023 PRD Comments. However, we recommend further changes so that it reads as follows:

F-270 ***King County should seek and plan for closure of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill in as timely manner as possible, and plan for future disposal when Cedar Hills Landfill closes to ensure no gap in service, subject to environmental constraints, relative costs to operate, partner and public interests, and overall solid waste system optimization. A replacement landfill shall not be located in King County.***

Thank you for your efforts in this regard.

Siting and Expansion of Essential Facilities [JANET DOBROWOLSKI]

My name is Janet Dobrowolski. I am a longtime resident living adjacent to the CHRLF and a member of the Environment Committee for the GMVUAC, a Joint Team member. I'd like to discuss “equity.” Policies **F-228** and **F-230** discuss the siting and expansion, respectively, of essential facilities, such as the CHRLF.

Unfortunately, Policy **F-228** has identified only 3 groups, **racial, cultural, or socio-economic**, to be included for assessment for equitable consideration. This policy ignores some groups currently impacted by public facilities. The communities surrounding CHRLF do not fit into KC's criteria. Currently impacted communities, regardless of their social equity status must be included. History has shown expansion will always be the choice over siting a new facility and existing communities have no standing.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

The policy statement “*No single community should absorb an inequitable share of these facilities and their impacts*” is already being violated by continued operation and expansion of CHRLF. Isn’t bearing the burden of one landfill for the county’s garbage for decades considered an inequitable share for one community?

Any analysis under **F-230** should include:

- **Historical and current** impacts for ALL impacted communities where expansion is considered, including regulatory violations, complaints, mitigation effectiveness, and any ongoing issues.
- **Combined** impact of public and private facilities within an area, such as Cedar Hills Landfill, Cedar Grove Compost, Reclamation sites and permitted asphalt plant.
- **Recommendations** from outside expert agencies, such as the EPA, should be solicited and held in high regard.

Frankly, the policies for equity look good on paper, but in reality are irrelevant with regards to expansions and assessments of impacts. HOW are the impacts assessed or WHAT weight is given to the impacts on a community?

Communities where expansion is considered will receive no equity or social justice under these current policies.

Chapter 10: Economic Development [Serena Glover—submitted in writing]
--

My name is Serena Glover. I am the Executive Director of the Friends of Sammamish Valley. We are part of the Joint Rural Area Team. The rural economy should not be endangered by allowing urban-serving businesses in the Rural Area. There are many instances where the County seems to be pushing “*rural economic development*” for the sake of rural economic development.

We believe the County should follow the intent and the letter of the State’s Growth Management Act in which **RCW 36.70A (5) Rural element** states: “*counties may provide for clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements, and other innovative techniques that will accommodate appropriate rural economic advancement, densities, and uses that are not characterized by urban growth and that are consistent with rural character.*”

We also believe the County also should follow the intent and the letter of PSRC’s *VISION 2050* Policy **MPP-RGS-13**, which says to: “*...avoid the conversion of rural land into commercial uses*” and Policy **MPP-DP-37**, which says to: “*Ensure that development occurring in rural areas is rural in character and is focused into communities and activity areas.*”

Throughout every document—GMA, RCWs, *VISION 2050*, *Countywide Planning Policies*, and the *KCCP* there is a strong *consistency* in requirements, goals, policies, language, etc. to “*conform with the rural character of the area,*” “*preserve rural character,*” “*consistent with rural character,*” etc. Consequently, we strongly urge the County to follow its very good policies when considering expanding so-called “*rural economic development*” beyond its identified rural economic clusters: Agriculture, Equestrian, & Forestry.

Finally, in Policy **ED-602 g** we are wary of the phrase “*agricultural tourism,*” which is ill-defined with unknown ramifications for the Rural Area. For example, who decides what is value-added and how? This must be defined. Further, if a product is brought in from outside the county, to what “*value-added programs*” is the policy referring and how can imported products be considered beneficial to county production of food or flowers?

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

It is especially *inappropriate* for the County to once again be promoting "*specialty beverages*" production as part of the rural economy! This battle has been ongoing for over 20 years with continued attempts to open the Rural Area to *urban-serving* businesses that have no connection to agriculture or any production of food, flowers, or agricultural products that *require* a rural location. Such businesses clearly are *not* an element, nor should they be, of the rural economy. Any promotion of Wineries, Breweries, and Distilleries in the Rural Area directly violates the intent of Policy **R-324**, which clearly defines that "*no urban-serving facilities*" are allowed to operate in the rural area. Thus, to avoid a direct conflict within the KCCP, we urge removal of any reference here to "*specialty beverages*."

Chapter 12: Implementation, Amendments, & Eval [Greg Wingard—submitted in writing]

My name is Greg Wingard. I am the President of the Green River Coalition. We are part of the Joint Rural Area Team. I personally have been involved in growth management-related issues with the County for over 40 years.

Implementation of many good County Policies and Code is inadequate regarding permitting, land use, code enforcement, and other issues impacting development and uses on Rural Area parcels.

We have seen over the years many problems with *implementation* of County Policies and Code—we have touched upon this in our detailed Written Comments on Chapter 12, as well as on other Chapters. Although the County, in general, has strong Policies and Code language, all too often implementation has been wanting. Either through poor interpretation, spotty followthrough, poorly funded and not-prioritized enforcement, and myriad exceptions / special considerations, the County does not give justice to those Policies and Code in practice on the ground to serve its residents.

We question why the following has been proposed to be removed: "*Review of land segregation, substantial development permits and other development proposals are key parts of the development process for making sure facilities and services to support potential development are adequate and for evaluating environmental impacts.*" Clearly, the process used to ensure facilities and services to support potential development are adequate and to evaluate environmental impacts is critical. Although there are newly added paragraphs that direct one to specific County Code Titles (i.e., "*Surface Water Management, Water and Sewer Systems, Roads and Bridges, Building and Construction Standards, Fire Code, Land Segregation, Planning, and Zoning*") that address various aspects of such a process, we find this process so important to helping to maintain the integrity and character of the Rural Area that it should remain and be further discussed within Chapter 12.

Unfortunately, we see far too many instances where policies simply are ignored such as Policy **I-501** which states:

I-501 When needed infrastructure and facilities are not available in a timely manner, development approvals shall: Be denied; Divided into phases; or Provide the needed facilities and infrastructure to address impacts directly attributable to their project.

This is especially true for road infrastructure, for which the County has *insufficient* funds to keep up with needed maintenance.

Development Regulations [Peter, Mike B., Tim]

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

No Mixed-Use in NB zones [PETER RIMBOS]

My name is Peter Rimbos. I am the Coordinator for the Joint Rural Area Team. I will discuss Development Regulations, specifically, **21A.04.090** on Neighborhood Business zones and **21A.08.030** on allowed residential land uses. We strongly agree with the Executive’s proposal to limit mixed-use development to the urban area and Rural Towns.

In its Report, Staff has suggested that Council “*may wish to allow limited mixed-use development in some instances in the rural area, such as in rural neighborhood commercial centers.*” Further, Staff has made the *same* suggestion for **21A.04.100** (Commercial Business), **.110** (Regional Business), and **.120** (Office Zone) — all of which are for the Urban Unincorporated Area, not the Rural Area and all of which require public sewers.

For the past 7 years, working with Chris Jensen when they were at DLS-Permitting, we have pursued exactly what the Executive has proposed, specifically to ensure the mixed-use development under construction in the NB district located at the intersection of Issaquah-Hobart Rd and Cedar Grove Rd (i.e., next to the Tiger Mountain Store) cannot happen again. If you’ve been by the area, the three multiple story apartment/condos, etc. (with more to come) are utterly out of place in an area completely surrounded by RA-zoned parcels.

The two examples cited in Staff’s comment—rural neighborhood commercial centers in “*Preston and outside Maple Valley*”—are *land-use designations* meant for “*commercial*” activities, not multistory high-density housing.

Please accept the Executive’s proposal to limit mixed-use development to the urban area and Rural Towns. We strongly do. Again, thank you.

Code Enforcement [MIKE BIRDSALL]

My name is Michael Birdsall, a member of the Joint Rural Area Team. I ask you today to add **nine words** to one policy about Code Enforcement. **Nine words.**

I regularly drive by two locations where permits were issued with conditions, but those conditions are not enforced. As a result, two urban serving businesses are growing on properties zones rural residential. Travesty. King County must shore up its code enforcement function.

But instead of shoring up that function, the proposed amendment to Policy **I-504** downgrades code enforcement from “*pursuing complaints*” to only “*responding to complaints*”. That is linguistically better and reflects current practice. The real problem not addressed begins with relying on complaints from the public. That’s too passive. Current practice is broken. Reform can begin by adding to that amended policy this active requirement: “*periodically assessing whether imposed permit conditions are being met.*” I’ll say that again: “*periodically assessing whether imposed permit conditions are being met.*”

See how “**periodically assessing**” is neither “*pursuing*” nor “*responding*” to complaints, but objectively monitoring the effectiveness of permits?

Adding these **nine words** will lead to more systematic compliance than waiting for citizens to complain. Why delegate monitoring to the public? That makes every citizen a whistleblower. Erin Brockovich was a great movie, but whistleblowing doesn’t work as everyday policy.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

Many problems affecting the Rural Area are rooted in failure to enforce County Policies and Code. We cannot emphasize enough that **revamping** both Permitting and Code Enforcement taken together – i.e., the entire Permitting Division - is necessary to uphold the major goals underlying Policies like **I-504**.

Nine words will start the reforms.

Why? Failing to enforce code adversely impacts people, property, health and safety, and our shared environment. Major county goals. But this ten-year update of county policies only tweaks two little phrases in Policy **I-504** for linguistic precision. The real issue is overlooked: that code enforcement must be a vital **active** service to protect and preserve people, property, health and safety, and our shared environment in the rural area. Major goals of King County. And benefits that extend to all county residents.

So we strongly recommend adding the role of “**periodic assessment**” to Policy **I-504**.

Also, add “**Code enforcement**” under Policy **F-209a** as a service the County provides in rural areas.

KC Code 21A.22.060 [TIM O'BRIEN]

My name is Tim O'Brien. I am the Chair of the Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, one of the many organizations that comprise the Joint Rural Area Team.

We propose adding five items to **KC Code 21A.22.060 Development Condition B: On sites larger than twenty acres, activities shall occur in phases to minimize environmental impacts. The size of each phase shall be determined during the review process in accordance with the following:**

1. On sites one hundred acres or less, each phase shall not be more than twenty-five acres; and
2. On sites more than one hundred acres, each phase shall not be more than fifty acres. Phases that include areas of greater than twenty-five acres shall have setbacks double those specified in subsections E and F of this section.
3. A third phase shall not be initiated until reclamation of the first phase is substantially complete. No more than two phases shall be allowed to operate at a time without previous phases having been reclaimed.
4. Minor variation from these standards may be requested and approved as part of the permit review process where it is demonstrated to be needed or beneficial for compliant operation of the mineral extraction based on regulations for protection of water quality, environmental conditions or safety;
5. Any significant revision of the mining plan or schedule, or ownership, will require the operation to reapply for a permit to conduct mining on the site, including the opening of a Public Comment period. If the revised permit to conduct mining is denied, then the operation must begin reclamation-only activities within one year of such determination.

The original purpose for our 2022 Docket Item was to prevent the typical practice of delaying reclamation by updating mine plans/expansions, and then delaying long enough either to go bankrupt or limit liability by selling site/business to “another” party. A good complement to the above proposed Code changes is to include a statement that major changes in the Reclamation Plan (or Schedule) will require a new application to conduct mining (with accompanying public comment, etc.). The presumption is that such a new application is an opportunity to fully review mining on a site like it was a new mine proposal. In fact, **KC Code 21A.22.050** Periodic review. should apply to reclamation, not just permitted extraction activities. ... Compounding all of this, is the lack of Periodic Review per Code, as KC DLS-Permitting simply doesn't have the person-power to do it, as related to us by Jim Chan on 10/26/21.

Finally, a disastrous example. King County can never allow the environmental debacle and legal quagmire that occurred this in mid 2023 at the Reserve Silica site in Ravensdale to happen again! Forty acres were illegally

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

clearcut, then 33 truckloads of contaminated fill from the Tacoma ASARCO Superfund site were illegally dumped on the clearcut land and illegally graded. We alerted King County DLS-Permitting about the clearcut and provided photographic evidence—we were ignored! The Federal EPA and the State DOE alerted King County of the dumping of the contaminated fill—extremely embarrassing! As King County does little inspection and little code enforcement, none of this should be a surprise.

[Please note the above was the full Oral Testimony prepared, but there was not sufficient time to complete it within the 2-min allotted per speaker. We provide it here to help you with the full context.]

Four-To-One

We provided multiple sets of Comments on this Topic in 2023 during the GMPC’s multiple meetings.

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies
May 15 — LSLU Committee Briefing**

Briefing on the Striking Amendment [Peter, Don, Ken, Karen, Tim, Mike B., Janet]

“Striker” Process and Schedule [PETER RIMBOS]

Good morning. My name is Peter Rimbos. I am the Coordinator for the Joint Rural Area Team.

We’ve have had little time to review the “*Striker*” released late yesterday, but will do so over the next week before the May 22 deadline for line amendments. We will be looking at several key Policies and Code sections that we covered in our February 6 Detailed Written Comments. Several of our speakers today will discuss some of those.

I will discuss the process and schedule and the impact on *effective* Public participation.

Our involvement with the 2024 KCCP Major Update started in January 2022 working with KCCP Manager, Chris Jensen. We’ve been very active in the process and have submitted formal Comments throughout: March 2022 on **Scoping**, January 2023 on the **DEIS**, February 2023 on **Concept Proposals**, July 2023 on the **Public Review Draft**, and February 2024 on the **Executive’s Recommend Plan**. We also have provided over forty (including today) Oral Testimonies at this Committee’s multiple Briefings.

Clearly, we consider the **2024 KCCP Major Ten-Year Update** very important. We will stay involved through final approval by the end of the year. We deeply appreciate all the work you and your staffs have done and continue to do on the Update. Thank you.

We do have two major concerns about *process* though:

1. One week to review the voluminous “*Striker*” clearly is insufficient even for an experienced team like ours and clearly for most members of the public.
2. Our experience in dealing with every Major and Mid-Point Update over the past 20 years or so tells us to be wary of last-minute proposed changes offered following a nearly 3-yr intense process. We ask you to thoroughly consider the merits and rationale behind such proposed changes *before* implementing them.

Thank you.

Minimum Lot Dimensions [DON HULING]

My name: Don Huling, board member of SCAR (Soos Creek Area Response) member of the Joint Rural Area Team.

I am addressing Policy **R-309** regarding minimum lot dimensions in the Rural areas. The proposed language would state that King County’s Permitting division shall comply with code requirements for minimum lot dimensions when considering building permit applications. Similarly, the KCCPs policies should state that Permitting shall not apply greater than the code’s maximum density provisions when contemplating applications for a property subdivision.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

One might consider such language unnecessary since the codes already clearly state these standards, which have not changed for over 3 decades.

However, County Permitting has been regularly ignoring these provisions for years, as recently attested to in a document submitted to the court by the Director of Permitting.

This is resulting in much denser development in our Rural areas than envisioned in the policies and laws put in place to protect these communities and resources from being lost to sprawl development.

The negative impacts of Permitting's negligence are already evident, not only on our overburdened Rural transportation system, but on a wide spectrum of natural resource concerns such as water quality, wildlife habitat, carbon sequestration and more, which are fundamental reasons why we strive to limit development outside of our Urban Growth areas.

This habit of ignoring the codes for which it is entrusted to faithfully administer has become deeply embedded in the culture in the Permitting division. If we are to turn this culture toward one that respects these laws, the Council needs to give the Executive clear direction to implement reforms. Inserting language to that effect into the KCCP policies is a crucial step in that direction.

Thank you for listening to our concerns.

Siting of Facilities that Require an Rural Area Location [KEN KONIGSMARK]

My name is Ken Konigsmark, a rural Preston resident and actively involved in many conservation, policy, and growth management issues for 30 years. I'm a member of the Joint Rural Area Team.

In **Chapter 3— RURAL AREAS AND NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS** under the **Rural Public Facilities and Services** section the Executive's December 2023 *Recommended Plan* shows the 2016 KCCP's opening paragraph of this section to be completely removed. This included removing of the phrase: "*provide guidance for siting those facilities that require Rural Area location*" with no suitable replacement, thus eliminating the documented policy that only those facilities that *require* a Rural Area location can be so located. Our February 6, 2024, Detailed Comments, proposed some key word changes in Policies **R-401** thru **R-403** to address this policy gap:

R-401 *King County shall work with cities and other agencies providing services to the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands to adopt standards for facilities and services in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands that:*

...
d. ((d)) Do not require an urban level of infrastructure or encourage urban development.

R-402 *Public spending priorities for facilities and services within the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands should be as follows:*

...
c. ... to support rural-serving sustainable economic development that is sized and scaled at levels appropriate for Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands and does not foster urbanization.

We and all of you too are well aware of ongoing efforts by many businesses catering to urban consumers to locate onto rural lands, whether that be WBD's, Event Centers, Concert venues, or other such inappropriate uses that do not meet existing GMA or County policies. Your updated Comp Plan policies should reflect the clear County direction and goals that only those facilities that *require* a Rural Area location and primarily serve

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

local rural residents can be located in the RA. Please update policies **R401** thru **R403** to reflect this crucial requirement.

Rural Towns & Cities in the Rural Area [KAREN MEADOR]

My name is Karen Meador; I am a member of the Green Valley/Lake Holm Association, part of the Joint Rural Area Team, and a King County writer and historian.

The development density in Rural Towns should not approach that of Cities in the Rural Area. In that vein, I would like to speak to Policy **R-506**, regarding housing and construction in Rural King County. It is our view that there are, in reality, no effective limits on population centers in the Rural Area. Black Diamond is considered a “City in the Rural Area” and is in the process of quintupling its population to over 25,000 residents. Local, as well as nearby State and County roads are already severely overburdened, on occasion with grave consequences. In addition to lack of road capacity, there are deleterious impacts to the nearby Agricultural Production District as well as numerous environmental concerns, which include impacts to wildlife as well as cultural and heritage venues.

We propose the deletion of the final sentence in Policy **R-506**, eliminating the reference to development density in Rural Towns being acceptable to approach that of Cities in the Rural Area. The proposed policy statement reads as follows:

Rural Towns may contain higher-density housing than permitted in the surrounding Rural Area, and should provide affordable and resource-worker housing ((if utilities and other services permit)). ~~Development density in Rural Towns may approach that achieved in Cities in the Rural Area, when appropriate infrastructure is available.~~

Only adherence to strict development density standards concerning Rural Towns and the surrounding Rural Area will preserve King County’s diverse and unique Rural Legacy.

Proposed New Mineral Resource Policies [TIM O’BRIEN—submitted in writing]

There are many problems associated with extraction of mineral resources in KC. There is little to no Code Enforcement, no code-required 5-yr Periodic Reviews), and Reclamation is a gigantic loophole that becomes bigger when paired with no enforcement.

All of this undermines KC’s *relatively* good Code on mineral resource extraction. However, the key to make this work is code enforcement, and behavior of these businesses, i.e. they do not feel they need to comply with the conditions of their permits, shows us that there is little to no code enforcement of industrial and resource extraction in unincorporated King County. Permitting and Code Enforcement also needs to prioritize enforcement of these industrial and mining sites vs. residential properties, as the industrial and mining sites have a much large impact on the environment and community.

Ideally, there should be a moratorium placed on new permits or for extending existing/expiring permits until proper code enforcement of these sites can be put in place. One area of code that can be changed to help the situation is to adopt new rules proposed that prevent permit holders from extending permits by simply changing their mining or reclamation plans. Further, permits should be issued for no more than 10 years at a time.

Transportation Policies [MIKE BIRDSALL]

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

Good morning. My name is Michael Birdsall. I am a retired transportation planner with decades of experience in planning for growth, and I am speaking today on behalf of the Joint Team of rural area organizations.

Concerning transportation policies in Chapter 8...

Thank you for accepting some of our recommendations in the Striker. But you were not comfortable with some of our proposals for significant changes of direction. Please reconsider. Current policies have a terrible track record. The financial system is only able to fund 12% of known needs, such that road and bridge closures loom ahead. People living in outlying cities account for over half the trips using county roads, causing much of that backlog of future costs, but those city-based road users pay zero into the county road fund. Rural area residents have difficulty accessing their own arterials, blocked by heavy streams of through traffic from those cities. And going to Olympia to ask the state to bail out it's richest county only generates laughter. Change is overdue. Please take another look at our policy proposals to guide the next ten years. The Joint Team is willing to work with you all summer long, to develop line amendments you can approve next fall.

Concerning rural policy in Chapter 3...

The Joint Team asked me to comment specifically on renumbered Policy 322 regarding non-residential uses in the rural area. We proposed also saying here that substantial off-site traffic impacts were not in keeping with rural character. But those words didn't make it into the Striker. Truth is, external traffic impact is one of the main reasons given over and over to oppose non-residential uses – especially urban-serving activities. Adding these few words to the policy is truthful, relevant, and effective. Please set the stage now for more effective action going forward.

Thank you for listening.

Maximizing Capacity and Lifespan of Cedar Hills Landfill [JANET DOBROWOLSKI]

My name is Janet Dobrowolski. I am a longtime resident living adjacent to the CHRLF and a member of the Environment Committee for the GMVUAC, a Joint Team member. I'd like to discuss Policy F-270 concerning the Capacity and lifespan of Cedar Hills Landfill.

If we are to believe KCSWD, their 2019 Comprehensive plan meets the requirement of maximizing the capacity. Alternative 2 will extend the life to approximately 2038 and will be at capacity with no further expansion available. The only way to substantially increase capacity and lifespan of the landfill is to violate the original special use permit and expand into the 1000' buffer. Pat McLaughlin and John Walsh have assured me that expansion is no longer an option.

Because of this, F-270 should no longer be about maximizing the capacity, rather it should be directing the KCSWD to commit to a future disposal alternative now and plan for the final closure of the landfill. Because KCSWD says it will take 10-12 years to fully implement a new disposal method, this policy should require them to make a decision now so there is no gap in service when the landfill is full after implementation of the current Comp plan.

Recent issues have made it clear the landfill is becoming too large for KCSWD to efficiently and safely manage. For KC to demand they expand further is irresponsible. Gas collection pipes are failing requiring 70 more vertical collection pipes to be installed over the next 2 years, while excess methane had been leaking into the atmosphere because of the failures. A large methane plume that exceeds what they are reporting to the EPA had been detected on multiple scientific flyovers. This certainly doesn't fit with the County's environmental goals. Arsenic is a problem and has been for a number of years, resulting in excessive levels going to the

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

Wastewater treatment plant and into our waterways, as well as into the atmosphere. BEW is no longer taking the landfill gas, so it is being flared, further putting the environment and public at risk from the excess arsenic, for which atmospheric testing is not required. Frankly, Cedar Hills is a Superfund site waiting to happen. The list goes on.

KC needs to realize the landfill will be at capacity and needs to fully close, so the policy needs to be directed at a new solution.

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies
June 5 — LSLU Committee Briefing**

Striker & Line Amendments [Peter, Mike B., Karen, Don, Jeff, Tim, Michael T., & Terry]

Overview and NB Districts [PETER RIMBOS]

My name is Peter Rimbos. I am the Coordinator of the Joint Rural Area Team. We support the May 31 Line Amendments offered by Committee members, but are disappointed most of the twenty-one we offered were not included.

Today you will hear from several Joint Team members who will discuss the complexity associated with several key Rural Area issues, plus the nuances involved with understanding the “*on-the-ground*” impacts to Rural Area residents. We request you give strong consideration to our testimonies to help inform any changes you make prior to voting on your final Recommendation on the Update.

I briefly will speak to one particular issue, Rural neighborhood business districts. Specifically, **Code 21A.04.090 Neighborhood business zone** and **Policies R-302 and R-401**.

As described in the “*Striker*,” this “*...land use designation is used to recognize existing small pockets of commercial development, ... that are too small to provide more than convenience shopping and services to surrounding residents. They generally do not have infrastructure or services such as water supply or sewage disposal systems any different from those serving the surrounding area.*”

We agree with the Executive, allowing mixed-use development, such as multi-family dwellings, in such small pockets, often directly adjacent to RA-2.5, -5, or -10-zoned parcels, is incompatible, while adding little housing in the Rural Area. We see no purpose served, except to crowd out needed local services—the reason for this land use designation. An excellent example of what should not be allowed is the multi-story, multi-family buildings being constructed at the Issaquah-Hobart Road/Cedar Grove Road SE intersection. Many Rural neighborhood business districts often are located at the intersection of two county roads.

Thank you.

Transportation [MIKE BIRDSALL]

Good morning. My name is Michael Birdsall. I am a retired transportation planner with decades of experience planning for growth. I am speaking today on behalf of the Joint Team of rural area organizations.

Thank you for the two Line Amendments that touch on transportation issues, but more is needed. On May 15 we requested amendments in six specific areas. Futurewise has written to you supporting those amendments. They all remain necessary. Please *reconsider*.

To sum up:

In Policies T-201 and T-304:

Support more transit service between outlying cities and the urban core. This is needed to reduce long distance commuter travel, lessen greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce the county’s unfunded road maintenance and construction needs. Countywide policy based on growth management must be clear enough to guide program development at both Metro Transit and the Roads Division.

**KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies**

In Policy T-218:

Create a new road design standard for interim spot improvements of high value to pedestrian and bicycle safety. This must be clearly articulated within the official Road Standards because current standards don't allow anything for less than full reconstruction to ultimate design standards. And given the systemic funding crisis, that can't be afforded in our lifetime anywhere. Provide authority for a new in-between solution.

In Polices T-308 and T-502:

Current policies for concurrency and impact fees sadly miss the majority of traffic impacts due to growth, because those rules aren't applied across city/county borders. Jurisdictional silos have undermined the very strategy intended by the Growth Management Act to make growth pay its way. A new approach is needed, one that is regionally consistent and multi-modal in scope. Changes in state law have opened the way for innovation in this area. The county needs to lead on this or a regional solution won't happen.

Rural Towns & Cities in the Rural Area [KAREN MEADOR]

My name is Karen Meador; I am a member of the Green Valley/Lake Holm Association, part of the Joint Rural Area Team, and a King County writer and historian.

The development density in Rural Towns should not approach that of Cities in the Rural Area. In that vein, I would like to speak to Policy **R-409**, regarding housing and construction in Rural King County. It is our view that there are, in reality, no effective limits on population centers in the Rural Area. Black Diamond is considered a "*City in the Rural Area*" and is in the process of quintupling its population to over 25,000 residents. Local, as well as nearby State and County roads are already severely overburdened, on occasion with grave consequences. In addition to lack of road capacity, there are deleterious impacts to the nearby Agricultural Production District as well as numerous environmental concerns, which include impacts to wildlife as well as cultural and heritage venues.

We propose the deletion of the final sentence in Policy **R-409**, eliminating the reference to development density in Rural Towns being acceptable to approach that of Cities in the Rural Area. For comparison, the Rural Towns of Carnation and Fall City each have populations of ~2,000, an *order of magnitude* below that of Black Diamond's planned growth.

Only adherence to strict development density standards concerning Rural Towns and the surrounding Rural Area will preserve King County's diverse and unique Rural Legacy.

Manufacturing Land Uses [DON HULING]

My name is Don Huling, a Board Member of Soos Creek Area Response, which is a member of the Joint Rural Area Team. Today I will speak to KC Code **21A.08.080 Manufacturing land uses**.

AMEND the Use Table to remove any "*Materials Processing Facility*" permitted uses in the Forest zone. Material processing needs to be better defined. It should be limited to Agricultural-zoned areas, where there are by-products taken offsite. Such processing of agricultural materials should stay close to the source, remain on agricultural-zoned land, and be limited in scale to agricultural needs. **Allowing material processing in Forest-zoned areas will lead to improper land use, more code violations, increased environmental damage, and a higher fire risk for the forest and people living there.**

AMEND the Use Table to restore "*Wood Products*" Conditional-use permits in the Forest and Rural Area zones. Otherwise, it would allow stump grinding and stockpiling activities, such as had been proposed by

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

Enumclaw Recycling Center. It would also tend to allow facilities such as Buckley Recycling Center. Based on over a decade of litigation, the county is well aware of the environmental and other adverse issues of allowing large-scale stump grinding, wood waste processing, and stockpiling in agriculturally zoned lands. **Both of these are perfect examples of adverse environmental impacts and litigation costs for the County.**

Without the “Materials Processing and “ Wood Products” Use Table changes we’ve outlined, people in the Rural Area will continue to suffer the adverse ramifications of both these legitimate manufacturing uses.

Thank you.

Facility Standards and Urban Levels of Infrastructure in the Rural Area [JEFF GUDDAT]

My name is Jeff Guddat. I am the President of Soos Creek Area Response, a member of the Joint Team. Today I will speak to facility standards and urban levels of infrastructure in the Rural Area. The “*Striker*” states: “*The policies below set forth King County’s general approach to providing services and setting facility standards for the Rural Area and provide guidance for siting those facilities that require Rural Area locations.*”

KCCP Policies should reflect the clear County direction and goals that only those facilities that *require* a Rural Area location and primarily serve local rural residents can be so located. Specially, the Policies referred to in that “*Striker*” quote are **R-330** and **R-331**. We call for simple, but important additions to each that clearly state for facilities and services in the Rural Area that they: “*do not require an urban level of infrastructure*” and are “*rural serving.*”

We in the Rural Area see “*on-the-ground*” impacts of KC Policies everyday. One egregious example is Pacific Raceways, which was inappropriately sited and now seems to be “*grandfathered in*” to any changes it wishes year after year. Pacific Raceways started in the 60’s as a local raceway for local racers. They have operated as such under a Conditional Use Permit since the early 80’s. However, they have been gradually growing and expanding and King County Permitting recently has allowed them to expand their venue to allow hosting up to 100,000 people at an event in the coming years. We must keep the Rural Area rural, and allowing such large events is not keeping the Rural Area rural.

Urban-Serving Businesses & Out-of-Date P-Suffix Zoning [TIM O’BRIEN]

My name is Tim O’Brien, chair of Enumclaw Plateau Community Association, one of the CSAs in SE King County and part of the Joint Rural Area Team that provides public input on KCCP and other county matters.

Because of lack of code enforcement, approximately 1 in 3 parcels is being used for unpermitted commercial purposes. Examples of this are RV storage lots, event venues, construction company depots and warehousing facilities. The result is that land and homes in the Rural Area become more expensive and harder to purchase for most people - making the home affordability crisis in King County even worse. Lack of code enforcement causes many more county/public resources, such as legal counsel resources to be used to try to correct these problems. The KCCP along with code enforcement is the prescribed solution to these problems and it takes much more resources to correct these violations, than the resources needed to just do proper code enforcement.

Another example of where our KCCP and code is not being enforced is the proliferation of *P-suffix* conditional overlays of zoning. A local example is *EP-P01*, where the conditional requirement for use as a lumber mill has not been satisfied for more than 20 years, so the *P-suffix* zoning on this site should be removed and original zoning of F should be put back into place for resource lands.

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

A third major lack of code enforcement for commercial purposes is that the county generally allows upzoning vs. mine reclamation. Also, we propose that any changes to a mine plan or reclamation plan should not extend the mine permit schedule by more than 25%, and periodic site reviews need to be put back in place by Code Enforcement.

Home Occupations & Industries [MICHAEL TANKSLEY]

My name is Michael Tanksley, President of the Hollywood Hills Association, a member of the Joint Rural Area Team. I will address our proposed amendments related to provisions for Home Occupations and Home Industries.

Current language states: *“In the A, F and RA zones, **residents of a dwelling unit** may conduct one or more home occupations, or industries, as accessory activities...”*

The key concept we want to reinforce here is *“residents of a dwelling unit.”*

The intent of this existing language may seem self-evident - that people may have a small business in their own home, whether they are renters or owners of that residence. This has allowed for a wide variety of small businesses to operate compatibly within our Rural neighborhoods and communities.

But, this provision has been interpreted to allow commercial operations on any Rural property as long as a dwelling unit exists there. The result is that we increasingly see entities buying or leasing residential properties and using them to site commercial enterprises at locations on which the owner/operator does not actually live, which has in turn has led to activities which are incompatible with neighboring residential and resource uses.

The type of property that is typically targeted for such conversion are rarely in the more affluent neighborhoods, but generally occur on less expensive properties, putting additional pressures on those communities and our dwindling stock of affordable housing options.

In order to clarify the intent of the codes, we propose that the language for Home Occupations and Industries be amended to state clearly that residents of a dwelling unit may conduct these businesses as long as, and I quote our proposal:

The dwelling unit is the primary residence of the owner and operator of the home occupation, or industry, business.

This simple clarification is designed to put the *“Home”* back into Home Occupation & Industry activities. Thank you.

NB Districts [TERRY LAVENDER—Written Testimony]

I urge the Local Services and Land Use Committee to add back the Executive’s language that limits mixed use development to **urban areas and rural towns**. I support the similar comments made by Futurewise and the Joint Rural Area Team.

The purpose of Neighborhood Business Zones is to serve the everyday needs of surrounding urban or rural residential areas. Most rural Neighborhood Business zones are small and located on two lane rural roads that

KC Council 2024 KCCP Update
Local Services & Land-Use Committee Briefings
Joint Rural Area Team Oral Testimonies

already carry more traffic than they are designed for. Most are not served by sewers or other public facilities and only suitable for low density development.

I live close to the Cottage Lake Neighborhood Business Zone which is probably the largest and most extreme example of a Neighborhood Business zone in King County and was designated in the 1971 Middle Bear Creek Plan. It is not served by sewer and all the businesses are on septic. It has a Safeway, Walgreens and other small businesses. Adjacent to but not in the Business Zone, is a Fire Station, Elementary School, two Churches and Cottage Lake Park. Very nearby is the King County Woodinville Library. Also nearby but not in the zone, are two long time grandfathered auto repair businesses. This is a heavily used intersection with traffic coming from the East and heading down the hill to Woodinville and 405 or turning on Avondale and heading to 520. Mixed use would add density that the roads cannot serve, take the place of businesses intended to serve the local area and should be located in Duvall, Redmond and Woodinville. There are no public services to support such development.

Please make the change going forward.