

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-101 King County ((will)) shall continue to preserve and sustain its rural ((legacy)) history, character, and communities through programs and partnerships that support, preserve, and sustain its historic, cultural, ecological, agricultural, forestry, and mining heritage through collaboration with <u>Indian tribes</u>, local and regional preservation and heritage programs, community groups, rural residents and business owners including forest and farm owners, ((rural communities, towns, and e)) <u>Cities in the Rural Area</u>, and other interested ((stakeholders)) <u>parties</u>.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>"Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen</p> <p>Other edits for clarity and current practice</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy goal is "preserve and sustain rural history, character, and communities." Everything else is strategy that could be deleted.
<p>R-201 It is a fundamental objective of the King County Comprehensive Plan to maintain the character of its designated Rural Area. The Growth Management Act specifies the rural element of comprehensive plans include measures that apply to rural development and protect the rural character of the area (Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070((5))). The Growth Management Act defines rural character as it relates to land use and development patterns (Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.030((15))). ((This definition can be found in the Glossary of this Plan.)) Rural development can consist of a variety of uses that are consistent with the preservation of rural character and the requirements of the rural element. ((In order to)) To implement the Growth Management Act, it is necessary to define the development patterns that are considered rural, historical, or traditional and do not encourage urban growth or create pressure for urban facilities and service.</p> <p>Therefore, King County's land use regulations and development standards shall protect and enhance the following attributes associated with rural character and the Rural Area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The natural environment, particularly as evidenced by the health of wildlife and fisheries (especially salmon and trout), aquifers used for potable water, surface water bodies including Puget Sound and natural drainage systems and their riparian ((corridors)) areas; Commercial and noncommercial farming, forestry, fisheries, mining, home((-)) occupations and home industries; Historic resources, historical character, and continuity important to local communities, as well as archaeological and cultural sites important to <u>Indian tribes</u>; Community small-town atmosphere, safety, and locally((-))-owned small businesses; Economically and fiscally healthy Rural Towns and Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers with clearly defined identities compatible with adjacent rural, agricultural, forestry, and mining uses; Regionally significant parks, trails, and open space; A variety of low-density housing choices compatible with adjacent farming, forestry, and mining and not needing urban facilities and services; Traditional rural land uses of a size and scale that blend with ((historic)) <u>historical</u> rural development; and Rural uses that do not include primarily urban-serving facilities. 	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Edits for clarity, current terminology, and grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-202 The Rural Area geography shown on the King County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map shall include areas that are rural in character and ((meet one or more of the following criteria)) that:</p> <p>a. Have ((Ø))opportunities ((exist)) for significant commercial or noncommercial farming and forestry (large-scale farms and forest lands are designated as Resource Lands);</p> <p>b. ((The area w))Will help buffer nearby Natural Resource Lands from conflicting urban uses;</p> <p>c. ((The area is)) Are contiguous to other lands in the Rural Area, Resource Lands or large, predominantly environmentally critical areas;</p> <p>d. ((There are)) Have major physical barriers to providing urban services at reasonable cost, or such areas will help foster more logical boundaries for urban public services and infrastructure;</p> <p>e. ((The area is)) Are not needed for the foreseeable future that is well beyond the 20-year forecast period to provide capacity for population or employment growth;</p> <p>f. ((The area has)) Have outstanding scenic, historic, environmental, resource or aesthetic values that can best be protected by a rural designation; or</p> <p>g. Have ((S))significant environmental constraints that make the area generally unsuitable for intensive urban development.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Edits for clarity and streamlining</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-203 ((King County's)) The Rural Area geography is considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to ((an)) be in the Urban Growth Area ((until)) unless reviewed pursuant to the Growth Management Act (Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.130((3))) and the Countywide Planning Policies.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Edits for clarity and streamlining</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-204 Farming and forestry are vital to the preservation of rural King County and should be encouraged throughout the Rural Area. King County should encourage the retention of existing and establishment of new rural resource-based uses, with appropriate site management that protects habitat resources. King County's regulation of farming((-keeping of livestock,)) and forestry in the Rural Area should be consistent with these guiding principles:</p> <p>a. Homeowner covenants for new subdivisions and short subdivisions in the Rural Area should not restrict farming and forestry;</p> <p>b. Development regulations for resource-based activities should be tailored to support the resource use and its level of impact;</p> <p>c. Agricultural and silvicultural management practices should not be construed as public nuisances when carried on in compliance with applicable regulations, even though they may impact nearby residences; and</p> <p>d. County environmental standards for forestry and agriculture should protect environmental quality, especially in relation to water and fisheries resources, while encouraging forestry and farming.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>"Keeping livestock" is part of "farming"</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In sub a., the phrase is "not restrict farming and forestry," while K.C.C. 21A.14.330 (in the PO) uses "preclude agricultural and forestry activities." They could be made consistent.
<p>R-206 ((The e))Conservation of forest land and forestry throughout the Rural Area shall remain a priority for King County. Landowner property tax incentives, technical assistance, permit assistance, regulatory actions, and community-based education shall be used</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a 	<p>No issues identified.</p>

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
throughout the Rural Area to sustain the forest land base and forestry activities. King County should ensure that its regulations, permitting processes, and incentive programs facilitate and encourage active forest management and implementation of forest stewardship plans.					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	
R-207 Rural Forest Focus Areas (are identified) shall be designated geographic areas where special efforts are necessary and feasible to maintain forest cover and the practice of sustainable forestry. King County shall continue to target funding, when available, (new) economic incentive programs, regulatory actions, fee and easement acquisition strategies and (additional) technical assistance to the Rural Forest Focus Areas. (Strategies specific to each Rural Forest Focus Area shall be developed, employing the combination of incentive and technical assistance programs best suited to each focus area.)	Substantive change	Reoriented statement of fact to policy direction and to reflect current practice. Protection and delivery of incentives are not tailored to specific RFFAs.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale column states that the removed sentence does not meet current practice. Councilmembers could choose to give policy direction for the Executive to develop strategies specific to each area rather than removing the language.
R-208 The Rural Forest Focus Areas should be maintained in parcels of 20 acres or more (in order) to retain large, contiguous blocks of rural forest. Regulations and/or incentives should seek to achieve a maximum density of one home per 20 acres.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-209 King County should develop incentives to encourage agricultural activities (in the remaining) on prime farmlands located outside the Agricultural Production District. These incentives could include tax credits, expedited permit review, reduced permit fees, permit exemptions for activities complying with best management practices, assistance with agricultural waste management, or similar programs.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edited for clarity	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-210 King County supports the raising and management of livestock and the production of related value-added products. The management of livestock and the lands and structures supporting the raising of livestock, should be consistent with industry best management practices and (must) shall comply with county, state, and federal regulations related to the specific industry.	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Shall" is more consistent with Comprehensive Plan terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The word "shall" could be added to the first sentence to give this policy direction. The phrase beginning with "shall" in the second sentence could be deleted as it is not necessary to state in a policy that the County will comply with the law.
R-211 King County should continue to support and sustain equestrian activities and ensure that regulations support those activities compatible with the area in which they are located. The (e)County should encourage subdivision layouts that preserve opportunities for livestock and equestrian activities.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-213 Soft-surface multiple-use trails in corridors separate from road rights-of-way are the preferred option for equestrian travel for safety reasons and to avoid conflicts with residential activities associated with the street. Existing off-road trails should be preserved during site development, with relocation as appropriate to accommodate development while maintaining trail connections. The King County Road Design and Construction Standards ((will)) shall accommodate safe equestrian travel within road rights-of-way. Where appropriate, capital improvement programs for transportation and park facilities shall also enable the use of new facilities by equestrians. Construction standards for multiple-use ((nonmotorized)) trails to be established in road rights-of-way within the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands should assure a minimum eight-foot-wide gravel shoulder on arterial roads and 4.0 foot gravel shoulder on local access roads, or provide a trail separated from the driving lanes by a ditch or other barrier. Construction standards for soft-surface multiple-use ((nonmotorized)) trails in corridors separate from road rights-of-way shall be consistent with current trail construction and maintenance practices as promulgated by the U.S. Forest Service.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>"Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen</p> <p>Updates to reflect current terminology; trails are not just for nonmotorized uses</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second to last sentence is detailed construction standards already contained in the King County Road Standards. This level of detail is unusual in the Comp Plan and could be removed. "Active Transportation" is a broader category than walking and biking; it also includes equestrian travel and micromobility devices such as e-bikes and e-scooters, among other things. The Department of Commerce's 2023 checklist for comprehensive plan updates does require an active transportation component, but whether any given policy addresses all active transportation or a subset (such as walking and bicycling) is a policy choice.
<p>R 214 King County's land use regulations should protect rural equestrian community trails by supporting preservation of equestrian trail links in the Rural Area and within the Agricultural and Forest Production District. Representatives of the equestrian community should be given the opportunity to review and monitor regulatory and policy actions by King County, such as Rural Area development regulations, that have the potential to affect equestrian trails</p>	<p>Policy Staff Flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first sentence is duplicative of R-213 and could be removed.
<p>R-216 Equestrian trails should be a category in the ((e))County's Public Benefit Rating System, so that a landowner who provides trail access may qualify for a tax reduction under the program.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-217 County departments negotiating trades or sales of ((e))County-owned land shall determine whether any historically established trails exist on the property, and, when economically feasible, ensure that those trails are retained or replaced and are not lost as a condition of the trade or sale. Trails that provide key linkages, for either multi-use or equestrian trails, shall be considered to have strategic value to the county's trail network and shall be retained or replaced whenever possible.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
R-301 <u>King County shall use all appropriate tools at its disposal to limit growth in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands, such as land use designations, development regulations, level of service standards and incentives, to:</u> a. Retain ((A)) a low growth rate ((is desirable for the Rural Area, including Rural Towns and Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers, to)); b. ((e)) Comply with the State Growth Management Act((:)); c. ((continue preventing)) Prevent sprawl, the conversion of rural land, and the overburdening of rural services((:)); d. ((f)) Reduce the need for capital expenditures for rural roads((:)); e. ((m)) Maintain rural character((:)); f. ((p)) Protect the environment; and g. ((f)) Reduce ((transportation-related)) greenhouse gas emissions. ((All possible tools may be used to limit growth in the Rural Area. Appropriate tools include land use designations, development regulations, level of service standards and incentives.	Substantive Change	Strengthened to a shall to reflect current Growth Management Act mandates and County practices and regulations for limiting growth in the Rural Area and on Natural Resource Lands Sub-c is updated to include prevention of the conversion of rural land, consistent with existing intent and as mandated by the Growth Management Act, VISION 2050 IN MPP-RGS-13, and the Countywide Planning Policies in DP-46 Other clarifying and streamlining edits consistent with existing intent	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy is strengthened. King County would now be required to use all appropriate tools at its disposal to limit growth in RA and NRL, whereas before all possible tools "may" be used. Sub b. could be removed, as it is a requirement.
R-302 Residential development in the Rural Area should <u>only</u> occur ((as follows)) : a. In Rural Towns at a variety of densities and housing types as services an infrastructure allows, compatible with ((maintenance)) protection of historic resources and community character; and b. Outside Rural Towns at low densities compatible with traditional rural character and uses((:)); farming, forestry, and mining; and rural service levels.	Substantive change	To reflect other policy and code mandates for appropriate infrastructure needed to support development in the rural area, especially in rural towns with higher density zoning that don't have sewer service Other clarifying edits consistent with existing intent	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although this remains a "should" policy, this language strengthens the policy somewhat by stating that it should <i>only</i> occur as written. The policy also gives direction that development in rural towns should <i>only</i> be undertaken when adequate services and infrastructure are available.
R-303 Rural Area zoned properties should have low residential densities that can be sustained by minimal infrastructure improvements such as septic systems and rural roads, should cause minimal environmental degradation and impacts to significant historic resources, and ((that)) will not cumulatively create the future necessity or expectation of urban levels of services.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy could be strengthened, by changing "should" to "shall." As written, this policy does not recognize the possibility of large on-site septic systems or community septic systems. Councilmembers may want to add clarifying language here to make it clear whether such systems are appropriate.
R-304 Rural Area zoned residential densities shall be applied in accordance with R-305 – R-309. Individual zone reclassifications are discouraged and should not be allowed in the Rural Area. ((Property owners seeking to)) Individual zone reclassifications ((should)) shall demonstrate compliance with R-305 – R-309.	Substantive change	Strengthened to a "shall" to ensure consistency with the rural zoning standards of the Comprehensive Plan.	More robust review of rural rezones and improved alignment with the intent and standards of the Comprehensive Plan	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: No commensurate code change is needed, as K.C.C. 21A.44.060 currently requires consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, which would now include consistency with this new "shall" requirement. Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: 2025 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is somewhat of a contradiction in this policy in that individual rezones "should not be allowed" followed by an allowance for individual rezones. It may be clearer to link the two sentences. This could also be a code criteria for rezones, and therefore be deleted from the policy.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-305 A residential density of one home per 20 acres or 10 acres shall be achieved through regulatory and incentive programs on lands in the Rural Area that are managed, preserve, or prioritized for forestry or farming respectively, and <u>lands that</u> are found to qualify for a Rural Forest Focus Area designation in accordance with R-207.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Substantive Change</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a substantive change as lands would not have to be actively managed for forestry or farming to qualify. "Prioritized" suggests that the County could designate any RA property as a priority for future farming or forestry and it would fall into this category. Executive staff state that the intent is to ensure that County priorities are represented in future decisions about density and to protect certain rural area properties from increased densities through rezones.
<p>R-306 A residential density of one home per 10 acres shall be applied in the Rural Area where: a. The lands are adjacent to or within one-quarter mile of designated ((Agricultural Production Districts, the Forest Production District or legally approved long-term mineral resource extraction sites)) <u>Natural Resource Lands;</u> ((or)) b. The lands contain moderate or significant; environmentally constrained areas as defined by county ((ordinance, policy or federal or)), state, or federal law((-or)); regionally significant resource areas; or ((substantial)) critical habitat as determined by legislatively approved ((basin plans or)) Watershed Resource Inventory Area Plans; ((and)) or c. ((The predominant lot size is greater than or equal to 10 acres in size)) <u>A residential density of one home per five acres would harm or diminish the surrounding area, burden infrastructure, increase development pressure, or be inconsistent with the development patterns promoted by the Comprehensive Plan.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Sub-a and b – clarifying/ streamlining edits that reflect existing intent. Specifically, in sub-b, basin plans is removed here because they are proposed for repeal in the ordinance adopting the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, as they are primarily from the 1990s and do not reflect current conditions or regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Sub-c – This language was guidance from when the post-Growth Management zoning conversion was first implemented in the early 1990s. The new, lower zoned densities were often not applied to smaller parcels that were already developed at the time, which often created a patchwork of various zones and lot sizes in any given area. The policy needs reorienting to current application and context when reviewing proposed rezones now. Properties are often smaller in size than the minimum lot size and, in the case of RA-10, they abut other rural area zoned parcels (such as RA-5, RA-2.5) as well as city parcels, that allow even smaller lots. Given this, the predominant lot size approach is no longer an appropriate method for distinguishing between RA-10 and other zones. The policy is reoriented to better align with</p>	<p>Will help provide clarity when reviewing proposed rezones, avoid use of an outdated approach, and ensure protection of rural character. Unlikely to have significant impacts on rural densities.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: Commensurate updates in K.C.C. Chapter 20.22 Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The change in sub c. would allow parcels to be rezoned to RA-5 even if the predominant lot size in the area was 10 acres or greater. This is a policy choice. The replacement criteria "harm or diminish the surrounding area" is open to interpretation. Councilmembers could provide more specific or different direction. Executive staff indicate that this phrase would include looking at visual impacts, noise impacts, runoff, flood hazard, and shoreline stabilization. Because any rezone from RA-10 to RA-5 would either 1) allow for more lots than allowed under the current zoning or 2) Allow for construction of a detached ADU by bringing the lot in conformance with the minimum lot size, it is unclear how a rezone from RA-10 to RA-5 could comply with the directive to not "increase development pressure."

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-308 A residential density of one home per five acres shall be applied in the Rural Area <u>only</u> where:</p> <p>a. <u>The lands are more than one-quarter mile away from designated Natural Resource Lands;</u></p> <p>b. <u>The lands (is) are physically suitable for development with minimal, environmentally sensitive features as defined by county, state, or federal law; regionally significant resource areas; or critical habitat as determined by legislatively ((adopted watershed based)) approved Watershed Resource Inventory Area plans; and ((b. Development can be supported by rural services;</u></p> <p>c. The land does not meet the criteria in this plan for lower density designations; and</p> <p>d. The predominant lot size is less than 10 acres.)</p> <p>c. <u>This residential density would not harm or diminish the surrounding area, burden infrastructure, increase development pressure, and be inconsistent with the development patterns promoted by the Comprehensive Plan.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>other Growth Management Act and Comprehensive Plan goals and mandates.</p> <p>Sub a. and new sub-b – Language added for parallel considerations and contrast with R-306, with edits for clarity, consistent with existing intent</p> <p>Old sub-b – removed, as this requirement is not unique to RA-5 zoned properties; it would be the same for all RA densities. Instead relies on new sub-c.</p> <p>Old sub-c - removed unnecessary and passive language Instead relies on new Subsection c.</p> <p>Old sub-d - This language was guidance from when the post-Growth Management zoning conversion was first implemented in the early 1990s. The new, lower zoned densities were often not applied to smaller parcels that were already developed at the time, which often created a patchwork of various zones and lot sizes in any given area. The policy needs reorienting to current application and context when reviewing proposed rezones now. Properties are often smaller in size than the minimum lot size and, in the case of RA-5, they abut other rural area zoned parcels (such as RA-5, RA-2.5) as well as city parcels, that allow even smaller lots. Given this, the predominant lot size approach is no longer an appropriate method for distinguishing between RA-5 and other zones. The policy is reoriented to better align with other Growth Management Act and Comprehensive Plan goals and mandates.</p>	<p>Will help provide clarity when reviewing proposed rezones and avoid use of an outdated approach. Unlikely to have significant impacts on rural densities.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: Commensurate updates in K.C.C. Chapter 20.22 Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The size of surrounding lots would no longer be directly taken into consideration when rezoning. In 2023, that language was the subject of some discussion related to a proposed rezone application that was ultimately denied. As part of that discussion, Executive staff stated to the Hearing Examiner that "predominant lot size" meant "predominant zoning;" the Hearing Examiner disagreed. While it is a policy choice to remove this language, if it were to remain, additional clarification of the language would be needed. New sub c. would require that all four criteria would need to be met to deny a rezone. It's a policy choice whether to have this be an "and" statement, or whether to say that only one or some of these criteria would need to be met in order to deny a rezone. Policy staff would note that in R-308, sub c. has "and," but in R-306, sub c. has "or,"
<p>R-309 The RA 2.5 zone has generally been applied to Rural Areas with an existing pattern of lots below five acres in size that were created prior to the adoption of the 1994 Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>Policy Staff Flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first two sentences are not policy direction and could potentially be added to the lead-in text.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>These smaller lots may still be developed individually or combined, provided that applicable standards for sewage disposal, environmental protection, water supply, roads, and rural fire protection can be met. A subdivision at a density of one home per 2.5 acres shall only be permitted through the Transfer of Development Rights from property in the designated Rural Forest Focus Areas. The site receiving the density must be approved as a Transfer of Development Rights receiving site in accordance with the King County Code. Properties on Vashon Maury Island shall not be eligible as receiving sites.</p>						
<p>R-310 Accessory dwelling units in structures detached from the primary dwelling shall be counted as a separate dwelling unit for the purpose of lot calculations under the zoning in place at the time of a proposed subdivision .</p>	<p>Policy Staff Flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy, and the corresponding code section in the Proposed Ordinance, allow for different numbers of detached ADUs on a property depending on whether an ADU existing prior to subdivision. An example: If someone has a ten-acre property in the RA-5 zone, and they have a detached ADU, the ADU has to become the primary unit on the second property when they subdivide, and neither property can ever have an ADU again. On the other hand, if someone has the same property without an ADU, and subdivides and builds a new home on the second property, both properties can then build ADUs. Whether to maintain this difference, or allow the same number of ADUs regardless of when subdivision happens, is a policy choice, but either the code or the policy need to be changed for consistency.
<p>R-311 The King County (Residential Density Incentive) <u>Inclusionary Housing</u> Program shall not be available for development in the Rural Area zones.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>To reflect proposed repeal of the Residential Density Incentive Program and replacement by the expanded Inclusionary Housing Program. The expanded program is still not appropriate for Rural Area zones.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This could be covered by code provisions and deleted as a policy.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-312 ((As an innovative means to)) King County shall continue to operate an effective Transfer of Development Rights Program to:</p> <p>a. ((P)) Permanently ((preserve)) conserve private lands with countywide public benefit((;));</p> <p>b. ((to e)) Encourage higher densities in urban areas; ((and))</p> <p>c. ((f)) Reduce residential development capacity in Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands;</p> <p>d. Incentivize establishment of parks and open space in urban areas((, King County shall continue to operate an effective Transfer of Development Rights Program)); and</p> <p>e. Support the County's climate resilience goals.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Reflects existing code allowances for Transfer of Development Rights acquisitions of parks and open space in urban areas. Incorporates climate change as an additional driver for Transfer of Development Rights-supported conservation.</p> <p>Other edits for clarity, streamlining, and current terminology</p>	<p>Reduction of climate change impacts at via Transfer of Development Rights easement acquisitions in unincorporated urban areas and in cities.</p>	<p>Conservation Futures Tax Opportunity Areas</p> <p>Land Conservation Initiative</p> <p>Strategic Climate Action Plan</p> <p>Clean Water Healthy Habitat Strategic Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addition of sub d. aligns with changes made to the TDR program in the 2020 Comp Plan update to allow urban properties to act as sending sites when receiving conservation futures tax funding. R-312, 313, and 314 have significant overlap and could be combined.
<p>R-313 The purpose of the Transfer of Development Rights Program is to reduce development potential in the Rural Area, ((and)) on designated Natural Resource Lands, and on urban open space lands acquired using conservation futures tax funding. ((its)) The Program's priority is to encourage the transfer of development rights from private rural and resource properties into the Urban Growth Area to protect natural resources while preserving housing potential and incentivizing development in locations best suited for growth.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Reflects existing code allowances for Transfer of Development Rights acquisitions of parks and open space in urban areas.</p> <p>Explains why it's a priority to conserve rural and resource lands, consistent with current practice and program goals</p> <p>Other edits for clarity, streamlining, and current terminology</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R-312, 313, and 314 have significant overlap and could be combined.
<p>R-314 King County supports and shall work actively to facilitate the transfer of Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands development rights to:</p> <p>a. ((Preserve)) Conserve the rural environment, encourage retention of resource-based uses and reduce service demands;</p> <p>b. Provide permanent protection to significant natural resources;</p> <p>c. Increase the regional open space system;</p> <p>d. Maintain low density development in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands;</p> <p>e. Steer development growth inside the Urban Growth Area in ways that promote quality urban neighborhoods where residents want to work and live; and</p> <p>f. ((Provide mitigation for the impacts of urban development on global climate change by simultaneously reducing transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions and sequestering carbon through retention of forest cover and conserving agricultural lands)) Contribute to climate change benefits.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Align policy with current science and environmental benefits, recognizing Transfer of Development Rights in and of itself doesn't support climate mitigation efforts quantifiably to the extent once believed, (though Transfer of Development Rights are still beneficial for climate mitigation and adaptation many reasons)</p> <p>Other edits for current terminology</p>	<p>Requires new urban development using Transfer of Development Rights to account for and mitigate, where appropriate, climate change impacts under the State Environmental Policy Act</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: Commensurate removal in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.37 Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R-312, 313, and 314 have significant overlap and could be combined.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-315 To promote transfers of development rights, King County shall:</p> <p>a. Facilitate transfers from private property owners with sending sites to property owners with receiving sites;</p> <p>b. Operate the King County Transfer of Development Rights Bank to facilitate the Transfer of Development Rights market, <u>maintain supply to the extent practicable</u>, and bridge the time gap between willing sellers and buyers of Transferrable Development Rights through buying, holding, and selling Transferable Development Rights;</p> <p>c. Work with cities to develop interlocal agreements that encourage transfers of development rights from Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands into cities;</p> <p>d. Work with cities regarding annexation areas where Transferrable Development Rights are likely to be used;</p> <p>e. Work with communities and seek funding and other means to provide public amenities to enhance the livability of incorporated and unincorporated area neighborhoods accepting increased densities through the Transfer of Development Rights Program; ((and))</p> <p>f. Work with the Washington State Department of Commerce, Puget Sound Regional Council, and King County cities to implement Washington State Regional Transfer of Development Rights legislation; <u>and</u></p> <p>g. <u>Explore new opportunities to increase Transfer of Development Right demand, prioritizing new receiving sites or Transfer of Development Right use within urban areas.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Emphasizes importance of demand to enable future conservation (i.e. it drives the system), encourages seeking new ways to drive demand, and specifies urban areas as preferred receiving areas.</p>	<p>Increased opportunities for Transfer of Development Rights partnerships with cities and augments urban demand, which drives additional conservation.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> Programmatic and Regulatory • <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> Creation of new fee-in-lieu Transfer of Development Rights option when Transfer of Development Rights are not available for purchase • <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> No • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
<p>R-316 Eligible sending sites shall be lands designated on the King County Comprehensive Plan land use map as: Rural Area (with RA-2.5, RA-5, or RA-10 zoning), Agriculture (with A zoning), Forestry (with F zoning), Urban Separator (with R-1 zoning), or Urban Residential Medium or Urban Residential High (with R-4, R-6, R-8, R-12, R-18, R-24 or R-48 zoning) and that are approved for Conservation Futures Tax funding((?)). These sites shall provide permanent land ((protection)) <u>conservation</u> to create a significant public benefit. ((Priority s)) <u>Sending sites ((are)) shall include, but not be limited to:</u></p> <p>a. Lands in Rural Forest Focus Areas;</p> <p>b. Lands adjacent to the Urban Growth Area boundary;</p> <p>c. Lands contributing to the protection of endangered and threatened species;</p> <p>d. Lands that are suitable for inclusion in and provide important links to the regional open space system;</p> <p>e. Agricultural and Forest Production District lands;</p> <p>f. Intact shorelines of Puget Sound;</p> <p>g. Lands ((identified as important according to the Washington State Department of Ecology's Watershed Characterization analyses)) <u>in the RA zone with conservation values related to farming, forestry, carbon sequestration, or open space;</u> or</p> <p>h. <u>Lands contributing open space or strengthening protection of critical area function and values in urban unincorporated areas.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Reorients policy from a statement to direction, consistent with existing intent.</p> <p>Updates to reflect current practice: align with code, removes reference to outdated analysis tool, clarifies key priorities for rural conservation, and alignment with critical area protection goals.</p> <p>Reflects current terminology.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first paragraph is regulatory in nature and already contained in K.C.C. Title 21A. It could potentially be deleted. • The subs are currently eligible regardless of being listed here. Executive staff indicate that the lettered list identifies those sending sites that the County wants to actively pursue, rather than passively accepting. This could be made more clear in the language.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>((R-317 For Transfer of Development Rights purposes only, qualified sending sites are allocated development rights as follows: a. Sending sites in the Rural Area zoned RA-2.5 shall be allocated one Transferrable Development Right for every two and one-half acres of gross land area; b. Sending sites in the Rural Area zoned RA-5 or RA-10 or Agricultural zoning shall be allocated one Transferrable Development Right for every five acres of gross land area; c. Sending sites with Forest zoning shall be allocated one Transferrable Development Right for every eighty acres of gross land area; d. Sending sites with Urban Separator land use designation shall be allocated four Transferrable Development Rights for every one acre of gross land area; e. Sending sites with an Urban Residential, Medium or Urban Residential, High land use designation shall be allocated Transferrable Development Rights equivalent to the zoning base density for every one acre of gross land area; f. If a sending site has an existing dwelling or retains one or more development rights for future use, the gross acreage shall be reduced in accordance with the site's zoning base density for the purposes of Transferrable Development Right allocation; and g. King County shall provide bonus Transferrable Development Rights to sending sites in the Rural Area as follows: 1. The sending site is a vacant RA zoned property and is no larger than one-half the size requirement of the base density for the zone; and 2. The sending site is a RA zoned property and is located on a shoreline of the state and has a shoreline designation of conservancy or natural.))</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>This is regulatory and a level of detail not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. It is currently in the Code and will continue there.</p>	<p>No change; standards would still be required in the code</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: Existing code in K.C.C. chapter 21.A.37 addresses these requirements Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-318 ((Prior to the county's allocation of Transferable Development Rights to a sending site landowner, the landowner shall record and place on title of sending site parcel a conservation easement documenting the development restrictions. If development rights are being retained for future development, the subsequent development must be clustered, and the tract preserved with a permanent conservation easement shall be larger than the developed portion. In the case of lands within the Rural Forest Focus Areas, no more than one dwelling unit per 20 acres shall be retained, and the tract preserved with a conservation easement shall be at least 15 acres in size.)) <u>Transfer of Development Right sending sites shall be permanently protected with a conservation easement or similar encumbrance to ensure perpetual conservation benefit.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Simplified language requiring permanent protection of TDR sending sites; allows "similar encumbrances" as conservation easements to simplify Transfer of Development Rights enrollment for King County fee title acquisitions.</p>	<p>Streamlined enrollment process</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic and Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: Commensurate updates to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.37 Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R-316 already includes the language shown here. R-318 could be deleted.
<p>((R-319 Transferrable Development Rights may be used on receiving sites in the following order of preference as follows: a. Incorporated Cities. Transfers into incorporated areas shall be detailed in an interlocal agreement between the city receiving the development rights and the county; b. Unincorporated urban commercial centers; c. Other unincorporated urban areas; and d. Rural Areas zoned RA-2.5, unless they are on Vashon-Maury Island, may receive transfers of development rights, but only from the Rural Forest Focus Areas.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Removal will reduce confusion around implementation, and reflect market-based nature of the program; the bank can be selective about selling to receiving sites, but the Program doesn't want to constrain private market activity, consistent with existing practice</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-319a King County should designate urban unincorporated areas as Transferrable Development Right receiving sites for short subdivisions. Use of Transferrable Development Rights in formal subdivisions shall be allowed only through a subarea study.))</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Allowance for urban Transfer of Development Right sending sites for subdivisions is a code requirement, and doesn't need to be a policy.</p> <p>"Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing intent. The subarea study definition will be removed, as it is no longer necessary. In this case, of Transfer of Development Rights, the study requirement is redundant to existing reviews that occur as part of departmental review of subdivision applications. So, the additional study requirement is proposed for removal. However, the code is updated to ensure that review of the subdivision application by the Hearing Examiner would need to include a finding that the use of Transfer of Development Rights doesn't create additional, unmitigated impacts.</p>	<p>Streamlined permitting process for subdivisions using Transfer of Development Rights</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: Current code in K.C.C. chapter 21A.37 already reflects subdivision allowance. <p>Replacement of subarea study requirement with Hearing Examiner review is reflected in K.C.C. chapter 21A.37 and K.C.C. 20.22</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
R-319 King County should prioritize Transferable Development Rights uses for residential density in urban areas. King County may also allow Transferrable Development Rights: a. In limited instances for development in the Rural Area, except for Vashon-Maury Island; and b. To provide incentives to developers for uses other than additional residential density.	New policy	Intent is (1) to clarify that we prefer Transfer of Development Rights to convert to residential density in receiving areas to increase housing capacity, consistent with R-312 and R-313, (2) to acknowledge the limited rural use of Transfer of Development Rights (currently for concurrency and proposed for duplexes in a Rural Town), and (3) to allow flexibility for future uses of Transfer of Development Rights if demand emerges for another kind of bonus. We would still prioritize residential density but wouldn't want to preclude the opportunity for additional conservation if the market expands in a new direction.	Helps ensure continued demand for TDRs by allowing TDRs to translate into non-density uses of value to developers.	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic and Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: Proposed change to K.C.C. 21A.08.030 to allow for a duplex on a substandard lot in Snoqualmie Pass Rural Town that could otherwise have an Accessory Dwelling Unit. <p>No additional proposed changes to K.C.C. at this time; new policy creates authority for future changes, where appropriate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the uses listed in the rationale column, TDRs can also currently be used in the RA-2.5 zone. This proposed change would also allow the code to be amended in the future to allow other uses of TDR in the rural area. Though no changes are proposed at this time, this would allow the County to authorize, through a code change, use of TDRs for non-density uses in the future without need for comprehensive plan amendments.
R-320 King County should seek other public funding and private-public partnerships for incorporated and unincorporated urban area amenities to strengthen the Transfer of Development Rights Program ((and facilitate the transfer of development rights from Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands into the King County Urban Growth Area to preserve the rural environment, encourage retention of rural and resource-based uses, and avoid urban service demands in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands)).	Clarification of existing policy intent	Removes language redundant to other policies about program goals.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This concept is already covered by R-315 sub e., so this policy could be deleted.
R-320a King County shall provide amenities to urban unincorporated Transferrable Development Right receiving areas to improve the livability of the receiving area. Amenities should be provided at levels commensurate with the number of Transferrable Development Rights used in the receiving area. The type, timing, and location of amenities provided to urban unincorporated Transferrable Development Right receiving areas should be informed by a public engagement process including members of the affected receiving area and the city affiliated with annexation.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the ideas in this policy are covered by R-315 sub e. This policy could be shortened or deleted.
((R-321 King County should pursue public funding and public-private partnerships, and bond or levy proposals, for additional Transfer of Development Rights Bank funding to target threatened private Rural Areas or Natural Resource Lands. Development rights purchased through such a program should be sold into any appropriate urban location.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Duplicative of R-320	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the Executive's rationale states that this is duplicative of R-320, R-320 is about funding for public amenities to encourage developers to buy TDRs, whereas R-321 is about pursuing funding for the County to purchase TDRs. Whether to remove encouragement to pursue bond and levy proposals for TDR funding is a policy choice.
R-322 The goals of the Rural and Resource Land Preservation Transfer of Development Rights Program are to: (1) reduce the development potential in Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands by 25%; (2) increase activity in the Transfer of Development Rights market; (3) bolster demand for Transferrable Development Rights;	Clarification of existing policy intent	R-322 duplicates R-313, R-314, and the section intro narrative. The 25% reduction goal is not captured elsewhere, but is difficult to track and is not part of	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in the Executive's rationale, the reduction in development potential by 25% is the only part of this policy not captured elsewhere. Though it states that it is not possible to do with

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>(4) offer Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands property owners access to incentive programs; (5) protect low density Rural Areas from encroaching urban development; and (6) reduce greenhouse gas emissions by decreasing vehicle miles traveled from the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands and by sequestering carbon.</p>		<p>current program operations/capacity.</p>				<p>current program capacity, if Councilmembers did want this tracked, it could be added as a "should" to one of the previous policies proposed for retention, or be added as a "shall" and resources designated for this purpose.</p>
<p>R-323 The Rural and Resource Land Preservation Transfer of Development Rights Program shall include, but is not limited to, the following: a. In addition to the density that is allowed on a receiving site in the urban growth area from the purchase of Transferrable Development Rights, the county shall evaluate the climate change benefits achieved by reducing transportation related greenhouse gas emissions that result from the transfer of development rights from the sending site, provided that such consideration is not precluded by administrative rules promulgated by the state; b. In order to satisfy transportation concurrency requirements in the Rural Area in a transportation concurrency travel shed that is non-concurrent, a development proposal for a short subdivision creating up to four lots may purchase Transferrable Development Rights from other Rural Area or Natural Resource Land properties in the same travel shed; allowing this is intended to reduce overall traffic impacts in rural travel sheds by permanently removing development potential. The transfer shall not result in an increase in allowable density on the receiving site. A short subdivision creating two lots where the property has been owned by the applicant for five or more years and where the property has not been subdivided in the last ten years shall satisfy the transportation concurrency requirements without having to purchase Transferrable Development Rights; c. King County shall provide an added density bonus of up to a 100% increase above the base density allowed in K.C. Code 21A.12.030, when Transferrable Development Rights are used for projects within any designated commercial center or activity center within the Urban Growth Area that provides enhanced walkability design and incorporates transit oriented development, and may provide an added density when Transferrable Development Rights are used for projects that provide affordable housing in the R-4 through R-48 zones; d. King County may allow accessory dwelling units in the Rural Area that are greater than one thousand square feet, but less than 1,500 square feet, if the property owner purchases one Transferrable Development Right from the Rural Area, Agriculture or Forestry designations; ((and)) e. King County may allow a detached accessory dwelling unit on a RA-5 zoned lot that is two and one-half acres or greater and less than three and three-quarters acres if the property owner purchases one Transferrable Development Right from the Rural Area, Agriculture or Forestry designations.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Generally, all provisions are either already in code, are being removed for other reasons already noted in other polices, or are covered by policy changes earlier in this section. Specifically: Sub-a: see related note on removing greenhouse reduction calculations; Sub-b: duplicates K.C.C. 14.70.025 Sub-c: duplicates K.C.C. Chapter 21A.12 Subs-d, e, and f: duplicates K.C.C. 21A.08.030</p> <p>New proposed policy R-319 above would continue to allow Transfer of Development Rights for bonuses other than residential density, but with more flexibility and more consistent with current program framework.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>[Lead-in text on Page 3-28] Although low-density residential development, farming and forestry are the primary uses in the Rural Area, some compatible public and private uses are appropriate and contribute to rural character.</p>	<p>Policy Staff Flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Value-added goods" could be added to the list of uses compatible in the RA zone, consistent with descriptions of

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
Compatible uses might include small, neighborhood (churches) places of worship, feed and grain stores, produce stands, forest product sales and home occupations such as woodcrafters, small day care facilities or veterinary services. In addition, it may be necessary to locate some public facilities in the Rural Area, such as utility installations that serve rural homes. Any allowed nonresidential uses should be designed to blend with rural residential development and resource uses.						compatible or allowed uses elsewhere.
R-324 Nonresidential uses in the Rural Area shall be limited to those that: a. Provide convenient local products and services for nearby residents; b. Require location in a Rural Area; c. Support natural resource-based industries; d. Provide adaptive reuse of significant historic resources; or e. Provide recreational (and) or tourism opportunities that are compatible with the surrounding Rural Area.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Sub-e would currently require uses to provide both recreational <i>and</i> tourism opportunities; but there are uses that are currently allowed that may only provide one or the other. Policy is also split into two, with the 2 nd half now in R-324a, as they address different issues (types of uses versus conditions on the use)	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some friction between this policy and R-503b, R-505, and R-513. For instance, R-503b, R-505, and R-513 imply that non-resource industrial development is allowed if it provides employment for residents but doesn't meet any of these criteria. Additionally, the phrase "convenient local products and services" appears aimed at consumer goods and services, not public infrastructure. These policies could be clarified to reduce some of the friction.
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 and function with rural services, including on-site wastewater disposal.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Relocated from R-324	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issued identified.
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).	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edits for clarity	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This "shall" language requires approval of golf facilities when not located in these areas. Councilmembers may want to change this to "may be allowed through a conditional use" to clarify that approval is not mandatory.
R-327 Consistent with the recommendations of the School Siting Task Force, included as Appendix (Q) E, in the Rural Area: a. Except as otherwise provided in subsections d. and e. of this policy, an existing elementary, middle, or junior high school may be modified or expanded but shall not be converted to a high school; b. An existing high school may be modified or expanded or converted to an elementary, middle, or junior high school; c. Snoqualmie Valley 1: parcel number 1823099046, as shown on the King County Department of Assessments map as of March 31, 2012, may develop as a new school; d. Lake Washington 4: parcel numbers 0825069008 and 0825069056, as shown on the King County Department of Assessments map as of March 31, 2012, may develop as a new school and convert an existing school on the site to a high school use; e. Tahoma 1: parcel number 2622069047, as shown on the King County Department of Assessments map as of March 31, 2012, may develop as a new school and convert an existing school	Technical change	To reflect changes in appendix numbering	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issued identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
on the site to a high school use only if no feasible alternative site can be located within the Urban Growth Area; f. Lake Washington 2: parcel numbers 3326069010 and 3326069009, as shown on the King County Department of Assessments map as of March 31, 2012, may develop as a new school only if no feasible alternative site can be located within the Urban Growth Area, in which case it may be incorporated into the Urban Growth Area; and g. Enumclaw A and D: the rural portions of parcel numbers 2321069064, 2321069063, and 2321069062, as shown on the King County Department of Assessments map as of March 31, 2012, may develop as ballfields or recreational playfields only, for a school located on the urban portions of the parcels.						
R-329 Library services for the Rural Area should be provided by bookmobiles, or by libraries in Rural Towns or Cities in the Rural Area or may be allowed as an accessory use to a park or in a historic building in the Rural Area.	Clarification of existing policy intent	To be consistent with existing code in K.C.C. 21A.08.040	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This change makes the KCCP policy consistent with the existing code. Council could choose to remove the allowance from code instead. As these provisions are already in code, this policy could potentially be removed. Executive staff recommend that the policy remain, to discourage the code from being amended without consideration of this policy.
((R-631)) R-329a No master planned resorts as defined in Chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington shall be permitted in ((the Forest Production District)) unincorporated King County.	Substantive change	Relocates a portion of R-631, with clarifying edits to reflect existing intent. King County does not allow "master planned resorts," as defined in the Growth Management Act (which includes allowing sewers in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands), anywhere in the unincorporated area – not just in the Forest Production District. Instead, King County allows a less intensive version of this as "destination resorts," if appropriately sized/scaled. This policy inadvertently conflated the two and is updated to reflect that underlying intent and what's allowed in current code.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Planned Resorts are not currently allowed in any zone in the zoning code. This would align the KCCP language with the zoning code provisions. Council could choose to add master planned resorts to the zoning code instead.
R-331 New subdivisions in the Rural Area should be designed and developed to maximize conservation of existing forest cover and native vegetation, and to minimize impervious surfaces within individual lots and in the subdivision as a whole. ((King County shall develop additional site design standards for new subdivisions that further reduce the impacts of new homes in the Rural Area on the natural environment, resource uses and other adjacent land uses.))	Substantive change	Removing outdated language from 2000. These goals are generally addressed throughout current K.C.C.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exec staff rationale states that the deleted portion is already "generally" addressed in the code. Council could choose to retain and provide direction for additional standards if desired.
R-332 Site design standards for new subdivisions in the Rural Area should include: minimization of impervious surfaces; maximizing retention of native soil and vegetation; supporting green	Clarification of existing policy intent	Editing consistent with current stormwater management practices, Clean Water Healthy	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>stormwater infrastructure; site layout and landscaping that minimizes wildfire risk; limitations on entrance signage; preservation of natural contours, existing meadows and opportunities for keeping of horses; and other standards to limit features typical of urban or suburban development.</p>		<p>Habitat, and regional stormwater goals.</p> <p>In 2019, jurisdictions were required to update their code to implement low impact development. Many of these listed standards are part of that requirement minus signage, fire risk, and horse keeping. The Surface Water Design Manual requires all, except those.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	
<p>((ED-502)) R-333a In the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands, King County shall provide assistance through development of customized stewardship plans for individual properties, to help property owners understand their properties' characteristics and the potential impacts of their actions, and to make sustainable land management choices that protect natural resources.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Relocated without edit from to Chapter 10, as this policy is not directly about economic development</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified. • Flag for CAO update.
<p>R-334 To maintain traditional rural development patterns and assure continued opportunities for resource activities in the Rural Area, large lot development is preferred in the Rural Area. Clustering of lots is permitted when:</p> <p>a. The development provides equal or greater protection of the natural environment, natural resource lands, historic resources, or archaeological sites;</p> <p>b. Clusters are limited in size to be compatible with surrounding large lots or nearby agricultural and forestry uses;</p> <p>c. The clustered development is offset with a permanent resource land tract preserved for forestry or agriculture, as designated by the owner at time of subdivision or short subdivision, or a permanent open space tract. Under no circumstances shall the tract be reserved for future development; and</p> <p>d. The development can be served by rural facilities and service levels (such as on-site sewage disposal and fire protection).</p>	<p>Policy Staff Flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councilmembers may wish to include additional parameters on the size and scale of clustered development in the policy or in code to address rural development patterns.
<p>R-335 When a resource or open space tract is created as part of a plat, the ((e))County should require a stewardship plan to ensure appropriate management of the tract.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified. • Flag for CAO update.
<p>R-336 King County shall continue to support the rural development standards that have been established to protect the natural environment by addressing seasonal and maximum clearing limits, impervious surface limits and resource-based practices. Stormwater management practices should be implemented that emphasize preservation of natural drainage systems ((-protect)) and protection of water quality and natural hydrology of surface waters and groundwater. Rural development standards should also, where feasible, incorporate and encourage ((L))low ((t))impact ((D))design principles for managing stormwater onsite by minimizing impervious surfaces, preserving onsite hydrology, retaining native vegetation and forest cover, capturing and reusing rainwater, controlling pollution at the source, and protecting groundwater. King County shall take care that requirements for onsite stormwater</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The things listed here area all encouraged by Chapter 5 or existing development regulations, with the exception of clearing limits which were implemented and then struck down by the courts. As this policy is duplicative, it could potentially be removed. • Maximum clearing limits have been determined to be unconstitutional by the courts. The reference to "maximum" could be struck in accordance with this ruling.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
management complement requirements for onsite wastewater management.						
R-336a To help achieve the goal of reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions associated with new construction, King County should adopt and implement green building codes that are appropriate, ambitious and achievable.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is already covered by the policies in chapter 5 and so could potentially be removed.
R-336b ((Adoption of such codes may result in an increased use of f)) Renewable energy technologies ((that)) may be sited in the Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands, as appropriate. Development standards ((will seek to)) should ensure that the siting, scale, and design of these facilities respect and support rural character.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Reoriented from statement to policy direction, consistent with existing intent. "Will seek to" means the same as "should"	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
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: a. ((p)) Protect ((basic)) public health and safety and the environment ((, but)) ; b. ((a)) Are financially supportable at appropriate densities; c. ((c)) Are appropriate size and scale; and d. ((d)) Do not encourage urban development.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Restructured for clarity. Incorporates appropriate size and scale in sub-c, consistent with existing mandates in the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exec staff state that the intent of this policy is that the County work with partners when adopting County standards for those partners' facilities in the RA and NRL. The first part of the policy could be reworded to be clearer about that intent. The second part of the policy could be a separate sentence to make it clearer that it's about the standards, not the coordination.
R-402 Public spending priorities for facilities and services within the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands should be as follows: a. First, to maintain existing facilities and services that protect public health and safety; b. Second, to upgrade facilities and services when needed to correct ((level of service)) level-of-service deficiencies without unnecessarily creating additional capacity for new growth; and c. Third, to support sustainable economic development that is sized and scaled at levels appropriate for Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands and does not foster urbanization.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-403 In the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands, standards and plans for utility service should be consistent with long-term, low-density development and resource industries. Utility facilities that serve the Urban Growth Area but must be located in the Rural Area or on Natural Resource Lands (for example, a pipeline from a municipal watershed) should be designed and scaled to serve primarily the Urban Growth Area. Sewers needed to serve previously established urban "islands," Cities in the Rural Area, Rural Towns, or new or existing schools pursuant to R-327 and ((F-264)) F-262a shall be tightlined and have access restrictions precluding service to other lands in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands.	Technical change	Reflects policy renumbering	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive staff state that "urban islands" refers to isolated pockets of unincorporated urban areas surrounded by rural or resource lands, and that the only remaining area fitting this definition is the Bear Creek UPDs. The language could be updated to reflect this.
R-501 The <u>range of uses allowed on lands with the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center</u> ((s designated on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map are)) <u>land use designation shall be scaled to be small</u> ((-scale business areas)) <u>businesses</u> that ((should)) provide convenience shopping and services for ((the surrounding community)) <u>surrounding Rural Area and Natural Resource land residents, such as retail, community and human services, and personal services.</u>	Substantive change	Clarifying edits to: to make it clear that these are not the same as "centers" under the Multicounty Planning Policies and Countywide Planning Policies where growth is targeted, consistent with existing intent; consolidation of R-502;	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The underlying language appears to be referring to the areas being small rather than serving small businesses. Whether to make this change is a policy choice.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
		and breaking up the policy with new R-501a and R-501b below to make it clear that R-501 is about existing centers, R-501a is about prohibiting new centers, and R-501b is about expanding existing centers, consistent with existing intent				
R-501a No new nodes of lands shall be designated as Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center((s-are needed to serve the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands)).	Substantive Change	Breaking up R-501 with new R-501a and R-501b to make it clear that R-501 is about existing centers, R-501a is about prohibiting new centers, and R-501b is about expanding existing centers, consistent with existing intent	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This language is stronger than the underlying, although "no new RNCCs are needed" implies that they need not be created. Whether to outright prohibit the creation of new RNCCs is a policy choice.
R-501b ((Expansion of the boundaries of the)) Adding the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center land use designation to land adjacent to an existing Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center((s)) shall not be ((permitted)) allowed except through a subarea plan or area zoning and land use study.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Breaking up R-501 with new R-501a and R-501b to make it clear that R-501 is about existing centers, R-501a is about prohibiting new centers, and R-501b is about expanding existing centers, consistent with existing intent	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The changes to the first part of the policy may not be needed.
R-502 Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers should accommodate only small scale retail, community and human services, and personal service uses that provide convenience shopping and services to nearby Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands residents.))	Clarification of existing policy intent	Consolidated with R-501	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-503 King County commercial development standards for Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center((s)) lands should facilitate economic reuse of existing structures, minimize increases in impervious surfaces, and encourage retention of historic character and scale. Urban-level parking, landscaping, and street improvement standards are not appropriate for Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers except as demonstrated as being needed to address the safety of the public.	Clarification of existing policy intent	To make it clear that these are not the same as "centers" under the Multicounty Planning Policies and Countywide Planning Policies where growth is targeted, consistent with existing intent	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The change may not be necessary.
R-503a ((Where appropriate,)) King County should allow the use of existing structures/parcels to accommodate Farmers Markets ((within)) on Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center((s)) lands.	Clarification of existing policy intent	To make it clear that these are not the same as "centers" under the Multicounty Planning Policies and Countywide Planning Policies where growth is targeted, consistent with existing intent "Where appropriate" is not needed, because it is implied in the Comprehensive Plan definition of "should"	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The change to how RNCCs are characterized may not be necessary.
((R-507)) R-503b Rural Towns serve as activity centers for the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands and may be served by a range of utilities and services, and may include several or all of	Clarification of existing policy intent	To reflect that parks are also currently provided in Rural Towns, and to use current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first sentence needs policy direction:

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>the following land uses, if supported by necessary utilities and other services and if scaled and designed to protect rural character:</p> <p>a. Retail, commercial, and industrial uses to serve the surrounding Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands population;</p> <p>b. Residential development, including single(family) detached housing on small lots, as well as multifamily housing and mixed-use developments;</p> <p>c. Other retail, commercial, and industrial uses, such as resource industries, tourism, commercial recreation, and light industry; and</p> <p>d. Public facilities and services such as community services, parks, (churches) places of worship, schools, and fire stations.</p>		<p>Moved from below to so the policies flow from overarching role of Rural Towns (this policy) to then the specific Rural Towns that meet this criteria.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	
<p>R-504 King County designates the Rural Towns of Fall City, Snoqualmie Pass, and the (Town of) Vashon as unincorporated Rural Towns. These historical settlements in unincorporated King County should provide services and a range of housing choices for Rural Area residents. The boundaries of the designated Rural Towns are shown on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. Adjustments to these boundaries shall only occur through a subarea <u>plan or area zoning and land use</u> study, and shall not allow significant increases in development potential or environmental impacts. No new Rural Towns (are needed to serve the Rural Area) <u>shall be created</u>.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>"Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing intent. The subarea study definition will be removed, as it is no longer necessary. In this case, expansions of Rural Town boundary adjustments could happen via either a subarea plan or an area zoning and land use study.</p> <p>The last sentence is reoriented from a statement to policy direction, consistent with existing intent. The current statement is from the 1994 Comprehensive Plan when the Rural Town designation was first created to reflect the 3 existing nodes of more intensive development in the rural area (Vashon, Fall City, and Snoqualmie Pass) and to comply with the Growth Management Act mandate that no additional development of</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This language is stronger than the underlying, although "no new Rural Towns are needed" implies that they need not be created. Whether to outright prohibit the creation of new Rural Towns is a policy choice.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
		this density occur in the rural area. The statement was intended to set a marker that no additional rural towns be created moving forward.				
R-505 Commercial and industrial development that provides employment, shopping, and community and human services that strengthen the fiscal and economic health of rural communities should locate in Rural Towns if utilities and other services permit. Urban-level parking(,landscaping,) and street improvement standards are not appropriate for Rural Towns. Sidewalks and other pedestrian safety measures should be provided to serve ((the)) Rural Towns.	Clarification of existing policy intent	To align with current code. The Road Standards say "Street trees and landscaping should be incorporated into the design of road improvements for all classifications of roads" and don't distinguish between urban, rural, or rural town.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least Vashon Rural Town has urban level parking and street improvements, including curb and sidewalk. This language doesn't recognize the differences between the three Rural Towns. Generally, the standards don't differentiate for the same zone in different geographies. It's also conflicted by the next sentence and R-509. It is unclear how "urban-level parking" is implemented in the development regulations.
R-506 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, <u>when appropriate infrastructure is available.</u>	Clarification of existing policy intent	As written, "if utilities and other services permit" appears to only apply to affordable and resource worker housing, which would be an additional requirement on these types of development that wouldn't necessarily have larger impacts than market-rate housing. Moved to end of policy to apply more generally, consistent with existing requirements in the Growth Management Act and Comprehensive Plan	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although this is proposed for removal, the proposed inclusionary housing program only applies in rural towns where sewer is available, suggesting that affordable housing <i>should</i> only be provided when utilities and other services permit. Councilmembers could consider retaining this provision or altering the inclusionary housing program.
R-508 Sewers may be allowed in Rural Towns if necessary to solve existing water quality and public health problems ((which)) <u>that cannot be addressed by other methods</u> , provided that any extension of sewer mains from urban areas to serve a Rural Town shall be tightlined systems designed to not serve any intervening lands. All alternatives shall be exhausted before sewers may be allowed. Rural Towns shall not be enlarged to facilitate provision of sewers.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-509 Rural Towns should be compact, promoting ((pedestrian and nonmotorized travel)) <u>active transportation</u> while ((permitting automobile)) <u>allowing vehicle</u> access to most commercial and industrial uses. New development should be designed to strengthen the desirable characteristics and the historic character of the town, be supported by necessary public facilities and services, and be compatible with historic resources and nearby Rural Area or Natural Resource Land uses. New industrial uses should locate where they do not disrupt pedestrian or bicycle traffic in established retail areas of town or conflict with residential uses.	Substantive change	Reflects current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active transportation is broader, allowing for some motorized uses such as e-scooters and e-bikes. This is a policy choice.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-510 ((The Cities in the Rural Area and their Potential Annexation Areas are part of the overall Urban Growth Area for purposes of planning land uses and facility needs.)) King County should work with Cities in the Rural Area to:</p> <p>a. ((e)) Encourage the provision of affordable housing((, t));</p> <p>b. ((m)) Minimize the impacts of new development on the surrounding Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands;</p> <p>c. <u>Avoid the conversion of rural lands into commercial uses and the creation of pressure to extend or expand urban services, infrastructure, and facilities, such as roads or sewer, across or into the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands;</u> and</p> <p>d. ((t-p)) Plan for growth consistent with long-term protection of significant historic resources(;) <u>and the surrounding Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>First sentence is policy direction, and redundant to narrative above the policy</p> <p>Sub-c is added to include prevention of the conversion of rural land and associated development pressure, consistent with existing intent and as mandated by the Growth Management Act, VISION 2050 IN MPP-RGS-13, and the Countywide Planning Policies in DP-46</p> <p>Other edits for grammar and clarity</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy, and the section on Cities in the Rural Area, could potentially be moved to chapter 1 or 2.
<p>R-511 Within Potential Annexation Areas of Cities in the Rural Area the following uses shall be permitted until the area annexes to the city:</p> <p>a. Residential development at a density of one home per five acres or less with mandatory clustering; and</p> <p>b. Nonresidential development such as commercial and industrial as determined through ((previous)) subarea plans.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>As written, this policy would only apply to subarea plans before a certain date (unclear which date) and/or that may not be currently adopted, when it should apply to any currently adopted subarea plan regardless of when the plan was adopted</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is an urban policy and would be more appropriate in chapter 2. Sub b. is no longer applicable and could be removed.
<p>R-512 The creation of new Industrial-zoned lands in the Rural Area shall be limited to those that have long been used for industrial purposes, do not have potential for conversion to residential use due to a historic designation and that may be accessed directly from State Route 169.</p>	<p>Policy Staff Flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies in this section refer to "industrial uses," which is not a phrase used in the code. These policies could be clarified to use terms consistent with how uses are described in King County. Council may want to determine if the policies in this section, regarding industrial zones and associated uses in the rural area geography meet the Council's policy goals.
<p>R-513 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 only <u>on existing Industrial zoned properties</u> in Rural Towns and ((in the designated industrial area adjacent to the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center of)) <u>the Preston Industrial Area.</u></p>	<p>Substantive Change</p>	<p>Edits for accuracy, to reflect that the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center next to Preston was erroneously imposed and does not align with the zoning of the area (which is proposed for correction in the land use and zoning map amendments in Snoqualmie Valley North East King County subarea plan that is being evaluated concurrently with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update)</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies in this section refer to "industrial uses," which is not a phrase used in the code. These policies could be clarified to use terms consistent with how uses are described in King County. "Rural Public Infrastructure Maintenance Facilities" are more appropriately addressed in the public facilities section, and agriculture and forestry product processing are already allowed in the rural area under R-324.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
R-514 Development regulations for new industrial development in the Rural Area shall require the following: a. Greater setbacks, and reduced building height, floor/lot ratios, and maximum impervious surface percentage standards in comparison to standards for urban industrial development; b. Maximum protection of sensitive natural features, especially salmonid habitat and water quality; c. Building and landscape design that respects the aesthetic qualities and character of the Rural Area, and provides substantial buffering from the adjoining uses and scenic vistas; d. ((Building colors and materials that are muted, s)) Signs that are not internally illuminated, and site and building lighting that is held to the minimum necessary for safety; e. <u>Prohibition of ((H))</u> heavier industrial uses, new industrial uses producing substantial waste byproducts or wastewater discharge, or new paper, chemical and allied products manufacturing uses <u>allowed</u> in the urban industrial zone (((shall be prohibited))); and f. Industrial uses ((requiring)) <u>be sized to not require</u> substantial investments in infrastructure, such as water, sewers, or transportation facilities, or facilities that generate substantial volumes of heavy-gross weight truck trips(((, shall be reduced in size to avoid the need for public funding of the infrastructure))).	Substantive change	Edits for clarity and to reflect current code	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies in this section refer to "industrial uses," which is not a phrase used in the code. These policies could be clarified to use terms consistent with how uses are described in King County. Although the Executive rationale states that this aligns with current code, 21A.14.280 does require muted colors. Councilmembers could retain the provision here, delete the provision in code, or provide broader policy language here while maintaining the code language. Sub f. is a substantive change, as it now prohibits industrial uses requiring <i>any</i> substantial investments in infrastructure, whereas the underlying language only prohibits this when the infrastructure would need <i>public</i> funding.
R-515 Existing industrial uses in the Rural Area outside of Rural Towns(((, the industrial area on the King County designated historic site along State Route 169 or the designated industrial area adjacent to the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center of Preston))) without Industrial zoning currently shall be zoned rural (((residential))) area but may continue if they qualify as legal, conforming and/or nonconforming uses.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edits for clarity and streamlining	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies in this section refer to "industrial uses," which is not a phrase used in the code. These policies could be clarified to use terms consistent with how uses are described in King County.
R-516 ((Within Rural Towns and larger Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers, non-motorized connectivity, where consistent with rural character,)) Connectivity for active transportation uses should be encouraged in Rural Towns, where consistent with rural character, to promote ((walking and bicycling)) <u>physical activity</u> and to improve public health.	Substantive change	Restructured for clarity. Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers is removed, as those nodes of commercial development are small and isolated, and thus not appropriate for or capable of non-motorized connectivity, consistent with rural levels of service in the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The change of "nonmotorized" to "active transportation" expands the uses allowed and is a policy choice. The proposed removal of Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers as places where active/non-motorized transportation should be encouraged is a policy choice.
R-517 King County should explore ways of creating and supporting community gardens, Farmers Markets, produce stands and other similar community(((-)))-based food growing projects to provide and improve access to healthy, affordable food for all rural residents.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-601 The Rural Forest Commission shall advise the King County Executive and Council on the development <u>and implementation</u> of ((innovative)) <u>strategies, programs, policies and regulations</u> that benefit forestry (((and))), that encourage the retention of the forest land base in King County, <u>and support rural forest landowners.</u>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Updated to reflect current scope and role of the Rural Forest Commission	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
King County shall continue to support the Rural Forest Commission with staff and other resources.						
R-602 The Agriculture Commission shall advise the King County Executive and Council on ((agricultural issues and programs, including, but not limited to: a. Existing and proposed legislation and regulations affecting commercial agriculture; b. Land use issues that affect agriculture; and c. Ways to maintain, enhance and promote agriculture and agricultural products in the region.)) <u>programs, policies, regulations, and land use issues that affect commercial agriculture, encourage retention of farmland, support farmland access for traditionally underserved communities, and contribute to a strong local food system.</u> King County shall continue to support the Agriculture Commission with staff and other resources.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Updated to reflect current scope and role of the Agriculture Commission	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
((R-606)) R-603 Farm lands, forest lands and mineral resources shall be conserved for productive use through the use of Designated Agricultural and Forest Production Districts and Designated Mineral Resource Sites where the principal ((and preferred)) land uses ((will)) shall be commercial resource management activities ((, and by the designation of appropriate compatible uses on adjacent Rural Area and urban lands)).	Clarification of existing policy intent	Relocated to lead with the designation and then the ways to support/implement that designation. Striking word "preferred" to recognize non-resource uses may be preferred in some cases, e.g. forest protection for carbon sequestration and habitat, consistent with existing practice. "Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen. Removed language redundant to R-607	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-604 King County shall promote and support <u>commercially viable and environmentally sustainable forestry, agriculture, and other resource-based industries as a part of a diverse and regional economy.</u>	Substantive change	Including commercial considerations, consistent with Growth Management Act requirements to protect resource lands of long-term commercial significance	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-604a King County shall support ((and designate)) mineral resource lands of long-term <u>commercial</u> significance and promote policies, environmental reviews, and management practices that minimize conflicts with neighboring land uses and mitigate environmental impacts.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Including commercial considerations, consistent with Growth Management Act requirements to protect resource lands of long-term commercial significance "Designate" is redundant to R-603	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
((R-605 Forestry and agriculture best management practices are encouraged because of their multiple benefits, including natural resource preservation and protection.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Addressed under " environmentally sustainable" in R-604	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	
R-608 King County should encourage infrastructure and services that support resource lands management and resource-based businesses. These should be sited ((in close proximity)) <u>close</u> to designated Agricultural and Forest Production Districts and Designated Mineral Resource Sites ((when)) <u>where potential adverse impacts and incompatibilities can effectively be mitigated.</u>	Substantive Change	Edits for clarity	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As written, this is a potentially substantive change. "When" implies that they should only be sited there when impacts can be mitigated. "Where" could be read that APDs, FPDs, resource sites are inherently places where impacts can be mitigated. Executive staff indicate that "when" is the Executive's intent, which would keep the policy substantively the same as the underlying language.
R-609 King County should expand access to property tax incentive programs to encourage landowners to continue ((practicing)) <u>and expand</u> farming and forestry and to help ensure retention of the resource land base. These programs should be publicized and marketed <u>to ensure equitable access to program benefits.</u>	Substantive change	Updates to reflect program goals to not only keep support current farming/forestry but also expand them, as well as advancing equity goals.	Could lead to increased farm and forestry uses for properties using incentives, and more equitable program delivery / incentives benefitting priority populations.	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: Programmatic • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
((R-610 King County shall employ a variety of innovative programs and incentives to help maintain and enhance resource-based industries.))	Clarification of existing policy intent	Very general policy that is more specifically addressed throughout may policies in this chapter.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
R-612 King County shall work cooperatively with cities, Indian tribes, other public agencies, private utilities, resource managers, land ((--)) owners, and residents to conserve public and private Resource Lands for long-term productivity and environmental protection in a consistent and predictable manner.	Technical change	Current terminology and grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
R-613 Designated Forest and Agricultural Production District lands shall not be annexed by cities <u>except as allowed in Policies R-656 and R-656a.</u>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Reflects existing allowance for Agricultural and/or Forest Production District lands to be moved into the Urban Growth Area and potentially annexed under policies R-656 and R-656a	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
R-614 King County should establish written agreements with agencies, Indian tribes and other affected parties whose close coordination and collaboration are essential to effective implementation of resource management programs. Such agreements should serve to establish consensus and commitment to achieving specific resource management goals and to define the specific roles and responsibilities of each agency.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
((R-615 King County should avoid duplication of federal and state regulations that apply to resource-based industries. However, King County reserves the authority to address issues of local concern with regard to resource-based activities and operations.))	Clarification of existing policy intent	Policy direction is not needed to allow this	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
R-616 Resource-based industries should use practices that: a. Protect the long-term integrity of the built environment, adjacent land uses, and cultural resources; b. Maintain the long-term productivity of the resource base; and c. Result in maintenance of ecosystem health and habitat.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not policy direction to King County, it is directing private land owners to do something. It could potentially be removed.
R-618 King County shall be a leader in resource management by demonstrating environmentally sound agriculture and forestry on ((e))County-owned land.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-619 King County shall include resource education through its signs on trail systems that are linked with working farms, forests, and mines. ((Interpretation should: a. Provide historical perspective; b. Demonstrate current adaptive resource management practices (forestry, fisheries, wildlife, agriculture); and c. Explain economics of various resource uses.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Too much detail for Comprehensive Plan policy; addressed through implementation in King County Parks planning	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-620 The Forest Production District shall remain in large blocks of contiguous forest lands where the primary land use is commercial forestry. Other resource ((industry)) uses, such as mineral extraction and agriculture, should be permitted within the Forest Production District when managed to be compatible with forestry.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Streamlining; industry is implied in resource	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-621 The Forest Production District is a long-term designation. Lands may be removed from the Forest Production District only through a subarea plan or area zoning and land use study, and only to recognize areas with historical retail commercial uses.	Clarification of existing policy intent	<p>"Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing intent. The subarea study definition will be removed, as it is no longer necessary.</p> <p>In this case, expansions of Forest Production District land removal could happen via either a subarea plan or an area zoning and land use study.</p>	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
R-622 King County recognizes the many values provided by the public forestland in the county, and encourages continued responsible forest management on these lands. King County should collaborate with other public land managers in planning for the <u>restoration</u> , conservation, use, and management of forest resources on public lands for multiple public values <u>such as sustainable supply of timber, carbon storage and sequestration, and other ecosystem benefits.</u>	Substantive change	Updated to reflect current practice, and provide additional clarity on of the type of other benefits beyond forestry that are being prioritized. Supports other changes in Chapter 5 and a new work program item related to old growth/mature forests	Additional protection of upper watershed and major river corridors	Strategic Climate Action Plan Action GHG 6.4.1 Land Conservation Initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first sentence doesn't include policy direction. It could be deleted. This policy and R-623 could be combined.
R-623 King County is committed to maintaining working forestland in the Forest Production District, and shall continue to work with landowners and other ((stakeholders)) partners to promote forestry, reduce uses and activities that conflict with resource uses, and recognize forestland values.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy and R-622 could be combined.
R-624 To reduce conflicts with resource uses and wildfire risks, a forest management plan shall be required as a condition of development for any residential uses in the Forest Production District. Accessory dwelling units shall not be allowed in the Forest Production District.	Substantive change	Emphasizes existing fire safety/protection requirement for forest management plans in K.C.C. 21A.08.030.B.2.b, which will be more important over time as wildfire risks increase with climate change	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-626 King County should conserve working forests and should encourage continued private forestry through the acquisition or transfer of development rights in the Forest Production District. Land acquisition proposals that would remove lands from forest management should be evaluated to ensure that the long-term commercial significance of the Forest Production District is not compromised.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Reflects current practice	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-628 In consultation with <u>Indian</u> tribes and other affected agencies and landowners, King County should support land trades that result in consolidated forest ownership and work with forest managers to identify and develop other incentives for continued forestry.	Technical change	Current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
[Lead in text on page 3-53] Recreational and institutional developments, such as conference centers, ski areas and associated hotels, allow more people to enjoy the aesthetic benefits of forest lands. Such facilities are acceptable if ((located in areas of existing development, such as Snoqualmie Pass, and if)) their operation and use are <u>resource-dependent and</u> restricted adequately to minimize conflict with resource lands. Major recreational or institutional development ((sites)) can adversely affect the Forest Production District because they reduce the forest land base and conflict with other resource management goals.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development conditions for these uses do not require them to be "resource-dependent or minimize conflict with resource lands." Additionally, conference centers and hotels are not allowed uses in the forest production district (although they could be a component of another allowed use such as a destination resort). While this is not a policy, it's inconsistent with the regulations. Options are to remove this language, modify it to match the code, or modify the code to make changes consistent with this language.
R-631 ((No master planned resorts shall be permitted in the Forest Production District.)) New or expansion of existing recreational or institutional uses, including destination resorts, in the Forest Production District may be permitted if compatible with long-term forestry, the interests of <u>Indian</u> tribes and other resource management goals.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Relocates first sentence to R-329a, which is true for more areas than just the Forest Protection District	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term "institutional use" is used in the Growth Management Act and the term "institutions" is used in the Multicounty Planning Policies, but the term is not defined in either place, nor in the KCCP or Title 21A. Executive

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
		Clarifies types of recreational uses included, consistent with uses allowed in existing code.				staff indicate that institutional uses refers to nonresidential uses that are not considered commercial, industrial, or recreational. Councilmembers could choose define the term in the lead-in text to include cultural uses, religious facilities, health services, and educational services, which are the corresponding terms in Title 21A.
R-632 King County should continue to work with all affected parties and the Washington State Department of Natural Resources to improve the clarity of jurisdictional responsibilities for proposed timber harvests and associated enforcement of forest practice regulations ((in the Rural Area)), and to ensure that landowners comply with county regulations when they are converting portions of a site to a non-forest use. ((Harvesting of forest lands for the purpose of converting to non-forest uses shall meet all applicable county standards for clearing and critical areas management, and the loss of carbon sequestration capacity resulting from such forest conversions should be fully mitigated. Landowners opting to conduct forest management activities under state approved forest practices permits should be restricted from developing those areas for non-resource purposes for six years from the date of forest practice approval. Recognizing that some landowners combine the development of a residence or an agricultural activity on a portion of the property with long term forestry on the rest, the county should provide flexibility in its regulations to address the residential development and agricultural activity differently from the forest management.))	Substantive Change	Reflects that clarifying state vs county jurisdiction is important to improving enforcement. For removed language, this level of detail more appropriate for the code, and we do not need a policy to state that the code must be followed.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy used to refer to forests in the Rural Area, now it broader and refers to all forest practices. This is a policy choice.
R-633 King County should ensure that regulations applying to forest practices do not discourage forest management on properties in long-term forestry((Forestry should be regulated consistent with best management practices in)), consistent with the Forest Practices Act. The ((e))County should work to simplify its regulatory processes related to forest management.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edits for clarity and streamlining	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R 634 King County should promote public understanding of the benefits of commercial timber production and encourage the use of local wood.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy is duplicative of R-627 and could be removed.
R 635 Working with public and private forest land managers, King County shall encourage long term forest productivity and the protection of land and water resources by participating in collaborative, multi-ownership planning efforts.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy could potentially be combined with policy R-622 or R-623.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-636 King County promotes forest management that achieves long-term forest health; protection of watersheds, critical areas and habitat to support fish and wildlife populations; protection of threatened and endangered species; management of stormwater runoff and associated pollutants; conservation and economic viability of working forests; <u>wildfire risk reduction</u>; recreation; carbon storage and sequestration ((and reduction in greenhouse gas emissions)); and adaptation to climate change.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>To reflect current policy priorities and context</p>	<p>King County is more actively engaged directly or indirectly (via collaborations) in conducting or promoting forest management activities that reduce wildfire risk. This includes working with landowners to reduce wildfire risk, selective thinning around critical County-owned infrastructure, and forest restoration. Relevant to King County forest lands and forest land owners/managers</p>	<p>King County Wildfire Risk Reduction Strategy 30 Year Forest Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: Programmatic • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy direction could be added.
<p>R-641 King County ((should)) shall consider climate change impacts and take steps to improve forest health ((and resilience to climate change impacts through its technical assistance to forest land owners, management of county-owned forest lands, and support of neighborhood-based efforts to reduce risks from wildfires)) and <u>wildfire resilience on County-owned forest lands.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Strengthening policy commitment given the importance of this issue. Also, R-641 split into two modified policies: one focusing on county-owned forest lands (this one is retaining the R-641 identity) and a new collaboration policy in R-641e focusing on private forest land owners and residents.</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
<p><u>R-641a King County shall take steps to plan for and reduce wildfire risk in the wildland-urban interface in unincorporated King County including wildfire risk assessment and planning, amending codes to align with best practices for wildfire risk reduction, and public education.</u></p>	<p>New policy</p>	<p>Advancing recommendations from the King County wildfire strategy</p>	<p>County takes actions to reduce wildfire risk in the unincorporated parts of the wildland-urban interface.</p>	<p>Wildfire Risk Reduction Strategy Action 4 30-Year Forest Plan Strategy 1-3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: Programmatic and Regulatory • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: Proposed changes to K.C.C. Chapter 16.82 to remove permitting barriers for vegetation management for wildfire risk reduction • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: Likely yes – probably grant funding • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
<p><u>R-641b King County shall encourage wildfire preparedness, including wildfire risk assessment and planning, in cities and towns located in the wildland-urban interface in King County.</u></p>	<p>New policy</p>	<p>Advancing recommendations from the King County wildfire strategy</p>	<p>Cities and towns take actions to reduce in wildfire risk in the incorporated parts of the wildland-urban interface.</p>	<p>Wildfire Risk Reduction Strategy Action 4 30-Year Forest Plan Strategy 1-3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal</u>: Programmatic • <u>Description of proposed regulations</u>: n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need</u>: Likely yes – probably grant funding • <u>Anticipated timeline</u>: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>((R-637)) R-641c King County ((should)) shall encourage community ((fire planning)) wildfire preparedness so that residents are aware of the dangers of forest fires and take steps to make their properties less vulnerable. ((King County should support neighborhood based efforts to manage forests to improve forest health and reduce the risk of wildfire.))</p>	Substantive change	Strengthening policy commitment given the importance of this issue	Residents take actions to reduce in wildfire risk in the wildland-urban interface.	Wildfire Risk Reduction Strategy Actions 3, 4, 6, and 8 30-Year Forest Plan Strategy 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-641d King County wildfire risk reduction activities shall prioritize the needs of residents whose ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from wildfire impacts may be limited by income, health, mobility, or other disparities.</p>	New policy	Ensures King County's wildfire risk reduction work is accounting for equity and prioritizing those who need to most assistance.	Improved equitable outcomes in the wildland-urban interface.	Wildfire Risk Reduction Strategy 30-Year Forest Plan Strategy 1-3 Strategic Climate Action Plan Sustainable and Resilient Frontline Communities Focus Area 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>Policy R-641dd</p>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy is being reviewed as part of the critical areas regulations changes that are being sent over on 3/1. This policy can be found in the Critical Areas Review Matrix
<p>((R-640)) R-641e King County ((should continue to)) shall collaborate with key partners, such as the University of Washington, Washington State University including Extension, state and federal agencies, cities, first responders, Indian tribes, and ((forest)) landowners, ((to)) on activities that improve forest resilience and reduce wildfire risks, including the following: a. ((monitor)) Monitoring and ((evaluate)) evaluating impacts of climate change on forests and wildfire potential in King County b. Promoting species and structural diversity within and across forest stands in King County; c. Providing educational and technical assistance for small forest landowners; d. Leveraging partnerships to increase funding for landowner incentive cost-share programs; e. Expanding and enhancing opportunities for building public awareness and promoting shared learning about wildfire preparedness and risk reduction in King County; f. Reducing landslide and flooding risks resulting from wildfire damage and associated impacts; and g. Supporting the recovery of natural systems and communities affected by wildfire.</p>	Substantive change	Strengthens the policy while creating flexibility to work with partners beyond the listed partners and to reflect that the partners may change in any given case. Includes key strategies to advance, reflecting current policy goals related to wildfire risk reduction	King County is pursuing a diverse portfolio of activities to reduce wildfire risk, in collaboration with appropriate partners.	Wildfire Risk Reduction Strategy 30-Year Forest Plan Strategy (Strategy 1, Climate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: Likely yes – probably grant funding Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could delete the long list of "key partners" since it covers most people.
<p>R-642 King County shall continue to implement the objectives of the Farmland Preservation Program. Protection of property purchased under the Farmland Preservation Program shall be a high priority when balancing conflicting interests such as locating transportation, active recreation, utility facilities, or other uses that could have an adverse impact on farm operations. King County</p>	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The last sentence could be removed, as it's already covered by other policies and not related to the FPP policy intent.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
shall use the Transfer of Development Rights Program as another tool to preserve farmland.						
R-642a King County should develop a long((-)term strategy for financing protection of sufficient farmland to significantly expand and retain food production, including improving the farmability of protected farmland, and ensuring that the easements are well-managed for the long((-)term.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-642b Farmers conducting work on property on which King County owns a Farmland Preservation Program easement or farmers leasing properties owned by King County should be limited to predominantly agricultural <u>activities</u> and agricultural((-supportive activities)) <u>support services</u> .	Clarification of existing policy intent	To changes in terminology adopted in the code in 2017	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy could be reframed to focus on the use of the land, rather than the behavior of the people. The terminology for "agricultural activities" and "agricultural support services" doesn't align between the KCCP and the Code. These could be cleaned up.
R-643 Agricultural Production Districts ((are)) shall be blocks of contiguous farmlands where agriculture is supported through the protection of agricultural soils and related support services and activities. Roads and natural features ((are)) should be appropriate boundaries for Agricultural Production Districts to reduce the possibility of conflicts with adjacent land uses.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Reorients from a statement to policy direction, consistent with existing intent and current practice	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing "are" to "should be" softens the policy. This is a policy choice.
R-645 All parcels within the boundaries of an Agricultural Production District should be zoned Agricultural, either A 10 or A 35.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy could be changed from "should" to "shall" to align with the policy intent that all APDs be zoned A-10 or A-35. This policy could be combined with R-646.
R-646 Lands within Agricultural Production Districts ((should)) shall remain in parcels large enough for commercial agriculture. A <u>maximum</u> residential density of one home per 35 acres shall be applied where the predominant lot size of <u>agricultural-zoned parcels in the surrounding area</u> is 35 acres or larger, and a <u>maximum</u> residential density of one home per 10 acres shall be applied where the predominant lot size of <u>agricultural-zoned parcels in the surrounding area</u> is smaller than 35 acres.	Substantive change	<p>Consistent with requirements in the Growth Management Act, land within Agricultural Production Districts must be large enough for commercial agriculture.</p> <p>Zoning on agricultural lands should consider conditions on other surrounding agricultural parcels alone, not other types of parcels (which are generally intentionally smaller than agricultural parcels).</p>	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy could be combined with R-645.
R-647 Agriculture should be the principal land use in the Agricultural Production Districts. Permanent new construction within districts shall be sited to prevent conflicts with commercial farming or other agricultural uses, and nonagricultural uses shall be limited. New development shall not disrupt agriculture operations and shall have a scale compatible with an active farming district.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While this is a "should" policy, the corresponding policy for forests is a "shall" policy. Whether to make them consistent is a policy choice. The language is duplicated in R-649 but is a "shall" policy there.

**Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24**

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-649 Agriculture (must) shall remain the predominant use in any Agricultural Production District and aquatic habitat or floodplain restoration projects ((, as well as, King County)) and mitigation reserves program projects shall not reduce the ability to farm in the Agricultural Production District. (Therefore, until the county implements the watershed planning process described in R-650, such projects are allowed only when supported by owners of the land where the proposed project is to be sited. Criteria to be considered:</p> <p>a. For a project proposed to be sited on lands that are unsuitable for direct agricultural production purposes, such as portions of property that have not historically been farmed due to soil conditions or frequent flooding, and which cannot be returned to productivity by drainage maintenance, or</p> <p>b. For a project proposed to be sited on lands suitable for direct agricultural production:</p> <p>(1) there are no unsuitable lands available that meet the technical or locational needs of the proposed project, and the project is included in, or consistent with, an approved Water Resources Inventory Area Salmon Recovery Plan, Farm Management Plan, Flood Hazard Management Plan or other similar watershed scale plan; or the project would not reduce the baseline agricultural productivity within the Agricultural Production District.)</p> <p><u>King County, through implementation of projects and programs, shall ensure sufficient land within Agricultural Production Districts remain available to support long term viability of commercial agriculture and that its programmatic and project actions support the maintenance or improvement of drainage and other agricultural support infrastructure. To the maximum extent practicable, King County should tailor measures to protect threatened or endangered species to support continued operation of working farms within the Agricultural Production Districts and should strive for outcomes consistent with goals King County may establish for optimal area of productive agricultural lands within the Agricultural Production Districts.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Suite of changes to reflect current status and future plans for Fish, Farm, Flood, based on lessons learned coming out of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood work, substantively consistent with recommended policy language from the Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee.</p> <p>Specific to this policy, changes: reflect that the County completed the process directed in R-650; remove detail addressed in the code; ensure projects/programs to protect threatened and endangered species considers Agricultural Production District management for continued productivity of commercial agriculture in the Agricultural Production Districts</p>	<p>Strives for balance of agriculture and species protection/habitat restoration and enhancement in Agricultural Production Districts</p>	<p>Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic and Regulatory Description of proposed regulations: Existing code in K.C.C. 21A.24.381 Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: 2025 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy conflicts with R-647 which says "should." Using "should" or "shall" is a policy choice. The language could be deleted either here or in R-649 to avoid duplication. The language beginning with "to the maximum extent practicable" is separate topic from what precedes it and could potentially be made into a separate policy. (This sentence is also a "should" statement, so "To the maximum extent practicable" is extraneous.) Executive staff indicate that the requirement about aquatic habitat and floodplain restoration projects is intended to apply to King County projects only. The policy would need to be amended to make this clear.
<p>R-650 (Aquatic habitat restoration projects, floodplain restoration projects and projects under King County's mitigation reserves program in an Agricultural Production District shall be evaluated through a collaborative watershed planning process with the goal of maintaining and improving agricultural viability, improving ecological function and habitat quality, and restoring floodplains through integrated, watershed wide strategies. A watershed planning process shall be established for an agricultural production district because of the number of potential restoration projects and shall:</p> <p>a. ensure that agricultural viability in the Agricultural Production District is not reduced as the result of actions taken and that agriculture remains the predominant use in the agricultural production district;</p> <p>b. evaluate and recommend actions at all scales across the affected watershed to maintain and improve agricultural viability, restore ecological functions and aquatic habitat and restore floodplains, including voluntary actions taken by landowners;</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Suite of changes to reflect current status and future plans for Fish, Farm, Flood, based on lessons learned coming out of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood work, substantively consistent with recommended policy language from the Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee.</p> <p>Specific to this policy, changes: reflect new, required project review process that would be implemented with the adoption of the 2024 update, which provide additional clarity on how balancing salmon habitat and</p>	<p>Establishes an internal, administrative review process in for Water and Land Resources-sponsored projects to consider competing interest and balancing multiple objectives. Projects sponsored by entities other than Water and Land Resources may also use the review process, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: 2025 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the final paragraph, "in the unincorporated area where a habitat or floodplain restoration project may result," the word "where" could be interpreted in multiple ways. "whenever" might be clearer.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>e. _____ be a collaborative effort among affected land owners, interested stakeholders, and King County and shall be updated on a periodic basis; and</p> <p>d. _____ identify and recommend actions that King County should take or ensure are taken to maintain and improve agricultural viability in the Agricultural Production District and address any impacts to agriculture from aquatic habitat restoration projects, floodplain restoration projects and projects under King County's mitigation reserves program constructed in the Agricultural Production District.)</p> <p>The County shall administer a collaborative review process considering watershed context for projects sponsored by the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Water and Land Resources Division, in the unincorporated area where a habitat or floodplain restoration project may result in reducing the amount of land available for farming in Agricultural Production Districts. The review process shall be administered by the Division and strive for balance in outcomes that achieve co-equal goals of maintaining and improving suitability of land for agricultural productivity, increasing habitat quality, and restoring floodplains and ecological function. The review process should:</p> <p>a. _____ Occur early in the planning process for projects, and at regular intervals for ongoing programs;</p> <p>b. _____ Consider guidance from relevant plans relating to agriculture, salmon recovery, and floodplain management;</p> <p>c. _____ Consider efforts for advancing multiple resource interests;</p> <p>d. _____ Track on-the-ground changes in land cover relative to acreage targets for farmland and habitat restoration areas, focused on impacts to agricultural lands and fish populations;</p> <p>e. _____ Consider input and recommendations resulting from engagement and input from external partners and subject matter experts; and</p> <p>f. _____ Identify and address barriers to efficient implementation of the process.</p> <p>The review process may also be offered for projects and programs sponsored by King County agencies aside from the Water and Land Resources Division and/or for projects and programs sponsored by external entities.</p>		<p>agricultural needs should be operationalized.</p>				
<p>R-650a ((The Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District is the first Agricultural Production District to undergo a watershed planning effort called for in R-650. King County shall implement the recommendations of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm and Flood Advisory Committee. The recommendations of the task forces and other actions identified in the final Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations will form the basis for a watershed planning approach to balance fish, farm and flood interests across the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District and an agreement on protecting a defined number of acres of agricultural land. The Advisory Committee, or a successor committee, will monitor progress of the task forces and will reconvene to evaluate the watershed planning approach to balancing interests prior to the next Comprehensive Plan update. The policy issues and recommendations outlined in the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Suite of changes to reflect current status and future plans for Fish, Farm, Flood, based on lessons learned coming out of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood work, substantively consistent with recommended policy language from the Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee.</p> <p>Specific to this policy, changes streamlines Snoqualmie Valley-specific Fish, Farm, Flood</p>	<p>Supports completion of outstanding Snoqualmie Valley-specific Fish, Farm, Flood</p>	<p>Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: 2025 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations are largely specific to the Snoqualmie Valley and are not intended to be applied broadly in other Agricultural Production Districts. Future Fish, Farm, Flood efforts focused in other Agricultural Production Districts will need to go through their own processes to identify barriers to success for all stakeholders in these geographic areas. R-649 continues to apply to the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District until the watershed planning effort outlined in the Fish, Farm and Flood recommendations is complete. A policy reflecting the outcome of this effort shall be included in the next eight year update.)) The County shall continue to support the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District fish, farm, flood effort, as appropriate, through completion of the task forces and establishment of measurable goals for agriculture, habitat restoration, and floodplain restoration for the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District.</p>		<p>direction and reflects current status</p>				
<p>R-650b The County shall continue to document and consider the lessons learned from the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District fish, farm, flood effort to guide and refine the collaborative planning and review processes in a watershed context for projects and programs in other geographies with the co-equal goals of balancing farm, fish, and flood interests where farms, fish habitat and floodplains overlap, as well as strategies for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating losses of farmable land, floodplain functions, and habitat functions. The County should support planning efforts similar to the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee in other geographies if and when the County and partners choose to pursue such efforts or if acute tensions among various interests arise in a particular Agricultural Production District or other area of the county.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Suite of changes to reflect current status and future plans for Fish, Farm, Flood, based on lessons learned coming out of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood work, substantively consistent with recommended policy language from the Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee.</p> <p>Specific to this policy, changes outline approach for related planning in geographies other than Snoqualmie Valley, and prioritizes use of existing applicable lessons from the Snoqualmie Valley work to inform work in other Agricultural Production Districts</p>	<p>Broadly advances existing valuable knowledge for immediate implementation (rather than waiting for planning processes in each Agricultural Production District), and right-sizes future planning, as needed and where appropriate, in consideration of available resources</p>	<p>Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: TBD Anticipated timeline: 2025 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive staff note that the "TBD" for "anticipated resource need" means that the amount is TBD, but that additional staff resources will definitely be necessary for ongoing program support.
<p>((R-651 Maintaining the viability of farmlands is a high priority for King County. Within the Agricultural Production Districts, measures to protect threatened or endangered species shall be tailored to ensure working farms can continue to operate.))</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Suite of changes to reflect current status and future plans for Fish, Farm, Flood, based on lessons learned coming out of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood work, substantively consistent with recommended policy language from the Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee.</p> <p>Specific to this policy, it is addressed via other updated Farm, Fish, Flood policies</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-653 The Lower Green River Agricultural Production District is a regionally designated resource that is to remain in unincorporated King County except as allowed in Policies R-656 and R-656a. The Lower Green River Agricultural Production District functions as an</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Reflects existing allowance for Agricultural and/or Forest Production District lands to be moved into the Urban Growth</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second sentence is a statement, not policy direction, and could be removed.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>urban separator between the cities of Kent and Auburn. King County may contract with other jurisdictions to provide some local services to this area as appropriate.</p>		<p>Area and potentially annexed under policies R-656 and R-656a</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	
<p>R-655 Public services and utilities provided by King County and other entities within and adjacent to Agricultural Production Districts shall be designed to support agriculture and minimize significant adverse impacts on agriculture and to maintain total farmland acreage and the area's historic agricultural character:</p> <p>a. Whenever feasible, water lines, sewer lines, and other public facilities should avoid crossing Agricultural Production Districts. Installation should be timed to minimize negative impacts on seasonal agricultural practices;</p> <p>b. Road projects planned for the Agricultural Production Districts, including additional roads or the widening of roads, should be limited to those that are needed for safety or infrastructure preservation and that benefit agricultural uses. Where possible, arterials should be routed around the Agricultural Production Districts. Roads that cross Agricultural Production Districts should be aligned, designed, signed, and maintained to minimize negative impacts on agriculture, and to support farm traffic; (and)</p> <p>c. In cases when King County concludes that regional public infrastructure cannot be located outside of, and must intrude into, Agricultural Production Districts, the County shall ensure that the infrastructure be built and located to minimize disruption of agricultural activity, and shall establish agreements with the relevant jurisdictions or agencies(-); and</p> <p>d. If public services and utilities reduce total acreage in the Agricultural Production District, mitigation shall follow the criteria established in policy R-656a.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Edits for clarity and to capture related streamlined narrative.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The phrase "significant adverse impacts" could be changed to avoid using SEPA language. • In sub a. and b., could delete "Whenever feasible" before "should" statements, as they are extraneous. • In sub c., "regional public infrastructure" could be changed to "regional public services and utilities" to match the terminology uses in the rest of the policy. • In sub d., "public services and utilities" could be changed to "infrastructure projects" to better fit with the rest of the sentence.
<p>R-656 King County may allow lands to be removed from the Agricultural Production Districts only when it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a. <u>1.</u> Removal of the land will not diminish the productivity of prime agricultural soils or the effectiveness of farming within the local Agricultural Production District boundaries; and ((b-)) <u>2.</u> The land is determined to be no longer suitable for agricultural purposes; or ((c-)) <u>b.</u> The land is needed for public services or utilities as described in policy R-655.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Restructured for clarity and consistency with R-655, which recognizes that public services/utilities projects do not always have the ability to ensure they do not diminish farmlands or farming</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>R-656a King County may only approve the removal of land from the Agricultural Production District if it is, concurrently with removal of the land from the Agricultural Production District, mitigated through the replacement of agricultural land abutting the same Agricultural Production District that is, at a minimum, comparable in size, soil quality, and agricultural value. As alternative mitigation, the County may approve a combination of acquisition and restoration totaling three acres for every one acre removed as follows:</p> <p>a. A minimum of one acre ((must)) shall be added into another Agricultural Production District for every acre removed; and</p> <p>b. Up to two acres of unfarmed land in the same Agricultural Production District from which land is removed shall be restored for every acre removed.</p> <p><u>Replacement land to comply with the requirements of this policy may be acquired added to the Agricultural Production District in advance of removal of land from the Agricultural Production District, rather than concurrently, if the criteria in R-656b are met.</u></p>	Substantive change	Reflects creation of R-656b, which creates flexibility in the sequencing of acquiring replacement land to improve feasibility of policy implementation. This allows for necessary public services/ utilities projects while ensuring preservation of Agricultural Production District acreage and agricultural value. King County Roads attempted to implement R-656a as currently written for two critical road safety projects, but was unable to achieve this within project timelines and available project funding.	Replacement land for Agricultural Production District loss mitigation could be acquired in advance and "banked" for future public services/ utilities projects.	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Capital Project and Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: Potentially, but due to underlying mandate (not the policy change) Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p><u>R-656b Replacement land required under R-656a may be acquired and added to the Agricultural Production District in advance of removal as follows:</u></p> <p>a. The mitigation is for a public agency or utility project consistent with R-655;</p> <p>b. Property proposed to be added to the Agricultural Production District is approved by the Department of Natural Resources and Parks to ensure compliance with R-656a;</p> <p>c. The subsequent map amendment to remove the Agricultural Production District land identifies the previously added land being used for mitigation; and</p> <p>d. The Department of Natural Resources and Parks tracks the acreage of advance additions of replacement land and subsequent removals to ensure that the requirements of R-656a are met.</p>	New policy	Creates flexibility in the sequencing of acquiring replacement land to improve feasibility of policy implementation. This allows for necessary public services/ utilities projects while ensuring preservation of Agricultural Production District acreage and agricultural value. King County Roads attempted to implement R-656a as currently written for two critical road safety projects, but was unable to achieve this within project timelines and available project funding.	Replacement land for Agricultural Production District loss mitigation could be acquired in advance and "banked" for future public services/ utilities projects.	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Capital Project and Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: Potentially, but due to underlying mandate (not the policy change) Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-657 King County shall work with ((and provide support to)) Washington State University Extension and other technical service providers for ((its)) their research and education programs that assist small-scale commercial farmers.</p>	Substantive change	Reflects current County role and available resources; The County hasn't provided financial support in many years.	No change	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of "provide support to" is a policy choice. Council could choose to retain this language and allocate funding to support this.
<p>R-658 King County shall work with other jurisdictions and non((-))profits to expand markets for farm products by supporting ((Puget Sound Fresh and other)) programs that promote local food and connect buyers with producers.</p>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Updated to make policy more timeless (for example, Puget Sound Fresh no longer exists)	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-659 King County should work with other jurisdictions, farm advocacy groups, and others to support ((Farmlink,)) farmer training and other programs that help new farmers get started, gain access to farmland and develop successful marketing methods.</p>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Updated to make policy more timeless (for example, Farmlink no longer exists)	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-661 King County should develop and encourage the use of incentives ((to encourage)) for food production on prime farmland. These incentives could include tax credits, expedited permit review, reduced permit fees, permit exemptions for activities complying with best management practices, or similar programs. The ((e))County</p>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edits for clarity and to reflect current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BIPOC terminology, rather than POC terminology, could be used here; Executive staff state it was not intentional to not use those terms.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
should continue to work with community-based organizations that can assist farmers who are People of Color, immigrants, (and minority farmers) refugees, and other communities that have traditionally experienced access issues(;) in gaining access to farmland.						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second sentence ("give opportunity") could be a separate policy from the first ("use incentives for food production") as the policy intent is different.
R-661a To help make more farmland accessible to beginning, (and) low-income, historically underserved, and socially disadvantaged farmers, King County should expand its leasing of agricultural land to farmers and community organizations where appropriate and should encourage private farmland owners to lease unused land to farmers.	Substantive change	<p>To advance equity goals.</p> <p>While "socially disadvantaged" is not current County terminology, it is aligned with USDA language which is defined as farmers and ranchers (SDFRs) belonging to groups that have been subject to racial or ethnic prejudice. SDFRs include farmers who are Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Hispanic or Latino, and Asian or Pacific Islander. For some but not all USDA programs, the SDFR category also includes women.</p>	Increased accessibility of land to SDFRs and community organizations serving historically underserved farmers.	Local Food Initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-661b King County should expand representation of low income, (and) historically underserved, and socially disadvantaged farmers and community organizations within King County agricultural processes, such as the Agriculture Commission, advisory committees, task forces, and hiring.	Substantive change	<p>To advance equity goals.</p> <p>While "socially disadvantaged" is not current County terminology, it is aligned with USDA language which is defined as farmers and ranchers (SDFRs) belonging to groups that have been subject to racial or ethnic prejudice. SDFRs include farmers who are Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Hispanic or Latino, and Asian or Pacific Islander. For some but not all USDA programs, the SDFR category also includes women.</p>	More influence in related County planning and actions, which can improve equitable outcomes for priority populations.	Local Food Initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-662 Agricultural processing, packing and direct sales are considered agricultural activities and should be allowed at a size and scale appropriate to the zone in which they are operating. King County (shall) should work with local and state health departments to develop regulations supporting these activities and with local non(-)profits and academic institutions to educate farmers about safe food processing practices and compliance.	Substantive change	Some of this has occurred, such as for meat processing. Additional work might be needed, but it's unclear when, in what context, and with what resources that will occur. So, a "should" is more appropriate for the policy direction here.	None; does not change current practice	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This change softens the policy, which is a policy choice. The Executive rationale states that it is unknown if additional work is needed and when or how that would happen. Councilmembers could consider retaining the shall and providing policy direction or removing the final sentence.
R-663 King County supports the processing and packaging of farm products from crops and livestock, and (will) shall continue to work with farmers, ranchers, cities, neighboring counties, and other interested parties to address infrastructure and regulatory needs	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
that promote sales to consumers, institutions, restaurants, and retail enterprises.						
R-664 King County supports innovative technologies to process <u>waste from</u> dairy and other livestock (waste) to reduce nutrients and to create other products such as energy and compost in areas that have Agriculture and Rural Area land use designations.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edits for clarity	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The code only allows this use (anaerobic digester) in the A zone. The code could be updated to allow them in the RA zone as well.
R-665 King County should develop incentives that support local food production and processing to increase food security; provide a healthy, affordable local food supply; and reduce energy use.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This concept is mostly covered by R-661. References to processing, food security, and energy use could be consolidated there, and then R-665 could be deleted.
R-666 King County shall provide incentives, educational programs, and other methods to encourage agricultural practices and technological improvements that maintain water quality, protect public health, protect fish and wildlife habitat, protect historic resources, maintain flood conveyance and storage, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, control noxious weeds, (and) prevent erosion of valuable agricultural soils, and increase soil water holding capacity while maintaining the functions needed for agricultural production.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-667 King County shall continue to support agriculture with an expedited review process and reduced fees for structures necessary for farm operations.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This concept is covered by R-661. This policy could be deleted.
R-668 King County shall work with federal, state, local, and private agencies to improve the availability and efficiency of water for agriculture through use of tools such as: expanding the availability of recycled water to farms(;); offering incentives for irrigation efficiency(;); <u>and supporting</u> mechanisms for water rights banking and trading that will give farmers greater certainty for water rights while protecting instream flows. King County (will) <u>shall</u> encourage the maintenance and preservation of agriculture water rights for agriculture purposes. Assessments of future surface and groundwater availability for agriculture should consider projected impacts of climate change.	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen. Other edits for grammar.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-668a King County (will) <u>shall</u> continue to support drainage improvements through its Agricultural Drainage Assistance Program and actively seek new ways to make drainage projects less expensive and easier to implement and to improve drainage systems across property lines.	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-669 King County should continue to collaborate with the Washington State University Extension, the University of Washington, and King Conservation District to: a. (d) <u>Develop</u> information on <u>and analyze</u> the (likely) current and future impacts of climate change on agriculture in King County(;); b. (and to d) <u>Develop</u> mitigation, resiliency, and adaptation strategies that are appropriate for King County's soils and farm economy((- Research should address)), such as soil management, use of commercial compost, water storage, irrigation, alternative crops, integrated pest management, and nutrient management((- The information should be made available to)); <u>and</u>	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edits for clarity	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
c. Share the information and strategies with farmers through technical assistance programs and farm planning.						
R-669a Farmers conducting work on property on which King County owns a Farmland Preservation Program easement should use Agricultural Best Management Practices and other sustainable farming methods.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy, R-680, and P-114 could be combined.
R-670 King County should provide incentives for soil management practices that reduce greenhouse emissions through its Agricultural Best Management Practices Cost-Sharing Program.	Policy Staff Flag					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy and R-680 could be combined.
Policy R-671						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy is being reviewed as part of the critical areas regulations changes that are being sent over on 3/1. This policy can be found in the Critical Areas Review Matrix
R-672 King County should work with federal, state and local jurisdictions to reduce flood impacts to agricultural operations. The ((e))County ((will)) shall continue to investigate the needs of agriculture before, during and after flood events, to determine if and how losses can be reduced, and ((will)) shall use this information in designing its floodplain policies and regulations.	Clarification of existing policy intent	"Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; policies should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen. Other edits for grammar.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-673 In addition to enhancing the Farmland Preservation Program, the ((e))County should develop more innovative solutions and incentives to keep agricultural land affordable and profitable for active farming.	Technical	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This concept is covered by R-661. This policy could be deleted.
R-675 King County ((should)) shall prioritize its programs to help build and support a sustainable, reliable, equitable, and resilient local food system. King County ((should)) shall strive to ((make)) strengthen the local food system, ((accessible)) increase accessibly to ((at)) to the local food supply, and strive to make access to the local food system culturally appropriate by: a. Expanding leadership and ownership of food production opportunities to low-income, historically underserved, and socially disadvantaged farmers; and b. Making locally grown, healthy, and culturally relevant foods available to and reflective of King County communities and low-income, historically underserved, and socially disadvantaged farmers.	Substantive change	Equity revisions made to strengthen and be more intentional about who increased food accessibility and land access will be available for, consistent with current program goals and practices	Increased accessibility and availability of local food to historically underserved communities and advanced ownership among historically underserved farmers in various aspects of the food production system.	Local Food Initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a policy choice to strengthen the policy by changing "should" to "shall." Sub a. and R-677c cover the same concept. One of them could be removed.
R-677 King County should promote and support local food production and local processing to strengthen a sustainable and climate resilient the local food system and reduce the distance that food must travel from farm to table.	Substantive change	Strengthening the connection between local food production and climate resilience, reflective of the current work being done around food access as outlined in the Local Food initiative and Strategic Climate Action Plan	Ensures actions to support the local food system take into account climate impacts and needs	Local Food Initiative Strategic Climate Action Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: No Anticipated timeline: Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could reword to state the policy goal of strengthening the food system and reducing farm to table distance.
R-677a King County should continue food waste programs for single ((family,)) detached and multifamily residences, businesses, and institutions, aimed at reducing generation, promoting donation and encouraging curbside collection for anaerobic digestion and composting.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Edits for clarity and to reflect current terminology	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
((R-677b King County should prioritize the economic development of the food and agriculture industries in order to build a more sustainable and resilient local food system.	Clarification of existing policy intent	Very broad policy without much clarity or specifics; objective is captured elsewhere.	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	
<u>R-677c King County should support low-income, historically underserved, and socially disadvantaged populations in efforts to improve equitable food access and food production goals, including support for alternative pathways for farmland access that meet their community's needs.</u>	New policy	To support equity outcomes and changing framework to a community-serving and community-supporting initiative. This is more reflective of the current work being done around food access as outlined in the Local Food initiative and Strategic Climate Action Plan	Increased accessibility and availability of local food to historically underserved communities and advanced ownership among historically underserved farmers in various aspects of the food production system.	2020 Strategic Climate Action Plan Action 5.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R-677c covers the same concept as R-675 sub a. They could be combined.
R-678 King County should support and collaborate with ((either organizations to further the development of)) food incentive program providers, with food providers, producers, and distributors, and with community-based organizations to further develop and expand programs that increase ((the ability of shoppers to)) access to affordable foods, increase the use of food assistance benefits, and increase the ability of farmers to accept electronic and other forms of payment at Farmers Markets and farm stands.	Substantive change	To support equity outcomes and changing framework to a community-serving and community-supporting initiative. This is more reflective of the current work being done around food access as outlined in the Local Food initiative and Strategic Climate Action Plan	Increased accessibility and availability of local food to historically underserved communities and advanced ownership among historically underserved farmers in various aspects of the food production system.	2020 Strategic Climate Action Plan Action 5.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The language about electronic payments is no longer needed and could be removed.
R-679 King County shall identify existing and potential mineral extraction sites on the Mineral Resources Map ((in order)) to conserve mineral resources, promote compatibility with nearby land uses, protect environmental quality, maintain and enhance mineral resource industries, and serve to notify property owners of the potential for mineral extraction activities. The County shall identify(: a. _____ Sites with existing Mineral zoning as Designated Mineral Resource Sites; b. _____ Sites where the landowner or operator has indicated an interest in mineral extraction, sites that as of the date of adoption of the 1994 Comprehensive Plan had potential Quarrying/Mining zoning, or sites that the County determines might support future mineral extraction as Potential Surface Mineral Resource Sites; and c. _____ Sites where mining operations predate zoning regulations but without zoning or other land use approvals as Nonconforming Mineral Resource Site sites consistent with Washington State Department of Natural Resources mineral resource mapping and in accordance with the mineral resource lands evaluation and designation criteria established in Chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington and applicable sections in Washington Administrative Code.	Clarification of existing policy intent	The existing language was the process used to first designate mineral lands in 1994 in compliance with the Growth Management Act. It is not current practice, does not have current applicability/use, and does not align with the evaluation requirements in state law. Other technical edit for grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
R-681 King County may designate additional sites on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map as Mining only following a site-specific rezone to Mineral zoning. Upon approval of a rezone	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>to Mineral zoning, the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map shall be amended to designate the site as Mining during the next Comprehensive Plan update. King County should approve applications for site-specific rezones to Mineral zoning and applications for permits that would authorize mineral extraction and processing only following site-specific environmental study(,) and early and continuous public notice and comment opportunities, when:</p> <p>a. The proposed site contains rock, sand, gravel, or other mineral resources;</p> <p>b. The proposed site is large enough to confine or mitigate all operational impacts;</p> <p>c. The proposal will allow operation with limited conflicts with adjacent land uses when mitigating measures are applied;</p> <p>d. The proposal has been evaluated under the State Environmental Policy Act so that the County may approve, condition or deny applications consistent with the County's substantive State Environmental Policy Act authority, and ((in order)) to mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts.</p> <p>e. Roads or rail facilities serving or proposed to serve the site can safely and adequately handle transport of products and are in close proximity to the site.</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated timeline: n/a 	
<p>R-683 King County may amend the Mineral Resources Map to identify additional Potential Surface Mineral Resource Sites as part of the ((eight)) 10-year or midpoint update.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Reflects new state 10-year comprehensive planning cycle</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-686 ((In order))To comprehensively assess the environmental impacts associated with a zoning change, conditional use, or operating approval for a mineral extraction proposal, the range of environmental impacts, including short-term and long-term effects arising or existing over the lifetime of the proposal, shall be assessed at the earliest possible stage. This should include the potential for phasing of future proposals for structures and operations related to mineral extraction, such as asphalt and concrete batch plants.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>To clarify that this environmental assessment should consider impacts of phasing of mining activities, rather than future permits for other uses.</p> <p>Other technical edit for grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-687 King County should prevent or minimize conflicts with mineral extraction when planning land uses adjacent to Designated Mineral Resource Sites and Potential Surface Mineral Resource Sites. Subarea plans or area zoning and land use studies may indicate areas where Mining is an inappropriate land use designation. Designated Mineral Resource Sites and Potential Surface Mineral Resource Sites and Nonconforming Mineral Resource Sites should be shown on the Mineral Resources Map ((and subarea study maps in order)) to notify nearby property owners and residents of existing and prospective mineral extraction activities.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>"Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
		<p>intent. The subarea study definition will be removed, as it is no longer necessary.</p> <p>In this case, changes to mining designations could happen via either a subarea plan or an area zoning and land use study.</p> <p>The reference to subarea study maps is inappropriate, as the only place where mineral designations are reflected is the Mineral Resources Maps in the Comprehensive Plan; subarea plans and area zoning and land use studies do not do this, and thus should not be supplanted here.</p>				
<p>R-689 Conditions and mitigations for significant adverse environmental impacts associated with mineral extraction or mining operations and their associated structures or facilities should be required, especially in the following areas:</p> <p>a. Air quality, including greenhouse gas emissions from minerals extracted for energy production;</p> <p>b. Environmentally sensitive and critical areas, such as surface and groundwater quality and quantity, wetlands, fisheries and wildlife habitats, and aquatic habitats;</p> <p>c. Noise levels;</p> <p>d. Vibration;</p> <p>e. Light and glare;</p> <p>f. Vehicular access and safety;</p> <p>g. Land and shoreline uses;</p> <p>h. Traffic impacts;</p> <p>i. Visual impacts;</p> <p>j. Cultural and historic features and resources;</p> <p>k. Site security; and</p> <p>l. ((Climate change impacts from minerals extracted for energy production; and</p> <p>m.)) Others unique to specific sites and proposals.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Sub-l is moved up to the air quality item in sub-a, for clarity and consistency with State Environmental Policy Act review</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-690 Where mineral extraction or mining are subject to state or federal regulations, King County should work with the state and federal governments to ensure that proposals are reviewed with consideration of local land use and environmental requirements, regional impacts from transport, and assessment of climate change impacts from end((-))use of minerals and mined materials.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Grammar</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned implementation of proposal: n/a Description of proposed regulations: n/a Anticipated resource need: n/a Anticipated timeline: n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
<p>R-691 King County should work with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources to ensure that mining areas are reclaimed in a timely and appropriate manner. Reclamation of mineral extraction or mining sites in the Forest Production District should return the land to forestry. Where mineral extraction is completed in phases, reclamation also should be completed in phases as the resource is depleted. When reclamation of mineral extraction sites located outside of the</p>	<p>Policy Staff Flag</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council may wish to consider whether the County's current policies and regulations regarding reclamation of mineral extraction sites meets the Council's policy goals.

Chapter 3 Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
2/9/24

Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistent with other plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
Forest Production District is completed, the site should be considered for redesignation to a land use designation and zoning classification compatible with the surrounding properties.						
R-692 King County shall encourage the removal of existing stockpiles of previously mined material ((in order)) to promote and achieve reclamation of land to its highest and best use.	Technical change	Grammar	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> n/a • <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a • <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.