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COUNTY OF PIERCE
NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETINGS
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

2015 Comprehensive Plan Update
The Growth Management Act requires Pierce County to review and update, if necessary, its Comprehensive Plan and associated development regulations by June 30, 2015. The Planning Commission will review the proposed update and regulatory amendments and provide recommendations to the Pierce County Council.

The Planning Commission will begin public hearings on the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update on April 21, 2015. All of the documents to be reviewed and used as the basis for the Planning Commission to make their recommendations can be found on-line at www.piercecountywa.org/compplan.

The Planning Commission anticipates hearing testimony on specific issues as indicated below. All meetings start at 6:00 p.m. and will be held in the Public Meeting Room at the Pierce County Public Services Building, 2401 S. 35th St., Tacoma, EXCEPT FOR THE APRIL 22ND MEETING.

April 21
Overview of urban area modifications – such as land use, parks, transportation, parcel designation changes.

*April 22 - NOTE LOCATION
Tacoma Pierce County Health Department, 3629 So. D St, Tacoma
Overview of proposed Agricultural Resource Lands criteria.

April 28
Overview of rural area modifications – such as accessory dwelling units, school siting, rural commercial centers.

April 29
Planning Commission discussion and deliberation begins.

April 30
Final Consideration and Recommendation.

Contact:  Sean Gaffney, Manager, PALS, 253-798-2724
sgaffne@co.pierce.wa.us

Questions about procedure may be referred to Planning and Land Services at 2401 So. 35th Street, Tacoma, WA 98409 or by contacting Toni Fairbanks, Commission Clerk, at tfairba@co.pierce.wa.us or 253-798-7156.
DATE:        April 21, 2015
TO:          Pierce County Planning Commission
FROM:        Sean Gaffney, Manager, Long Range Planning
SUBJECT:     2015 Pierce County Comprehensive Plan – GMA Periodic Update
             The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires Pierce County to review and
             update, if necessary, its Comprehensive Plan and associated development
             regulations by June 30, 2015.

NOTICE:      Notices of the Planning Commission public meetings were published in the
             official County newspaper, the Puyallup Herald, beginning February 25, 2015,
             and other local newspapers as applicable.

SEPA:        A Determination of Nonsignificance will be issued. The Environmental Impact
             Statement for the regional policies, VISION 2040, will be adopted by reference
             for this non-project action.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A  Pierce County Public Outreach/Participation (Source)
Attachment B  (Intentionally Left Blank)
Attachment C  GMA Periodic Update Policy/Text Requirements (Source)
Attachment D  Draft Comprehensive Plan
Attachment E  Proposed Amendments to Title 18, “Development Regulations – General
               Provisions”
Attachment F  Proposed Amendments to Title 18A, “Development Regulations – Zoning”
Attachment G  Proposed Amendments to Title 18B, “Development Regulations – Signs”
Attachment H  Proposed Amendments to Title 18F, “Land Divisions and Boundary Changes”
Attachment I  Proposed Amendments to Title 18G, “Development Regulations – Conservation
               Programs”
**Attachment J**  Proposed Amendments to Title 18J, “Development Regulations – Design Standards and Guidelines”

**Attachment K**  Maps depicting proposed changes to Land Use Designations

---

**READING THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

As applying to the Draft Comprehensive Plan only (not the regulations):

The **aqua** color indicates new policies to address new State and regional requirements.

The **grey** color indicates text changes from agency comments since the last draft.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Planning staff recommends approval of the proposed 2015 Update package to include staff supported modifications from the Land Use Advisory Commissions (LUAC) as indicated starting on page 35 of this report.

Staff finds the proposed amendments effectively address requirements set forth in the Growth Management Act (GMA), VISION 2040, and the Countywide Planning Policies.

---

**PUBLIC OUTREACH/PARTICIPATION**

Public participation is an essential component to updating the Comprehensive Plan. This is an opportunity to educate residents, property and business owners, as well as other stakeholders about the update process and solicit feedback on emerging planning issues. Pierce County established a Public Participation Plan early in the process to inform the public when and how they could participate. The County has seven objectives through its outreach:

1. Build upon past planning work and carry forward the vision and directions that are important for the County;
2. Build community trust in the planning process;
3. Seek public input and ideas of what Pierce County should become in the next 20 years;
4. Encourage participation of community groups that may not normally participate in the planning process;
5. Provide for “early and continuous” public participation;
6. Explain the laws by which the County is obligated to conduct the update process; and
7. Inform the public about plans that are related to the Comprehensive Plan.

Pierce County has achieved these objectives through various methods as identified in the Public Participation Plan. Pierce County has invested numerous hours preparing for and participating in outreach through social media, study sessions, stakeholder meetings, open houses/public meetings, and advisory commission study sessions. All in all, the County held 51 meetings/open houses in
which the public could actively participate in the update process. Additional detail is provided in Attachment A – Pierce County Public Outreach/Participation.

A postcard was sent to every mailing address (124,071) in unincorporated Pierce County in March 2014 informing the public about the update process and providing the web page address. In addition the County used direct mailing to notify landowners of potentially significant changes. Those included the commercial activities in the rural areas (Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development – LAMIRD) and the adjusted criteria to identify Agricultural Resource Lands.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND OUTREACH PROGRAM:**

**Social Media**

Pierce County created a new webpage completely devoted to the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan. The webpage provided an opportunity for the public to stay current with emerging issues and upcoming events as well as providing comments. A “button” located on the webpage allows the public to immediately provide their input and comments.

The major components of the website include:

- An electronic calendar linked to public meeting/open house dates and material;
- An electronic library of background material related to the plan update;
- An opportunity to sign-up for the interest party list and receive future email updates; and
- Weekly electronic updates.

**Study Sessions**

Staff presented major topics to both the Pierce County Council/Community Development Committee (quarterly) and the Pierce County Planning Commission. The topics included:

- 2014 Buildable Lands Report
- Scope of update including identified issues to be reviewed
- Public Participation Strategy
- Reformat of Comprehensive Plan and the Community Plan element
- Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDS)
- Program progress and timeline
- Agricultural Resource Land criteria
- 2014 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle applications

**Stakeholder Meetings**

Staff convened various meetings with stakeholder groups to discuss potential issues that may be resolved through the update process. The groups include, but are not limited to:
• Agricultural and environmental groups
• Cities and towns
• School districts
• Development industry
• Community groups

**Open Houses/Public Meetings**

Pierce County conducted five series of open houses through the process to provide background information on the general update process as well as specific topics. Comments sheets were also available for participants to provide feedback/opinions on the topic(s). The open houses included:

1) **March 2014 - General Open House.** Pierce County conducted four open houses in areas that currently do not have an active Land Use Advisory Commission (LUAC). The purpose of the open houses was to provide general information to the public about the update process. This forum covered the same information that was presented to the LUACs. The open houses were located in Anderson Island, Eatonville, McMillin, and Bonney Lake.

2) **May/June 2014 - General Open House.** Pierce County conducted five open houses that centered on specific topics; transportation, parks, livable communities, and land use. The purpose of the open houses was to inform the public regarding current conditions and plans for growth and solicit feedback. The open houses were located in Key Peninsula, Prairie Ridge (Bonney Lake), Frederickson, Roy, and Mid-County.

3) **November 2014 - LAMIRD public meetings.** Pierce County conducted two public meetings that focused on rural commercial areas in Greenwater and Elbe/Ashford/Park Entrance. The purpose of the meetings was to inform the public of the State criteria for designating commercial areas in the rural portions of the County. They were also designed to provide a method of obtaining evidence of commercial activities in existence on July 1, 1990, from the public.

4) **February 2015 - Agricultural Resource Lands (ARL) Open House.** Pierce County conducted four public open houses that focused on proposed modifications to the ARL criteria and resulting re-designation of property from a rural land use designation to ARL. The purpose of the meetings was to inform the property owners why property was proposed to be re-designated and how it affects the development potential of their property. Notice of these open houses was mailed to each property owner affected by the proposed modification. The open houses were located in Buckley, Key Peninsula, Eatonville, and Graham.

5) **April 2015 - Draft Plan Open House.** Pierce County conducted five open houses to present the draft Comprehensive Plan and related regulations to the public. The purpose of the open houses is to solicit comment on the draft proposal. These public open houses augment the LUAC public meetings scheduled in March and April 2015. The open houses were held in McMillin, Bonney Lake, Graham, Parkland, and Anderson Island.
Land Use Advisory Commissions (LUACs)

Pierce County convened the seven LUACs at various times in 2014 to address the update process or topics associated with the community plans and Comprehensive Plan. Members of the LUACs also convened in joint meetings and as an Ad Hoc committee. The purpose of the meetings was to present the County’s approach to reformatting the respective community plans as well as updating the Comprehensive Plan and associated regulations. In total, the LUACs met 23 times in 2014. Each active LUAC met two times in March and April 2015. LUAC recommendations are provided starting on page 35 of this report.

The calendar for ongoing meetings is available at www.PierceCountywa.org/Realize2030.

“A NEW LOOK” - REFORMATTING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND COMMUNITY PLANS

Comprehensive Plan

The Pierce County Comprehensive Plan was originally adopted in 1994. In the last twenty years various new topics have been incorporated into a document format that has remained unchanged. While the County is only obligated to update its policies if necessary to meet GMA provisions, this update process is also an opportunity to format the policy document(s) in a way that more clearly articulates how the County will manage future growth. In addition, some existing policy is rewritten in “plain talk” or, if appropriate, deleted because it is not policy and reads as if it is regulatory in nature. The result is policy statements that are easily understood by the general public and stakeholders.

The graphic on the following page illustrates how policies are organized within this new format:
Within each element chapter, the policies are organized presented in the following format:

**SOLUTIONS TO HOUSING ISSUES**

The Housing and Land Use Elements provide directions to accommodate enough affordable housing for all economic segments of the community. Land use strategies may include: allowance for accessory dwelling units; infill development; rehabilitation of existing housing; mixed use development; and smaller lot sizes. Regulatory strategies may include streamlined approval processing and priority permit processing.

The Land Use Designations Map in the Land Use Element identifies ten land use designations within an Urban Growth Area to accommodate projected housing needs: Moderate Density Single Family, High Density Single Family, Master Planned Communities, Major Urban Centers, Activity Centers, Community Centers, Neighborhood Centers, Mixed Use Districts, High Density Residential Districts, and Urban Villages. Of these designations, the Moderate Density Single Family, High Density Single Family, and the High Density Residential Districts are to accommodate only residential uses.

**Resources:**
- Housing Affordability Report and Recommendations from the Pierce County Housing Affordability Task Force
- 2015-2016 COBG Consolidated Plan
- Area Plans on Aging
- Homelessness Housing and Assistance Plan

**GOALS**
A goal is a general statement to introduce the general idea of the following policies.

**POLICIES**
A policy is a statement to guide decision making. Policies are intended to be carried out by an implementation measure.

**NUMBERING**
Policy numbering corresponds with the chapter title. Policies subsequent to a larger policy issue are numbered in a hierarchical format.

**CHAPTER AND PAGE NUMBERS**
Page numbers are organized by chapter number and page; they also include the title of the chapter.

**NARRATIVE INFORMATION**
An introduction to each section, supplemental information, and data may be found in the narrative preceding policies.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND SIDEBARS**
Text boxes and sidebars are used to provide more information, examples, and visuals that are associated with policies.
Pierce County adopted its first post GMA community plan in 1999. Since that time a total of 11 sub-area plans have been adopted. While these plans have been adopted as separate actions, they are part of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed Comprehensive Plan clarifies the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan and the individual community plans. This is accomplished through:

1. consolidation of all of the policies that apply countywide; and
2. retention of policies associated with community plan areas that are specific to the respective area; and
3. retention of background and community character narrative; and
4. retention of existing and desired conditions.

Individual community plan documents will include the community-specific background information, community action steps, policies that apply countywide, policies specific to the community plan area, and the appropriate maps. The complete Comprehensive Plan will have all of these components merged into one document. For those who are interested in a specific community plan area, a document will be available with all applicable information.

**Policy Refinement**

With the adoption of each community plan, it has become evident some issues are not unique to the respective area; the separate documents have duplicate policies. Additionally some policy statements are written more like regulation. As a means to streamline the policies, the County reviewed each community plans and categorized the policies into one of four categories:

1. Community-specific policies to be retained;
2. Policies that apply countywide and should be or are already addressed in the Comprehensive Plan;
3. Policies that are regulatory in nature and should be or are already adopted; or
4. Action steps that have already been done.

The result of this categorization was used as the basis of the new format.

The graphic on the following page illustrates how Community Plan policies are represented in this new format.
COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES

COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES IN EACH ELEMENT
After each element the community plan policies have been integrated into the document to easily access additional policies for each community plan area.

ALDERTON - McMILLIN

GOALS

The goal of the rural land use and land development decisions that impact the community are consistent with and complementary of the rural character of Alderton-McMillin. This includes decisions related to development, grant funding, roads, infrastructure and services, and anything that could change or impact the character and structure of the community.

RURAL RESIDENTIAL

GOAL AM LU-1 Ensure the Alderton-McMillin community remains rural in character over the next 20 years.

AM LU-1.1 The rural character of Alderton-McMillin is defined and shall be maintained as working farms, forests, open space, and low density residential homes on large lots.

AM LU-1.2 To maintain and preserve the rural character of the Alderton-McMillin community, the following types of non-agricultural activities are considered incompatible with rural character:

AM LU-1.2.1 Activities that generate constant, ongoing noise;
AM LU-1.2.2 Activities that generate large amounts of traffic within a short duration;
AM LU-1.2.3 Activities that are dependent upon an urban population draw (other than farm sales and tours);
AM LU-1.2.4 Activities that operate into night hours; or
AM LU-1.2.5 Activities that require extensive lighting or lighting that spills onto neighboring properties.

AM LU-1.3 Any major amendment to approved development applications shall include a condition of approval that requires the major amendment to meet design standards.

AM LU-2 Identify lands for Rural 10 and Rural 20 designations and ensure activities on those lands meet the objective of maintaining a rural lifestyle and rural character.

AM LU-2.1 Rural lands that are not devoted to resource uses, Rural Neighborhood Center, Rural Farm, or Rural Industrial Center shall be zoned Rural 10 or Rural 20.

AM LU-2.2 Within Rural 10 and Rural 20 designations, the dominant land use should be detached single-family homes on large lots.

AM LU-2.3 Allow limited civic uses within Rural 10 and Rural 20. Civic uses shall have size restrictions compatible with the rural area.
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GMA Periodic Update Requirements

The GMA requires Pierce County to review and update, if necessary, its Comprehensive Plan and associated development regulations by June 30, 2015. Pierce County convened staff from various County departments to complete the review. The review focused on consistency with:

1. Growth Management Act legislative and rules updates;
2. Growth Management Hearing Board decisions;
3. Associated court decisions;
4. VISION 2040 - Multi-County Planning Policies; and,
5. Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs).

In completing this review, Pierce County relied upon the Washington State Department of Commerce’s Periodic Update checklist, and Puget Sound Regional Council’s “Reporting Tool for Local Comprehensive Plans.”

As a result of the review, the proposed changes address:

- New or revised policy statements;
- New or revised regulatory language; or
- New or revised background information.

Attachment C highlights the topics, necessary policy/information, and the source which requires the topic to be addressed. While some of these revisions are minor, others may be considered “Major Policy Issues.” Additional information is provided in another portion of this staff report that addresses “Major Policy Issues.”

Major Policy Issues

A review of the Comprehensive Plan identified a number of policy topics that need to be modified to be consistent with GMA, VISION 2040, the Pierce County CPPs, or Growth Management Hearing Board decisions. The entire list of these modifications is identified under the GMA Periodic Update Requirements section of this staff report. Pierce County also identified additional policy changes necessary to address high profile issues. As the County began to address these issues, it became apparent some necessary policy changes have far reaching consequences to the general public, individual property owners and community stakeholders. In some instances Pierce County embarked on targeted outreach to individual property owners or stakeholder groups, where appropriate, to inform them of the issue and recommended resolution. Five topics/issues emerge as major policy issues:

- Agricultural Resource Lands (ARL) Criteria and Designation
- Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDs)
- New Schools in the Rural Area
- Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Outside the UGA
- Potential Annexation Areas (PAAs)
OTHER POLICY ISSUES

Through its review of the Comprehensive Plan, Pierce County identified a number of policy topics that should be considered for modification. Those include:

- Replace the Rural Reserve 5 land use designation with a new Rural 5 land use
- Clarify the various Open Space categories
- Direct Historic Document Maintenance Fund allocation

REGULATORY AMENDMENTS

The proposed regulatory amendments implement proposed policy modifications as identified under other sections of this staff report as well as changes supported through existing policy. The regulatory amendments addressed as part of the policy section include:

- Deletion of “Rural Use Exception”
- New Schools in the Rural Area
- Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Outside the UGA
- Replace the Rural Reserve 5 land use designation with a new Rural 5 land use designation

Amendments, technical in nature, correct code citations as well as clarify that the Resource Lands and Rural are separate land use designations.

LAND USE DESIGNATION MAP AMENDMENTS

2014 APPLICATION PROCESS

Pierce County accepted formal applications that proposed changes to the Land Use Designation map. The County (LUACs and Planning Commission) has completed the review and recommendations on this package. No further review is necessary. The Planning Commission recommendation was made on December 2014. The Land Use Designation Map in the proposed Plan reflects those recommendations:

- M-1 (Fred Wagner): Changes the land use designation for one parcel within the South Hill Community Plan area from High Density Single-Family (HSF) to High Density Residential District (HRD);
- M-2 (Scott Edwards): Changes the land use designation for eight parcels within the Mid-County Community Plan area from Employment Center (EC) to High Density Residential District (HRD);
- M-3 (Schactler): Changes the land use designation for two parcels from Rural 10 to Agricultural Resource Lands (ARL);
- M-4 (FRETOC): Changes the zoning classification on approximately 53 acres from Community Employment (CE) to Employment Services (ES); and
M-5 (Purdy Interchange LLC): Changes the land use designation for 19 parcels from Employment Center (EC) to Mixed Use District (MUD).

In addition, Pierce County received a number of requests to change the permitted uses property through the County’s public outreach program. During the update process the County also identified properties in which a change of land use designation may be appropriate as opposed to expanding the permitted uses within a properties current zoning classification. The recommendations are identified in the sections below.

The remainder of the staff report is organized by the scheduled topic for each planning commission meeting:

1. Urban and Countywide Issues
2. Agriculture Resource Land
3. Rural and Resource Issues
Meeting #1:  APRIL 21, 2015
URBAN AND COUNTYWIDE ISSUES

POTENTIAL ANNEXATION AREAS

The GMA allows cities and towns to annex only areas that are within the designated urban growth area. The provisions do not require urban areas to be annexed within any specific timeframe. Typically a jurisdiction pursues annexation at the request of property owners. Historically, the County has not been proactive in supporting annexation; the County reviews a “Notice of Intention” and may respond to potential issues through the Boundary Review Board. The current Plan does not contain any policies that address annexation. The County’s response to Notices of Intention has typically focused on annexation boundaries in relation to public roads. This long term approach has had consequences to the County’s ability to provide services:

- Annexation areas have excluded residential areas which typically do not have a tax base to support County services; and
- Unincorporated “islands” have been created that make it inefficient for the County to provide service.

WHAT PROMPTED THE CHANGE?

In VISION 2040, it is stated that all unincorporated urban areas will either be annexed by neighboring cities or incorporated by 2040. These regional policies state the County should:

Affiliate all urban unincorporated land appropriate for annexation with an adjacent city or identify those that may be more feasible for incorporation.

To be consistent with VISION 2040, the Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) have been amended to address annexation. The policies are premised on the establishment of “Potential Annexation Areas” (PAAs). The policies also call for a more coordinated annexation approach.

PROPOSED CHANGE

The proposed Plan incorporates new policies that address annexation of unincorporated urban areas. The policies:

- Encourage annexation of unincorporated urban areas by neighboring cities and towns;
- Directs the County to partner with cities and towns in annexation outreach efforts;
- Affiliates unincorporated areas with cities and towns and establishes “Potential Annexation Areas” (PAA);
- Directs the County to explore the economic viability of incorporation for unincorporated areas not affiliated with a neighboring city or town;
• Identifies unincorporated urban “islands” between cities and towns as the highest priority for annexation;
• Directs the County to work with cities and towns in establishing joint planning agreements; and
• Directs the County to explore and implement financial incentives to encourage a city or town to annex its respective PAA.

**OPEN SPACE CATEGORIES**

In the current Comprehensive Plan there are numerous references to “open space.” Depending on the context, the term has different meanings.

Multiple Pierce County agencies acquire and manage land for open space purposes - from recreation, to habitat conservation, to flood hazard reduction.

In the proposal, a new classification of open space is organized around the purpose of the open space. For example, policies for the management and perseveration of open space for habitat are very different than policies for working lands or outdoor recreation.

**WHAT PROMPTED THE CHANGES?**

There is confusion as to the use of the term “open space” in the various sections of the Comprehensive Plan and regulations. This adjustment will recognize that open space serves many purposes and means different things to different agencies and citizens. The categories are designed to clarify the situation.

**PROPOSED CHANGE**

Five categories are identified in the update:

1. **Habitat.** Open space for the preservation of plant and animal habitat may include habitat for fish and wildlife species; rivers, streams, bays, and estuaries; and coastal beaches, lakeshores, and banks of rivers and streams.

2. **Working Lands.** Open space used for the managed production of working lands may include forest lands, agricultural lands, and areas of economic importance for the production of food or fiber.

3. **Outdoor Recreation.** Open space for outdoor recreation may include athletic fields, recreation facilities, playgrounds, picnic areas, meadows, wooded areas, and trails; and access to beaches and shorelines for swimming, fishing, boating, and beachcombing.

4. **Community-Defined Values.** Open space for community-defined values may include areas used for buffers between communities, respites from the built environments, and for connecting with nature; and areas of outstanding scenic, historic, and cultural value.
5. **Public Health and Safety.** Open space for public health and safety may include areas used for stormwater management, flood control, water quality for public use, air quality, and carbon sequestering.

### Historic Document Maintenance Fund (HDOC)

Pierce County currently collects a one-dollar fee for every document recorded by the Pierce County Auditor’s office. This fee is authorized through the RCW 36.22.170. The fees are intended to be used for historic preservation, archiving, and the management of historic records.

The Pierce County Council appropriates the use of the funds during the adoption of the annual budget. The funds are distributed to the County Clerk’s office for the management of court records and to the Landmarks and Historic Preservation Commission.

### What prompted the changes?

The Landmarks and Historic Preservation Commission has requested changes to the Comprehensive Plan that would earmark all funding go to the Commission to support their mission.

### Proposed Change

The proposal adds a new policy under the Cultural Resources Element that addresses this request.

### Title 18A, Development Regulations – Zoning

**Allow Multi-family without Non-residential Component within the Activity Center zoning classification in the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan area.**

The current Development Regulations allow for multi-family development within the Activity Center zoning classification only if the residential units are located on a second floor or higher, above a non-residential activity (Level 5). Chapter 18A.33 – Use Category Descriptions defines Multi-Family Housing Level 5 as follows:

> Level 5: Multi-family component of mixed use developments in which residential units are primarily located above the non-residential activity located on the first floor of the same building(s). The multi-family component of a mixed use development is not restricted to a specific number of units per building or development; provided that multifamily units located on the first floor shall not occupy more than 15 percent of the total gross floor area of the first floor nor exceed ten units and all first floor units are located to the rear of the building. (18A.33.210 E.)
What prompted the change?

A request was submitted to allow for multi-family development to be allowed absent a non-residential component in the Activity Center zoning classification. Staff reviewed the current policies and did not identify any current policies that would prevent other forms of multi-family development in the Activity Center zoning classification.

Proposed Change

Amend the Use Tables associated with “Parkland-Spanaway-Midland” (PCC 18A.28.010) to allow Multi-Family Housing Levels 1 – 4 outright and delete reference to Level 5. Multi-family Housing Levels 1 – 4 are as follows:

- **Level 1:** Three to four-unit multi-family buildings (tri- and four-plexes), with ground level access to each unit, also known as "attached single-family."
- **Level 2:** Three to four-unit multi-family buildings (tri- and four-plexes), with upper level access to some or all units.
- **Level 3:** Multi-family buildings with five or more units per building, with ground level access to each unit, also known as "attached single family."
- **Level 4:** Multi-family buildings with five or more units per building, with upper level access to some or all units.

**ALLOW ALL LEVELS OF “MOTOR VEHICLES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT SALES, RENTAL, REPAIR AND SERVICE” IN COMMUNITY CENTER IN PARKLAND-SPANAWAY-MIDLAND COMMUNITIES PLAN AREA.**

The current Development Regulations allow for Motor Vehicles and Related Equipment Sales, Rental, Repair and Service Levels 1 – 3 permitted outright and Level 4 through an Administrative Use Permit in the Community Center zoning classification. Level 5 is not currently permitted. Chapter 18A.33 – Use Category Descriptions defines Motor Vehicles and Related Equipment Sales, Rental, Repair and Service Level 4 and 5 as follows:

- **Level 4:** Same uses as Level 2, except this level allows for motor vehicles sales as an accessory use provided the number of vehicles for sale on-site does not exceed 15 at any given time.
- **Level 5:** On-site sales, lease, or rental of automobiles, trucks not exceeding three tons of vehicle weight, and recreational vehicles.” (18A.33.270 M.)

What prompted the change?

A request was submitted to allow for on-site sales of automobiles in the Community Center zoning classification. Staff reviewed the current policies and did not identify any current policies that would prevent stand-alone sales of automobiles. It is been determined that the characteristics of a stand-
alone business that rents, leases, or sells motor vehicles would not be much different than a motor vehicle repair business with accessory sales. Therefore it has been found that the use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

**Proposed Change**

Amend the Use Tables associated with “Parkland-Spanaway-Midland” (PCC 18A.28.010) to allow Motor Vehicles and Related Equipment Sales, Rental, Repair and Service Level 4 outright and add Level 5 as a use type allowed outright.

**INSERT “WINERIES” AS A COMPONENT OF THE AGRITOURISM USE TYPE.**

It is commonly recognized that “Agricultural Tourism” refers to visiting an agribusiness, horticultural, or agricultural operation, to purchase products, or participate in a form of recreational or educational experience. It is a tourist activity that is connected in a complementary way with the primary operation.

The current regulations define the Agritourism Use Category as:

“...uses which involve the sale of locally grown agricultural products and agriculturally-based operations or activities that bring visitors to an active farm or ranch...” (18A.33.260 A.)

The definition further provides examples of the types of activities that may be considered Agritourism. “Wineries” are not currently listed as an example. Tasting rooms are commonly integrated as a complementary use to wineries.

The Agritourism Use Category has five different levels. Each of the levels requires at least 50 percent of the product that is offered for sale to be produced in Pierce County.

Wineries are currently listed as a Level 2 under the Food and Related Products – Industrial Use Category. The current regulations define Food and Related Products as:

“...uses which involve the processing of non-animal food materials, raw milk, ice manufacturing, and other food products manufacturing, processing, storage and packaging...” (18A.33.280 C)

**What prompted the change?**

It is necessary to clarify that a winery and associated tasting room is part of agribusiness that supplements the sales of the winery operation.

**Proposed Change**

Amend the Agritourism Use Type under the Resource Use Category to incorporate “wineries” to read as follows:
**Agritourism:** Agritourism Use Type refers to uses which involve the sale of locally grown agricultural products and agriculturally-based operations or activities that bring visitors to an active farm or ranch. Agritourism includes a wide variety of activities including, but not limited to, corn mazes, harvesting fruit and vegetables, feeding animals, riding animals, lodging, farm gift shops, farm-related events, learning about farm practices, produce stands, and wineries. Agritourism may include tractor rides, but shall not involve motorized off-road vehicle racing or similar motor vehicle activities.

ALLOW FOR LEVEL 2 “Lodging” USE TYPE WITHIN THE EMPLOYMENT CENTER (EC) ZONING CLASSIFICATION IN THE SOUTH HILL COMMUNITY PLAN AREA.

The existing Development Regulations (18A.29.010) do not allow for any level of “Lodging” within the EC zoning classification of the South Hill Community Plan area. Chapter 18A.33 – Use Category Descriptions defines Lodging Level 2 as:

Lodging house. (18A.33.270 K.)

Chapter 18.25.030 – Definitions defines Lodging house as:

“...any building, except for a single-family residence or accessory structure, held out to the public to be an inn, hotel or to provide lodging or a place where sleeping accommodations, whether with or without meals, are furnished for a fee to transient guests, in which rooms are used for the accommodation of such guests.”

What prompted the change?

A request was submitted to allow for a hotel and retail business to be constructed on a parcel zoned Employment Center. Staff reviewed the current policies in the Comprehensive Plan and South Hill Community Plan and found policies and text that support commercial and service businesses within the EC zoning classification which supports and serves the workforce within the Employment Center. A hotel, or lodging as defined in the development regulations, is a use which would support and serve the workforce. The same conclusion cannot be made for a general retail establishment.

Proposed Change

Amend the Use Tables associated with “South Hill” (PCC 18A.29.010) to allow Lodging Level 2 outright in the Employment Center zone classification.
EXEMPTION FOR BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENTS.

The existing Development Regulations (18F.70.030 A.2.) do not allow for boundary line adjustments that result in parcel area that is less than the density permitted through the existing zone classification. This regulation prevents an existing nonconforming lot to be increased to any size less than the density permitted through the existing zone classification.

What prompted the change?

An application submitted through the 2014 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle requested policies to be added to the Comprehensive Plan to allow for boundary line adjustments between two nonconforming lots. Staff reviewed the current policies and did not identify any current policies that would prevent this type of boundary line adjustment to occur. Therefore it has been found that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

Proposed Change

Amend 18F.70 to allow for boundary line adjustments between two nonconforming lots. This chapter has also been edited to clarify various components of the boundary line adjustment approval process.

MODIFY TREE CONSERVATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECTS IN EMPLOYMENT CENTER LAND USE DESIGNATION.

Table 18J.15.030-2 (General Minimum Tree Unit Density) requires that development in Employment Center land use designation provide tree density at 20 tree units per acre.

What prompted the change?

The current requirement to retain or provide replacement trees at 20 tree units per acre is not compatible with the space needs of industrial and manufacturing operations that are encouraged to be developed within the Employment Center land use designation. Large amounts of impervious area including large building footprints, extensive paved areas for parking and storage, rail lines, and transportation leave little space for the amount of trees currently required. After site development, heavy truck traffic contributes to poor soil conditions for remaining trees and often there is physical damage to trucks and tree branches. Policies in the Frederickson Community Plan recognize that
there are limits to how much tree retention is feasible and that regulations should evaluate and modify regulations so that new businesses are encouraged and expansion of existing businesses are supported.

The amount of trees and space required by the current regulations routinely forces developers to file for deviation through Site Plan Review to show they are providing for as many trees as possible while still meeting all other requirements. Site Plan Review requests are routinely approved, but add time, cost, and uncertainty to the development process.

**Proposed Change**

Amend Table 18J.15.030-2 to change the “General Minimum Tree Unit Density” from 20 tree units/acre to 5 tree units/acre.

The proposal does not change any other landscape buffer requirements (i.e., street trees, perimeter landscaping, and parking lot landscaping) for the Employment Center land use designation. Therefore it has been found it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

**COUNTY PROPOSED MAP CHANGES – URBAN**

The proposed Plan includes the following changes within the urban area:

- **SR 7 and 18th Ave East:** Changes the land use designation for 184 parcels (36.13 acres) from High Density Residential District (HRD) to Mixed Use District (MUD). The property is located within the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan area. The Commercial Mixed Use District (CMUD) zoning classification would implement the new land use designation. The site is surrounded by MHR that is already developed as storage uses or construction yards. Development of the site with multi family is not compatible given the surroundings.

- **SR 161 and 204th Street East:** Changes the land use designation for two parcels (4.13 acres) from Moderate Density Single Family (MSF) to Mixed Use District (MUD). The property is located within the Graham Community Plan area. The Moderate High Density Residential (MHR) zoning classification would implement the new land use designation.

- **SR 7 and 114th Street South:** Changes the land use designation for three parcels (7.82 acres) from Moderate Density Single Family (MSF) to Mixed Use District (MUD). The property is located within the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan area. The Commercial Mixed Use District (CMUD) zoning classification would implement the new land use designation. The site is currently occupied with commercial/contractor uses. Furthermore the site is bound by mixed used zoning to the north and south. Development of the site as residential is not compatible with surrounding land uses.

- **Sales Road/96th Street South:** Changes the land use designation for three parcels from Moderate Density Single Family (MSF) to Employment Center (EC) and one parcel from High Density Residential District (HRD) to Employment Center (EC) totaling 4.74 acres. The property is located within the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan area. The
Community Employment (CE) zoning classification would implement the new land use designation. The site already is partially developed with more intensive uses and is surrounded by existing CE zone and light industrial uses. Development of the site as residential is not compatible with surrounding land uses.

- **121st Street East and 20th Ave East**: Changes the land use designation for six parcels (5.75 acres) from Employment Center (EC) to High Density Residential District (HRD). The property is located within the Mid-County Community Plan area. The Moderate High Density Residential (MHR) zoning classification would implement the new land use designation. The Planning Commission has recommended change to surrounding properties to HRD. These properties would become “islands” of EC designation, without this change. As noted in this section, EC land is increased resulting in a no net loss of EC land.

- **104th Street East and Canyon Rd East**: Changes the land use designation for nine parcels (14.47 acres) from Community Center (CC) to Employment Center (EC). The property is located within the Mid-County Community Plan area. The Community Employment (CE) zoning classification would implement the new land use designation. This site is not currently served by sanitary sewer. To provide sewer to this site would require running sewer service under SR 512 at a significant cost. The existing CC designation permits a variety of uses that are dependent on sewer service. A change to EC will permit more uses that are not dependent on sewer service.

- **120th Street East and SR 161**: Changes the land use designation for 34 parcels (17.97 acres) from Major Urban Center (MUC) to Community Center (CC). The Community Center (CC) zoning classification would implement the new land use designation. Refer to the “Other Policy Issues” section of this staff report for detailed information. The MUC land use designation was originally applied in 1995 to reflect a regionally adopted “Center” in unincorporated Pierce County. Since 1995, the majority of the MUC has been annexed by the City of Puyallup. What little MUC remains, does not warrant the designation.

- **112th Street East and 28th Ave East**: Changes the land use designation for one parcel (3.99 acres) from Employment Center (EC) to High Density Residential District (HRD). The property is located within Mid-County Community Plan area. The Moderate High Density Residential (MHR) zoning classification would implement the new land use designation. This property does not appear to meet the criteria for EC. The property is adjacent to an existing Neighborhood Commercial and would be more compatible as a multi-family site. The reduction of this EC is compensated by the other increases in EC.

- **Canyon Road East & 176th St. E**: Removes the Mineral Resource Overlay (MRO) on 23 parcels (56.79 acres) in the northwest corner of the intersection. The property is located within the Frederickson Community Plan area. The change is proposed because the property is authorized to develop under conditions of land use controls and the infrastructure is in place.

- **SR 7 and 200th Street East**: Removes the Mineral Resource Overlay (MRO) on 407 parcels (109.55 acres) south of 196th Street E and north of 204th Street E. The property is located
within the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan area. The change is proposed because the overlay is on a fully developed residential community.

PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT

Pierce County’s Parks and Recreation Department is a major provider of park and recreation facilities in the County. The facilities include 5,039 acres of parks, 23 miles of trails, and a full range of facilities for formal and informal recreation. Pierce County Parks and Recreation (PCParks) has a strong presence with tournament athletics, golf, alternative sports (e.g. ice rink, disk golf, other), and trails.

The Parks and Recreation Element is a new section of the Comprehensive Plan. It provides policy direction for parks, recreation, open space and trails that are owned or operated by Pierce County. This new chapter is the first time that all policies relating to PCParks are collected in one location of the Comprehensive Plan.

The policies in the Parks and Recreation Element are a continuation of the policy direction established in the 2008 Pierce County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan and continued in the 2014 PROS Plan. The policies focus the County’s role as a provider of facilities and service at a regional level as opposed to a neighborhood level. As such the policies support regional parks, County Parks, tournament level sports complexes, regional open space, regional trails, and shoreline access.

The policies in this element also establish priorities for spending capital funding. The priorities, in order of importance, reflect a philosophy of:

1) Maintaining the existing facilities,
2) Upgrading and expanding existing park sites, and
3) Building new facilities at new park sites.

Additional policies address how the County plans to coordinate with cities and towns to transition responsibility for park lands in areas where annexation or incorporation may occur.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires a Transportation Element be part of the Comprehensive Plan. There are eleven required “sub-elements” in the Transportation Element:

1. Land use assumptions considered in estimating transportation usage;
2. Impacts of the plan to state roadways;
3. Projects and services to accommodate the travel needs;
4. Inventory of transportation services and facilities;
5. Service standards for our roadways;
6. Actions that would bring these roadways into compliance if our usage exceeded the service standards;
7. Travel forecasts going forward at least ten years;
8. Identification of state and local needs to meet current and future needs;
9. Transportation demand Management Strategies;
10. Intergovernmental co-ordination; and
11. A nonmotorized component.

The 2015 Transportation Element contains all of the above sub-elements. The following topics are related sub-elements.

**Concurrency Methodology Changes**

The Transportation Element proposes to decrease the adopted standard for transportation concurrency from 1.05 to 1.0.

The concurrency standard is calculated as a ratio of V/S where the “V” is the twenty four hour vehicle volume for a roadway section divided by the Service Threshold, also known as “S”. It is proposed that the denominator or the S be increased to allow more vehicles within a given V/S ratio. The net effect of changing the concurrency standard to 1.0 as discussed above and adjusting the “S” will result in a higher level of congestion for a given V/S ratio.

The V/S standard and forecasted 2030 V/S for the County roadways play key roles in selecting projects that appear in the recommended project listing of this element.

**Recommended Project Listing**

Projects recommended to meet future transportation needs are shown on Map 12-12 (Page 12-101) of the Transportation Element. Three types of projects suggested in Map 12-12:

- “Concurrency Projects” address those roadways that will are forecasted to “fail” (where the V/S is greater than 1.0) the County’s Service Standard.
- Corridors and Connectors projects assure the preservation of Right-of-Way to facilitate the development and improvement of roadways for additional needed connectivity to the existing roadway system. The projects are derived from Pierce County Ordinance No. 2012-81.
- Economic development projects promote the mobility of people and goods to and from the County’s regional manufacturing center in Frederickson.

**Considering “Ultimate Capacity”**

This Transportation Element adopts and applies the concept of “Ultimate Capacity”. Ultimate Capacity would only be considered when a roadway facility is approaching or exceeding the V/S 1.0 threshold by a certain level. There would be no parallel routes which the County could develop or improve within the 6 year concurrency “window”.

---
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The County would define the attributes of a roadway with the designation of “Ultimate Capacity.” The attributes includes a roadway’s maximum number of lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk, illumination, and other similar elements. The impacts of improving roadway capacity on mobility, built and natural environment, finance, and safety would be thoughtfully balanced in implementing the concept of “Ultimate Capacity.”

**OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS EXCEED OUR FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

The Transportation revenues and expenditures by 2030 are shown in Figure 12-M below (from the Transportation Element).

This forecast of revenues and expenditures are based on a wide range of assumptions relating to both the revenue and expenditure lines. The graphic depicts a category of revenue as “unidentified source”. This represents a “gap” of approximately $188M between expenditures and revenues. Achieving a balanced transportation budget may not necessarily equate to an adjustment in revenue; it could be achieved through decisions that look at the expenditures or a combination of both revenues and expenditures. A framework which guides how to refine the financial plan is included in the proposed Transportation Element.

**Figure 12-M: AGGREGATE 2030 TRANSPORTATION REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES**
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AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE LANDS

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE LANDS (ARL) CRITERIA AND DESIGNATION

HISTORICAL

Pierce County is required to establish criteria to identify and designate agricultural resource lands.

The lands designated as agricultural resource lands through the 1994 Pierce County Comprehensive Plan were identified using four criteria:

1) 10-acre or larger parcel sizes;
2) Prime or unique soils according to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA);
3) Land primarily devoted to agriculture; and
4) Not adjacent to lots of record of one acre or less on more than 50 percent of the perimeter.

The application of these criteria to areas outside of the urban growth areas identified approximately 17,900 acres as designated agricultural lands.

The lands designated as agricultural resource lands through the 2004 GMA Periodic Update changed from the original criteria to include:

1. The refinement of the soil type,
2. The addition of a grass/legume production yield,
3. Decreasing the minimum lot size requirement from 10 acres to 5 acres, and
4. Expanding the criteria from preserving lands with existing agricultural activity (devoted to agricultural) to those lands that have the potential to be viable agricultural lands;
5. Not characterized by urban level growth;
6. Not designated as Forest Land by County Code or RCW 84.33.

This change in policy direction ties the designation of agricultural resource lands to the soil resource, not to the existence of current farming activity. Consequently, a property originally designated as agricultural because it operated as a farm could be de-designated through the application of the revised criteria if the property did not contain the specific prime agricultural soil types and high yields. Accordingly, a property that was previously designated as Rural would be re-designated as ARL if it met all the criteria, even if there was not any agricultural activity taking place on the property. Through the same amendment cycle Pierce County designated approximately 31,000 acres as ARL.
WHAT PROMPTED THE CHANGES?

Since the 2004 amendment cycle, Pierce County discovered technical errors that were made associated with its GIS query on its soil geographic database. Consequently, the 2004 amendment included lands which did not meet the updated agricultural resource lands criteria; the result being that more acreage was designated as ARL than actually existed according to the new criteria. To rectify the error a proposal was considered during the 2007 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle. However, the proposal was not adopted; rather, the County chose a path to rectify the error through the adoption of individual community plans and the next GMA Periodic Update. If corrected to reflect the existing criteria, ARL property would total approximately 12,000 acres.

The issue of the ARL map error was resurrected through the Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle in 2013. The Pierce County Council denied a request to “correct” the Land Use Designation map to reflect the adopted ARL criteria; however, the Council made a finding that states,

“*The ARL designation should be held over for review of ARL criteria as part of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update process*” (Ordinance No. 2013-59).

Pierce County participated in requested meetings with the agricultural preservation stakeholders to discuss the ARL criteria and potential modifications. The proposed modification to the ARL criteria stem from those discussions.

PROPOSED CHANGE

The change to the ARL designation keeps all of the existing criteria except it removes the requirement that a parcel’s soil type have a potential grass/legume production yield of 3.5 tons per acre or greater. This existing yield criterion is based on capacity to produce grass and legumes, an important factor for the County’s livestock producers, but immaterial for the many producers of fruits, vegetables, nursery stock, and other leading Pierce County agricultural products. Some of the County’s most productive soil barely qualifies under the current criteria. Other similarly productive areas are excluded entirely. The application of these modified criteria would designate a total of 65,154 acres as ARL, which equates to 5,452 parcels.

Included in this latest draft is an additional criterion that responds to school districts’ concerns. The criterion ties in the schools’ capital facilities planning into the designation process. If a governmental agency (including a school district) has lands or facilities included in their capital facilities plans adopted by the County Council, those lands or facilities would not be designated ARL. The Land Use Designation map will be updated if this new criterion is recommended by the Planning Commission.

Pierce County has notified all affected property owners of this proposed change. Four open houses were held at locations throughout the rural area to inform the audience why property is proposed to be re-designated and how it affects development potential.
The 1994 Pierce County Comprehensive Plan included various policies that directed the appropriate location and size of commercial centers in the rural area. The Plan designated various areas as Rural Activity Centers (RACs), Rural Neighborhood Centers (RNC), and Rural Gateway Centers (GC). The location of these rural commercial centers focused on areas where commercial services may be desired by rural residents. These areas included established businesses, vacant as well as re-developable property.

In 1997 the GMA was amended to limit the designation of commercial areas in the rural area to locations where businesses had been legally established. Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDs) are identified by an existing commercial area or existing commercial uses that were in existence on July 1, 1990, and have a logical outer boundary.

Through the 2004 GMA Periodic Update, the County adopted a policy to conduct LAMIRD evaluations of its rural commercial centers through the community planning process. The new policy states that all rural centers shall be evaluated and updated as necessary to be consistent with the LAMIRD provisions upon initiation or update of a community plan. This policy became effective on February 1, 2005.

Previously, the County conducted the LAMIRD evaluation through the community planning process for these areas:

- Graham Community Plan;
- Key Peninsula Community Plan;
- Alderton McMillin Community Plan (partial);
- Anderson Island/Ketron Island Community Plan (partial); and
- Mid-County Community Plan.

During this update the County conducted an evaluation and the Planning Commission made recommendations for these rural commercial areas:

- Greenwater Rural Gateway Center – reduced in area
- Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan area – remained the same
- Upper Nisqually Valley Community Plan area – remained the same
- Alderton McMillin - SR 162 and 128th Street East – remained the same
- Anderson Island– reduced in area
- Ketron Community Plan area – remained the same
- SR 507 and SR 702 – McKenna – reduced in area
• SR 7 and SR 702 - deleted
• SR 161 & Eatonville Cutoff Road – reduced in size
• SR 702 & 40th Avenue South – reduced in size
• SR 165 & 141st St. Ct. East – reduced in size
• SR 7 & 267th Street East – reduced in size
• SR 7 and 304th Street East – remained the same

LAMIRD REVIEW

The Pierce County Planning Commission reviewed pertinent information and conducted three public hearings on October 28, 2014, December 16, 2014, and February 24, 2015. Previous staff reports include evaluations and findings related to each LAMIRD. The Planning Commission recommendations are noted above.

Pierce County also evaluated its existing policies against the LAMIRD criteria. The proposed Comprehensive Plan reflects the necessary changes to the existing policies that included location, size, and boundaries for the County. The currently proposed policies include the requirements identified in the Revised Code of Washington.

ADDITIONAL LAMIRD AREA REVIEW

These two areas were not reviewed in the previous process:

1. Graham RAC: Between Eustis Hunt Road East and just south of 120th Street Court East. Modify the boundary to add 14 parcels to the RAC.
2. Barney’s Corner: SR 161 & Eatonville Cutoff Road. Add one additional parcel to the Planning Commission’s previous recommendation.

LAMIRD RELATED REGULATIONS - RURAL USE EXCEPTION (18A.33.290)

The existing provisions allow commercial uses in rural areas based on the following criteria:

• Abuts a state highway which is not designated as a limited access; and
• Borders property that is improved with existing commercial or industrial use types, multi-family, or mobile home park uses established on or before July 1, 1990 on more than 50 percent of the property’s boundaries.

In order to make the regulations consistent with the LAMIRD criteria and the State law, the proposal eliminates the allowance for commercial uses on properties designated as Rural Separator or Rural 10. This is referred to as the “Rural Use Exception.”
NEW SCHOOLS IN THE RURAL AREA

The Pierce County Comprehensive Plan currently has policies that state schools may be allowed in the rural area under certain situations. These include:

- The use is dependent on being in the rural area;
- Urban level services are not required;
- It is compatible with the functional and visual character of the immediate rural area; and
- Site development and performance standards are met.

In addition, two community plans (Alderton/McMillin and Mid-County) contain additional policies that address the location of schools in the rural area. Accordingly, current development regulations allow for primary schools in the majority of the rural land use designations - as permitted outright, through an administrative review, or as a conditional use permit. Secondary schools are permitted in the majority of land use designations through the same type of approvals; however, there are some instances where secondary schools are not allowed.

WHAT PROMPTED THE CHANGES?

VISION 2040 contains policies that direct new schools to be located within the urban area ignoring those concentrations of student populations who live in the rural area. The current Plan policies do not conform to VISION 2040, the region’s multi-county planning policies.

Additionally, the Countywide Planning Policies balance the rationale for locating schools in the urban area with the service needs of siting schools closer to student populations living in the rural area:

*The County... shall meet specific educational facility needs by... working toward standards that would prioritize the location of these facilities to be in urban areas, with consideration to existing facilities in rural areas. (PC CPPs Ed 5.3)*

Pierce County met with school district representatives to discuss potential policies and regulations that would limit the schools in the rural area. School districts have various challenges in constructing new and improving existing facilities. Locating new schools in the rural area is not just a matter of purchasing less expensive land:

- Schools are needed where student populations reside;
- Student populations are increasing in the rural area due to vested development submitted before GMA was locally implemented; and
- Some of the school districts have significant portions of their boundaries located outside of the urban growth boundary.

PROPOSED CHANGE

The proposed Plan contains policies that direct new schools to be located in the rural areas only when an identified student need cannot be met in an adjacent urban area. The policies also state...
preference of expanding an existing campus over the construction of a new site. The policies call for facilities to be located and designed in a manner that is consistent with the existing character of the surrounding area. The associated regulations require a conditional use permit for schools in the rural area. The proposed changes to the regulations further detail the justification that must be submitted. The proposed regulations prohibit schools within the Rural Sensitive Resource (RSR) zoning classification because the use is not consistent with the RSR designation criteria – limit impervious surfaces to protect environmentally sensitive areas.

**Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Outside the UGA**

An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is a small, self-contained residential unit located on the same lot as an existing single-family home. ADUs are generally defined to be smaller in size and prominence than the main residence on the lot. An ADU may be attached or detached from the main single-family home. An attached unit is a separate living space within the principal home. Attached units may be located on any floor but typically have a separate entrance. A detached unit is a separate structure located somewhere on the lot. It may be the second floor of a detached garage or a separate living structure.

The 1993 Washington Housing Policy Act requires that counties that plan under GMA adopt regulations that encourage ADUs in single-family zones. The purpose of encouraging ADUs is to:

- Provide homeowners with an opportunity to subsidize housing costs through rental income from either the ADU or principle unit;
- Increase opportunities for affordable housing in locations that may otherwise be priced out of the housing market; and
- Provide for an alternative type of housing.

Jurisdictions have had flexibility in establishing regulations to address local circumstances. Regulations typically address size limitations, location on a site, and owner occupancy.

The current Plan policies recognize ADUs as a beneficial form of affordable housing. The policies direct the County to develop regulations that would allow one ADU on a residential lot where an existing single-family home is located. The existing policy further states:

"Accessory dwelling units shall not be included in the calculation of residential densities."

The concept of “residential densities” reflects the number of homes allowed on a parcel based on the size of the piece of property.

The existing regulations allow for the establishment of both attached and detached ADUs. In either situation, the property owner has to live on-site. Additional standards address the size and design of the unit. Consistent with the current adopted policy, ADUs are not incorporated in the residential density calculations.

While an ADU is an important opportunity for land owners, during the last 15 years they have not made up a significant amount of the homes constructed in Pierce County. In review of permit data between 2000 and 2015, approximately 650 accessory dwelling units were permitted in
unincorporated Pierce County. Of this total, roughly 18 percent are located within the UGA, and 82 percent are located outside of the UGA.

**WHAT PROMPTED THE CHANGE?**

The current Plan policy appears to conflict with Growth Management Hearing Board (Board) decisions addressing ADUs and density in rural/resource land designations. More specifically, the decisions have indicated that when allowing ADUs outside the UGA they count toward the maximum allowable density. Board decisions have stated:

* A freestanding ADU is a separate dwelling unit and has all the structural characteristics of a dwelling unit...

* To allow a freestanding accessory dwelling unit on every single-family lot without regard to the underlying density in rural residential districts...fails to prevent urban sprawl...and...allows growth which is urban in nature outside of an urban growth area. (Case No. 03-3-0003, Corrected Final Decision and Order)

* Attached or internal accessory dwelling units do not increase the density of structures on a parcel of property and therefore need not be counted as separate dwelling units in determining residential dwelling densities in rural zones. (Case No. -02-2-0007c Order on Compliance)

* The Board finds that...amending the County’s development standards for ADUs fails to comply with the Growth Management Act’s requirement to protect rural lands and rural character, so far as the amendments add manufactured homes as allowable freestanding ADUs on lots smaller than 10 acres. (Case No. 04-3-0018)

**PROPOSED CHANGE**

Accessory dwellings remain an allowed use both inside and outside the UGA.

Based on the Board decisions, the updated Plan contains policies that require that detached ADUs outside of the UGA be included in the density calculation. If a property owner records a document that designates 50 percent of the parcel as open space, the density incentive provisions may be applied.

**ELIMINATION OF RURAL RESERVE 5 LAND USE DESIGNATION**

With the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan in 1995 a land use designation was created that identified rural areas that were thought to be the first areas in which to expand the UGA. When the first Buildable Lands Report (2002) was completed, it was clear that the urban growth area in Pierce County was adequately sized to accommodate growth for some time.
Currently there are 5,205 parcels (8,586 acres) that are classified as Rural Reserve 5 (Rsv5) that are being changed to a new Rural 5 designation. In addition, there are other Rsv5 parcels that meet the new Agricultural Resource Lands designation and are being changed.

**WHAT PROMPTED THE CHANGES?**

Since 1995, new regional policies and Hearing Board decisions have limited the County’s ability to expand the Urban Growth Area without use of an identified methodology. The primary focus of the new regional policies is that UGA should not be expanded into the rural areas, but that they should be allowed additional density.

If population increases ever warranted any expansion beyond what is planned, the boundaries of an UGA expansion are to be adjacent to cities and towns.

By keeping the old designation, the title gives an expectation of rural to urban conversion that no longer exists.

**PROPOSED CHANGE**

Eliminate the Rural Reserve 5 and replace it with a new designation of Rural 5. The allowed uses of today’s Rsv5 are carried over to the new Rural 5 designation.

**TITLE 18A, DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS – ZONING**

**ALLOW “MOTOR VEHICLES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT SALES, RENTAL, REPAIR AND SERVICE” IN RURAL ACTIVITY CENTER**

The current Development Regulations do not allow for Motor Vehicles and Related Equipment Sales, Rental, Repair and Service Level 5 in the Rural Activity Center outside of community plan areas. Chapter 18A.33 – Use Category Descriptions defines Motor Vehicles and Related Equipment Sales, Rental, Repair and Service Level 5 as:

“On-site sales, lease, or rental of automobiles, trucks not exceeding three tons of vehicle weight, and recreational vehicles.” (18A.33.270 M.)

**What prompted the change?**

An application submitted through the 2014 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle requested a policy be added to the Comprehensive Plan to allow for Level 3 within a Rural Activity Center. Staff reviewed the current policies and did not identify any which would prevent this type of use in the Rural Activity Center.

The current regulations allow for Use Level 3. Level 3 permits on-site rental and lease of motor vehicles as an accessory use to an automobile repair shop. It has been determined that the
characteristics of a stand-alone business that rents, leases, or sells motor vehicles would not be much different than a motor vehicle repair business with accessory sales. Therefore it has been found that the use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

**Proposed Change**

Amend the Use Tables associated with “Outside of Community Plan Areas” (PCC 18A.17.020) to add Vehicles and Related Equipment Sales, Rental, Repair and Service Level 5 as a permitted use in the Rural Activity Center zoning classification.

**ALLOW FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICE AND COMMERCIAL USE TYPES WITHIN THE ANDERSON AND KETRON ISLANDS COMMUNITY PLAN AREA.**

The current Development Regulations allow for limited service and commercial uses in the Rural Neighborhood Center zoning classification.

**What prompted the change?**

Ferry service to and from the islands are limited and at time may be challenging for residents to obtain necessary medical and other types of services not currently permitted in the Rural Neighborhood Center.

An application submitted through the 2014 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle requested policies to be added to the Comprehensive Plan to allow for an expanded list of permitted uses within the Rural Neighborhood Center land use designation. Staff reviewed the current policies and did not identify any current policies that would prevent the proposed use types in the Rural Activity Center.

**Proposed Change**

Amend the Use Tables associated with “Anderson and Ketron Islands” (PCC 18A.19.020) as follows:

- Add the following as permitted use types under the RNC zoning classification:
  
  **Civic Use Category**
  
  Health Services – P1, 2
  
  Level 1: Medical and dental offices, emergency medical facilities providing 24-hour walk in service.
  
  Level 2: Hospitals and institutional facilities. Such facilities may involve surgical and medical procedures as well as mental health related care.

  **Resource Use Category**
  
  Agritourism – P4
Level 4: Farmers market (sale of produce, shrubbery, plants, eggs, wine, arts and crafts, and dairy products). Retail sales market size is not limited. Building size (new and/or existing) is limited up to 500 square feet. At least 50 percent of products offered for sale must be produced in Pierce County, and 90 percent of products offered for sale must be produced in Washington State.

Commercial Use Category

Business Services – P1

Level 1: Total floor area up to 2,500 square feet, with no outdoor storage of vehicles.

- Change the following use types that are currently allowed through a conditional use permit to be allowed outright:

Commercial Use Category

Eating and Drinking Establishments – P4

Level 4: Restaurant, tavern or brewpub that serves beer, wine or liquor. This level of restaurant, tavern or brewpub will have a separate lounge area for patrons 21 years of age or older or in some cases be entirely restricted to patrons 21 years of age or older.

Storage and Moving – P1, 2

Level 1: Total use area consists of a lot or combination of lots less than one acre in size. Outdoor Use Allowed.

Level 2: Total use area consists of a lot or combination of lots of 1 to 4 acres in size. Outdoor Use Allowed

- Add the following as a permitted use type through a conditional use permit:

Commercial Use Category

Lodging - C3

Level 3: Lodging house with up to 20 guest rooms.

COUNTY PROPOSED MAP CHANGES – RURAL/RESOURCE

The proposed Plan includes the following changes within the rural area:

- SR 706 - Ashford Rural Center: The land use designation remains as Gateway Center. The zoning classification that implements the land use designation changes from Village Residential (VR) to Tourist Commercial (TC) on one parcel (4.34 acres). The property is located within the Upper Nisqually Valley Community Plan area. This property has existing uses as of July 1, 1990 that consisted of commercial aviation uses associated with the Ashford airport. This proposal is consistent with the LAMIRD criteria.
• Agricultural Resource Lands (ARL): Countywide – refer to the “ARL” section for detailed information.

• Rural Reserve 5(Rsv5): Countywide – refer to the “Rural and Resource” section for detailed information.

• Between Eustis Hunt Road East and just south of 120th Street Court East (Graham RAC): Changes the land use designation for 13 parcels (15.8 acres) from Rural 10 (R10) to Rural Activity Center (RAC). The property is located within the Graham Community Plan area. This area has been meets the LAMRID criteria as discussed under the LAMRID discussion section of this report. The RAC zoning classification would implement the new land use designation.

• SR 161 & Eatonville Cutoff Road (Barney’s Corner): Changes the land use designation for 2 parcels (3.6 acres) from Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC) to Rural 10 (R10). The property is not within a community plan area. These parcels are being removed because they do not meet the LAMRID criteria. The R10 zoning classification would implement the new land use designation.
**LAND USE ADVISORY COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations were made by Land Use Advisory Commissions. Staff response on the LUAC recommendations are details in the following detailed summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUAC</th>
<th>ARL</th>
<th>Addition/Change to Existing Policy</th>
<th>Rest of Package</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frederickson Advisory Commission (FAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change Suggested</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Advisory Commission (GAC)</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Peninsula Advisory Commission (KPAC)</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Change Suggested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-County Advisory Commission (MCAC)</td>
<td>No Recommendation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change Suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland-Spanaway Midland Advisory Commission (PSMAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inactive due to lack of appointed members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Advisory Commission (PAC)</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Change Suggested</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill Advisory Commission (SHAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change Suggested</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF LUAC RECOMMENDATIONS**

The table below provides a summary of each LUACs proposed changes to the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update package and staff response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUAC</th>
<th>Summary of LUAC Recommendations</th>
<th>Staff Response to LUAC Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAC</strong></td>
<td>Add “buffers, stormwater facilities, power lines, and easements” to policy LU-25</td>
<td>Not Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require a budgeted, funded plan for urban level infrastructure to be built prior to final plat approval.</td>
<td>Not Support. Policies already exist. Refer to policy CF-3 on page 3-6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete policy FR LU-8.7.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allow banners for community events and activities.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to review the community plan within the next 2 years.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUAC</td>
<td>Summary of LUAC Recommendations</td>
<td>Staff Response to LUAC Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Maintain the existing ARL yield criteria</td>
<td>Not Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain original community plan policy 1.3.5.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Either retain original community plan policy 22.1.5 or change ENV-5.17 to include hazardous waste and fertilizers.</td>
<td>Support retaining original community plan policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change the references to Pierce Transit to “transit agencies.”</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPAC</td>
<td>Neither motion received a majority vote for ARL</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise the map amendment at 104th St E and Canyon Road E (McLaren) to go from CC/CC to MUD/MUD rather than staff recommendation of CC/CC to EC/CE.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designate Anderson’s and Island View as Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC).</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinsert original Community Plan policy 2.4.3, 4.1.1.3, and 17.1.1.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAC</td>
<td>Revise community plan policies associated with rezoning properties zoned as Residential Resource.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following sections contain the specific policy and map changes recommended by the LUACs, organized in the same order as the summary table in the previous section.

**FREDERICKSON ADVISORY COMMISSION (FAC)**

**Land Use Element – Urban Residential section**

Page 2-30

**GOAL LU-25**  The allowable number of dwelling units within individual urban development proposals shall be calculated using net developable acreage.

**LU-25.1**  In determining net developable acreage, deductions shall be made for roads, and environmentally constrained land, buffers, stormwater facilities, power lines, and easements.

**Frederickson Land Use Element – General section**

Page 2-109

**GOAL FR LU-4**  Require that there be a budgeted, funded plan for urban level infrastructure to be built prior to final plat approval.

**Frederickson Land Use Element – Residential section**

Page 2-113

**GOAL FR LU-8**  Residential density should vary based upon characteristics of the built and natural environment.

(...)  **FR LU-8.7**  The maximum density incentive granted should not exceed the maximum density generally allowed in a zone by more than 30%.

**Frederickson Design and Character Element – Sign Design section**

**GOAL FR D-14**  Enable individuals, businesses, and community groups to promote temporary activities to the wider community through the adoption of clear regulations governing the use, size, and allowed duration of temporary signs.

**FR D-14.1**  Allow banners for community activities and events.

**FR D-14.2**  Banners should be of a style, size, and color that complement the surrounding environment and standard on which they are affixed. Consideration should be given to
whether or not the structures from which the banners are being suspended can support the weight and the force of the wind upon the banners.

FR D-14.3 Commercial center banners must be primarily promoting the commercial center where they are displayed. Specific advertising of businesses or merchandise is prohibited.

FR D-14.4 Temporary signs that are placed within a permanent structure, such as on private light standards, shall be prohibited.

FR D-14.5 Prohibit temporary signs that are affixed to a utility pole unless expressly reviewed and approved by the utility provider.

Graham Advisory Commission (GAC)

Land Use Element – Resource Lands/Agricultural section

Page 2-62


(…)

LU-81.2 Designation of Agricultural lands of "long-term commercial significance" requires consideration of size of the land and soil composition and the land’s proximity to populated areas. The following criteria shall be considered when designating land as Agricultural Resource Land.

LU-81.2.1 Soils. The key criterion for defining Agricultural Resource Lands is the presence of the County's most productive agricultural soils and their associated production yield. These are soils types identified as Prime Farmland which have a grass/legume production yield of 3.5 tons per acre or greater in the farmland classification field of the Pierce County Area Soil Survey published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service.

Key Peninsula Advisory Commission (KPAC)

Key Peninsula Land Use Element – Rural Residential section

Page 2-142

GOAL KP LU-2 Allow a variety of rural residential land uses in the R10 zone that are consistent with a rural lifestyle.

KP LU-2.1 The dominant land use shall be detached single-family residences.

KP LU-2.2 Permit resource uses (farms and forestry). Mineral extraction (gravel mines, etc.) shall be a conditional use.
KP LU-2.3 Permit civic uses such as churches, educational facilities, and public safety services that can be supported by rural infrastructure.

KP LU-2.4 Allow tourism facilities such as hotel and motel uses with up to 20 guest rooms in locations throughout the Peninsula as a conditional use. Where new lodging facilities are developed on shoreline locations, encourage provisions for public access to the shoreline. Limit such public access to the lodging facilities’ property.

KP LU-2.5 Support the development of Master Planned Resorts that will provide local jobs. Where new resorts are developed on shoreline locations, provisions for public access to the shoreline should be encouraged. Such public access should be limited to the resort property.

KP LU-2.6 Allow for limited commercial services that are compatible with the functional and visual character of the rural area and serve a need for residents living in the rural area. Examples include backhoe services, home maintenance services, and other types of contractor yards.

Two Policy Options:

Option 1: Key Peninsula Environment Element – General section

GOAL KP ENV-1 Support public education and incentive-based programs that protect the function and value of the natural environment.

KP ENV-1.1 Provide informational brochures and publications to public and civic organizations including the library, fire stations, schools, utility providers, and community groups for distribution to local citizens.

KP ENV-1.2 Advertise public assistance opportunities for repairing failing septic systems.

KP ENV-1.3 Educate citizens regarding potential impacts of household hazardous waste on groundwater including proper use and disposal of fertilizers and pesticides.

KP ENV-1.4 Discourage the use of fertilizers and pesticides on lawns in shoreline areas. Offer educational information to residents regarding environmentally friendly, biodegradable, non-chemical alternatives.

KP ENV-1.5 Promote the use of non-toxic alternatives to household products. Provide informational handouts that explain how to dispose of toxic household products.

KP ENV-1.6 Require that educational information of shoreline best management practices is distributed to new shoreline property owners when the property is transferred.

KP ENV-1.7 Provide incentives that encourage environmentally sound development practices.

KP ENV-1.8 Encourage the removal of invasive plants such as Scot’s broom and noxious weeds such as tansy ragwort.
Option 2: Environment Element – Water Quality section

GOAL ENV-5  Protect aquifers and surface waters to ensure that water quality and quantity are maintained or improved.

(...)

ENV-5.17  Educate citizens regarding potential impacts of household hazardous waste on groundwater including proper use and disposal of fertilizers and pesticides. Promote public education on the appropriate type, amount, time, and location for application of pesticides.

Key Peninsula Transportation Element – Transit Service section

GOAL KP T-4  Promote the continued development of the transit system to serve the internal and external travel needs of Key Peninsula residents.

KP T-4.1.1  Promote increased transit service for commuters traveling within and outside of the Key Peninsula area. Provide a range of transit services that is cost effective and reliable.

KP T-4.1.2  Request that Pierce Transit transit agencies provide more frequent Bus PLUS service (i.e., hourly service) within the Key Peninsula area as demand warrants.

KP T-4.1.3  Work with Pierce Transit and Sound Transit transit agencies to expand express services to the Purdy park-and-ride lot. Coordinate these services with services operating on the Key Peninsula.

KP T-4.1.4  Work with Pierce Transit transit agencies to establish commuter services that link population centers and park-and-ride facilities on the Key Peninsula with the network of regional express services.

KP T-4.1.5  Work with Pierce Transit transit agencies to determine the feasibility of providing service to areas on the Key Peninsula that are not currently served by transit. Request that Pierce Transit transit agencies consider the extension of Bus PLUS service to the Longbranch area.

KP T-4.1.6  Support efforts by Pierce Transit transit agencies to develop stops along future primary Bus PLUS service routes, including SR-302 (Elgin-Clifton Road KPN), Key Peninsula Highway, Wright-Bliss Road KPN, Lackey Road KPN, Creviston Drive NW, Cramer Road KPN, and Whiteman Road KPS.
**KP T-4.1.7**  Provide **Bus PLUS** stops at the rural commercial centers and community facilities within the Key Peninsula area.

**KP T-4.1.8**  Ensure that potential bus stops are considered as part of future roadway improvement projects. Consider the provision of adequate right-of-way to accommodate the placement of accessible bus stops.

**KP T-4.1.9**  Work with **Pierce Transit transit agencies** to provide improved marketing and promotion of the full range of transit services available to Key Peninsula residents, including **Bus PLUS** service, vanpooling, and rideshare services.

**KP T-4.1.10**  Encourage **Pierce Transit transit agencies** to expand the network of vanpool services that operate on the Key Peninsula.

**KP T-4.2**  Provide transportation improvements that facilitate bus travel and pedestrian access to bus stops.

**KP T-4.2.1**  Work with **Pierce Transit transit agencies** to identify locations where improvements are needed to improve bus travel. Consider such improvements as part of future roadway improvement projects.

**KP T-4.2.2**  Facilitate pedestrian access to **Bus PLUS** stops through the provision of shoulder improvements, which can also serve as passenger waiting areas.

**KP T-4.2.3**  Locate **Bus PLUS** stops at convenient locations where buses can pull off the roadway. Avoid the placement of bus stops near busy intersections, whenever possible.

**KP T-4.3**  Support the expansion of existing park-and-ride lots that serve Key Peninsula commuters and the development of new park-and-ride lots in the Key Peninsula area.

**KP T-4.3.1**  Support the expansion of the Purdy park-and-ride lot and any related expansion of local and regional bus service at that location.

**KP T-4.3.2**  Work with **Pierce Transit transit agencies** to obtain park-and-ride lots through leasing or purchasing of state and private properties. Consider the feasibility of developing a park-and-ride lot along SR-302 (e.g., Lake Kathryn Village shopping center) to serve residents in the northern part of the Key Peninsula area.

**KP T-4.3.3**  Encourage **Pierce Transit transit agencies** to establish new park-and-ride facilities, together with appropriate pedestrian and safety amenities, in other parts of the Key Peninsula as needs develop.
# Mid-County Advisory Commission (MCAC)

## Map Amendments

**104th St E and Canyon Road E (McLaren): CC to MUD**

---

**Mid-County Land Use – Urban Commercial section**

---

**GOAL MC LU-18**  
A Mixed Use District designation should be established in the 104th St E and Canyon Road E area to create a transition between surrounding residential, civic and, commercial uses.

**MC LU-18.1**  
The Mixed Use District designation should allow for a mix of commercial retail, service, office, compatible light industrial and residential uses. Residential uses may include single-family and multi-family development with densities between 12 and 25 units per acre.
Map Amendments

Pt. Fosdick/Anderson: RSR/RSR to RNC/RNC

Island View: R10/R10 to RNC/RNC

Gig Harbor Land Use Element – Residential section

GOAL GH LU-3 Residential density within the unincorporated portion of the Urban Growth Area should average 4 dwelling units per acre.

GH LU-3.1 Two-family development (duplexes) and attached single-family dwelling units should be allowed in single-family residential neighborhoods when they meet community design standards.

GH LU-3.2 An accessory dwelling unit should be permitted on lots where a single-family residence exists.

GH LU-3.3 Multi-family units shall be permitted in commercial and high-density residential zones when consistent with the impervious cover, open space, health and sanitation regulations, and other applicable regulations.
Gig Harbor Land Use Element – section

GOAL GH LU-6  Access Employment Centers via an arterial roadway and locate in close proximity to SR-16. Direct heavy truck traffic away from residential neighborhoods.

GOAL GH LU-7  Employment Centers should avoid lands significantly constrained by critical areas or environmentally sensitive areas. Where critical areas or environmentally sensitive areas cannot be avoided, buffering, increased setbacks, lighting control, stormwater control, and other techniques shall be used to protect the critical area or environmentally sensitive area from adverse impacts.

GOAL GH LU-8  Land uses allowed within Employment Centers should be devoid of nuisance factors such as excessive noise, light, and odor; should not pose an environmental health hazard; and should not result in high public service and facility demands. Accordingly, uses such as hazardous waste treatment and storage facilities, wrecking yards, smelters, and chemical manufacturing or storage should not be allowed. Adult entertainment uses shall not be allowed.

Gig Harbor Environment Element – Groundwater section

GOAL GH ENV-8  The Gig Harbor Peninsula is completely dependent on local groundwater for supply. Groundwater quality and supply are generally good throughout the Peninsula; however, the area is susceptible to saltwater intrusion and several locations have shown evidence of some saltwater contamination. Evaluate water availability, water needs, and water conservation measures in each land use decision process.

GH ENV-8.1  Institute minimum natural vegetation retention requirements that provide areas for infiltration of surface water and groundwater recharge to occur. Such requirements should be complimentary to vegetation retention requirements for other objectives of the Natural Environment and Open Space Element.

South Hill Advisory Commission (SHAC)

South Hill Land Use Element – General section

GOAL SH LU-7  Provide strict guidance for rezones to ensure community plan goals and objectives are properly implemented.

(...)  

SH LU-7.2  Ensure residential rezone applications are consistent with the intent, goals, objectives, and standards as set forth in the South Hill Community Plan.
Residential rezones may be allowed when if it is demonstrated that more than 5 years have passed since the last change in zoning and the following criteria are met:

**SH LU-7.2.1.1** A PDD shall accompany all rezone applications;

**SH LU-7.2.1.2** If the request is to up-zone from Residential Resource, it must be demonstrated that the environmental constraints qualifying the property for such classification no longer exist on the site, or that the development will be designed in a manner that provides protection of the environmentally constrained area and provides designated areas of wildlife habitat and open space;

**SH LU-7.2.1.3** An analysis of market vacancy has demonstrated that there is a need for higher density within the South Hill Community Plan area. The analysis must consider the availability of buildings for the same type of use and shall demonstrate why the rezone is necessary. The analysis shall not be an analysis of market potential;

**SH LU-7.2.1.4** For any rezone request to allow higher densities, the site must be located on an arterial within 1,000 feet of a transit stop;

**SH LU-7.2.1.5** Compatibility with surrounding uses shall be maintained; and,

**SH LU-7.2.1.6** For any rezone request to allow higher densities, connection to sewers shall be required; and

**SH LU-7.2.1.7** The Examiner shall provide written findings that the proposed zone and PDD implement the goals, objectives, and standards of the designation better than the existing zone.
Supplemental Staff Report and Errata

DATE: April 21, 2015

TO: Pierce County Planning Commission

FROM: Sean Gaffney, Manager, Long Range Planning

SUBJECT: 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update

The following items are either new policies recommended to be incorporated or corrections to existing information in the April 2015 Draft Comprehensive Plan.

**LAND USE ELEMENT – AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE LANDS (ARL)**

**ARL criteria – Refinement of forestry land exclusion**

Currently, for the purpose of identifying ARL lands, Pierce County excludes land classified under the State’s forestry program authorized by RCW 84.33. Recently, the State changed its procedures and allows counties the option of combining that program with another authorized under RCW 84.33 – Current Use Open Space - Timber Lands. For the purpose of identifying properties that are available for long term agricultural use, and that area being used for timber production, it seems to make sense to use both of the Assessor-Treasurer’s “use classifications” to exclude forestry.

**Recommended Amendment #1 (Page 2-64)**

**LU-81.1.4** Designated forest and timber lands as identified by Pierce County, and RCW 84.33, and RCW 84.34 shall be excluded.

**ARL criteria - Clarification of development agreement exclusion**

To avoid any confusion in the future, the suggestion is being made to change the word **agreement** to **permit**. There is now a process called a Development Agreement authorized by State law RCW 36.70B that has specific meaning and process. The confusion over the words has recently come up during the review process on an unrelated application review. It has brought to light the potential confusion of using the same wording for different purposes.

The draft plan has been electronically searched, and the only time this wording is used is in one of the agricultural resource land policies.
This original policy was meant to apply to official County actions having the effect of authorizing nonresidential land use actions; those that have been granted and vested through the County’s application review process. A Development Agreement would be only one kind of vested land use approvals.

**Recommended Amendment #2 (Page 2-64)**

LU-81.1.3.4 Lands covered by a non-residential development permit agreement for uses other than agriculture.

---

### ARL Permitted Uses – Organizational camps

The rural areas of Pierce County are host to a number of organizational camps. These camps provide recreational, environmental, and religious activities in a rural setting. This use needs the rural setting to accomplish the organization’s program objectives. The ARL zones in Pierce County currently do not include “Organizational Camps” as a permitted use. The addition of Organizational Camps as a Community and Cultural Services use in the ARL zones with Conditional Use Permit review would provide for this important rural use.

**Recommended Amendment #3**

Amend 18A to add Community and Cultural Services, Level 7, Organizational Camps, to all ARL zones for Non-Community and Community Plan Zoning Tables as highlighted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Categories and Use Types</th>
<th>Rural Centers</th>
<th>Resource Lands and Other Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Government Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Cultural Services</td>
<td>P1-5:C6</td>
<td>P1-5:C6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### PARKS & RECREATION ELEMENT

#### Management Priorities & Purposes

The policies below address management of the park system and assist Parks in clarifying management priorities and purposes.

**Recommended Amendment #4**

Page 11-6

PR-1.7 Implement a whole system management approach to improving and maintaining the park system through integration of long term sustainability; promoting flexibility of
uses and activities; ensuring equity across the system; providing a variety of activities; ensuring adequate support facilities; and, designing with cost effective methods and partnerships.

PR-2.4 Work toward an interconnected system of parks and trails in the urban area that safely connects to schools, civic facilities, shopping, and recreational facilities.

Page 11-8

PR-5.10 Develop and implement unified standards to minimize future design and maintenance costs and to promote an identifiable image for the park system.

PR-5.11 Use Master Plans to guide park development and ensure public support. Plans should identify types of uses and development, public access, stewardship, and restoration.

PR-5.11.1 Ensure capital projects are consistent with the Master Plan in type of use and intensity.

National Water Trails

Kitsap County has received a National Water Trails designation for the entire Kitsap Peninsula. This designation applies to the entire Kitsap Peninsula, which includes Key and Gig Harbor Peninsula. Kitsap County recently asked Pierce County to support its designation of appropriate Water Trail sites and mapping.

The National Water Trails System serves to bring existing and newly identified water trails together into one cohesive national network of exemplary water trails. A National Water Trail is established through an application to the National Park Service. The Secretary of the Interior makes the official designation of a new national water trail. The benefit of a National Water Trail designation may include opportunities to obtain technical assistance and funding for planning and implementing water trail projects.

Recommended Amendment #5 (Page 11-11)

PR-19.6 Support the development of the Kitsap Peninsula Water Trails Management Plan in collaboration with jurisdictions in Kitsap and Mason Counties.

PR-19.7 Explore implementation of the Kitsap Peninsula Water Trails Management Plan as applicable to facilities in Pierce County.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

Appendix D, starting on page 12-155, identifies transportation projects from “Adopted Plans.” The existing Table of Contents does not currently recognize the list of projects outside of community plan areas. Text in this section also mistakenly references Table 12-X as identifying projects within community plan areas. In addition, Table 12-X inadvertently excludes projects that have been adopted as part of the transportation plan.
The **1992 Pierce County Transportation Plan** (PCTP) included the first adopted list and map of long-range transportation projects. Many of these projects were eliminated from the PCTP during the 1990s due to the incorporation of the Cities of Edgewood, Lakewood, and University Place. The adoption of the Nonmotorized Transportation Plan in 1997 and later adoption of 11 Community Plans added to the list of adopted projects envisioned for both motorized and nonmotorized travel. It is worth noting that some Community Planning Boards decided to remove a significant number of the PCTP projects, especially those that recommended new roadway alignments. The current make-up of adopted projects can be characterized as follows:

- Adopted Community Plan projects within Community Planning Area boundaries.
- Pierce County Transportation Plan projects for areas outside of the Community Planning Areas.
- Nonmotorized Transportation Plan (NMTP) projects.

Map 12-22 and Map 12-23 show a composite of projects from the Pierce County Transportation Plan and Community Plans. Projects from the 10 Community Plans have been inserted into their respective areas in the 2 maps. Table 12-X and Table 12-Y list the projects from the Pierce County Transportation Plan outside of Community Plan areas, thus are still an adopted part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Map 12-24 through Map 12-23 and Table 12-Z through Table 12-HH are the maps and project listings that are adopted within each of the ten Community Plans. It is worth noting that there were no specific roadway projects contained in the Upper Nisqually Valley Community Plan, so there is not a map or table for that area.

The NMTP improvements are depicted in Map 12-19 and Map 12-20, in the body of the Transportation Appendix. Due to the vast number of projects, they are not listed in this document. The entire NMTP, including project listings, can be found online.
### Recommended Amendment #7 (page 12-158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Proposed Improvement</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C15</strong></td>
<td>Lake Tapps Parkway</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E/East Valley Hwy to 182&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E10</strong></td>
<td>112&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E Connector</td>
<td>214&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E to 198&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E arterial</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E11</strong></td>
<td>230&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E/243&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E Arterial</td>
<td>Buckley-Tapps Hwy E/230&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E to SR 410/234&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E19</strong></td>
<td>East Valley Hwy E</td>
<td>Sumner City Limits to King County Line</td>
<td>Add additional lanes, geometric, and intersection improvements</td>
<td>Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E21</strong></td>
<td>South Prairie Rd E</td>
<td>South Prairie City Limits to 198&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E arterial intersection</td>
<td>Intersection and geometric improvements</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E22</strong></td>
<td>Forest Canyon Rd E</td>
<td>Sumner City Limits to Sumner-Tapps Hwy E</td>
<td>Geometric, shoulder, and grade improvements</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E23</strong></td>
<td>Sumner-Tapps Hwy E</td>
<td>SR 410 to South Tapps Dr E</td>
<td>Intersection, geometric, and shoulder improvements. Turn lanes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E24</strong></td>
<td>West Tapps Dr E</td>
<td>Bonney Lake City Limits to Sumner-Tapps Hwy E</td>
<td>Widen lanes and shoulders, geometric improvements</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E26A</strong></td>
<td>210&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E/214&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E</td>
<td>Edwards Rd E to Snag Island Dr E</td>
<td>Intersection, geometric, and shoulder improvements, realign 40&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E/214&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E intersection</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E26B</strong></td>
<td>214&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E/218&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E</td>
<td>Snag Island Dr E to Sumner-Buckley Hwy E</td>
<td>Intersection, geometric, and shoulder improvements</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E26C</strong></td>
<td>214&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E: North section</td>
<td>Sumner-Buckley Hwy E to SR 410</td>
<td>Widen lanes and shoulders, realign and reconstruct</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E26D</strong></td>
<td>214&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E: South section</td>
<td>SR 410 to 120&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E</td>
<td>Add additional lanes from South Prairie Rd E to SR 410. Geometric and shoulder improvements</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E28</strong></td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E</td>
<td>East Valley Hwy E to SR 167</td>
<td>Add additional lanes, geometric and intersection improvements</td>
<td>Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E29</strong></td>
<td>Connells-Prairie Rd E</td>
<td>214&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E to Sumner-Buckley Hwy E</td>
<td>Reconstruct to road and drainage design standards</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E31A</strong></td>
<td>112&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E: West section</td>
<td>214&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E to 254&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E</td>
<td>Rehabilitate and reconstruct, shoulder improvements</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E31B</strong></td>
<td>122&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E: East section</td>
<td>254&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E to Buckley City Limits</td>
<td>Rehabilitate and reconstruct, shoulder improvements</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E32</strong></td>
<td>Mundy-Loss Rd E</td>
<td>Sumner-Buckley Hwy E to SR 162</td>
<td>Rehabilitate and reconstruct.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E4</strong></td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E/12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St E</td>
<td>182&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E to 210&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E</td>
<td>Upgrade 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sts E between 210&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E and 182&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Ave E</td>
<td>Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Limits</td>
<td>Proposed Improvement</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Sumner-Tapps Hwy E Extension</td>
<td>16th St E/Sumner-Tapps Hwy E to 112th St E</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>254th Ave E Arterial</td>
<td>Sumner-Buckley Hwy E/Buckley-Tapps Hwy E to 112th St E</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>198th Ave E Arterial</td>
<td>120th St E to South Prairie Rd E; segment of South Prairie Rd E between 198th Ave E</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25</td>
<td>96th St E</td>
<td>Fruitland Ave E to SR 7</td>
<td>Realign from Golden Given Rd E to 24th Ave E. improve intersections</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26</td>
<td>North Levee Rd E</td>
<td>Freeman Rd to Puyallup City Limits</td>
<td>Minor widening. Relocate road for trail construction. Improve shoulders, drainage, and intersections</td>
<td>Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32</td>
<td>68th Ave E/66th Ave E/18th St E</td>
<td>Tacoma City Limits to 12th St E</td>
<td>Improve intersections. Minor widening.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>100th St KPN</td>
<td>178th Ave KPN to Wright-Bliss Rd KPN</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P39</td>
<td>150th St NW</td>
<td>82nd Ave NW to Goodrich Dr NW</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P38</td>
<td>186th Ave KPN</td>
<td>Herron Rd KPN to Whiteman Rd KPS</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>94th Ave NW</td>
<td>Key Peninsula Hwy NW to Danforth Rd NW</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P57</td>
<td>38th St KPS</td>
<td>150th Ave KPS to Mahncke Rd KPS</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P58</td>
<td>150th Ave KPS</td>
<td>38th St KPS to Key Peninsula Hwy KPN</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>74th St KPN/57th St KPN/82nd St KPN Corridor</td>
<td>Lackey Rd KPN to Key Peninsula Hwy KPN</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>74th St KPN</td>
<td>Crescent Beach Rd KPN to Lackey Rd KPN</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>64th St KPS</td>
<td>Whiteman Rd KPS to Key Peninsula Hwy KPS</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>320th St E/336th St E Connector</td>
<td>336th St S/Kinsman Rd E to SR 7/320th St E</td>
<td>New Arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>8th Ave S</td>
<td>Harts Lake Loop Rd to SR 507</td>
<td>Rehabilitate and widen</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25/S26</td>
<td>Alder Cutoff Rd E</td>
<td>SR 7 to Eatonville City Limits</td>
<td>Rehabilitate bridges. Geometric and shoulder improvements.</td>
<td>Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Limits</td>
<td>Proposed Improvement</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>Harts Lake Valley</td>
<td>Harts Lake Loop Rd S to southerly terminus</td>
<td>Widen, rehabilitate pavement, and intersection realignment</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>Harts Lake Loop</td>
<td>8th Ave S to Allen Rd S</td>
<td>Improve alignment, widen, and sight distance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>336th St S Connector</td>
<td>336th St S/ Locke Dr S to 336th St S/56th Dr S/Tisch Rd S</td>
<td>New arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>Allen Rd S-40th</td>
<td>Harts Lake Loop Rd S to SR 702</td>
<td>Improve sight distance, widen, and pavement rehabilitation</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>Orville Rd E/Orting-Kapowsin Hwy</td>
<td>288th St E to SR 161</td>
<td>Improve alignment, widen, shoulders, pavement structure</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>304th St E</td>
<td>SR 7 to Schudy Rd S</td>
<td>Arterial improvement; pavement rehabilitation and widening</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>416th St E</td>
<td>SR 7 to Dean Kreger Rd</td>
<td>Improve intersection at SR 7, alignment, and widening</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>Eatonville Cutoff</td>
<td>SR 7 to SR 161</td>
<td>Improve intersections, alignment and shoulders</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>304th St S Extension</td>
<td>304th St S/Schudy Rd S to SR 507 at Murray Creek</td>
<td>New arterial</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>384 St E/Rapjohn</td>
<td>SR 7 to Lakeside S Extension</td>
<td>Road rehabilitation</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>8th Ave S-416th St E</td>
<td>8th Ave S/Harts Lake Rd S to Dean Kreger Rd E</td>
<td>New arterial</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>288th St E Extension</td>
<td>8th Ave E/288th St E to SR 7/288th St E</td>
<td>New arterial</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W34</td>
<td>Yoman Rd A.I.</td>
<td>Ferry Terminal to Otso Point Rd A.I.</td>
<td>Reconstruct to road and drainage design standards</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W36</td>
<td>Old Nisqually Rd SW</td>
<td>I-5 to Thurston County Line</td>
<td>Reconstruct to road and drainage design standards; truck lane</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6A</td>
<td>Mounts Rd SW</td>
<td>Lapsley Dr to I-5</td>
<td>Improve to road and drainage standards</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6B</td>
<td>Mounts Rd SW</td>
<td>I-5 to DuPont City Limits</td>
<td>Add additional lanes and realign</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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