

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-1	Agricultural & Forestry Product Processing	Ch 3; Lines 1127 - 1202	<p>Clear <u>definitions</u> must be established for what is meant by "agriculture and forestry product processing" in policies such as:</p> <p>((R-513)) R-334 Rural Public Infrastructure Maintenance Facilities, and agriculture and forestry product processing should be allowed in the Rural Area. Other new industrial uses in the Rural Area shall be ((permitted)) allowed only on existing Industrial zoned properties in Rural Towns and ((in the designated industrial area adjacent to the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center of)) the Preston Industrial Area.</p> <p>Also in KC Code 21A.06.1014F and 21A08.080.</p> <p>We recommend for such definitions the following:</p> <p>"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."</p>	<p>Local "processing" should be fostered and encouraged, not processing of raw materials brought in from outside the County. We need to support our local farmers and industries.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-2	CHRLF Closure	Ch 9; Lines 659 - 665	<p>Amend Policy F-440</p> <p><u>((F-270)) F-440 King County should maximize the capacity and lifespan of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill and plan for future disposal when Cedar Hills Landfill closes to ensure no gap in service, subject to environmental constraints, relative costs to operate, ((stakeholder)) partner and public interests, and overall solid waste system optimization. The County shall not seek to site a replacement landfill in King County for the Cedar Hills regional landfill.</u></p> <p>as follows:</p> <p><u>((F-270)) F-440 King County shall close the landfill operations at Cedar Hills Regional Landfill when the 2019 Comprehensive Plan expansion development is completed with no further expansion permitted. A plan for closure and future disposal alternatives will be determined well before the planned closure to ensure no gap in service, subject to environmental constraints, relative costs to operate, partner and public interests, and overall solid waste system optimization. The County shall not seek to site a replacement landfill in King County for the Cedar Hills regional landfill.</u></p>	<p>KCSWD's 2019 Comprehensive Plan meets the requirement of maximizing the capacity by using all available footprint space and safely going to heights allowable by engineering, so no further mandate to maximize should be forced upon KCSWD or members of the Public. Alternative 2 will extend the life to approximately 2038 and will be at full capacity with no further expansion available. The only way to substantially increase capacity and lifespan of the landfill is to violate the original SUP and expand into the 1000-ft buffer, which should never be considered. KCS WD has stated <i>further</i> expansion is no longer an option.</p> <p>Because of this, policy F-440 should no longer be about maximizing the capacity, rather it should be directing the KCSWD to plan for the final closure of the landfill after its 2019 Comprehensive Plan expansion is complete and to commit to a future disposal alternative now. 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 its current plan.</p> <p>For KC to demand it expand further is irresponsible and, frankly, a betrayal to members of the Public and promises KC has made to them. KC needs to realize the landfill will be at capacity and needs to fully close, so the policy needs to ensure KCSWD puts its efforts into finding and implementing a new disposal method rather than trying to eke out a couple more years of capacity that really is just not there.</p> <p>Recent issues have made it clear the landfill is becoming too large for KCSWD to efficiently and safely manage. Gas collection pipes are failing, requiring 70 more vertical collection pipes to be installed over the next 2 years, while excess Methane has been leaking into the atmosphere because of the failures. A large Methane plume that exceeds what KC is reporting to the EPA has been detected on multiple scientific flyovers. This certainly doesn't fit with KC's environmental goals. Arsenic is a problem and has been for a number of years, resulting in excessive levels going to the Wastewater Treatment Plant and into our waterways, as well as into the atmosphere. BEW is no longer taking the landfill gas, so it is flared, further putting the environment and the Public at risk from the excess Arsenic, for which atmospheric testing is not required. Frankly, CHRLF is a Superfund site waiting to happen.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-3	Dvmt Density in Rural Towns	Ch 3; Lines 1360 - 1364	<p>Delete final sentence highlighted below, eliminating the reference to development density in Rural Towns being acceptable to approach that of Cities in the Rural Area.</p> <p>((R-506)) R-409 Rural Towns may contain higher-density housing than ((permitted)) allowed 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.</p>	<p>The development density in Rural Towns should not approach that of Cities in the Rural Area. There are, in reality, no effective limits on population centers in the Rural Area. Black Diamond is defined as a “City in the Rural Area” and is in the process of <i>quintupling</i> 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 often-adjacent Agricultural Production Districts, as well as numerous environmental concerns, which include impacts to wildlife as well as cultural and heritage venues. For comparison, the Rural Towns of Carnation and Fall City each have populations of ~2,000, an <i>order of magnitude</i> below that low Black Diamond’s planned growth. Yes, this specifically addresses “development density,” not “<u>population.</u>” but why is the last sentence needed, as it adds nothing to the first sentence.</p>
JT-4	Facilities in RA	Ch 3; Lines 1087 - 1106	<p>Add the following highlighted underlining:</p> <p>((R-404)) R-330 d. ((d)) Do not require an urban level of infrastructure or encourage urban development.</p> <p>((R-402)) R-331 c. Third, to support rural-serving sustainable economic development that is sized and scaled at levels appropriate for the Rural Area((s)) and Natural Resource Lands and does not ((foster)) promote urbanization.</p>	<p>To be consistent with the stated intent in lines 1083-1085: “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 <i>require</i> a Rural Area location and primarily serve local rural residents can be so located.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-5	Home Occs & Industries (KC Code 21A.30.085) & KC Code 21A.30.090	Pages 503-507; Lines 10074 - 10056	<p>SECT. 213. Ordin. 15606, Sect. 20, as amended, and K.C.C. 21A.30.085 are hereby amended to read as follows: In the A, F, and RA zones, residents of a dwelling unit may conduct one or more home occupations as accessory activities, (under the following provisions) as follows:</p> <p>Amend A. to include:</p> <p><u>The dwelling unit is the primary residence of the owner and operator of the home occupation business. Attached garages are not considered part of the dwelling unit ground floor area for purposes of the provisions for home occupations.</u></p> <p>Amend C.2. and add a new 3. as follows:</p> <p>C. Total outdoor area of all home occupations shall be ((permitted)) as follows: ...</p> <p>2. For lots one acre <u>to five acres, one percent of the area of the lot, up to a maximum of two thousand square feet; and</u></p> <p>3. <u>For lots five acres</u> or greater: One percent of the area of the lot, up to a maximum of five thousand square feet. or greater: One percent of the area of the lot, up to a maximum of five thousand square feet((-));</p> <p>SECT. 214. Ordin. 10870, Sect. 537, as amended, and K.C.C. 21A.30.090 are hereby amended to read as follows:</p> <p>Add a new subsection L. as follows:</p> <p><u>L. The dwelling unit is the primary residence of the owner and operator of the home occupation business.</u></p>	<p>This is designed to put the "Home" back in Home Occupation activities. There are numerous cases of an entity buying or leasing a <u>residential property</u> and using it to site a <u>commercial business</u>, at which the owner/operator does not live. Sometimes the house is rented to an employee to satisfy existing code. In some these cases, this appears to be an arrangement on paper only to satisfy the "residents" clause. Standards would need to be identified for what proof of residency is required to meet this condition. The sentence on <u>attached garages</u> clarifies what portion of a house may be used for the calculation of total floor area.</p> <p>Lots under 5 acres tend to be located in neighborhoods which are more residential in character. This provision will reduce the visual intrusion on neighbors and works in harmony with other subsections.</p> <p>This new subsection is designed to put the "Home" back in Home Industry activities. There are numerous cases of an entity buying or leasing a <u>residential property</u> and using it to site a <u>commercial business</u>, at which the owner/operator does not live. Sometimes the house is rented to an employee to satisfy existing code. In some these cases, this appears to be an arrangement on paper only to satisfy the "residents" clause. Standards would need to be identified for what proof of residency is required to meet this condition.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-6	Materials Processing Facilities (KC Code 21A.08.080)	Pages 280-302; Lines 5754 - 6179	<p>SECT. 152. Ordin. 10870, Sect. 335, as amended, and K.C.C. 21A.08.080 are hereby amended to read as follows:</p> <p>A. Manufacturing land uses.</p> <p>Amend the Use Table to remove any “Materials Processing Facility” permitted uses in the F zone. Eliminate the highlighted portions of Development Condition 14 as follows :</p> <p>14. Only on the same lot or same group of lots under common ownership or documented legal control, which includes, but is not limited to, fee simple ownership, a long-term lease, or an easement, and:</p> <p>a. does not include retail sales of processed materials; and:</p> <p>b.(1) as accessory to a primary mineral use and may only process materials generated from on-site or properties within three miles of the site; or</p> <p>((b-) (2) as a continuation of a mineral processing use only for that period to complete delivery of products or projects under contract at the end of mineral extraction.</p> <p>Amend the Use Table to restore “Wood Products” Conditional-use permits in the F and RA zones.</p>	<p>For “Materials Processing Facility” for zones F, M, and RA the Executive made changes in response to our Docket Request (2022, #8). While the “Striker Amendment” has added a CUP for the F zone, that does not go far enough. Material processing needs to be better defined, and limited to Agricultural-zoned, and not Forest-zoned areas. There are really no by-product materials from forest lands that need to be processed, aside from the lumber itself. The by-products are from the industrial lumber mill and not the harvesting activities. Agricultural-zoned areas are different, where there are by products taken offsite from farms. Consequently, we suggest the processing of agricultural materials stay close to the source and remain on agricultural-zoned land and be limited to scale to agricultural needs and use consistent with the character of the surrounding land use – as the valid operations would propose. Allowing material processing in Forest-zoned areas will lead to improper land use, code violations, environmental damage and increased fire risk for the forest and people living there.</p> <p>For “Wood Products” in the F and RA zones <u>CUPs should be restored</u>, otherwise it would allow stump grinding and stockpiling activities, such as had been proposed by Enumclaw Recycling Center (located on Franklin Rd north of the City of Enumclaw, just south of the Green River Gorge), and now by same owners site in Ocoela that is now partially permitted because they say they produce a mix of coarse chips of bark and wood that is called “hog fuel.” It would also tend to allow facilities such as Buckley Recycling Center (located in the Rural/Agricultural area just north of the City of Auburn), which, due to well over a decade of litigation between it and King County, 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.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-7	Mineral Extraction — Site Design Standards (KC Code 21A.22.060)	Pages 423-426; Lines 8499 - 8577	<p>SECT. 185. Ordin. 10870, Sect. 444, as amended, and K.C.C. 21A.22.060 are hereby amended to read as follows:</p> <p>Except as otherwise provided in K.C.C. 21A.22.040, in addition to requirements in this title, all uses regulated under this chapter shall comply with the following standards:</p> <p>Add subsection 5. to B. as follows:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for amending subsections B.1. thru B.4 as per our 2/6/24 Detailed Comments. That said, 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) shall 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.</p> <p>To be clear, we need stronger protections around this area of mine reclamation/disposal. Currently, under existing Code and how it is interpreted in practice, we are living with the harmful practice of using mining sites, especially former or abandoned mining sites, effectively as waste-disposal facilities where, unfortunately, the standards that are supposed to provide a safeguard are routinely ignored by both the permitting agency and the site owner/operator. This appears to mainly be the case to maximize profits to the site owner/operator. Compounding all of this, is the lack of Periodic Review per Code (also a focus of our 2022 Docket Item), 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: “<i>We have had significant staff turnover tied to this body of work and are working on a plan to back into alignment with new staff.</i>”</p> <p>As a result, we see the need for more opportunities for Public Comment and Review, especially when there is a proposed change of activity and/or ownership. We have seen too many times when either has precipitated unanticipated problems and the Public is the last to know, but is the most affected. Although the existing KC Code 21A.22.060 Site design standards language could be regarded as already containing this requirement, as generally public comment is “required” as part of the permitting process, the requirement isn’t explicit. We already know from the debacle around the Reserve Silica site in Ravensdale (note: from the start of 2023 we have an ongoing dialogue with KC DLS-Permitting’s Deputy Director, Mark Rowe, and Code Enforcement Manager, Thomas Campbell, on this particular site and operation) that such changes to permits for these types of properties and situations are done without any public notice, involvement, or input. We believe such language is the <u>minimum</u> necessary to address such questionable activities by mine property owners and Permitting.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-8	Mineral Resource Policies	Lines 3525 - 3799	<p>We <i>re-iterate</i> the new text and ten new policies we proposed to the committee in our February 6, 2024, Detailed Comments, (Comments--Exec's "Recmd'd Plan", pp. 24-31) on the Executive's December 7, 2023, "<i>Recommended Plan</i>." Although a few were addressed—in some fashion—in the LS&L-U Committee's <i>Recommendation</i>, most were not.</p>	<p>To mitigate the ongoing environmental train wreck and to eliminate same in the future. 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 <i>relatively</i> 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.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-9	NB Zone	<p>Lines 3965 - 3985</p> <p>Ch 3; Lines 660 - 671</p> <p>Lines 1087 - 1106</p>	<p>SECT. 74. Ordin. 10870, Sect. 30, as amended, and K.C.C. 21A.04.090 are hereby amended to read...:</p> <p>A. The purpose of the neighborhood business zone (NB) is to provide convenient daily retail and personal services for a limited service area and to minimize impacts of commercial activities on nearby properties and ((in urban areas on properties with the land use designation of commercial outside of center,)) to provide for limited residential development. These purposes are accomplished by:</p> <p>Add back in the Executive's phrase highlighted underlined as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limiting nonresidential uses to those retail or personal services ((which)) that can serve the everyday needs of a surrounding urban or rural residential area; 2. Allowing for ((mixed use (housing and retail/ service))) mixed-use developments ((and)) in urban areas and rural towns;... <p>Eliminate highlighted subparagraph b.:</p> <p>R-302 b. In rural neighborhood commercial centers at low or middle densities that support housing co-located with commercial development, compatible with rural character and service levels;</p> <p>Add the following highlighted underlining:</p> <p>((R-401)) R-330 d. ((d)) Do not require an urban level of infrastructure or encourage urban development.</p> <p>((R-402)) R-331 c. Third, 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.</p>	<p>The phrase “in urban areas and rural towns” was added by the Executive in his 12/7/23 “Recommended Plan” to Council, but is <i>deleted</i> by the Council’s LS&L-U Committee in its Striker. The distinction enumerated by this phrase is important and should be added back in. Such “mixed-use development” has no place in Rural Neighborhood Business Districts.</p> <p>Subparagraph b. was <i>not</i> part of the Executive’s Recommend Plan (12/7/23), but added in by the Council’s LS&L-U Committee.</p> <p>These two changes are necessary to be <u>consistent</u> with the stated intent in lines 1083-1085: “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 <i>require</i> a Rural Area location and primarily serve local rural residents can be so located.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-9 cont'd	NB Zone	Lines 1235 - 1243	<p>Eliminate the following highlighted underlining:</p> <p>((R-501)) R-401 The uses allowed on lands with the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center((s designated on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map are)) land use designation shall be limited to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. ((s))Small-scale ((business areas)) businesses that ((should)) provide convenience shopping and services for ((the surrounding community)) surrounding Rural Area and Natural Resource Land residents, such as retail, community and human services, and personal services; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Housing, when part of a mixed-use development that is appropriately sized and scaled to be compatible with rural character.</p>	<p>The “Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center” designation is for local small businesses that serve Rural Area residents, <u>not</u> for multistory, multifamily housing. Such housing placed in rural settings, not only displaces needed local small businesses, but also is not “affordable” as there is little to no infrastructure—no transit, limited one-lane-each-way County roads, no sewers, no water. etc. The KC Executive was correct in eliminating such housing. Citizens have been working to eliminate such housing for over seven years!</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-10	P-Suffix Zoning / Dvmt Conditions (New Map Amendment)	Att. I — Land-Use & Zoning Map Amend's Line 2186 and beyond	<p><u>Add</u> the following <i>new</i> Map Amendment:</p> <p><u>Map Amendment XX: Countywide – P-Suffix Zoning / Development Conditions — AMENDMENT TO THE KING COUNTY ZONING ATLAS — ZONING</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>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.</u> <u>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.</u> 	<p>Most of these P-Suffix development conditions are many years out of date. 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. We have discussed this with KC DLS-Permitting and they agree that many P-Suffix development conditions are years out of date.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-11	<p>TUPs (KC Code 21A.32.100 & 120)</p> <p>CUPs</p>		<p>Eliminate permitting of “Event Centers” as <i>temporary</i> uses. Forty, fifty, or sixty (as current Code allows) events per year is not “temporary.” “Businesses” that hold events, such as weddings and family or group reunions, should <u>not</u> be granted a TUP, but rather should fall under KC Code 21A.06.958 - Recreation, active, as large-scale gatherings or social events.</p> <p>Place “Events” in a <u>separate</u> category such that places with a few events per year would be allowed and those essentially run “Event Centers” in the RA and A zones as a <u>business</u> under a Temporary-Use Permit (TUP) would be disallowed. Currently, TUPs allow “up to sixty days a year” (e.g., ~7 months of Saturdays and Sundays, which clearly is not “temporary.” “Temporary” should be no more than “ten days a year” (e.g., 5 Summer weekends). By defining Event Centers in code, they will no longer be able to use the TUP process.</p> <p>Provide sufficient funding to allow DLS-Permitting to conduct Code Enforcement, including enforcing the conditions it imposes with the issuance of CUPs. Otherwise, stop issuing CUPs and stop issuing permits to chronic violators, take them to court instead to save time, effort, money and to portico the Public and the environment.</p> <p>KC Code 21A.08.040 Recreational/cultural land uses already allows certain activities in the Rural Area either outright or with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). However, a CUP must be consistent with the KCCP policies for the Rural Area and KC Code 21A.44.040 criteria. Should CUPs be sought, then there should be <i>real</i> conditions imposed <u>and</u> enforced.</p>	<p>Continuing to allow the siting and permitting of urban-serving facilities and events in the Rural Area defeats one of the purposes of the GMA and violates RCW 36.70A.070 which defines the Rural element for Comprehensive plans.</p> <p>“Event Centers” do not belong in the Rural Area. Granting TUPs for Event Centers in the Rural Area allows <i>special-interest commercialization</i> of the Rural Area. State and County laws that protect rural and resource lands must be upheld. County actions should be consistent with its own Code, Policies, and practice and protect rural and resource lands from illegal, special-interest, and unnecessary <i>urban-use commercial development</i>. Allowing Event Centers in the Rural Area essentially grants special privileges to the few, at the expense of the many: farm businesses, rural residents, the environment, and taxpayers. Such urban-serving businesses belong in the UGA, <u>not</u> the Rural Area.</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan has many good policies, but without holding the line to stop these kinds of facilities and events its goals and the following policies (currently adopted KCCP numbering) to protect and preserve the Rural Area will fail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R-201 “... <u>maintain ... 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;</u>” R-202 “The Rural Area geography ... shall include areas that are rural in character and that...have <u>significant environmental constraints that make the area generally unsuitable for ... urban development;</u>” R-203 <u>The Rural Area geography is considered to be permanent ...;</u>” R-324 “<u>Nonresidential uses in the Rural Area shall be limited to those that: ... Require location in a Rural Area.</u>” <p>TUPs and CUPs must be focussed and limited; while permit exceptions should be just that—exceptions for a very specific purpose meeting very specific, temporary, and non-recurring situations or conditions, not the rule.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
<p>JT-12</p> <p>***</p>	<p>Transportation</p> <p>Public Transportation</p> <p>Active Transportation</p>	<p>Ch 8; Lines 1180 - 1182</p> <p>after Line 1365</p> <p>Lines 1386 -1390</p>	<p>Add the highlighted underlined words at end of policy:</p> <p>((T-204)) T-201 King County should support local and regional growth plans and policies by focusing transit services on centers and other areas of concentrated activity, and on commuter corridors between cities through the Rural Area and/or Natural Resource Lands.</p> <p>Add new highlighted underlined text:</p> <p>Many roads in the Rural Area were constructed decades ago and did not then provide suitably for active transportation; however, upgrading most roads to a modern standard is not financially feasible in the near future. Transitional road improvements could provide cost-effective benefits sooner by deviating thoughtfully from full design standards at targeted locations.</p> <p>Amend Policy T-218 as follows:</p> <p>((T-240))T-218 The specifications in the King County Road Design and Construction Standards shall include provisions for Transitional Road Improvements to support active transportation sooner at low cost by deviation from standards. The Transitional Improvement shall be consistent with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Alleviates a known safety and/or mobility condition by improving a relatively short segment of road; (b) Has low cost for the benefits obtained; (c) Does not overlap with any road construction project providing similar benefits with funding identified for completion within six years; (d) Does not preclude later conversion to full design standards. 	<p>*** We understand this LA could be broken into five separate LAs, but show them as one package for discussion purposes. ***</p> <p>Recognizing commuter corridors is key to ensure transit works as intended and serves the Public.</p> <p>This is a Public Safety issue and make fiscal sense.</p>

Joint Rural Team Proposed Line Amendments to KC Council

No.	Topic	Pp./Line Nos.	Joint Team PROPOSAL	Rationale
JT-12 cont'd	Transportation (cont'd)			
	Concurrency	Lines 1666 - 1669	<p>Add the highlighted underlined words to:</p> <p>((T-222)) T-308 The concurrency test shall be based on the ((L))level of ((S))service on arterials in unincorporated King County using the ((e))County's adopted methodology based on the level of service provided to turning movements for local access. ((The test may be applied to designated Highways of Statewide Significance.))</p>	<p>Concurrency is based on the county's "adopted level of service methodology" but this methodology is not defined in the plan, but in a separate concurrency Ordinance.</p>
	Road Services Policies & Priorities	Lines 1853 - 1860	<p>Add the highlighted underlined words to:</p> <p>((T-310))T-320 ((State highway facilities and arterial roads are designed to accommodate higher traffic volumes, at higher speeds, than local roads. To protect residential neighborhoods from the impacts of pass through traffic,)) Whenever possible, King County should design and operate roads to direct ((such)) pass-through traffic away from local roads, designated heritage corridors, and arterials that provide substantial local access to adjacent areas and encourage such traffic to use highways or principal arterials ((whenever possible)), which are designed to accommodate higher traffic volumes at higher speeds.</p>	<p>In rural areas the term "local road" must be construed to include some arterials as well, due to the sparse nature of the road system, generally lacking what cities call neighborhood collectors.</p>
Regional Coordination	Lines 2020 - 2022	<p>Add the highlighted underlined words to:</p> <p>T-502 King County should promote a multi((-))jurisdictional, multimodal regional corridor approach to reducing congestion and improving efficiency on highways and arterial roads, including a uniform and integrated countywide impact fee program and concurrency standards across all borders.</p>		