



**King County**

**Transportation, Economy and Environment Committee**

**STAFF REPORT**

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	5	<b>Name:</b>	Kendall Moore Rick Bautista
<b>Proposed No.:</b>	2012-B0045	<b>Date:</b>	April 3, 2012

**SUBJECT:**

Briefing on Executive's 2012 proposed amendments to King County Comprehensive Plan ("KCCP") policies and text (exclusive of those related to transfer of development rights) contained in Chapter 3 - Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands.

**SYNOPSIS OF KEY ISSUES**

- Broadening the scope of equestrian uses to the entire Rural Area and to include the APDS and FPDs
- Creating process for a watershed-level discussion of the interaction between agriculture, habitat restoration, wetland and floodplain management within the APDs
- Eliminating the use of tight-lined sewers to schools in the Rural Area

**OVERVIEW OF PERTINENT CHAPTER SECTIONS AND ISSUES:**

The Growth Management Act ("GMA") requires the County to designate Rural Areas and Natural Resource wherein agriculture, natural resources and mineral extraction uses, and uses of a rural character are predominate.

While a limited number of specific policy changes proposed for this Chapter may receive significant attention (noted above in the synopsis of key issues), there are no new broad initiatives proposed. Instead, most of the Executive's proposed changes are more aimed at (1) incorporating into existing policies the concepts of public health and sustainability, (2) eliminating redundant or outdated policy text and (3) making a number of clarifying or grammatical revisions.

NOTE: The text and policies regarding transfers of development rights (found in "Section III.C," on pages 3-22 through 3-327) have undergone the significant revisions. The analysis of these policies will be part of the May 15, 2012 TREE briefing.

## ANALYSIS

### 1. pp. 3-5 (text)

**One of the challenges facing the county is to provide for a diversity of lifestyle choices while providing public services at rural levels.**  
The growth in the Puget Sound region affects rural character everywhere in the region. King County was once firmly rooted in agriculture, forestry and mining. However, with regional growth both the rural economy and the rural population are changing, as are the expectations of some rural residents for county services. Some residents are more accustomed to independent lifestyles focused around resource uses such as farming, dairying, keeping of livestock, or forestry. Other residents and visitors can be surprised by the sights, sounds, and smells associated with rural living; and can be accustomed to higher levels of service and facilities than are traditionally provided in the Rural Area.

**ISSUE:** The above text is represented as new language, but (with the exception of the first sentence – bolded above) is identical to existing text of the preceding paragraph that is not being deleted. This creates a redundancy that can be resolved by simply appending the first sentence of the above text to the preceding paragraph and deleting the proposed "new" text.

### 2. p. 3-5 (text)

#### Public Engagement

Several years ago, numerous rural residents realized both a need to protect their diverse communities and to represent their common interests to the county. Thus, the Unincorporated Area Councils (UACs) were created to represent the interests of rural residents and business owners, within a specific area. ~~((The four rural UACs are Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council, Greater Maple Valley Area Council, Upper Bear Creek Unincorporated Area Council, and Vashon-Maury Island Community Council. Although each UAC operates separately and has different by-laws, the UAC's are now working together to represent~~

**ISSUE:** The proposal adds a new subheading of "Public Engagement" to emphasize the need for broader public input, but deletes the last two sentences related to the four rural Unincorporated Areas Councils ("UACs"). Council staff believe that in place of the deleted sentences, new text should be added to describe the effort the County is undertaking to engage more rural stakeholders, as envisioned by Ordinance 17139. As members will recall, Ordinance 17139 requires the Executive to develop a framework to engage the residents of the County's unincorporated areas. The Ordinance includes specific directions for the development of that framework, including the creation of

community service areas ("CSAs"), that the Executive agrees that additional language to more fully explain the public engagement is necessary.

**3. p. 3-11 (text)**

~~The county encourages forest stewardship planning and active forest management as a means of reducing conversion of forestland to other uses, improving ((to improve)) forest health, increasing ((to sustain)) rural economic prosperity ((activities)) and reducing ((to reduce)) risks from wildfire. Hundreds of landowners have written forest stewardship plans and ~~((entered the Timber Land Current Use Taxation Program. Some of these landowners have had difficulty implementing their plans because of development regulations))~~ have enrolled in current use taxation programs, demonstrating a commitment to forest management.~~

~~The county has worked with the Rural Forest Commission to identify and propose changes to the code to remove impediments to the implementation of forest stewardship plans. ~~((The small size of forested properties in the Rural Area means that))~~ However, the small size of rural forest properties presents another obstacle to implementation of forest plans. Because the volume of timber harvested at any one time is usually small, ~~((Under these circumstances))~~ it is difficult for landowners to find forestry services or log buyers. Many contractors do not consider small sites to be forestland with potential management opportunities, and they have not developed the tools and skills to work with small sites. There is untapped potential for work to be done by the private sector on small private forestlands. Outreach to forestry consultants and labor contractors concerning the potential small lot forest market is needed. Continuing forestry technical assistance and cost share to landowners, who otherwise are unlikely to pursue management activities, will encourage active forest stewardship and rural economic development.~~

**ISSUE:** Council staff has no issue at this time but simply wants to note that Executive's intent in adding more specific text regarding implementation challenges facing forest landowners, and more importantly, solutions that address those challenges, was to provide greater clarity as to the meaning of text in the first paragraph that is to be deleted.

**4. p. 3-14 (text)**

~~((In the 2004 Comprehensive Plan, Equestrian Communities were identified and mapped to support coordinated activities between the county and the equestrian industry, especially in preserving trails. However, a)) In recent years the diversity of equestrian uses has expanded throughout the rural portions of the county, going well beyond the traditional uses of a child and his or her favorite horse, a 4-H horse show, or a trail ride through the woods. Today's equestrian uses include raising and training a variety of~~

horse breeds, an increase in the number of riding arenas, and the construction of a state-of-the-art horse rehabilitation facility. This diversity of equestrian uses ((are found throughout the county and these uses)) should be sustained and encouraged where compatible with the existing character of the area in which ((new)) equestrian facilities are proposed to be built or expanded.

Several constraints may limit the development or expansion of equestrian activities. Even though the Growth Management Act limits ((As)) growth, some growth continues to occur throughout the rural areas of the county, impacting open land to sustain livestock, equestrian activities, and existing or potential trail segments that may be lost to uncoordinated land developments((and road improvements)). ((Also, requirements of the Endangered Species Act may limit livestock management choices and the location of new equestrian facilities on land constrained by large riparian corridors. Additionally, with the county's emphasis on preserving agricultural and forestry lands within the Agricultural and Forest Production Districts, the development of large equestrian facilities of a size and scale that would be incompatible with agricultural and forestry practices within these districts should be discouraged.))

**ISSUE** The text above is the lead-in to policies related to equestrian uses. Council staff does not have an issue at this time. However, it should be noted that the changes (1) represent a significant shift in how equestrian activities are viewed in their relationship to farming and forestry uses within Rural Area, and perhaps more importantly, within the Agricultural and Forest Production Districts, and (2) expand support for equestrian activities beyond the old mapped equestrian communities and into APDs and FPD

**5. pp. 3-14 and 3-16 (text and policies)**

Trail riding throughout rural King County is a popular ((E)) equestrian use((s)) enjoyed by both urban and rural residents((in the county include trail riding)). Although llama and alpaca treks are becoming increasingly popular, most of the trail riding in King County is on horses and mules. Several constraints may limit the continuation, development, or expansion of equestrian trails or trail segments including uncoordinated land development. Additionally, as ownership of private and/or public land with existing trails is transferred, these trails may be lost when easements are not in place to protect the trails at the time of the transaction or if the new owner is not aware that a trail runs across the parcel.

**R-212** King County should support ((the identified)) equestrian ((uses in)) use trail throughout the Rural Area and in the Agricultural and Forest Production Districts, as appropriate, by ((providing facilities on King County rights-of-way where not in conflict with the terms of utility easements to accommodate)):

- a. Working with local communities to identify and protect multiple-use trails and key linkages that support horse travel;
- b. ~~((by m))~~ Maintaining equestrian links, including multiple-use trails, where appropriate; ((and by adoption of supportive land use regulations for use of these areas for horsekeeping. King County will work with local communities to identify and protect multiple-use trails and other public trails that support horse travel within the Rural Area))
- c. Ensuring parking areas serving multiple use trails are designed and constructed, whenever possible to handle parking for horse trailers; and
- d. Constructing and maintaining equestrian trails under County ownership or management consistent with King County Backcountry Trail or Regional Trail Standards whenever possible.

**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 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 should assure a minimum eight-foot wide gravel shoulder on arterial roads and 4.5-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.))~~

**ISSUE** Council staff has no issues at this time but note several substantive revisions.

**R-212:** revised to reflect new support for expanding equestrian activities beyond the mapped equestrian communities and into the whole of the Rural Area, APD and FPD. A second revision is a clear de-emphasis on the use of county road rights-of-way for equestrian trails and more emphasis on identifying and preserving opportunities for off-road trails. The prime reasons for this change are to (1) reflect the preference of horse-riders to not use roadway shoulders (2) recognize that the use of trails on roadway shoulders creates safety issues with both riders and drivers, and (3) presents a high capital and long-term maintenance for the county. The third revision (new subparagraph c.) addresses a long-standing complaint by equestrians about the design of trailheads not providing appropriate space for unloading of horses due to lack of space or steep grades.

**R-213:** at the end of this policy, specific construction standards are deleted because they are already embedded as provisions of the County Road Standards.

6. p. 3-16

R-214 King County's land use regulations should protect rural equestrian community trails by supporting preservation of existing equestrian trail links in the Rural Area(~~(, protecting livestock from intrusions from residential development, and encouraging subdivision layouts that preserve opportunities for keeping of horses))~~ and within the Agricultural and Forest Production District. Representatives of the equestrian community (~~shall~~) should be given the opportunity to review and monitor regulatory and (~~programmatic~~) policy actions by King County, such as rural area development regulations, that have the potential to affect equestrian (~~uses~~) trails.

**ISSUE** Council staff see no need to change from "shall" to "should," but this change may be appropriate since the provision to allow the equestrian community the opportunity to "monitor" County actions may be difficult to implement.

R-217 County departments negotiating trades or sales of county land shall determine whether any historically established trails exist on the property, and, when economically feasible, ensure that those trails are retained or replaced (~~to ensure that key linkages to regional systems~~) and are not lost as a condition of the trade or sale. Trails that provide key linkages, for either multi-use or equestrian trails, should be considered to have strategic value to the county's trail network and should be retained or replaced whenever possible.

**ISSUE** Council staff notes that the new text which reads "should be retained or replaced" conflicts with the first sentence. Executive staff agrees there is a potential conflict and will review. Council staff will provide alternative language.

7. pp. 3-17 and 3-18

R-301 A low growth rate is desirable for the Rural Area, including Rural Towns, to comply with the State Growth Management Act, prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, reduce the need for capital expenditures for rural roads, maintain rural character, (~~and~~) protect the environment and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. (~~King County shall focus its resources on the unincorporated Urban Area until such time that these areas become part of cities.~~) 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.

**ISSUE** Council staff see no issue but would note that the deletion of the second to last sentence is a reflection of the recognition that there will be a continuing shift in focus towards the needs of the Rural Area.

**8. pp. 3-30 (text and policy)**

Resource and open space tracts often require stewardship over time to prevent or control invasive species encroachment and to restore forest health, species diversity, and wildlife habitat structure.

**R-332a** When a resource or open space tract is created as part of a plat, the county should require a stewardship plan to ensure appropriate management of the tract.

**ISSUE** Council staff see no issue with the policy but have suggested to the Executive that an expanded lead-in would help to better provide context as to the need for this new policy.

**9. p. 3-31**

**R-333** 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, surface water management standards that emphasize preservation of natural drainage systems and water quality, groundwater protection, and resource-based practices. These standards should be designed to provide appropriate exceptions for lands that are to be developed for kindergarten through twelfth grade public schools and school facilities, provided that the school project and all associated roadway safety enhancements shall comply at a minimum with the requirements of the King County Surface Water Design Manual.

**ISSUE** Council staff notes that the added text may be redundant in that a "school project" already includes all necessary related improvements. Executive staff agree reassess the need for this change and the proposed revision may be eliminated.

**10. pp. 3-33 and 3-34**

**R-403** In the Rural Area, 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 (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," ~~((rural))~~ cities in the rural area or Rural Towns ~~((, or new or existing public schools or public school facilities,))~~ shall be tightlined and have access restrictions precluding service to the Rural Area.

**ISSUE** This will be a key placeholder issue in later discussions. The policy revision deletes a reference to sewers serving schools in the Rural Area. This proposed deletion is in keeping with the Executive's proposed deletion of Policy F-249<sup>1</sup>.

The Executive intent in proposing deletion of policy F-249 is to signal that the issue of limiting sewer service to new or existing public schools and public school facilities was the subject of intense debate by the Growth Management Planning Council ("GMPC") last year during their discussion on proposed revisions to the Countywide Planning Policies ("CPPs"). No action on this issue was taken by the GMPC except to create a School Siting Task Force, which was given the responsibility for deliberating on the matter and develop recommendations to address the issue.

The Task Force is expected to complete their deliberations at the end of March. At that point, new policy language will be transmitted to both the GMPC and Council for consideration in both the CPPs and 2012 Update, respectively.

Council staff notes that the currently-proposed text revision to policy R-403 represents the Executive's "default" if there are delays in the GMPC action.

#### **11. pp. 3-60 and 3-62 (text and policy)**

~~((Some of the highest quality salmon habitat in King County is found within APDs. Additional protection or restoration of critical habitat within the APDs has been recommended by each of the Water Resources Inventory Area Salmon Conservation Plans. Protection and enhancement of existing salmon habitat is a resource based land use that should be included in all farm management plans. Specific habitat protection rules should not jeopardize the agricultural productivity within APDs. Aquatic habitat restoration or wetland mitigation projects should be limited in scale to achieve the objectives of the project while limiting fragmentation of farms and aquatic habitat. Many habitat restoration projects can be designed in a manner that provides benefits to both fish habitat and the agricultural landowner.))~~

---

<sup>1</sup> Proposed to be deleted:

**F-249** Public sewer expansions shall not occur in the Rural Area and on Natural Resource Lands except where needed to address specific health and safety problems threatening the existing uses of structures or the needs of public schools or public school facilities, consistent with the paramount duty of the State to make ample provision for the education of all children residing within its borders. Public sewers may be extended, pursuant to this policy, only if they are tightlined and only after a finding is made by King County that no reasonable alternative technologies are technologically or economically feasible and that an on-site sewer disposal system for the public school or public school facility would not protect basic public health, safety, and the environment during the use of this site for a school or school facility. Utility providers shall ensure, through a signed agreement between the school district and the utility provider, that any sewer service permitted for the school district is designed only to serve public schools or public school facilities. Public sewers which are allowed in the Rural Area or on Natural Resource Lands pursuant to this policy shall not be used to convert Rural Area land or Natural Resource Lands to urban uses and densities or to expand permitted nonresidential uses.



The river valleys in King County are critical locations for agriculture, salmon habitat and natural floodplain processes. In compliance with growth management, portions of several of these valleys were designated as Agriculture Production Districts (APDs) to protect the best of our diminishing farmland for long-term commercial agriculture, thereby preventing their conversion to other uses that are often incompatible with habitat protection or that would require expensive flood risk reduction projects. As a result of federal listing of Chinook salmon as a threatened species, King County is also obligated to take actions for protection of Chinook habitat in our watersheds. Such actions include restoration of habitat in portions of each of our rivers and, because many sections of our river systems are in a highly altered state, those reaches within APDs offer some of the most promising opportunities for habitat restoration critical to salmon recovery. At the same time King County is committed to the preservation of productive agricultural soils and local agricultural production and protection of public safety in flood prone areas through the restoration of floodplain processes. King County recognizes that fish, flood management and farm interests must work together in a collaborative manner and that the farmers in the county support fish protection and fish recovery through many regulated and voluntary actions. It is essential that farmers and other property owners in each watershed be directly included in planning and in the review of integrated, watershed-wide strategies that support the needs of agriculture, fish recovery, and flood risk reduction and floodplain management.

- R-648** Until the county implements the watershed planning process described in R-648a, ((A))aquatic habitat restoration projects ((of)), floodplain restoration projects and projects under King County's mitigation reserves program are only allowed on agricultural 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 where the proposed project and actions King County identifies and ensures implementation of **would** ((result in a net benefit to)) improve agricultural productivity within the APD. Agriculture must remain the predominant use in the APDs and these projects shall not reduce the ability to farm in the area. Such projects may only be allowed on agricultural lands when there are no other suitable lands available and the project is supported by landowners who would be impacted by the project and when :
- a. 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 ((functional)) similar watershed scale plan; or
  - b. The project would improve agricultural productivity within the APD.

**R-648a** 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 when necessary because of the number of potential restoration projects and shall:

- 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;
- 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;
- c. be a collaborative effort among affected land owners, interested stakeholders, and King County and shall be updated on a periodic basis; and
- 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 APD.

**ISSUE** The Executive-proposed text and policy revisions relate to the interaction of agriculture, fish recovery projects, flood risk reduction and floodplain management within the APDs.

This interaction has been and will continue to be a key issue for several environmental, fish habitat protection and agricultural interest groups. Focus on the issue goes back to the 2008 KCCP update, when changes were first considered to policy R-648 (renumbered from R-542 in the 2008 KCCP update). The changes were driven by concerns about wetland mitigation projects for two roadway projects within the APDs, and the resulting loss of agricultural lands.

The Council decided to leave the policy R-648 unchanged, but directed the Executive to convene meetings with the various stakeholder groups to try and achieve consensus on changes to the policy. Over the course of the past four years, the Executive has worked with the various stakeholders. In the Executive's October 2011 Public Review Draft of proposed updates to the KCCP, the draft policy<sup>2</sup> proposed was not well-received by

---

<sup>2</sup> **R-648** ~~Aquatic habitat restoration projects ((or floodplain restoration)) flood risk reduction projects are allowed ((on agricultural 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 where the proposed project would result in a net benefit to agricultural productivity. Agriculture must)) in an APD only if agriculture remains the predominant use in the same APD((s)) and ((these)) the project((s shall)) does not reduce the ability to farm in the ((area)) same APD. ((Such)) Aquatic habitat restoration projects ((may only be allowed on agricultural lands when there are no other suitable lands available and the project is supported by landowners who would be impacted by the project and when:~~

- ~~a. The project is included in an approved Water Resources Inventory Area Plan, Farm Management Plan, Flood Hazard Management Plan or other functional plan; or~~

several stakeholder groups. Many expressed the concern that there was too much emphasis on the needs of the agricultural interests, rather than striking a balance. Additional discussions ensued between the Executive staff and the stakeholder groups

With the exception of a general restatement of the County's three goals to protect agriculture land, recover salmon, and manage floodplains, the current Executive-proposed version of the policy R-648 is significantly different from that of the public review draft. Specifically, the Executive-proposed revisions now appear to:

- Essentially maintain the status quo in policy R-648 in regards to project impacts on agriculture, and
- Set the stage for a move from using a project-by-project approach of reviewing proposals towards a more comprehensive watershed level planning effort involving a wider range of stakeholders. These planning efforts (spelled out in new policy R-648a) would occur in specific watersheds that contain an APD and would reflect the conditions, concerns and stakeholders specific to each watershed.

Council staff also notes that there is missing text on policy R-648, between the words "of" and "would." Council staff will work with the Executive to resolve this issue.

## 12. pp. 3-65 and 3-367

**R-656** King County shall work with and provide support to ~~((the work of))~~ Washington State University Extension for its research and education programs that assist ~~((technical and marketing assistance for))~~ small-scale commercial farmers.

**ISSUE** No issue; but would note that the deletions work with proposed revisions in other policies<sup>3</sup> (R-657, R-657a, and R-663), and reflect an intent for more direct involvement by the County, as opposed to, by the WSU Extension.

---

~~b. The project would improve agricultural productivity within the APD)) and flood risk reduction projects in an APD:~~

~~a. shall be planned with property owners whose land would be affected by the project;~~

~~b. shall be planned and designed to optimize benefits to agricultural production in the same APD;~~

~~c. to the maximum extent practical, should be located on sites that are unsuitable for direct agricultural production purposes; and~~

~~d. if the project's success necessitates locating on a site in the APD that is suitable for direct agricultural production, shall result in substantial benefits to agricultural productivity within the same APD and shall result in substantial benefits for salmon recovery efforts or to flood risk reduction. If these conditions cannot be achieved directly, King County shall ensure actions are implemented to offset any adverse impacts to agricultural productivity within the same APD that result from the project.~~

<sup>3</sup> **R-657** King County shall work with other jurisdictions ~~((continue))~~ to broaden support for ~~((innovative initiatives, such as))~~ the Puget Sound Fresh Program, which provides marketing assistance to

**ATTACHMENT:**

1. Matrix

---

farmers and links consumers to local farms and farmers markets. ((and Farmlink Programs, to promote and enhance agriculture in King County.))

**R-657a** King County should work with other jurisdictions, farm advocacy groups and others to support Farmlink and other programs that help new farmers get started, gain access to farmland and develop successful marketing methods.

**R-663** 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 while maintaining the functions needed for agricultural production.

**Chapter 3: Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>R-101                      King County will continue to preserve and sustain its rural legacy <del>((by supporting))</del> <u>and communities through programs and partnerships that support, preserve, and sustain its</u> historic, cultural, ecological, agriculture, forestry, and mining heritage through collaboration with the King County Landmarks Commission, 4Culture, <del>((unincorporated area councils, community organizations, rural residents, and rural business owners, including forest and farm owners))</del> <u>local and regional preservation and heritage programs, and other interested stakeholders.</u></p>	<p>Technical change to be more inclusive and clear about County's commitment to sustaining rural legacy and character.</p>	<p>The use of the term "interested stakeholders" as opposed to a specific listing will have the effect of potentially broadening opportunities for public participation.</p>
<p>R-102                      King County will continue to support the diversity and richness of its rural communities and their distinct character by working with the unincorporated area councils, <del>((community groups,))</del> <u>community councils, community development associations, other organized groups,</u> rural residents<del>((,))</del> and business owners <u>on programs</u> to sustain and enhance the rural character of <del>((its))</del> rural and resource lands, Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers, and Rural Towns.</p>	<p>Technical change to be more inclusive.</p>	<p>The text preceding this policy should be expanded to describe the current effort to expand involvement beyond the UACs and should specifically mention the CSAs.</p>
<p>R-203                      King County's Rural Area is considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to an Urban Growth Area until reviewed pursuant to the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.130(3)) and <u>the</u> Countywide Planning <del>((Policy FW-4))</del> <u>Policies.</u></p>	<p>Technical change to delete reference to specific CPP.</p>	
<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:                      a. Homeowner covenants for new subdivisions and short subdivisions in the Rural Area should not restrict farming and forestry;                      b. <u>Development regulations for resource-based activities should be tailored to the</u></p>	<p>Provide policy basis to ensure that existing and potential revisions to regulations relating to farming and forestry in the Rural Area take into account the impacts of the rural activity, rather than apply a one size fits all.</p>	<p>This would be the policy basis for consideration of changes to the code that would provide a potentially wider scope of resource-related uses in the Rural Area.</p>

**Chapter 3: Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p><u>resource use and its level of impact;</u>            ((b)) <u>c.</u> 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            ((e)) <u>d.</u> 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>R-206            The conservation of forest land and forestry throughout the Rural Area shall remain a priority for King County. Landowner <u>property tax incentives</u> ((programs)), technical assistance, permit assistance, regulatory actions and community-based education shall be used 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.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>R-207            Rural Forest Focus Areas are identified geographic areas where special efforts are necessary and feasible to maintain forest cover and the practice of sustainable forestry. King County shall target funding, when available, new economic incentive programs, regulatory actions, and additional technical assistance to the ((identified)) 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.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>R-209            The county should develop ((specific)) incentives to encourage agricultural activities in the remaining 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.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	

**Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>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. <u>The county should encourage subdivision layouts that preserve opportunities for livestock and equestrian activities.</u></p>	<p>New sentence moved from policy R-214.</p>	<p>This change is appropriate since Policy R-214 is really focused upon trail protection.</p>
<p>R-212 King County should support <del>((the identified))</del> equestrian trail use <del>((s in))</del> throughout the Rural Area <u>and in the Agricultural and Forest Production Districts as appropriate</u>, by:  <u>a. Working with local communities to identify and protect multiple-use trails and key linkages that support ((providing facilities on King County rights-of-way where not in conflict with the terms of utility easements to accommodate)) horse travel;</u>  <u>b. ((by m))Maintaining equestrian links, including multiple-use trails, where appropriate; ((and by adoption of supportive land use regulations for use of these areas for horsekeeping. King County will work with local communities to identify and protect multiple-use trails and other public trails that support horse travel within the Rural Area.))</u>  <u>c. Ensuring parking areas serving multiple use trails are designed and constructed, whenever possible to handle parking for horse trailers; and</u>  <u>d. Constructing and maintaining equestrian trails under County ownership or management consistent with King County Backcountry Trail or Regional Trail Standards whenever possible.</u></p>	<p>Technical change to clarify meaning and reflect existing county administrative and regulatory processes.</p>	<p>The new text in subparagraph a. reinforces intent to recognize equestrian activities in the APDs and FPDs</p> <p>New subparagraph c. addresses a long-standing complaint by equestrians about the design of trailheads not providing appropriate space for unloading of horses due to lack of space or steep grades.</p>
<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 <u>and Construction Standards</u> will 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. <del>((Construction standards for multiple use nonmotorized trails to be established in road rights-of-way within the Rural Area should assure a minimum eight foot-</del></p>	<p>Technical change.</p>	<p>Removal of standards is appropriate as these are currently included in county regulations.</p>

Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)		
Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
wide gravel shoulder on arterial roads and 4.5 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.)		
R-214 King County's land use regulations should protect rural equestrian community trails by supporting preservation of <u>existing</u> equestrian trail links in the Rural ( <del>(, protecting livestock from intrusions from residential development, and encouraging subdivision layouts that preserve opportunities for keeping of horses.))</del> Area <u>and within the Agricultural and Forest Production Districts</u> . Representatives of the equestrian community ( <del>(shall)</del> ) <u>should</u> be given the opportunity to review and monitor regulatory and ( <del>(programmatic)</del> ) <u>policy</u> actions by King County, such as rural area development regulations, that have the potential to affect equestrian ( <del>(uses)</del> ) <u>trails</u> .	Technical change	Council staff does not have an issue at this time, but simply notes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new text reinforces intent to recognize equestrian activities in the APDs and FPDs, and</li> <li>• The deleted text addressing how subdivision design could incorporate livestock/equestrian needs, is moved from policy R-211.</li> </ul>
R-217 County departments negotiating trades or sales of county land shall determine whether any historically established trails exist on the property, and, <u>when economically feasible</u> , ensure that those trails are retained or replaced ( <del>((to ensure that key linkages to regional systems))</del> ) <u>and are not lost as a condition of the trade or sale. Trails that provide key linkages, for either multi-use or equestrian trails, should be considered to have strategic value to the county's trail network and should be retained or replaced whenever possible.</u>	Technical change to clarify meaning. Sentence replaced "key linkages" phrase deleted from policy to demonstrate County's intent to ensure trail connectivity whenever possible.	The new text "should be retained or replaced" seems to conflict with the text of the first sentence that appears to indicate that the county "shall" ensure that trails are retained or replaced.  Executive staff agrees that there is a potential conflict. Council staff working on new language.
R-301 A low growth rate is desirable for the Rural Area, including Rural Towns, to comply with the State Growth Management Act, prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, reduce the need for capital expenditures for rural roads, maintain rural character, ( <del>(and)</del> ) <u>protect the environment and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.</u> ( <del>((King</del>	Addition reflects recent empirical data that development in urban areas produces less vehicle miles traveled and subsequently less GHG emissions than development in rural areas	No issue but would note that the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added text related to greenhouse-gas emissions could be viewed as redundant with the existing text that seeks to "protect the</li> </ul>



**Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy/Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>County shall focus its resources on the unincorporated Urban Area until such time that these areas become part of cities.) 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.</p>		<p>environment".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deletion of the second to last sentence is a reflection of the recognition that there will be a continuing shift in focus towards the needs of the Rural Area.</li> </ul>
<p>R-303 The Rural Area should have low residential densities that can be sustained by minimal infrastructure improvements such as septic systems and rural roads, 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. ((Concurrency certificates for proposed new subdivisions in the Rural Area shall not be issued if trips generated by such subdivisions would exceed rural transportation level of service standards.))</p>	<p>Policies related to concurrency were consolidated into the Transportation Chapter in 2008. The methodology for concurrency no longer involves concurrency certificates.</p> <p>This was changed in 2008, The last sentence of this policy was overlooked at the time.</p>	<p>No issue by should note that the text preceding the policy is also being deleted for the same reason</p>
<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. 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 ((credits)) 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 Islands shall not be eligible as receiving sites.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Reflects proper reference to the County TDR program</p>
<p>R-323 Nonresidential uses in the Rural Area shall be limited to those that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide convenient local <u>products</u> and services for nearby <u>rural</u> residents;</li> <li>Require location in a Rural Area;</li> <li>Support natural resource-based industries;</li> <li>Provide adaptive reuse of significant historic resources; or</li> <li>Provide recreational opportunities that are compatible with the surrounding Rural Area.</li> </ol>	<p>Technical change</p>	

**Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>R-325 In the Rural Area, elementary schools may locate where required to serve neighborhoods. New middle/junior high schools and high schools and school facilities are encouraged to locate in <del>((rural))</del> cities <u>in the rural area</u> or unincorporated Rural Towns. In reviewing proposals for middle/junior high and high schools and school facilities outside <del>((rural))</del> cities <u>in the rural area</u> or Rural Towns, King County should ensure that any approved project will not stimulate local demand for urban-level services. In order to support the availability of public facilities and services for educational purposes, public schools and public school facilities may exceed nonresidential development standards as provided for by county code, shall comply at a minimum with applicable surface water design manual standards and may be provided with public sewer services in accordance with F-249.</p>	<p>Updates terminology related to cities in the rural area.</p>	<p><b>BOOKMARK</b></p> <p>The text that reads "and may be provided with public sewer services in accordance with F-249" will need to be revisited to reflect decisions on the use of public sewers to rural schools.</p> <p>The Executive proposes to insert reference to the "rural area" in this and several other policies. The new references <u>should be capitalized</u> in each case for consistency with current text references</p>
<p>R-332a <u>When a resource or open space tract is created as part of a plat, the county should require a stewardship plan to ensure that appropriate management of the tract.</u></p>	<p>Resource and open space tracts need to be appropriately managed to prevent incursion of noxious weeds or other adverse environmental impacts. Through proper management, the tracts will provide environmental benefits.</p>	<p>Council staff has requested that the lead-in text for this new policy be revised to provide additional context as to the need for this policy</p>
<p>R-327 Library services for the Rural Area should be provided by bookmobiles, or by libraries in Rural Towns or <del>((rural))</del> cities <u>in the rural area</u>.</p>	<p>Updates terminology related to cities in the rural area.</p>	
<p>R-333 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, surface water management standards that emphasize preservation of natural drainage systems and water quality, groundwater protection, and resource-based practices. These standards should be designed to provide appropriate</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>A <del>school project</del> already includes all necessary related improvements. Executive staff agree that it is not required and can be deleted</p>

**Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy/Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>exceptions for lands that are to be developed for kindergarten through twelfth grade public schools and school facilities, provided that <del>Resource Policy</del> and all associated roadway safety enhancements shall comply at a minimum with the requirements of the King County Surface Water Design Manual.</p>		
<p>R-336 King County shall work with residential builders and developers to encourage the use of low impact development practices, where feasible, that protect native vegetation and soils, restore disturbed soils, and reduce impervious surfaces. <u>The purpose is to reduce flooding, erosion and sedimentation, prevent and mitigate habitat loss, enhance groundwater recharge, and prevent surface and ground water quality and degradation.</u> King County shall continue to promote preservation of native vegetation and soils and restoration of disturbed soils on rural residential zoned parcels to the maximum extent ((practicable)) feasible. Dispersion of runoff from impervious surfaces into native vegetation in accordance with the Surface Water Design Manual is the preferred method of stormwater management in the Rural Area.</p>	<p>Technical change to explain purpose.</p>	
<p>R-403 In the Rural Area, 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 (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," ((rural)) cities <u>in the rural area</u> or Rural Towns(<del>(, or new or existing public schools or public school facilities,))</del>) shall be tightlined and have access restrictions precluding service to the Rural Area.</p>	<p>Updates terminology related to cities in the rural area and deletes reference to sewers serving schools in the rural area. The latter amendment relates to Policy F-249. The issue of sewer service to new or existing public schools and public school facilities is being deliberated by the School Siting Task Force. New policy language will be transmitted to the King County Council after the Task Force and the Growth Management Planning Council complete their work.</p>	<p><b>BOOKMARK</b>  This issue will need to be revisited after the GMPC has acted and Council has acted to begin the CPP ratification process.</p>
<p>R-502 Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers should accommodate only small-scale retail, community and human services, and personal service uses that provide convenience</p>	<p>Technical change. Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers are small and</p>	<p>This particular policy has been implemented in only one instance, at the request of the property owner.</p>

**Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy/Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
shopping and services to nearby Rural Area residents. <del>((If land suitable for residential development is included within the boundaries of a Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center, it should be zoned for rural residential development consistent with the residential development policies of this plan.))</del>	generally contain one to ten lots, rezoning of these commercial lands for residential uses is not anticipated.	Carrying out the rezoning called for in the deleted text may increase pressure to expand the boundaries of such centers as are result of the loss of land for commercial use.
R-503 King County should adopt commercial development standards for Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers that 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 <u>except as demonstrated as being needed to address the safety of the public.</u>	Technical change for clarity and to ensure public safety.	
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. <u>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 Town.</u>	Technical change for clarity. Ensure rural character is being maintained.	
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 <del>((rural))</del> cities <u>in the rural area.</u>	Updates terminology related to cities in the rural area.	
R-510 The <del>((rural, incorporated))</del> cities in the rural area and their Urban Growth Areas <del>((shall be))</del> are considered part of the <del>overall</del> Urban Growth Area for purposes of planning land uses and facility needs. King County should work with <del>((rural))</del> cities <u>in the rural area</u> to encourage the provision of affordable housing, to minimize the impacts of new development on the surrounding rural land and to plan for growth consistent with long-term protection of significant historic resources, the surrounding Rural Area and Resource Lands.	Technical change	The use of the <del>overall</del> may be significant in regards to the arguments that are being forwarded by the city of Snoqualmie to justify their proposed UGA expansion.

**Chapter 3: Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>R-511 Within ((Rural City)) Urban Growth Areas of cities in the rural area, the following uses shall be permitted until the area annexes to the city:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Residential development at a density of 1 home per 5 acres or less with mandatory clustering; and</li> <li>b. Nonresidential development such as commercial and industrial as determined through previous subarea plans.</li> </ul>	<p>Updates terminology referring to cities in the rural area</p>	
<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 ((which)) <u>that</u> may be accessed directly from SR-169.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>R-514 Development regulations for nonvested industrial development in the Rural Area shall require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Greater setbacks, and reduced building height, floor/lot ratios, and maximum impervious surface percentage standards in comparison to standards for urban industrial development((-));</li> <li>b. Maximum protection of sensitive natural features, especially salmonid habitat and water quality((-);</li> <li>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((-);</li> <li>d. Building colors and materials that are muted, signs that are not internally illuminated, and site and building lighting that is held to the minimum necessary for safety((-);</li> <li>e. Heavier industrial uses, nonvested industrial uses producing substantial waste byproducts or wastewater discharge, or nonvested paper, chemical and allied products manufacturing uses in the urban industrial zone shall be prohibited((-); and</li> <li>f. Industrial uses requiring substantial investments in infrastructure such as water, sewers or transportation facilities shall be scaled to avoid the need for public funding of the infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<p>Technical change</p>	

**Chapter 3: Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>R-516  <del>Within Rural Towns and larger Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers, ((Non)) non-</del>            motorized connectivity, where consistent with rural character, should be encouraged to            promote walking and bicycling and to improve public health <del>((within Rural Towns and larger            Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers))</del>.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>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 <del>((as they impact))</del> that affect agriculture; and            c. Ways to maintain, enhance and promote agriculture and agricultural products in the            region.            King County shall continue to support the Agriculture Commission with staff and other            resources.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>R-603            King County should work with other <del>((counties))</del> jurisdictions, agencies and community            organizations to help maintain and enhance commercial agriculture and forestry by            addressing challenges common across the region.</p>	<p>Recognizes the need for inter-            jurisdictional and cross-agency            cooperation to enhance agriculture and            forestry</p>	
<p>R-611            King County should develop and employ effective means to inform affected property owners            about nearby resource management activities. This may include, but not be limited to:            a. Notice on title for properties within five hundred feet of designated agriculture, forestry,            and <del>((mining))</del> mineral resource lands;            b. Signage; and            c. Community meetings and other public notification tools.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>R-619            King County shall <del>((provide for integrated))</del> include resource education through <u>its signs on</u>  <u>trail ((and sign)) systems that are linked with working farms, forests, and mines.</u></p>	<p>Technical change</p>	

**Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>Interpretation should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide historical perspective;</li> <li>b. Demonstrate current adaptive resource management practices (forestry, fisheries, wildlife, agriculture); and</li> <li>c. Explain economics of various resource uses.</li> </ul>		
<p>R-624 To reduce conflicts with resource uses, a forest management plan shall be required as a condition of development for any residential uses <u>in the FPD</u>. Accessory dwelling units shall not be allowed in the FPD.</p>	<p>Clarifying amendment</p>	<p>No issue, but cannot see how it could be interpreted otherwise given the policy's location in the FPD section of the Plan.</p>
<p>R-627 King County should promote and support production, harvest, utilization, and marketing of wood products grown in the county's ((R))rural and forest areas. King County should ((encourage)) <u>ensure that regulations applying to rural and forest areas do not discourage the establishment of sawmills and other wood product businesses and services ((that are able to serve the small forest landowners in the county)).</u></p>	<p>Provide policy basis for changes in regulations to make it easier to have small sawmills and wood processing in King County</p>	<p>No issue but would note that the proposal is strongly supported by the Forest Commission</p> <p>Need to determine of need grammatical change because of "Rural Area" reference</p>
<p>R-632 King County should continue to work with all affected parties and the WDNR to improve the 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. Landowners opting to conduct forest management activities under state approved forest practices permits should be restricted from developing those areas for ((non-forestry)) <u>non-resource</u> purposes for six years from the date of forest practice approval. Recognizing that some landowners combine the development of a residence <u>or an agricultural activity</u> 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 <u>and agricultural activity</u> differently from the forest management.</p>	<p>Broadens policy to recognize multiple resource uses on forest lands.</p>	<p>No issue but would note that the proposal is strongly supported by the Forest Commission</p>

**Chapter 3. Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p><b>R-633a</b>  <u>The county should promote public understanding of the benefits of commercial timber production and encourage the use of local wood.</u></p>	<p>Provides policy basis for programs to promote public understanding of the benefits of local forestry and encourage the use of local wood.</p>	<p>No issue but would note that the proposal is strongly supported by the Forest Commission</p>
<p><b>R-638</b>            King County encourages the use of recycled, organic-based soil amendments, <u>such as biosolids</u>, and fertilizers in forest ecosystems, which can reduce erosion and sedimentation into streams, increase water-holding capacity of soils, stimulate the growth of trees and other vegetation and enhance fish and wildlife habitat. King County shall work with the general public and private and public forestland owners to encourage the selective and appropriate use of these materials for ecosystem enhancement and restoration.</p>	<p>Technical amendment – clarifying language</p>	
<p><b>R-641</b>            King County shall continue to implement the objectives of the <u>Farmland Preservation Program (FPP)</u>. Protection of property purchased under the FPP shall be a high priority when balancing conflicting interests such as locating transportation, active recreation or utility facilities. <u>King County shall use of the Transfer of Development Rights Program as another tool to preserve farmland.</u></p>	<p>Recognizes TDR as a tool for farmland preservation</p>	<p><b>BOOKMARK</b>             Discussion of this policy will occur as part of the committee discussion on TDR policy and code revisions.</p>
<p><b>R-642</b>  <u>Agriculture Production Districts (APDs)</u> are 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 appropriate boundaries for APDs to reduce the possibility of conflicts with adjacent land uses.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p><b>R-643</b>            King County should <u>continue to seek funding and purchase</u> additional development rights to farmland in the APDs (<del>as funding becomes available</del>).</p>	<p>Directs county to continue to seek funding for FPP</p>	<p>No issue but indicates a more proactive approach to finding funds for purchases</p>
<p><b>R-645</b>            Lands within APDs should remain in parcels large enough for commercial agriculture. A residential density of one home per 35 acres shall be applied where the predominant lot size is</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	



Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>35 acres or larger, and a residential density of one home per 10 acres shall be applied where the predominant lot size is <del>((less))</del> <u>smaller</u> than 35 acres.</p>		
<p>R-647            On-site housing for farm employees shall be allowed where this can be accomplished without unnecessarily removing land from agricultural use or conflicting with other public interests. King County should <del>((develop guidelines to allow on-site housing for farm employees, including guidelines that account for the restrictive covenants on properties in the FPP))</del> <u>address the regulatory constraints that make it difficult for farmers to offer housing for farm employees.</u></p>	<p>Directs the county to address the regulatory constraints to farmworker housing; retains meaning of policy but is more specific about the next steps needed,</p>	<p>No issue but must be addressed in future legislation</p>
<p>R-648  <u>Until the county implements the watershed planning process described in R- 648a, ((A))aquatic habitat restoration projects ((er)), floodplain restoration projects and projects under King County's mitigation reserves program are only allowed on agricultural 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 where the proposed project and actions King County identifies and ensures implementation of would ((result in a net benefit to)) improve agricultural productivity within the APD. Agriculture must remain the predominant use in the APDs and these projects shall not reduce the ability to farm in the area. Such projects may only be allowed on agricultural lands when there are no other suitable lands available and the project is supported by landowners who would be impacted by the project and when :</u></p> <p>a. The project is included in, <u>or consistent with</u>, an approved Water Resources Inventory Area Salmon Recovery Plan; <del>((Farm Management Plan;))</del> Flood Hazard Management Plan or other <del>((functional))</del> <u>similar watershed scale plan</u>; or</p> <p>b. The project would improve agricultural productivity within the APD.</p> <p>R-648a  <u>Aquatic habitat restoration projects, floodplain restoration projects and projects under King County's mitigation reserves program in an agricultural production district shall be evaluated</u></p>	<p>Restates county policy to protect agriculture land, recover salmon, and manage floodplains.</p> <p>Revises policy to move from a project-by-project approach to a multi-stakeholder landscape level planning effort to accomplish all three goals.</p>	<p>Executive-proposed revisions appear to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essentially maintain the status quo in policy R-648 in regards to project impacts on agriculture, and</li> <li>Set the stage for a move from using a project-by-project approach of reviewing proposals towards a more comprehensive watershed level planning effort involving a wider range of stakeholders. These planning efforts (spelled out in new policy R-648a) would occur in specific watersheds that contain an APD and would reflect the conditions, concerns and stakeholders specific to each watershed.</li> </ul>

Chapter 3: Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)

Policy/Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p><u>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. The watershed planning process shall:</u></p> <p>a. <u>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;</u></p> <p>b. <u>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;</u></p> <p>c. <u>be a collaborative effort among affected land owners, interested stakeholders, and King County and shall be updated on a periodic basis; and</u></p> <p>d. <u>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 APD.</u></p>		<p>Council staff also notes that there is missing text on policy R-648, between the words "of" and "would". Council staff will work with the Executive to resolve this issue.</p> <p><b>See the April 3<sup>rd</sup> staff report for a more detailed background and discussion of these revisions</b></p>
<p>R-653 Public services and utilities within and adjacent to APDs shall be designed to 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 APDs. Installation should be timed to minimize negative impacts on seasonal agricultural practices; <del>((and))</del></p> <p>b. Road projects planned for the APDs including additional roads or the widening of roads should be limited to those <u>that are needed for safety or infrastructure preservation and ((which)) that benefit agricultural uses.</u> Where possible, arterials should be routed around the APDs. Roads that cross APDs should be aligned, designed, <u>signed</u> and maintained to minimize negative impacts on agriculture, and to support farm traffic; and</p> <p>c. In cases when public or privately owned facilities meeting regional needs must intrude</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	

Chapter 3: Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
into APDs, they should be built and located to minimize disruption of agricultural activity.		
<p>R-654 Lands can be removed from the APDs(<del>(, except as provided in R-655,)</del>) only when it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal of the land will not diminish the productivity of prime agricultural soils or the effectiveness of farming within the local APD boundaries; <del>((and))</del></li> <li>The land is determined to be no longer suitable for agricultural purposes<del>((-))</del>; <del>and</del></li> <li><del>((In addition to meeting these two tests, r))</del> Removal of the land from the APD may <del>((only))</del> occur <u>only</u> if it is mitigated through the addition of agricultural land abutting the same APD <u>that is at least comparable in size, soil quality and agricultural value.</u> <del>((of equal acreage and of equal or better soils and agriculture value.))</del></li> </ol>	Clarification of existing policy	No issue at this time. The proposed text revision in subsection c. appear to allow greater flexibility in using the term "at least comparable" rather than the more rigid "equal or better".
<p><del>((R-655 Land that is zoned rural and has permanent non-agricultural structures can be removed from the Sammamish APD only when a subarea plan demonstrates that removal of the land will not diminish the productivity of prime agricultural soils or the effectiveness of farming within the APD. Land to be removed from the APD shall retain rural zoning and shall not be rezoned to urban zoning. The removal of land zoned rural from the Sammamish APD shall not be contingent on the addition of land to the APD.))</del></p>	Removes policy about Sammamish APD that is no longer relevant because there are no longer any rural-zoned parcels in that APD	Agree that no longer relevant.
<p>R-656 King County shall work with and provide support to <del>((the work of))</del> Washington State University Extension for <u>its research and education programs that assist</u> <del>((technical and marketing assistance for))</del> small-scale commercial farmers.</p>	Technical change	No issue but would note that the deletion works with proposed revisions in policies R-657, R-657a, R-658 and R-663, to indicate an intent for more direct involvement by the County, as opposed to, by the WSU Extension.
<p>R-657 King County shall work with other jurisdictions <del>((continue))</del> to broaden support for <del>((innovative initiatives, such as))</del> the Puget Sound Fresh Program, which provides marketing assistance to farmers and links consumers to local farms and farmers markets. <del>((and Farmlink Programs, to</del></p>	This policy is split into two policies: R-657 now addresses marketing. Purpose of the change is clarification and emphasis.	No issue but would note that the proposal is strongly supported by the Agriculture Commission

**Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)**

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p><u>promote and enhance agriculture in King County.))</u></p>		
<p>R-657a  <u>King County should work with other jurisdictions, farm advocacy groups and others to support Farmlink and other programs that help new farmers get started, gain access to farmland and develop successful marketing methods.</u></p>	<p>This policy was formerly part of R-657. Policies are split for clarification and emphasis on efforts to help new farmers.</p>	<p>No issue but would note that the proposal is strongly supported by the Agriculture Commission</p>
<p>R-657b  <u>King County should work with other jurisdictions to continue to provide support to farmers markets.</u></p>	<p>New policy to specifically call for support for farmers markets.</p>	<p>No issue but would note that the proposal is strongly supported by the Agriculture Commission             Could be combined with R-657</p>
<p>R-658            The county should develop ((specific)) incentives to encourage agricultural activities in the remaining prime farmlands located outside the APD. These incentives could include tax credits, expedited permit review, reduced permit fees, permit exemptions for activities complying with best management practices or similar programs.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>R-663            King County shall provide incentives, educational programs and other methods to encourage agricultural practices <u>and technological improvements</u> 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 while maintaining the functions needed for agricultural production.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>R-664            King County shall continue ((<del>its Agricultural Building Permit program</del>)) <u>to support agriculture with an expedited review process and reduced fees for structures necessary for farm operations.</u></p>	<p>Technical change</p>	<p>Appropriate to remove outdated reference</p>

Chapter 3 Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands (Exclusive of Transfer of Development Rights Policies)

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>R-668 King County should use pilot or demonstration projects and multi-agency collaboration to develop a new suite of <del>((allowed))</del> practices that will provide options for landowners whose existing operations are affected by alluvial fan deposits. These should provide timely and cost-effective relief from debris and the associated changes to the watercourse along with protection <del>((and/or))</del> of intact fish habitat and restoration of <u>degraded</u> fish habitat within these areas.</p>	<p>Technical change</p>	
<p>R-669 King County should work with federal, state and local jurisdictions to reduce flood impacts to agricultural operations. The county will <del>((consider))</del> <u>investigate</u> the needs of agriculture before, during and after flood events, to determine if and how losses can be reduced, and will use this information in designing its floodplain policies and regulations.</p>	<p>Expands and strengthens direction to include needs of agriculture in designing flood regulations and policies</p>	<p>No issue but would note that the proposal is strongly supported by the Agriculture Commission</p>
<p>R-675 King County should collaborate with other organizations to further the development of programs that increase the ability of shoppers to use <u>food assistance benefits and the ability of farmers to accept</u> electronic and other forms of payment at farmers markets and farm stands.</p>	<p>Technical amendment</p>	<p>Appropriate to identify specific actions</p>

