

May 8, 2007

To: All Interested Parties

RE: *Integrated Key Peninsula Community Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement*

Pierce County Planning and Land Services (PALS) and the Environmental Official have issued the *Integrated Key Peninsula Community Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)* which provides information that was utilized in plan development and discusses environmental impacts, benefits, and changes that would occur through the adoption of the community plan. Extensive environmental, economic, and land use information was utilized in the formation of the community plan, therefore the Environmental Official has opted to utilize the environmental review and disclosure process outlined in WAC 197-11-055, 197-11-158, and 197-11-210 through 238. The Environmental Summary and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement have been prepared in order to disclose the greatest amount of information in a manner that is useful for decision-makers and the public.

Your review and subsequent comments concerning this document are important to ensure that all environmentally significant impacts have been identified. Our department appreciates your timely review. The deadline for receiving comments is 4:30 p.m. on June 7, 2007.

A Final SEIS, which summarizes and responds to the comments received, will be issued subsequent to the end of the comment period. You will receive notification of availability of the Final SEIS if you are on our mailing list or if you have provided your name and address to department staff.

Comments on the Draft SEIS should address environmental information, impacts, and mitigation measures and should be directed to the Environmental Official. Comments on the community plan should be addressed to the Pierce County Planning Commission. All comments will be reviewed and considered for the Final SEIS but only those directed to the Environmental Official or addressing environmental impacts will be responded to in the Final SEIS.

Please address your comments on the Draft SEIS in writing to: Environmental Official, c/o Toni Fairbanks, Pierce County Planning and Land Services, 2401 South 35th Street, Tacoma, WA 98409-7490. Comments provided on CDs will not be accepted.

Please address your written comments on the community plan to: Pierce County Planning Commission, c/o Advance Planning Division, Room 228, Pierce County Planning and Land Services, 2401 South 35th Street, Tacoma, WA 98409-7490. You may also attend a Planning Commission hearing. Dates and times are listed on the web at www.piercecountywa.org/pals.

If you have questions concerning the *Integrated Key Peninsula Community Plan and Draft SEIS*, please contact Mike Kruger at (253) 798-2700 or (253) 798-2785. I appreciate your assistance in reviewing this document for accuracy and completeness. Thank you.

Sincerely,

CHUCK KLEEBERG
Director, Planning and Land Services

Chapter I

Environmental Summary

for the

Integrated Key Peninsula
Community Plan

and

Draft Supplemental
Environmental Impact Statement

Pierce County Planning and Land Services

Chuck Kleeberg, Director
2401 South 35th Street
Tacoma, Washington 98409

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FACT SHEET ii

BACKGROUND INFORMATION1

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY9

 Introduction.....9

 Major Conclusions10

 Areas of Controversy15

 Issues to be Resolved.....20

CONCISE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES20

SUPPORTING RECORDS AND MATERIALS.....41

APPENDIX A – DISTRIBUTION LIST43

LIST OF TABLES

 Table 1. Pierce County Environmental Documents 3

 Table 2. Controversial Rezone Proposals 16

 Table 3. Comparison of Land Use Designations / Zones by Acres..... 21

 Table 4. LAMIRD Analysis – Lake Kathryn Rural Activity Center 23

 Table 5. LAMIRD Analysis – Key Center Rural Activity Center 24

 Table 6. LAMIRD Analysis – 118th Avenue Rural Neighborhood Center 26

 Table 7. LAMIRD Analysis – Wright-Bliss Rural Neighborhood Center 27

 Table 8. LAMIRD Analysis – 134th Avenue Rural Neighborhood Center 28

 Table 9. LAMIRD Analysis – Home Rural Neighborhood Center..... 29

 Table 10. LAMIRD Analysis – Longbranch Rural Neighborhood Center..... 30

LIST OF MAPS

 Zoning/Land Use Designations – Alternative 1

 Zoning/Land Use Designations – Alternative 2

 Zoning/Land Use Designations – Alternative 3

 LAMIRD Analysis – Lake Kathryn Rural Activity Center

 LAMIRD Analysis – Key Center Rural Activity Center

 LAMIRD Analysis – 118th Avenue Rural Neighborhood Center

 LAMIRD Analysis – Wright-Bliss Rural Neighborhood Center

 LAMIRD Analysis – 134th Avenue Rural Neighborhood Center

 LAMIRD Analysis – Home Rural Neighborhood Center

 LAMIRD Analysis – Longbranch Rural Neighborhood Center

FACT SHEET

Title and Description of Proposed Action

The Pierce County Council is considering adoption of the *Key Peninsula Community Plan*. This community plan adopts policies and action steps that will direct and guide future growth and land use decisions within the Key Peninsula Community Plan area of Pierce County. The adoption of this community plan will amend portions of the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan. Adoption of the Key Peninsula Community Plan by the Pierce County Council is considered a non-project action under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

The *Key Peninsula Community Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* (SEIS) is integrated into one document in accordance WAC 197-11-158 through 197-11-258. The integrated document provides environmental information that was utilized in plan development and discusses environmental impacts, benefits, and changes that would occur through the adoption of the Key Peninsula Community Plan and regulations. The alternatives included in the Draft SEIS include the No Action Alternative, the Community Planning Board (CPB) Alternative, and the Sensitive Watershed Alternative. The Draft SEIS has been prepared in order to disclose the greatest amount of information in a manner that is useful for decision-makers and the public.

This document is not intended to satisfy individual project SEPA requirements.

Proponent

Pierce County
Planning and Land Services Department

Lead Agency

Pierce County
Planning and Land Services Department
2401 South 35th Street
Tacoma, WA 98409

Responsible Official:
Chuck Kleeberg, Director
Planning and Land Services Department
(253) 798-7210

Contact Person:
 Mike Kruger, Senior Planner
 Planning and Land Services Department
 (253) 798-2700 or 798-2785
 (253) 798-3680 Facsimile

Authors and Principal Contributors

Pierce County Planning and Land Services Department

Date of Draft SEIS Issuance:

May 8, 2007

Date Comments are Due:

June 7, 2007

Expected Date of Final SEIS and Appeal:

The Final SEIS will be issued after addressing comments received on the Draft SEIS. No action will be taken on the Final SEIS until 7 days after issuance. The exact dates of the appeal period will be specified upon issuance of the Final SEIS. The appeal period will commence upon issuance of the Final SEIS and will be open for 14 days.

Tentative Adoption Date

The Pierce County Planning Commission is scheduled to review the *Key Peninsula Community Plan* document at a series of public hearings in May 2007, with review and adoption by the Pierce County Council tentatively scheduled for August and September 2007. Questions regarding the County Council schedule should be directed to the County Council's main office at (253) 798-7777.

Location of Background Material and Documents Incorporated by Reference

Background material and documents used to support development of the community plan and integrated Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Pierce County Planning and Land Services Department, Room 228, 2401 South 35th Street, Tacoma, WA 98409, (253) 798-2785.

Relation to Other Documents

The community plan was formed through an extensive series of public meetings with citizen input and participation. The work of the Key Peninsula Community Planning Board is hereby incorporated by reference and is inclusive of the background information and analysis provided to the participants throughout the decision-making process. Supporting documentation is listed in the Environmental Summary.

A series of environmental documents have been prepared by Pierce County to evaluate the impacts of the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations, inclusive of amendments. These documents, listed in Table 1 of Chapter I, provide background information on environmental impacts and mitigation measures. These documents provide substantial background information and are incorporated by reference. The reader is encouraged to utilize the documents to gain a greater understanding of basic environmental functions and impacts. Pierce County continues to use a phased environmental review approach for development of the Comprehensive Plan and other GMA related documents such as community plans and regulations. Additional environmental documentation, in the form of supplemental EISs, addenda, or other SEPA determinations may be made as the community plan is further developed or amended. This document is not intended to satisfy individual project SEPA requirements.

Cost to the Public

Copies of the *Integrated Key Peninsula Community Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* are available at no charge from the Pierce County Planning and Land Services Department. Copies are also available for review at the department and at select libraries throughout the County. The document may also be accessed on the Pierce County webpage at www.piercecountywa.org/pals.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Overview of the Community Plan and Implementing Actions

The adoption of the Key Peninsula Community Plan by the Pierce County Council is a non-project action. The community plan provides background information and adopts policies and implementing actions that will direct and guide future growth and land use decisions within the Key Peninsula Community Plan area of Pierce County.

The community plan is divided into five subject areas or elements: Land Use Element, Community Character and Design Element, Natural Environment, Economic Element, and Facilities and Services Element. The community plan proposes one new Comprehensive Plan designation, Park and Recreation, and introduces the Rural Farm and Rural Sensitive Resource zones on the Key Peninsula. These new land use designations and zones are intended to promote economic development, produce a more desirable land use pattern and work in harmony with the environmental features of the Peninsula.

All of the elements of the community plan support one another and work toward attaining the identified direction and goals. In general, the Key Peninsula Community Plan further defines the Comprehensive Plan through policy and implementing actions that provide for:

- Retention of the rural forested and pastoral character of Peninsula;
- Preservation of the natural environmental features including the marine shorelines, streams, forests and fish and wildlife habitat;
- Increased economic development on the Key Peninsula through actions and programs that encourage tourism consistent with the rural environment;
- Reducing regulatory obstacles for agricultural and park land development;
- Adequately sized rural commercial areas that provide the everyday goods and services for local residents and tourists;
- Encouragement of resource based uses, home occupations, and cottage industry uses that provide local residents the ability to work where they live;
- Preservation of the historic resources and land use patterns; and
- Adequate facilities and services, such as transportation and parks, to serve existing development as well as anticipated future growth.

Regulations implementing the community plan are anticipated to be drafted in late 2007 and adopted in early 2008.

Environmental Documentation

This *Environmental Summary and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* is intended to address the environmental impacts, benefits, and changes that could occur through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Key Peninsula Community Plan. The Environmental Summary provides a comparative discussion of environmental conditions under the existing policies and regulations versus those proposed within the community plan. The discussion is generalized so that an overall impression of environmental trade-offs between the different alternatives can be evaluated. The discussion is not intended to be of sufficient detail to preclude specific development projects from undergoing further environmental review pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

Extensive environmental, economic, and land use information was utilized in the formation of the community plan. Information was provided to the Key Peninsula Community Planning Board regarding environmental conditions, economic conditions, infrastructure and services, existing and projected densities, and land use patterns. The citizens involved with plan development based their decisions upon this background information, as well as their knowledge of the community and their vision and goals for the community. Therefore the Environmental Official has opted to utilize the environmental review and disclosure process outlined in WAC 197-11-055, 197-11-158, and 197-11-210 through 238. The Environmental Summary directs the reader to references within the community plan that support the analysis of impacts.

A series of environmental documents have been prepared by Pierce County to evaluate the impacts of actions performed to implement the Growth Management Act (GMA). These environmental documents include the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations as well as amendments including community plans. These environmental documents, listed in Table 1, provide background information on environmental impacts and mitigation measures. The reader is encouraged to utilize the documents to gain a greater understanding of basic environmental functions and impacts. These documents are incorporated by reference. Pierce County continues to use a phased environmental review approach to development of the Comprehensive Plan and other GMA related documents such as community plans and regulations. Additional environmental documentation, in the form of a supplemental EIS, addenda, or other SEPA determinations may be made as the community plan is further developed or amended.

Table 1 Pierce County Environmental Documents - Growth Management Act Updates and Actions		
DATE	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT EVALUATED
November 1992	Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on Scope of EIS	Preparation and adoption of a comprehensive plan to conform with GMA requirements
July 1993	Draft EIS	Comprehensive Plan - June 30, 1993 Draft
September 1993	Final EIS	Comprehensive Plan
April 1994	Draft Supplemental EIS	Comprehensive Plan - March 29, 1994 Draft
June 1994	Final Supplemental EIS	Comprehensive Plan
November 1994	Addendum to (6/94) FSEIS	Comprehensive Plan - November 10, 1994 Draft
April 1995	Draft Supplemental EIS	Development Regulations
June 1995	Final Supplemental EIS	Development Regulations
June 1995	Adoption of Existing Documents (1993 & 1994)	Development Regulations
September 1995	Draft Supplemental EIS	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan
November 1995	Final Supplemental EIS	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan
November 1995	Addendum to (11/95) FSEIS	Capital Facilities Amendments to Comprehensive Plan
January 1996	Addendum to (6/95) FSEIS	Amendments to Development Regulations
February 1996	Draft Supplemental EIS	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations - Zoning for Compliance with the Growth Management Hearings Board
March 1996	Final Supplemental EIS	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations - Zoning for Compliance with the Growth Management Hearings Board
July 1996	Staff Report and Draft Supplemental EIS	1996 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
September 1996	Final Supplemental EIS	1996 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
September 1996	Addendum to Final Supplemental EIS	Capital Facilities Amendments to Comprehensive Plan
December 1996	Adoption of Existing Environmental Document (September 1996 Final SEIS)	1996 Amendments to Development Regulations
March 1997	Determination of Nonsignificance	Development Regulations – Adoption of Title 18H Timber Harvest
May 1997	Draft Environmental Impact Statement Community Growth Alternatives	Community Growth Alternatives for the Ashford/Elbe (Upper Nisqually) Gateway Community Plan
June 1997	Addendum to (6/95) FSEIS	Development Regulations
June 1997	Addendum to (6/95) FSEIS	Development Regulations (Emergency Wireless Ordinance)

Table 1 Pierce County Environmental Documents - Growth Management Act Updates and Actions		
DATE	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT EVALUATED
July 1997	Staff Report and Draft Supplemental EIS	1997 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
September 1997	Final Supplemental EIS	1997 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
September 1997	Addendum to (9/97) Final Supplemental EIS	Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
September 1997	Final Environmental Impact Statement Community Growth Alternatives	Community Growth Alternatives for the Ashford/Elbe (Upper Nisqually) Gateway Community Plan
October 1997	Addendum to (6/95) FSEIS	Development Regulations (Wireless Telecommunications)
December 1997	Adoption Notice, FSEIS (9/97)	1997 Amendments to Development Regulations
March 1998	Addendum to (7/97) Staff Report and DSEIS	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan (Open Space Priorities – Critical Salmon Habitat)
July 1998	Staff Report and Draft Supplemental EIS	1998 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
July 1998	Addendum to (6/95) FSEIS	Development Regulations (substantive and technical amendments)
August 1998	Final Supplemental EIS	1998 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
September 1998	Addendum to Final SEIS	Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
December 1998	Adoption of Existing Environmental Documents, FSEIS, 8/98 (1998 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, 8/98)	1998 Amendments to the Development Regulations-Zoning
December 1998	Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement	Upper Nisqually Valley Community Plan
February 1999	Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement	Upper Nisqually Valley Community Plan
March 1999	Addendum to Final SEIS (6/94)	Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (Upper Nisqually Valley Community Plan)
March 1999	Addendum to Final SEIS (6/95)	Amendments to the Development Regulations-Zoning for the Upper Nisqually Valley Community Plan
May 1999	Staff Report & Draft SEIS	1999 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
July 1999	Final Supplemental EIS	1999 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
September 1999	Addendum to FSEIS	1999 Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
December 1999	Adoption of Existing Environment Documents, DSEIS 5/99 and FSEIS 7/99	1999 Annual Amendments to Development Regulations-Zoning

Table 1 Pierce County Environmental Documents - Growth Management Act Updates and Actions		
DATE	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT EVALUATED
April 2000	Adoption of Existing Environment Documents, DSEIS 5/99 and FSEIS 7/99	1999 Annual Amendments to Development Regulations-Zoning, to Implement Rural Area of More Intensive Development
May 2000	Determination of Non-Significance	Amendments to the Pierce County Sign Code
February 2001	Addendum to Final SEIS (6/95)	Amendments to Development Regulations-Zoning to implement Subdivision and Platting, Title 18F.
March 2001	DSEIS, Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan for the Gig Harbor Community Plan
May 2001	Final SEIS, Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan for the Gig Harbor Community Plan
May 2001	Staff Report and Draft SEIS	2001 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
May 2001	Addendum to Final SEIS	Amendments to Development Regulations-Zoning to establish levels for education services in the Rural Separator zone, Title 18A
July 2001	Final Supplemental EIS	2001 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
July 2001	Addendum to FSEIS for 2001 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	Staff Report for State Corrections Facilities and Rural Military Lands
September 2001	Integrated Parkland-Spanaway-Midland (PSM) Communities Plan and Draft Supplemental EIS	Adoption of the Communities Plan for PSM
October 2001	Addendum to FSEIS for 2001 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	2001 Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
January 2002	DSEIS for Implementation of 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendments	Amendments to Development Regulations-Zoning to implement 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendments
February 2002	FSEIS for Implementation of 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendments	Amendments to Development Regulations-Zoning to implement 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendments
February 2002	FSEIS for Parkland-Spanaway-Midland (PSM) Communities Plan	Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan
August 2002	Addendum to FSEIS for Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan	Amendments to PCC Titles 18, 18A, 18B, 18J to implement Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan
October 2002	Addendum to FSEIS for 2002 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	2002 Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
December 2002	Addendum to FSEIS	Amendments to Development Regulations to address an amendment to Title 18A –Zoning, Nonconforming Uses, and amend Title 18 General Provisions

Table 1 Pierce County Environmental Documents - Growth Management Act Updates and Actions		
DATE	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT EVALUATED
January 2003	Addendum to FSEIS	Amendments to Development Regulations to address an amendment to Chapter 18A.25 – Zoning, addressing vehicle impound/salvage yards.
January 2003	DSEIS for South Hill Community Plan	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan for South Hill Community Plan
February 2003	Addendum to the FSEIS for Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan	Amendments to Title 18A Development Regulations-Zoning; Title 18B Signs; Title 18J Design Standards and Guidelines to implement the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan
March 2003	Determination of Significance/Scoping Notice	Directions for Protecting and Restoring Habitat package
April 2003	Final SEIS, South Hill Community Plan	Amendments to Comprehensive Plan for the South Hill Community Plan
July 2003	Staff Report and Draft SEIS	2003 Annual Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
July 2003	DSEIS for the Frederickson Community Plan	Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the Frederickson Community Plan
September 2003	FSEIS for the Frederickson Community Plan	Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the Frederickson Community Plan
October 2003	Addendum to FSEIS for 2003 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
November 2003	FSEIS for 2003 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	2003 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan
February 2004	Addendum to FSEIS	Amendments to Development Regulations to address an amendment to Title 18A –Zoning, to allow regional parks in the RAC
March 2004	Addendum to FSEIS of the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendment to Chapter 18J.30-Design Standards, Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan in accordance with Pierce County Council Resolution 2003-83s
June 2004	Addendum to FSEIS of the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to Title 18A and Title 18J of the Pierce County Code to develop standards for motorcycle and motor bike tracks when accessory to a residential use, noise attenuating barriers, and boarding of horses in urban residential zones.
August 2004	Staff Report and Draft SEIS	2004 Compliance Update - Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
August 2004	Addendum to FSEIS of the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to Title 18A and Title 18J of the Pierce County Code to implement the recommendations of the Urban Village Implementation Study.
October 2004	FSEIS for 2004 Compliance Update - Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	2004 Compliance Update - Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan

Table 1 Pierce County Environmental Documents - Growth Management Act Updates and Actions		
DATE	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT EVALUATED
October 2004	Addendum to FSEIS for 2004 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
February 2005	Addendum to FSEIS of the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to Title 18A – Zoning to Address Minimum Lot Sizes
April 2005	Addendum to FSEIS of the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to Title 18B – Signs and Title 18-General Provisions to Address Menu Reader Board Signs
May 2005	Staff Report and Draft SEIS	2005 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
July 2005	Determination of Significance	Amend Titles 18B - Signs and 18J – Design Standards & Guidelines to add new chapters to address interim standards in the Alderton-McMillin Community Plan area
August 2005	FSEIS for 2005 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	2005 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
August 2005	Addendum to FSEIS of the Pierce County Development Regulations	2005 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
August 2005	DSEIS for the Mid-County Community Plan	Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the Mid-County Community Plan
October 2005	Addendum to FSEIS for 2005 Annual Amendment to Comprehensive Plan	Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
November 2005	FSEIS for the Mid-County Community Plan	Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the Mid-County Community Plan
November 2005	Addendum to FSEIS for the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to Title 18 – General Provisions, Title 18A - Zoning, and Title 18J – Design Standards and Guidelines to address minimum density requirements, recreational vehicle parks, parking standards, rural pathways, SR-7 streetscape plantings, Gig Harbor Peninsula standards, and other clarifying and technical amendments
December 2005	Addendum to FSEIS for the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to Title 18A – Zoning, Title 18B – Signs, Title 18J – Design Standards and Guidelines to implement the 2005 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
January 2006	DSEIS for the Graham Community Plan	Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the Graham Community Plan
April 2006	Addendum to FSEIS for the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to address a new section of the PSM Communities Plan to include the Garfield Streetscape Improvement Plan, and amend Title 18J.30.120 Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Design Standards and Guidelines
May 2006	Addendum to FSEIS for the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to address a five acre minimum lot size in the Rural Separator Zone
July 2006	Staff Report and Draft SEIS	2006 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan

Table 1 Pierce County Environmental Documents - Growth Management Act Updates and Actions		
DATE	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT EVALUATED
August 2006	Addendum to FSEIS for the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to address amendments to Title 18-General Provisions, Title 18A-Zoning, Title 18B-Signs, Title 18F-Land Divisions and Boundary Changes, and Title 18J-Design Standards and Guidelines
September 2006	FSEIS for the Graham Community Plan	Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the Graham Community Plan
September 2006	FSEIS for 2006 Annual Amendments to Comprehensive Plan	2006 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
October 2006	Addendum to FSEIS for 2006 Annual Amendment to Comprehensive Plan	Capital Facilities Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
October 2006	Addendum to FSEIS for the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to 18A.75 Planned Development Districts; 18A.85 Use Permit Procedures
January 2007	Addendum to FSEIS for the Pierce County Development Regulations	Amendments to Implement 2006 Amendments to the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan
April 2007	FSEIS for the Alderton-McMillin Community Plan	Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the Alderton-McMillin Community Plan

The lead agency has determined that the requirements for environmental analysis, protections, and mitigation measures have been adequately addressed in the community plan adopted under Chapter 36.70A RCW, and in other applicable local, state, or federal laws or rules, as provided by RCW 43.21C.240 and WAC 197-11-158.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, Pierce County Council directed the Pierce County Planning and Land Services Department to complete a community plan for the Key Peninsula through Resolution R2003-42s. The Key Peninsula Community Plan area contains roughly 60 square miles of land which is designated as either rural or resource land. The communities of Key Center, Home, and Longbranch are located in the plan area. Less than one percent of the land within the plan area is designated for rural commercial uses.

Overview of the Community Plan

Community plans have historically been used by Pierce County to achieve a more detailed analysis of land use than can be accomplished at a Countywide Comprehensive Plan level. The smaller geographic area associated with community plans provide a better scale to evaluate and coordinate community involvement in decisions regarding appropriate land use types and land use controls.

The community plan provides background information and adopts policies and implementing actions that guide future growth and land use decisions on the Key Peninsula. The adoption of the community plan includes revisions to the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan. The Key Peninsula Community Plan is divided into five elements as listed below. Each of these elements considers the subject topics in greater detail.

Land Use Element

The Land Use Element sets out policies, which include proposed land use designations and zoning, and implementing actions. In the development of the community plan, planning staff and the Key Peninsula Community Planning Board (CPB) considered environmental features, available infrastructure, compatibility of various land uses, Comprehensive Plan policies, local area of more intense rural development criteria (LAMIRD), Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) decisions, and capacity for growth within the rural commercial areas when deciding what types of uses and regulations should be implemented. The proposed community plan encourages uses such as agriculture, aquaculture and forestry, uses that support and encourage tourism, compatible with the rural area and uses that are necessary to provide everyday services for local residents.

Community Character and Design

The Community Character and Design Element supports the Land Use Element by recognizing historical commercial districts and encourages the retention of a rural character throughout the community. Policies call for encouraging design standards in rural commercial centers that follow concepts of traditional northwest architecture. Revised streetscape design is encouraged to promote pedestrian circulation and slow traffic. Environmental benefits would be realized through use of low impact development techniques and use of native vegetation in landscaping. New signs will be designed and placed to enhance the rural scenic atmosphere of the Peninsula.

Natural Environment Element

The Natural Environment Element focuses on the Peninsula's clean air, water, and marine shorelines, and promotes the protection of the natural features within the community plan area. The Peninsula's lakes, streams, wetlands, aquifers, marine shorelines and forested areas are seen as contributing to the quality of life for all residents. These environmental features also provide motivation for tourists to visit the area who will spend money and provide economic benefits to residents. Important environmental features that are currently degraded should be restored and enhanced. The policies contained within this element work in conjunction with the Land Use Element to ensure future development and population growth is accommodated within the carrying capacity of the land. The Natural Environment Element also identifies programs to protect the environment and support natural resource industries such as aquaculture.

Economic Element

The Economic Element promotes employment through tourism. Providing jobs for local residents is a community priority. Home occupations and cottage industries, jobs related to tourism, and natural resource employment are encouraged. Rural activity centers should be the focal point for commercial business activities. Having a strong local employment base also reduces the pressure on the Peninsula's transportation system. Policies in this element encourage the County to look for opportunities to streamline the permit processes to facilitate economic development.

Facilities and Services Element

The Facilities and Services Element addresses infrastructure, facilities, and services that are necessary to support and maintain a healthy level of economic growth to serve the projected population and associated development. This element identifies and prioritizes infrastructure projects that are necessary to support other policy recommendations described in the other elements of the plan. Infrastructure policies address issues such as domestic water supply, septic systems, electric service, transit service, roadway systems, bike and pedestrian trail development, and park and recreation facilities. Service recommendations include providing better access to County offices, solid waste disposal, and fire protection.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion 1: The Key Peninsula Community Plan is consistent with the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) provides for preservation of rural areas and traditional rural economic activities, retention and enhancement of the job base, and allowance of jobs that are in keeping with the rural character and do not require urban services. GMA requires counties to foster land use patterns that help preserve rural based economies and traditional rural lifestyles; permit the operation of rural-based agriculture, commercial, tourist, and recreation businesses; and enhance the rural sense of community and quality of life. The Key Peninsula Community Plan achieves these goals through policies, regulations, and action steps.

The rural based economy is recognized by building upon the traditional natural resource industries of agriculture, aquaculture and forestry. The Key Peninsula Community Plan identifies and zones over 2,816 acres of Agricultural Resource Lands and Rural Farm land and allows agricultural products to be sold on these properties as a means of additional income. Aquaculture uses including shellfish farming, fish hatcheries, and processing are allowed throughout the plan area. Forest resource uses are supported by encouraging forest land owners to participate in programs that reduce property taxes on tree farms, as well as allowing uses such as custom milling and forest product sales on sites that engage in forest practice operations.

Home occupations and cottage industries are allowed and encouraged. The plan recognizes and supports tourism by identifying and zoning 2,293 acres of park and recreation land and streamlines the permitting process to encourage development of those areas. Tourism is also encouraged by land use standards that help maintain the rural character of the area by requiring a forested buffer along SR-302 and the Key Peninsula Highway.

The introduction of the Rural Sensitive Resource zone in areas with complex, high value environmental features is intended to recognize the natural constraints to development on these properties. These environmental features include streams, wetlands, estuaries, landslide hazard areas and ravines. Low impact development techniques will be required for new development and when bonus densities are requested, the required open space will be placed on the portion of each site that will provide the greatest environmental protection.

The Key Peninsula Community Plan is substantially consistent with the GMA provisions in 36.70A.070(5)(d) for limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRD). The evaluation of the Rural Activity Centers and the Rural Neighborhood Centers (RNC) are included in the Concise Analysis of Alternatives section of this document. The Rural Activity Centers (RAC) at Lake Kathryn and Key Center are consistent with the LAMIRD criteria of the GMA. The Rural Neighborhood Centers (RNC) at 118th Avenue, 134th Avenue, Home, and Longbranch are consistent with the LAMIRD criteria of the GMA. The proposed RNC at Wright-Bliss is not consistent with the criteria. Planning and Land Services staff will request the Planning Commission remove the portion of the RNC at Wright-Bliss that is inconsistent with LAMIRD criteria.

Conclusion 2: The Key Peninsula Community Plan promotes economic development through tourism appropriate to the rural area.

Many residents of the Key Peninsula commute off of the Peninsula for work. For residents of the south end of the Peninsula, the daily round trip commute can take several hours. Through the planning process, options for providing local family wage jobs were explored. Because there is no city or urban growth area on the Key Peninsula, zoning for employment uses is limited. Typically, opportunities for employment in rural areas are limited to commercial service businesses in rural commercial centers, home occupations and cottage industry, natural resources industries, or other business activities that are acceptable under a rural GMA framework such as agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry.

All of these employment opportunities are available and appropriate on the Key Peninsula and are supported by the plan.

The Key Peninsula has several geographic advantages over other rural areas in Pierce County and throughout Washington State. There are approximately 70 miles of saltwater shoreline. Furthermore, the Key Peninsula contains 2,293 acres of land that is either currently dedicated to park and recreation use or is owned by the public (undeveloped Key Peninsula Metro Park land, County land, or DNR land) and may be available for park and recreation use in the future. These facts together with the close proximity of the Key Peninsula to the high population urban areas surrounding Puget Sound create an opportunity for increased tourism.

Policies in the plan that encourage economic development through tourism include:

Objective 15. Support methods to retain the natural beauty and scenic atmosphere of the Key Peninsula.

Policies under Objective 15 in the Community Character Element require a forested buffer along SR-302 and the Key Peninsula Highway. Retaining this forested buffer adjacent to the major roadways on the Peninsula will help to maintain a rural atmosphere that tourists living in a city look for.

Objective 16. Support the development of streetscape improvements within rural commercial centers that will encourage economic development.

Policies under Objective 16 in the Community Character Element are intended to improve the appearance of the commercial districts. They are intended to slow vehicle traffic and encourage tourists to stop and shop in the locally owned businesses. Pedestrian features, well-designed signs, common areas, and good lighting will encourage economic development in the rural commercial centers.

Principle 8. Develop a pilot program on the Key Peninsula to authorize the installation of off-site tourist-oriented directional signs within the County road right-of-way.

Principle 8 of Objective 21, associated policies, and action items in the Community Character Element will create an opportunity for many of the local agricultural businesses such as wineries, llama farm, lavender farms, and shellfish farms to advertise their business location from the roads tourists travel. Further, tourism signs can identify locations where tourists can recreate such as parks, campgrounds, boat ramps, trails, and beaches.

Principle 1. Provide opportunities for Master Planned Resorts in the community.

Principle 3. Ensure lodging facilities are allowed uses throughout the Key Peninsula.

Currently, there are very limited lodging facilities on the Key Peninsula. Principles 1 and 3 of Objective 39 in the Economic Element provide overnight accommodation opportunities for tourists. A master planned resort along the south Puget Sound shoreline would provide a specific destination for tourists.

Conclusion 3: The Key Peninsula Community Plan identifies and adopts actions to protect and restore the natural environment.

The Key Peninsula is blessed with extensive natural features. These features are valued and relied upon by local residents and create the scenic beauty of the Peninsula that tourists appreciate. Important issues to the community that are highlighted in the Natural Environment Element of plan include protecting the groundwater supply, health of local fish, shellfish and wildlife resources, and protection and restoration of the marine shoreline.

The Key Peninsula is totally dependant on groundwater for its fresh water source. Protecting this resource is critical to the citizens that make their homes on the Peninsula. Plan polices call for methods to reduce the potential for seawater intrusion into aquifers, conservation of groundwater resources, protection of local aquifers, and aquifer recharge.

The health of local fish, shellfish, and wildlife is important to the economy of the Key Peninsula. Most of the streams on the Peninsula are home to various salmon stocks. The Minter Creek Fish Hatchery provides resources that are protecting the White River Chinook salmon, an endangered species. Several shellfish operations are located on the Key Peninsula and its surrounding marine waters. Raising oysters, clams and muscles provides jobs directly to local residents and supplies local restaurants with quality products. Geoduck aquaculture on local tidelands is a new and highly profitable industry that has created some controversy recently. Environmental impacts of geoduck farming are not completely understood. The Pierce County Council and Washington State Legislature are exploring questions surrounding impacts associated with geoduck farming. The Key Peninsula Community Plan recognizes this and requires all aquaculture to follow best management practices.

The community plan contains a variety of policies designed to protect and restore the marine shoreline. Hard shoreline armoring (traditional bulkheads) will only be permitted when it can be demonstrated that other less invasive erosion control methods would likely be ineffective. Construction of new homes and other non-water dependent structures will need to be placed at sufficient distance from the shoreline so that bulkheads will not be necessary for the lifetime of the structure. New dock construction is discouraged except for public use. Retention of native vegetation along the shoreline is encouraged and policies require shoreline habitat restoration in various circumstances.

Finally, as discussed in Conclusion 1, the Rural Sensitive Resource zone has been

introduced in areas with complex, high value environmental features and is intended to recognize the natural constraints to development on these properties. Low impact development techniques will be required for new development and when bonus densities are requested, the required open space will be placed on the portion of each site that will provide the greatest environmental protection.

Conclusion 4: The Key Peninsula Community Plan prioritizes redevelopment and revitalization of existing commercial areas and improves the aesthetic quality of the built environment.

Community plan policies recognize the historic commercial districts as important to the economy of the Key Peninsula. Each commercial district was analyzed through the community planning process and was evaluated for consistency with the GMA and criteria for LAMIRDs. Details of this analysis are included in the Concise Analysis of Alternatives section of this chapter. Seven historic rural commercial areas are programmed for development, redevelopment, and revitalization. Several other rural commercial areas failed to meet criteria for LAMIRDs and have not been zoned for new commercial development or redevelopment. Policies in the plan encourage development that will provide the basic goods and services for rural residents and tourists within rural centers.

The Community Character Element of the plan encourages significant changes to the aesthetic character of each rural commercial center. In December 2006, Pierce County and a design consultant firm held a design charette in the community. This charette included participation from local residents and business owners. Policies in the community character element of the plan that are based on the results of the design charette include:

- Objective 16.** Support the development of streetscape improvements within rural commercial centers that will encourage economic development.
- Objective 17.** Encourage development of pocket parks and public common areas within rural commercial centers.
- Objective 18.** Implement design features that will encourage pedestrian circulation within rural commercial centers.
- Objective 19.** Promote the improvement of compact nodes of commercial development which will create a strong sense of community identity that will encourage utilization by local residents and tourists.
- Objective 20.** New buildings and the significant exterior remodels of existing buildings should provide a rural or rustic building appearance following concepts of traditional Northwest architecture.

As these objectives are implemented, a noticeable change to the character of the commercial areas will be realized. Commercial areas will become an attractive asset to the community and will be destinations for local residents and tourists. Quality design of rural commercial areas including pedestrian amenities will allow businesses to prosper as consumers choose to get out of their vehicles and walk between places of businesses. Rural commercial areas will be transformed from vehicle-oriented strip development to community gathering places.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In the development of the Key Peninsula Community Plan, the Community Planning Board members (CPB) and citizens that participated in the planning process had many discussions concerning significant controversial issues. The most difficult subjects for the CPB concerned the designation of commercial zoning for specific parcels, designation of forest resource zoning on properties that are currently utilized for forest practice activities, potential mitigation of impacts associated with geoduck aquaculture, specific streetscape and traffic calming options, and how to implement recommendations from the Pierce County Biodiversity Network Assessment.

The following information describes some of the more difficult issues that are likely to emerge during upcoming public hearings. Discussion, analysis, and identification of impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in the section of this document entitled, Concise Analysis of Alternatives.

Land Use Element

Site Specific Commercial Rezones

The Key Peninsula CPB and citizens attending the community planning meetings provided PALS staff with a list of places on the Peninsula that are considered commercial districts or were historically utilized for commercial purposes. Planning staff completed an analysis of these areas for consistency with State GMA provisions for limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRD) criteria. Seven locations throughout the Peninsula were identified as meeting LAMIRD criteria. The CPB made decisions to zone these areas either Rural Neighborhood Center or Rural Activity Center based on the land use pattern and type of business activities that were occurring in 1990 consistent with the GMA. In several cases, property owners with land outside of the commercial areas identified by the CPB felt their land should be rezoned to a commercial designation. Three of these sites were given considerable attention by the CPB. The following table describes the location of the parcels in question, and includes PALS staff recommendation and the CPB recommendation.

Table 2 Controversial rezone proposals				
Commercial Area	Parcel Number	Parcel size	PALS recommendation	CPB recommendation
134th Ave RNC	0122292007	4.6 acres	Deny - Vacant parcel, extends strip commercial	Deny - Inconsistent with LAMIRD criteria
Wright-Bliss RNC	0022264030 0022264022	5.0 acres 4.65 acres	Deny – Vacant parcel and permitted resource use in 1990. Not within logical outer boundary	Approve - Within logical outer boundary of RNC, commercial use in 1990
Home RNC	4585000610 4585000600	0.86 acres 0.79 acres	Deny – vacant parcel and permitted residential use in 1990	Deny - Inconsistent with LAMIRD criteria

Consideration of a Forest Land Zone

One of the major themes of the community plan concerns economic development. The CPB looked at every option under Growth Management legislation that could provide flexibility for business and opportunities for family wage jobs on the Peninsula. There was also a desire to retain the historical industries on the Peninsula, provide employment, and preserve the forested landscape. With these considerations, the CPB recommended designating approximately 5,100 acres of the Peninsula as Forest Resource Lands.

The Forest Resource Lands designation would have resulted in the rezoning of all properties on the Key Peninsula that met the following criteria: property exceeding 20-acres in size and currently enrolled in a forest land taxation program or property exceeding 20-acres in size and currently utilized as a tree farm. These properties would have been zoned Forest Lands which includes an 80-acre minimum lot size.

Once the maps were completed that identified the Forest Resource Lands rezone, several concerns were identified. First, the forest land properties were not contained in large blocks of land. The map reflected a patchwork of sites throughout the Peninsula. The pattern of spot zoning forest resource lands is inconsistent with a goal of clustering forestry uses in contiguous blocks of land to minimize impacts to adjacent non-forestry uses. Second, many of the parcels identified were less than 160-acres in size and would not be eligible for future subdivision. Affected property owners testified that if the rezone recommendation moved forward, they would be forced to subdivide their property under current Rural 10 zoning in an effort to retain flexibility in their investments. Finally, there were no soils, topography, or other physical land characteristics that were common between the various forestry sites. In the end, the CPB determined that the remaining forestry uses on the Key Peninsula were simply based on property owner decisions to grow trees and the land did not qualify as a resource land. The CPB

determined the best method to retain forestry uses on the Peninsula was to continue to support and promote the property tax relief programs offered by Pierce County.

Geoduck Aquaculture

In 2005, development applications for several new geoduck farms were submitted to Pierce County for review. These farms were proposed to be located on the shoreline of the Key Peninsula as many of the tidelands provide prime geoduck habitat. Concerns were raised by upland property owners who live near the proposed geoduck farms. Residents voiced concerns about potential environmental impacts of geoduck aquaculture relating to visual, noise, water quality, and effects on other species.

This question of geoduck aquaculture dominated the Key Peninsula CPB meetings for several months. Representatives from the shellfish industry, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington State Department of Ecology and several local interest groups that are opposed to geoduck aquaculture testified to the CPB. The board eventually drafted language for the community plan that represented a compromise between all interested parties. These policies call for a variety of mitigation including:

- *Aquaculture activities should be mitigated to reduce visual and noise impacts to nearby residences.*
- *Best Management Practices shall be implemented for all aquaculture activities.*
- *To promote compatibility between aquaculture and residential development, discourage aquaculture where the aquaculture activity would create negative visual impacts to adjacent residential uses. Visual impacts of aquaculture activities shall be assessed by completing Washington State Department of Ecology's Aquaculture Siting Study, and submitted the completed analysis to Pierce County. Encourage aquaculture on tidelands below sites that are identified as landslide hazard areas in Pierce County Code, Title 18E, Critical Area Regulations.*
- *Amend Pierce County Code, Title 18E to require fish and wildlife assessments for aquaculture activities in locations designated as "Marine Shoreline Critical Salmon Habitat" areas.*
- *Prohibit aquaculture activities in eelgrass beds. A minimum buffer of 10 feet shall be required between the aquaculture activity and eelgrass beds. Eelgrass that invades a farm after the farm has been established shall not be prohibited from harvesting and the 10-foot buffer shall not be required.*
- *Tubes used for geoduck seeding shall be a grey or similar color that blends into the natural environment. Tubes shall be permanently labeled with a mark identifying the geoduck farmer.*
- *Individual tube netting to protect young geoduck shall only be permitted under large nets. Each large net utilized to cover the farms shall be a grey or similar color that blends into the natural environment and shall be permanently labeled with a mark identifying the geoduck farmer.*
- *Tubes and netting used to protect young geoduck should be removed from the beach as soon as practical when young geoducks are no longer vulnerable to predators.*

In September 2006, the Pierce County Council passed Resolution R2006-96 which

requested the Department of Planning and Land Services to prepare interim shoreline regulations concerning geoduck aquaculture. This resolution was prepared in anticipation of an update to the Pierce County Shoreline Master Program that is scheduled for completion in 2009. The Pierce County Planning Commission held public hearings on these interim regulations in early 2007. Many of the policy recommendations suggested by the Key Peninsula CPB were incorporated into the Planning Commission recommendation for regulating geoduck aquaculture. The Key Peninsula CPB determined that in light of the interim shoreline regulations, it was inappropriate for the community plan to contain specific policies mitigating geoduck aquaculture. The CPB has removed the specific mitigation concerning geoduck aquaculture from the community plan but is still recommending several policies that concern aquaculture in general. This mitigation is discussed in the Concise Analysis of Alternatives of this document.

Community Character Element

Streetscape and Traffic Calming Options

A variety of recommendations were described as a result of the community design charette intending to promote economic development through tourism. Reconstruction of the streets through the rural commercial areas was a major theme taken from the charette. Projects intended to slow traffic and encourage pedestrian circulation were considered a priority. Many of these concepts were accepted by the Key Peninsula CPB and have been incorporated into community plan policy.

16.1.1 Authorize a variety of techniques including landscape medians, roundabouts, bulb-outs, and other methods of slowing the traffic flow in rural commercial centers. Emphasis should be given to Key Center and Home rural commercial areas.

16.1.2 Consider the installation of on-street parking including parallel or angle parking based on the unique circumstances of each commercial center.

Policy 16.1.2 is the result of significant discussion and debate. Concern was raised by the Pierce County Public Works Department concerning the safety of this proposal. CPB members struggled with the question and the implications of vehicles backing directly into the road. In the end, the CPB decided to recommend the policy for several reasons. First, on-street parking is a proven method that slows traffic through many commercial districts. Second, each commercial area on the Key Peninsula would be analyzed independently for safety considerations. Finally, the decision of what occurs within the County or STATE right-of-way falls to traffic engineers and the intent of the community plan policy is to simply raise the question to those decision makers for their consideration.

Natural Environment Element

Lake Bay Biodiversity Management Area

Several adopted County plans were utilized to help understand the historical and existing environmental conditions of the Key Peninsula. One of these resources is the Pierce County

Biodiversity Network Assessment from August 2004. This document contains an assessment of an area referred to as the Lake Bay BMA. This 147-acre area included in the BMA surrounds Bay Lake. The conclusion and implementing action section of the Lake Bay BMA includes the following text:

Bay Lake represents small-vegetated lakes/ponds once frequently found throughout Pierce County. Human development in the western portion of the county around many of these habitat communities has largely altered wildlife presence. Historical presence of Western Pond Turtles (a listed species) signifies this lakes' past importance to wildlife. The presence of native vegetation combined with upland forestlands and little human disturbance likely contributes to the richness of birds and mammals within this BMA. Such richness would probably decline in face of land alteration or over-use and pollution of the lake environment. The presence of intact forestlands and freshwater contributes to mammal and raptor presence within this BMA and the surrounding area. (See Figure 11)

*Pierce County and the Key Peninsula Community Planning Board should be encouraged to manage Bay Lake as a naturally functioning system in terms of recreation and development. The remaining, undeveloped sections of Bay Lake shoreline should be retained as native vegetation. Intact upland habitat, primarily located on the eastern shore of Bay Lake, should also be retained as undisturbed natural vegetation or low scale managed timberland. **The use of motorized watercraft on this lake should be prohibited or limited, especially during spring and summer breeding seasons for most of the predicted species.** Storm water run off and other sources of non-point pollution should be prevented from filtering into Bay Lake*

Based on the information contained in the Biodiversity Assessment, the planning board determined that it was important to protect environmental diversity at Bay Lake. The following policy was recommended by the community planning board.

Support the implementation of the management recommendations from the Lake Bay Biodiversity Management Area as described in the Pierce County Biodiversity Network Assessment (August 2004).

This policy generated significant concerns by the residents surrounding Bay Lake as well as local residents who go boating on the lake. There was considerable debate by the CPB who eventually eliminated the policy. The policy was replaced with other policies intended to protect the biodiversity of the lake. These policies include designating all property adjacent to Bay Lake as Rural Sensitive Resource. Low impact development techniques are required for all new construction. Any subdivision of land which utilizes bonus density provisions would need to place the required open space adjacent to the shoreline.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Issues are likely to arise and be discussed through further public review before the Pierce County Planning Commission and the Pierce County Council. The preceding section outlined those subject areas that are likely to be an ongoing part of the public debate and may result in an alternative outcome. This document strives to fully present the environmental impacts and trade-offs of the choices before the community, Planning Commission, and the Pierce County Council.

CONCISE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

General Overview of Alternatives

To provide for objective environmental review three alternative courses of action are identified in this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).

Alternative 1 is the No-Action Alternative which represents the current Pierce County Comprehensive Plan policies and implementing development regulations. Alternative 1 is included for conformity with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

The two “action” alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3) propose changes to the current County Comprehensive Plan policies including new land use designations and zones. Alternative 2 is the Key Peninsula Community Planning Board (CPB) recommended action and introduces three new designations/zones to the Key Peninsula, Rural Sensitive Resource (RSR), Rural Farm (RF) and Park and Recreation; expands the size of the RAC at Key Center and the RNCs at 118th Avenue, 134th Avenue, Wright-Bliss, Home, and Longbranch; provides a base residential density of one dwelling unit on ten acres throughout the community plan area and introduces a variety of policies and actions to promote economic development through tourism and resource uses.

Alternative 3 is the Sensitive Watershed Alternative and encompasses the majority of the decisions of the CPB but recommends Rural 20 zoning with no bonus density provisions within the Burley Lagoon, Minter Bay, Rocky Bay and Filucy Bay watersheds and does not include increasing the size of the RNCs at 118th Avenue, Longbranch, or the area within the Minter Bay watershed at the RNC at 134th Avenue.

In general, the similarities between the alternatives include:

- Rural 10, ARL densities remain the same in all alternatives.
- Home occupations and cottage industries are allowed under all alternatives.
- Key Peninsula Community Plan boundaries are the same in all the alternatives.
- Critical area buffer requirements remain the same under all alternatives.

The following tables compare the alternatives. Table 3 displays the acreage of the land use designations and zoning classifications within the planning area as identified in each alternative. Tables 4 through 10 include the LAMIRD analysis for each rural commercial center. A series of maps are included at the end of this chapter and visually represent the three alternatives.

Table 3			
Comparison of Land Use Designations / Zones by Acres			
Designation/Zone	Alternative 1 “No Action”	Alternative 2 “CPB Recommendation”	Alternative 3 “Sensitive Watershed”
<i>Rural Commercial Designations</i>			
Rural Activity Center (RNC)	153	159	159
Rural Neighborhood Center (RAC)	101	151	146
<i>Rural Residential Designations</i>			
Rural Ten (R10)	35,420	24,787	17,796
Rural Twenty (R20)			12,045
Rural Sensitive Resource (RSR)		8,398	4,677
Rural Farm (RF)		2,304	1,519
Park and Recreation (PR)		2,292	1,749
<i>Natural Resource Lands</i>			
Agricultural Resource Lands	2,930	512	512
Total	38,605	38,605	38,605

Detailed Analysis of Alternatives

The Key Peninsula CPB did a complete analysis of the historical and existing commercial areas throughout the Peninsula when drafting the Land Use Element of the community plan. The Key Peninsula CPB followed the criteria outlined in the GMA and further detailed through decisions of Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board concerning “Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development” (LAMIRD). The applicable GMA criteria, Pierce County Comprehensive Plan policy, and the LAMIRD analysis including the data utilized by the Key Peninsula CPB for each rural commercial area is described in the following section.

Growth Management Act Requirements for Rural Development

The GMA was enacted to prevent the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development and development that conflicts with agricultural and forestry activities. Contained within the GMA are specific criteria for what constitutes rural development. Acceptable rural uses include rural residential development, forestry and agriculture. Rural areas may also provide for a variety of rural densities, uses, essential public facilities, and rural governmental services needed to serve the permitted densities and uses.

In 1997, RCW section 36.70A.070 (5) of the GMA was amended to include new criteria for limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRD). The LAMIRD criteria allows for inclusion of necessary public facilities and public services to serve a limited area. Limited areas are defined as “infill, development or redevelopment of existing commercial, industrial, residential, or mixed-use areas, whether characterized as shoreline development, villages, hamlets, rural activity centers, or crossroads developments”. Development or redevelopment (in terms of building size, scale, use or intensity) within these areas shall be consistent with the character of the existing areas. Development and redevelopment may include changes in use from vacant land or a previously existing use so long as the new use conforms to an existing area or existing use that was in existence on or before July 1, 1990.

More intensive rural development may also include “small-scale recreational or tourist uses, including commercial facilities to serve those recreational or tourist uses, which rely on a rural location and setting, but do not include new residential development. A small-scale recreation or tourist use is not required to be principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population. Public services and public facilities shall be limited to those necessary to serve the recreation or tourist use and shall be provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl”.

The LAMIRD criteria also allows for the “intensification of development on lots containing isolated non-residential uses or new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses that are not principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population and non-residential uses, but do provide job opportunities for rural residents. Rural counties may allow the expansion of small-scale businesses as long as those small-scale businesses conform to the rural character. Public services and public facilities shall be limited to those necessary to serve the isolated non-residential use and shall be provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl”.

Each county is tasked with the responsibility to “adopt measures to minimize and contain the existing areas or uses of more intensive rural development, as appropriate. Lands included in such existing areas or uses shall not extend beyond the logical outer boundary of the existing area or use, thereby allowing a new pattern of low-density sprawl. Existing areas are those that are clearly identifiable and contained and where there is a logical boundary delineated predominately by the built environment, but that may also include undeveloped lands if limited.” “In establishing the logical outer boundary the following shall be addressed: the need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities; physical boundaries such as bodies of water, streets and highways, and land forms and contours; the prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries; and the ability to provide public facilities and public services in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl.”

Pierce County Comprehensive Plan

In 2004, Pierce County initiated a review to complete the 10-year update of the Comprehensive Plan as required by the GMA. The update process included reviewing any new provisions that were incorporated into the GMA since the County adopted its Comprehensive Plan in 1995. One of the issues considered was the new LAMIRD criteria and the need to conduct an evaluation of all the rural centers in the County. The County Council made the policy choice to conduct this evaluation at the community plan scale. A new policy was incorporated into the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan, section 19A.110.030, that states upon the initiation or update of a community plan in the rural area of the County, all rural centers shall be evaluated and updated as necessary to be consistent with Growth Management Act provisions in RCW 36.70A.070(5) for Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD). This policy became effective on February 1, 2005, and applies to the Key Peninsula Community Plan process.

LAMIRD Evaluation of the Rural Centers

Review of the Rural Activity Center's and Rural Neighborhood Center's logical outer boundaries consisted of:

- A determination of civic, commercial or industrial businesses in existence on the Key Peninsula on or before July 1, 1990.
- The physical location of those businesses.
- The physical location of roads, shorelines, and other environmental features near the commercial businesses.
- A determination of location of civic, commercial or industrial uses that were developed between July 1, 1990 and the present.
- An analysis of the boundary of rural commercial areas established under the Pierce County Comprehensive in 1994.
- An analysis of vacant or redevelopable properties within the logical outer boundaries of commercial areas established by the preceding criteria.

The following tables illustrate the LAMIRD evaluation for the Rural Activity Centers and Rural Neighborhood Centers.

Lake Kathryn Rural Activity Center (RAC)

The location of uses in existence before July 1, 1990 and the boundary of the Rural Activity Center zoning established under the GMA in 1994 form the logical outer boundary of the Lake Kathryn RAC. Lake Kathryn is one of the two rural activity centers on the Key Peninsula. It is located several miles west of the City of Gig Harbor's urban growth area. The center contains some of the larger retailers in the area and the only shopping center. The only franchise fast food restaurant in the community is located in the center as well. Other uses include a wrecking yard, post office, gas station, mini-storage, and tavern. Table 4 describes LAMIRD information for the Lake Kathryn RAC.

Table 4				
LAMIRD Analysis				
Lake Kathryn Rural Activity Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
0122153046	1974	Food Store	Harvest Time Store	1.75
0122153045	1989	Industrial/Light Mfg.	Chainsaw/Small Eng. Repair	.52
0122153052	1978	Fire Station	Pizza Restaurant	.26
0122153051	1940	Towing Yard	Towing/Wrecking Yard	.65
0122153018	1940	Motor Vehicle Repair/Tavern	Motor Vehicle Repair/Tavern	.92
0122266044	1998	Vacant	Gas/Mini Mart	1.48
0122226060	2003	Vacant	Mini Warehousing	2.2
0122222011	-	Vacant	Vacant	9.87
0122221016	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.40
0122221008	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.40
3000280120	-	Vacant	Vacant	1.95

Table 4				
LAMIRD Analysis				
Lake Kathryn Rural Activity Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
3000280110	-	Vacant	Vacant	11.07
3000280040	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.78
3000280090	-	Vacant	Vacant	.45
3000280100	-	Vacant	Vacant	.49
3000280080	2004	Vacant	Fast Food Restaurant	1.28
3000280070	1992	Vacant	US Post Office	1.13
3000280060	-	Vacant	Vacant	1.49
3000280050	-	Vacant	Vacant	.94
3000280130	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.91
3000280010	1986	Gen. Merchandise	Gen. Merchandise	5.21
3000280030	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.22
3000280020	-	Vacant	Vacant	4.71
Total Acreage				58.08

Key Center Rural Activity Center(RAC)

The location of uses in existence before July 1, 1990 and the boundary of the Rural Activity Center zoning established under the GMA in 1994 form the logical outer boundary on the north, east and south sides the Key Center RAC. The logical outer boundary on the west side of Key Center is formed by agricultural resources uses. Key Center is the largest commercial center on the Key Peninsula at 97 acres and is the location of many of the retail and service uses local residents require. Commercial uses include a grocery store, hardware store, doctor's office, several taverns, and restaurants. Civic uses include a post office, public library and the headquarters for the local Fire District. Key Center is the only RAC in the community that contains multi-family housing. The commercial area is centralized along Key Peninsula Highway with Olson/Cramer Road being the main intersection. Table 5 describes LAMIRD information for the Key Center RAC.

Table 5				
LAMIRD Analysis				
Key Center Rural Activity Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
0021015008	1975	Retail	Fitness Center	.56
0021015006	1975	Gen. Merchandise	Hair Salon	.57
0021015099	1981	Gen. Merchandise	Furniture	.42
0021015090	1986	Building Supply/Garden	Nursery	.48
0021011015	1962	Eating/Drink Est.	Tavern	1.0

Table 5				
LAMIRD Analysis				
Key Center Rural Activity Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
0021011024	1946	Eating/Drink Est.	Tavern	.20
0021015078	<1980	Auto Parts/Repair	Retail Sales	.25
0021015077	<1980	Commercial	Liquor Store	.11
0021011026	1990	Commercial	Vacant	4.02
0021015017	Pre-1982	Shop and Office	Light Industrial	.99
0021011080	1960	Service Garage	Contractor/Storage	5.0
0021015083	1980	Light Industrial	Vacant	.54
0021011051	1990	Professional Office	Professional Office	.28
0021011066	1975	Building Materials	Building Materials	1.2
0021015004	1975	Market	Food Store	.87
0021011034	1977	Office	Gen Mer - Retail	.67
0021011047	1975	Fire Station	Fire Station - manned	.66
0021015011	1985	Library	Library	1.02
0021013014	1992	Camera Design	Storage/warehouse	8.02
0021014022	-	Vacant	Vacant Residential	1.12
0021014021	1990	SFR	SFR	3.89
0021011082	1936 / 00	SFR	SFR	6.70
0021011081	-	Vacant	Vacant Residential	1.12
0021015079	1993	Vacant	Medical Offices	1.80
0021015080	-	Vacant	Vacant Residential	1.60
0021015001	-	Vacant	Vacant Residential	1.60
0021011074	-	Vacant	Vacant Residential	.30
0021015095	-	Vacant	Multi-Family	1.19
0021015094	-	Vacant	Multi-Family	1.11
0021011073	-	Vacant	Vacant	.17
0021015003	1980	Retail Store	Deli	.54
0021015002	-	Vacant	Vacant	.80
0021015096	-	Vacant	Restaurant and Lounge	.61
0021015097		Water Utility	Water Utility	.89
0021015001	1954	Trading Post	Vacant Building	.51
0021015018	-	Vacant	Vacant	1.33
0021011044	-	Vacant	Vacant	1.05
0021011091	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.82
0021011008	1914	SFR	SFR	1.13
0021011060	-	Vacant	Vacant	3.20
0022364007	2002	Vacant	Auto Service	2.47
0021011045	-	Vacant	Vacant	10.91
0021015092	1975	SFR	SFR	5.88
0021011016	1965	Storage/Warehouse	Storage/Warehouse	.11
0021015091	2001	Vacant	Post Office	1.13
0021015014	-	Vacant	Vacant	1.93

Table 5				
LAMIRD Analysis				
Key Center Rural Activity Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
0021011018	-	Vacant	Vacant	.32
0021011056	-	Vacant	Vacant	3.55
0021015089	-	SFR	SFR	.95
0021015098	1992	Vacant	Sound Credit Union	.60
0021015007	-	Vacant	Vacant	.61
0021012024	1975	SFR	SFR	2.60
TOTAL ACREAGE				91.4

Wright-Bliss Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC)

The location of uses in existence before July 1, 1990 and the boundary of the Rural Neighborhood Center zoning established under the GMA in 1994 form the logical outer boundary on the north and east sides of the RNC. A road constructed to commercial standards within a commercial short plat form the western boundary of the RNC. The southern boundary of the RNC is established at a five-acre parcel containing a permitted resource use (log truck maintenance building) established in 1990. This use has recently converted to a pizza restaurant. The staff analysis concluded that the southern logical outer boundary exists at the southern boundary of the commercial short plat and does not extend to the existing pizza restaurant. Development is centered near the road intersection and includes a fire station, log home contractor, gas station, coffee shop, and pet/farm supplier. Table 6 contains the LAMIRD information for the Wright-Bliss RNC.

Table 6				
LAMIRD Analysis				
Wright-Bliss Rural Neighborhood Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
0022261047	1991	Vacant	Gas Station/Mini Mart	5.42
0022261048	1975	SFR	Feed Station	4.87
0022261032	1995	SFR	Fire Station	1.34
0022261010	-	Vacant	Utilities/Refuse	1.36
0022265015	-	Vacant	Log Home Assembly	2.54
0022265017	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.56
0022265016	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.53
0022264022	-	Vacant	Vacant	4.65
0022264030	1990	Log Truck Maintenance	Pizza Restaurant - Storage	5.00
TOTAL ACREAGE				30.27

118th Avenue Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC)

The location of uses in existence before July 1, 1990 and the boundary of the Rural Neighborhood Center zoning established under the GMA in 1994 form the logical outer boundary of the 118th Avenue RNC. The majority of commercial zoned land at the 118th Avenue RNC consists of the Charboneau Excavating, Inc. properties. This 12-acre site amounts to nearly one half of the commercially-zoned land in the center and is largely unimproved and has significant development potential. Other existing uses include a coffee shop, a veterinary hospital and several real estate offices. The center is a total of 30 acres. State Route 302 bisects the 118th Avenue RNC. Minter Creek, a salmon stream, runs through the commercial center on the north side of the highway. Table 7 contains the LAMIRD information for the Wright-Bliss RNC.

Table 7				
LAMIRD Analysis				
118th Avenue Rural Neighborhood Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
0122212041	2000	Vacant	Veterinarian Service	2.95
0122212038	1977	Restaurant	Realty Office	2.11
0122212039	1979	Restaurant	Fire Inspection -Restaurant	1.75
0122212040	-	Vacant	SFR	1.29
0122214049	1930	Purdy Pictures/Pizza	Espresso/Salon	3.24
0122217037	-	Vacant	Vacant	.78
0122217040	-	Vacant	Vacant	1.02
0122217038	-	Vacant	Vacant	1.37
0122217039	-	Vacant	Vacant	.81
0122212023	1983	Bldg. Mat/Garden Supply	Build Material/Garden	2.34
0122213070	1983	Bldg. Mat/Garden Supply	Build Material/Garden	5.0
0122213061	1983	Bldg. Mat/Garden Supply	Build Material/Garden	5.0
0122216033		Vacant	Vacant	1.0
0122216034		SFR	SFR	1.40
TOTAL ACREAGE				30.06

134th Avenue Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC)

The location of uses in existence before July 1, 1990 and the boundary of the Rural Neighborhood Center zoning established under the GMA in 1994 form the logical outer boundary of the 134th Avenue RNC. The 55-acre RNC at 134th Avenue sprawls along the Key Peninsula Highway from just south of the traffic signal at SR-302 south toward 139th Avenue. Vacant properties along the west side of the Key Peninsula Highway have been included in the logical outer boundary of the RNC as they are located between commercial business established in 1990 on the north, south and east. Table 8 contains the LAMIRD information for the 134th Avenue RNC.

Table 8				
LAMIRD Analysis				
134th Avenue Rural Neighborhood Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
0122308032	1990	Storage/Warehouse	Auto Repair/Pump Co.	1.66
0122308031	1990	Storage/Warehouse	Auto Repair/Pump Co.	1.15
0122308030	-	Vacant	Parking/Storage	1.18
0122308029	-	Vacant	Vacant/Well House	1.25
0122304039	-	Vacant	Vacant Residential	5.05
0122304054	-	Vacant	Vacant	.91
0122305037	-	Vacant	Vacant	4.69
0122305023	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.65
0122301045	1960	SFR	SFR	5.09
0122305017	1950	SFR	SFR	1.27
0122301011	1966	SFR	SFR	3.50
0122301063	1978	Retail Store	Retail Store	1.03
0122308043	2003	Vacant	Storage Tech	3.16
0122308044	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.38
0122305030	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.23
0122305029	1982	O.J.'s Tires in 9/89	Auto Parts/Repair	1.19
0122305028	1986	Gas/Mini Mart	Gas/Mini Mart	1.69
0122305027	-	Vacant	Vacant	.95
0122305035	-	Vacant	Vacant	.59
0122305036	-	Vacant	Vacant	.57
0122305034	-	Vacant	Vacant	.66
0122305033	-	Vacant	Vacant	.79
0122292010	-	Vacant	Vacant	.86
0122292049	1982	Church	Church	3.76
0122292054	1982	Church	Church	.93
0122292050	1987	County Home Day Care	MV Sales	1.2
0122292001	1987	Retail Store	Bldg Material/Farm Equip Rental	5.0
TOTAL ACREAGE				55.39

Home Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC)

The location of uses in existence before July 1, 1990 and location of environmentally constrained lands form the logical outer boundary of the Home RNC. Located at the junction of Key Peninsula Highway and Herron Road at Van Geldern Cove, Home is one of the earliest communities established on the Key Peninsula and has retained several commercial activities. The commercially-zoned area at Home is approximately 18 acres. Commercial and civic developments in Home include a grocery store, gas station, restaurant and post office. Table 9 contains the LAMIRD information for the Home RNC.

Table 9				
LAMIRD Analysis				
Home Rural Neighborhood Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
4585000694	1975	Post Office	Post Office	.67
4585000693	1970	Laundromat	Laundromat	1.69
0021352014	1970	Residential	Non-Residential	2.35
0021352015	1940	Detached Garage	Vacant	4.11
0021352030	1940	Residential	SFR	.45
0021352032	1950	SFR	SFR	1.45
0021352033	1975	SFR	SFR	.69
0021356002	1983	Storage Warehouse	Vacant Building	2.18
4585001330	1975	Restaurant	Restaurant	.47
4585000762	1978	Church	Church	1.71
4585000750	1900	SFR	SFR	.51
4585000741	-	Vacant	Vacant	.16
4585000730	-	Vacant	Vacant	.20
4585000621	1973	Store	Gas/Mini Mart	.64
4585000631	-	Vacant	Vacant	.09
4585000591	2001	SFR	Home Country Store - Retail	.73
TOTAL ACREAGE				18.10

Longbranch Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC)

The location of uses in existence before July 1, 1990 and location of environmentally constrained lands and topography constraints form the logical outer boundary of the Longbranch RNC. The Longbranch RNC is the smallest of the Key Peninsula commercial centers at 5.87 acres but is the only commercially-zoned area on the Peninsula to have an operating marina. The Longbranch RNC has one acre of established commercial development (Longbranch Mercantile) which is under repair. Table 10 contains the LAMIRD information for the Longbranch RNC.

Table 10				
LAMIRD Analysis				
Longbranch Rural Neighborhood Center				
Parcel Number	Date Use Established	1990 Use	Current Use	Acres
Commercial Uses:				
0020242055	-	Vacant	Vacant	2.59
0020242056	-	Vacant	Vacant	.07
0020242053	1956	Mercantile	Vacant Store	.92
0020242006	1920	SFR	SFR	.55
0020242045	1950	Other Residential	Marina	.57
0020242017	-	Vacant	Vacant	1.17
TOTAL ACREAGE				5.87

Alternative 1: No-Action Alternative

The 1994 Pierce County Comprehensive Plan, as amended, established four different land use designations within the community plan area. These designations are reflected in zone classifications of the same name. The majority of the plan area is designated Rural 10. The Rural 10 designation totals approximately 92% of the plan area in the No-Action Alternative at 35,674 acres. Agricultural Resource Lands amount to 7.6% of the plan area totaling 2,930 acres. Rural commercial areas (RACs and RNCs) total less than one percent of the plan area at approximately 254 acres. An in-depth narrative of these designations, zones, and overlays is contained within the Land Use Element of the community plan.

The No-Action Alternative includes the existing Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations which provide a base for guiding future growth and development. Under the No-Action Alternative, no revisions would be made to these documents.

Environmental Impacts and Potential Mitigation Measures

The Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and companion Development Regulations has been the subject of numerous State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) reviews. These SEPA documents, listed in Table 1, provide a full discussion of environmental impacts and potential mitigation measures related to the current land use designations and zones found within the Key Peninsula Community Plan, i.e., the No-Action Alternative. The following discussion focuses on the differences between the alternatives and provides a discussion of relative impacts between the alternatives.

Environmental Impacts

The No-Action Alternative designates and zones the Key Peninsula community similar to other unincorporated areas within Pierce County as provided within the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations.

The No-Action Alternative allows for fewer uses than what is provided for in either Alternative 2 or 3 (see discussions below for more details). For example, the uses allowed

in the RNCs and RACs would be expanded in Alternatives 2 and 3 to include more uses catering to the needs of local residents and tourists. Many of these new uses are based on the intensity of existing uses analyzed in the LAMIRD analysis. As the number of commercial uses and the intensity of commercial uses are expected to increase under Alternatives 2 and 3, the No-Action Alternative would have less environmental impacts.

A comprehensive review of the ARL criteria has resulted in a decrease of 2,418 acres of agricultural resource lands. It is likely that the de-designation of the 2,418 acres of ARL to other land use designations would occur even without a community plan. Mapping errors were discovered in the initial designation of ARL and must be corrected. Many properties previously designated as ARL do not meet the standards for resource lands. This is mainly a result of a more detailed review of soil types.

Development will continue in the Rural 10 zone with clearing of native vegetation for building sites. Some larger parcels will be subdivided to a maximum density of two dwelling units on ten acres.

Finally, the Key Peninsula Community Plan area is currently not subject to detailed design standards and guidelines which have been applied within other adopted community plan areas. Lack of streetscape and pedestrian features require increased vehicle trips between businesses, increased impervious surfaces in parking lots and discourage economic development. These design standards typically provide more relief within the built environment with increased landscaping and buffering requirements.

Mitigation Measures for No-Action Alternative:

The current County Development Regulations, including the Zoning Code, Critical Area Regulations, Forest Practice and Tree Conservation standards, Design Standards and Guidelines, and Site Development and Stormwater Management Regulations provide some levels of mitigation for proposed projects that may be submitted under Alternative 1, No-Action Alternative.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

- Residential development will continue throughout the Key Peninsula on existing lots.
- Subdivision of land will continue with some developments utilizing bonus density provisions of two dwelling units on 10 acres when 50% of the property is designated as open space.
- Commercial development will continue at the Lake Kathryn and Key Center RACs.
- Commercial development will continue at the 118th Avenue, 134th Avenue, Wright-Bliss, Home, and Longbranch RNCs.

Alternative 2: CPB Recommendation Alternative

The Key Peninsula Community Plan policies, implementing actions, and maps described in this section represent the Key Peninsula Community Planning Board recommendation and include new policy direction, changes in land use and revisions to land use maps.

The main themes of the proposed Key Peninsula Community Plan are to maintain the rural character of the Peninsula; increase economic development through tourism, preserve farm and forest lands; promote development of park and recreational uses; increase development and redevelopment of the historic commercial districts; encourage quality design of new commercial development in rural commercial districts; and address transportation needs for today and the future. Differences between the No-Action Alternative and the CPB Recommendation Alternative are discussed below.

The community plan introduces a new designation, Park and Recreation (PR), which would amend the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan. The Park and Recreation designation applies to Washington State Park lands, undeveloped Washington State Department of Natural Resource lands, undeveloped County lands, Key Peninsula Metro Park lands, and private lands that are improved with park and recreational uses. The designation is intended to encourage development of all park and recreation uses throughout the Peninsula.

The amount of rural commercial center zoning will increase under this Alternative. The rural commercial centers at 118th Avenue, Wright Bliss, 134th Avenue, Key Center, Home, and Longbranch would be increased in size pursuant to LAMIRD criteria. Additionally, several new uses including multi-family housing, contractor yards and vehicle salvage yards would be authorized in the rural commercial centers. These uses are authorized based on LAM IRD criteria relating to the businesses existence in the commercial centers in 1990.

The Rural Sensitive Resource (RSR) zone is introduced in this Alternative. The RSR zone is established in areas with complex, high value environmental features and is intended to recognize the natural constraints to development on these properties. These environmental features include streams, wetlands, estuaries, landslide hazards areas, and ravines. Low impact development techniques will be required for new development and when bonus densities are requested, the required open space will be placed on the portion of each site that will provide the greatest environmental protection.

The Rural Farm (RF) zone is also included in the Key Peninsula Community Plan. Through the analysis of the community plan, the acres of designated Agricultural Resource Lands were reduced. A mapping error in the initial designation of ARL resulted in more property designated for resource lands than met the criteria. Many of the existing farms could not meet the crop yield standard for agriculture resource lands. This is based on the poor soil characteristics of the Key Peninsula. The Key Peninsula CPB found that promoting agriculture and encouraging economic development through tourism was a major goal of the plan. As a result, the Rural Farm zone will be applied on many parcels that are designated ARL under the No-Action Alternative. This alternative would establish 2,304 acres of RF zoning.

The key elements of the proposed changes in the Key Peninsula Community Plan include:

Land Use Element:

Rural Ten (R10)

- Allowing lodging facilities with as many as 20 guest rooms for tourists through a conditional use permit.
- Policies encouraging Master Planned Resorts that provide public access to the marine shoreline.

Rural Farm (RF)

- A new zone on the Peninsula intended to promote agricultural uses and provide for direct marketing of agricultural products.
- Rural farm densities are one dwelling unit on 10 acres with a bonus density provision that would allow two dwelling units on 10 acres when 50% of the property is dedicated to agricultural use.

Rural Sensitive Resource (RSR)

- A new zone on the Peninsula in locations with complex environmental features.
- Open space dedication must protect environmental features when bonus density is pursued.
- Low impact development techniques are required.

Park and Recreation (PR)

- A new comprehensive plan designation and zone on the Peninsula established in locations that have park and recreation uses, are owned by a park and recreation provider, or have the potential for conversion to park and recreation use in the future.
- Recommendations to streamline the permit process for improvements at parks.

Agricultural Resource Lands (ARL)

- Refined ARL lands based on the provisions for designating ARL land in the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan, Title 19A.30.070 B.

Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC)

- RNCs with an established logical outer boundary based on LAMIRD criteria.
- Permitted uses based on LAMIRD criteria together with types of uses to serve local residents and tourists.

Rural Activity Center (RAC)

- RACs with an established logical outer boundary based on LAMIRD criteria.
- Permitted uses based on LAMIRD criteria together with types of uses to serve local residents and tourists.

Master Planned Resorts (MPR), New Fully Contained Communities (NFCC) and Major Industrial Developments (MID)

- Policies that encourage Master Planned Resorts.

- A placeholder for future consideration of a NFCC or MID in the north portion of the community plan area if the Washington State DOT selects a new corridor for SR-302 north of Burley Lagoon.

Community Character Element:

- Policies that encourage preservation and protection of historic buildings and sites.
- Policies that encourage development of streetscape improvements within rural commercial centers.
- Policies that encourage development of pedestrian features within rural commercial centers.
- Policies that encourage new buildings and significant exterior remodels of existing buildings in commercial centers to meeting architectural design standards.
- Consistent design standards for signs.
- Allow for off-site community oriented information signs.
- A pilot program for off-site tourist-oriented directional signs within the County road right-of-way.

Natural Environment Element:

- Recommendations for reducing the potential for seawater intrusion in local aquifers including low impact development techniques.
- Recommendations to restrict new hard shoreline armoring structures.
- Recommendations to discourage new dock and pier construction except for public use facilities.
- Programs that reduce pollution of shellfish beds.
- Priorities for open space preservation.
- Policies that encourages local participation in purchase and transfer of development rights programs.
- Methods to reduce light pollution.

Economic Element:

- Recommendations to improve the County permitting process.
- Home occupations and cottage industry criteria.
- Policies that promote natural resource industries.
- Policies that promote economic development through tourism.

Facilities and Services Element:

- Park, open space, and recreation priorities and recommendations for the community.
- Groundwater conservation recommendations.
- Solid waste management policies.
- Policies that encourage coordination between Fire District #16 and the Pierce County Fire Prevention Bureau.
- Transportation policies to guide future transportation improvements.
- Transportation project recommendations.

The complete CPB Recommendation is found in Chapter II of this document. The proposed CPB Recommendation Alternative would be implemented through amendments to Title 19A, Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and the associated Development Regulations. Development regulations are not included in this action and are anticipated to be completed by late 2007. SEPA analysis for the Development Regulations will be discussed in a subsequent environmental document and is not included here.

Environmental Impacts and Potential Mitigation Measures

The CPB Recommendation was designed by reviewing maps of natural hazards, environmental constraints, and natural resources to determine the best use of the land with the given carrying capacity. The following discussion provides an analysis of the environmental impacts of the CPB Recommendation Alternative.

Environmental Impacts

Land Use Element

Pierce County Development Regulation – Zoning provides the list of uses currently allowed in the community plan area. By comparing the list of uses authorized today against the policies contained within the CPB recommendation you can determine instances where the community plan could potentially result in adverse environmental impacts that would not be realized under the no-action alternative. These new uses are detailed below.

Rural Ten (R10)

- Lodging facilities with as many as 20 guest rooms for tourists.
- Educational facilities.
- Sawmills to accommodate custom milling operations.

Rural Farm and Agricultural Resource Lands (RF and ARL)

- Agricultural uses allow direct marketing of agricultural products.

Park and Recreation (PR)

- Skate boarding park
- Ball fields
- Amphitheater
- Aquatic Center
- RV park, campground
- BMX track
- Tennis and other sport courts
- Equestrian facilities
- Administrative support facilities

Rural Neighborhood Center (RNC)

- Contractor yard
- Marina

Rural Activity Center (RAC)

- Health services
- Amusement and recreation uses for tourists
- Vehicle salvage yards
- Multi-family housing

The new uses described above can result in a variety of adverse environmental impacts that would not occur under the no-action alternative. These impacts include increased impervious surfaces and removal of native forest and vegetation. A reduction in the recharge of local aquifers can be expected as well. Increased traffic and more demand on the existing transportation system near the rural commercial areas is anticipated as new commercial development occurs. Light pollution can be expected to increase. A reduction in air quality can be expected as land is cleared and vegetation is burned. Fragmentation of wildlife habitat will occur as residential growth continues.

Certain new uses such as lodging facilities, custom milling, contractor yards and vehicle salvage yards (permitted under LAMIRD criteria) have the potential to create environmental impacts based on their location and proximity to adjacent uses. Most environmental impacts associated with water quality, critical areas, traffic, etc., will be mitigated under existing environmental regulations. Certain considerations including specific building, parking and equipment storage locations, screening from adjacent uses, and compatibility with the community plan may be better mitigated through a public hearing process. A conditional use permit would be the proper method for considering these issues related to specific proposals once development sites are identified.

The community plan supports the consideration of a New Fully Contained Community or Major Industrial Development if SR-302 is re-routed north of Burley Lagoon between SR-16 and Mason County. The practicality of this concept is questionable based on the rigorous criteria described in the GMA. See RCW 36.70A for specific criteria. Specific mitigation of environmental impacts associated with such development on the Key Peninsula would be determined through a Planned Action. Identification of potential uses would be required to be disclosed in the application. Review of environmental impacts would include but not be limited to impacts to local aquifers, transportation systems, air and water quality, resource lands, and compatibility with adjacent rural residential uses.

Facilities and Services Element

All of the land use alternatives evaluated in this document will contribute to a cumulative increase in traffic over the next 20-year period. This cumulative traffic increase and its resulting air quality, noise, and aesthetic impacts will create adverse impacts associated with new development on the Key Peninsula.

The anticipated increase in traffic demand will be partially offset by the motorized and nonmotorized improvements identified in the Key Peninsula Community Plan. The ability of the County to implement additional capacity improvements on County roads will likely be limited by funding availability and land use and environmental constraints. In the

absence of capacity improvements to roadway facilities and the state highway system, the congestion expected on these arterials should be considered an unavoidable adverse impact.

Other Plan Elements

Significant adverse environmental impacts are not anticipated to occur from policies detailed in the Community Character and Design Element, the Natural Environment Element, or the Economic Element.

Current Mitigation Measures for CPB Alternative:

This section cites current programs, policies and regulations that assist with mitigating environmental impacts. Items that mitigate environmental impacts of the CPB

Recommendation Alternative include:

- County Development Regulations, including the Zoning Code, Critical Area Regulations, Forest Practice and Tree Conservation standards, and Site Development and Stormwater Management Regulations provide some levels of mitigation for proposed projects.
- The International Fire Code contains provisions for residential and commercial construction in rural areas.
- The International Building Code contains provisions for construction in seismic zones.
- Compliance with Washington State Departments of Ecology, Fish and Wildlife, and Natural Resources standards are applied to projects near freshwater and marine shorelines.
- Development on sites or remodeling of buildings with cultural/historical significance is subject to review and possible mitigation,
- Pierce County Traffic Impact Fee program,

Potential Mitigation Measures for CPB Recommendation Alternative:

- Remove parcel numbers 0022264030 and 0022264022 from the Wright-Bliss RNC as these sites do not meet the GMA criteria for LAMIRDs. See Table 2 – controversial rezone proposals.
- Require design standards as mandatory elements for new construction in rural commercial centers.
- Require conditional use permits for uses that have the potential to create conflicts with adjacent uses.
- Include a landscape buffering plan and limit hours of operations of commercial activities on farm properties to reduce noise and traffic impacts to surrounding neighbors.
- Low impact development techniques are mandatory in RSR and encouraged in rural commercial areas and shoreline locations.
- Lighting standards will be introduced to reduce light pollution.
- A revised sign code will mitigate visual impacts associated with unregulated off-site signage.
- The construction of transportation capacity improvements as identified in Appendix A of the Key Peninsula Community Plan.

- The provision of nonmotorized transportation facilities as identified in Appendix A of the Key Peninsula Community Plan.
- The implementation of additional demand-responsive transit services, more frequent bus service along fixed bus routes, and additional bus stops.
- Additional Park-and-Ride lots for buses and ridesharing.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

- Residential growth will continue.
- Traffic will increase throughout the community.
- Cumulative traffic along SR-302 north of Key Peninsula Highway.
- Loss of forest lands and farmlands will occur as residential development replaces those lands uses.

Alternative 3: Sensitive Watershed Alternative

The Sensitive Watershed Alternative is similar to the CPB Recommendation Alternative and would include adoption of policies, actions, and map revisions. Alternative 2 and 3 differ in respect to the zoning in four drainage basins on the Key Peninsula. Commercial shellfish operations occur in Burley Lagoon, Minter Bay, Rocky Bay and Filucy Bay. In 1985, Pierce County designated the Burley Lagoon, Rocky Bay, Minter Bay and Filucy Bay watersheds as Environmentally Sensitive Areas in the Pierce County Environmental Regulations. In 1988, the Pierce County Council adopted the Burley/Minter Water Quality Plan. This plan made recommendations for correcting water quality problems in the bays to restore commercial shellfish operations. Recommendations were implemented including one-acre minimum lot sizes for new residential development and 35-foot wide natural buffers adjacent to streams. Current GMA densities and County critical area buffers have replaced the 1988 standards with more restrictive regulations and increased the protection of the bays water quality.

The Sensitive Watershed Alternative would establish the Rural 20 zone with no provisions for bonus densities in the four watersheds. Designated Agricultural Resource Lands would be retained consistent with the CPB Recommendation. Rural commercial zoning in the four watersheds would be based on the No-Action Alternative. Alternative 3 would have the least environmental impacts of the three possible alternatives.

Environmental Impacts:

The environmental impacts between Alternative 2 and the Sensitive Watershed Alternative would be very similar. New commercial uses described under the LAMIRD analysis would be permitted within all rural commercial centers. Transportation infrastructure improvements as described in the Facilities and Services Element would be implemented as planned. Environmental impacts associated with these aspects of the community plan would be the same between Alternative 2 and Alternative 3.

The change from Rural 10 zoning with bonus density provisions to Rural 20 with no bonus densities would reduce the capacity for residential growth within the sensitive watersheds. A minimum of 40 acres would be required for new divisions of land. There are 28 parcels within the four watersheds that exceed 40 acres. These 28 parcels could

potentially get subdivided into 105 building lots. This is a reduction of 314 building lots that could be accommodated on the 28 parcels under the CPB Recommendation Alternative.

Two parcels included in the CPB proposal for inclusion into the 118th Avenue RNC would be removed as they are located within the Minter Bay watershed. One parcel identified for rezoning in the Longbranch RNC would be removed as it is located within the Filucy Bay watershed. Approximately four acres of commercially zoned land would be removed in the Sensitive Watershed Alternative.

The reduction of 314 potential building lots in the Rural 20 zone and the reduction of four acres of RNC zoned land would reduce the environmental impacts associated with new development under the Sensitive Watershed Alternative.

Current Mitigation Measures for Sensitive Watershed Alternative:

This section cites current programs, policies and regulations that assist with mitigating environmental impacts. Items that mitigate environmental impacts of the Sensitive Watershed Alternative include:

- County Development Regulations, including the Zoning Code, Critical Area Regulations, Forest Practice and Tree Conservation standards, and Site Development and Stormwater Management Regulations provide some levels of mitigation for proposed projects.
- The International Fire Code contains provisions for residential and commercial construction in rural areas.
- The International Building Code contains provisions for construction in seismic zones.
- Compliance with Washington State Department of Ecology, Fish and Wildlife and Natural Resources standards are application to projects near freshwater and marine shorelines.
- Development on sites or remodeling of buildings with cultural/historical significance is subject to review and possible mitigation.
- Pierce County Traffic Impact Fee program.

Potential Mitigation Measures for Sensitive Watershed Alternative:

- Remove parcel numbers 0022264030 and 0022264022 from the Wright-Bliss RNC.
- Removal of parcel numbers 0122216033 and 0122212040 from the 118th Avenue RNC.
- Removal of parcel number 0020242017 from the Longbranch RNC.
- Reduction of 314 new residential building sites in the Rural 20 zone.
- Require design standards as mandatory elements for new construction in rural commercial centers.
- Include a landscape buffering plan and limit hours of operations of commercial activities on farm properties to reduce noise and traffic impacts to surrounding neighbors.

- Low impact development techniques are mandatory in RSR and encouraged in rural commercial areas and shoreline locations.
- Lighting standards will be introduced to reduce light pollution.
- A revised sign code will mitigate visual impacts associated with unregulated off-site signage.
- The construction of transportation capacity improvements as identified in Appendix A of the Key Peninsula Community Plan.
- The provision of nonmotorized transportation facilities as identified in Appendix A of the Key Peninsula Community Plan.
- The implementation of additional demand-responsive transit services, more frequent bus service along fixed bus routes, and additional bus stops.
- Additional Park-and-Ride lots for buses and ridesharing.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

- Residential growth will continue.
- Traffic will increase throughout the community.
- Cumulative traffic along SR-302 north of Key Peninsula Highway.
- Loss of forest lands and farmlands will occur as residential development replaces those lands uses.

SUPPORTING RECORDS AND MATERIALS

In accordance with WAC 197-11-235(8)(a)(b) the supporting documentation for this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and the Key Peninsula Community Plan is included and listed below. Any further information and documentation is on file with Pierce County Planning and Land Services, Advance Planning Division, Room 228, 2401 South 35th Street, Tacoma. The following list of meetings and workshops document the public involvement to date. Information on the meetings contained within the list can be found in the files for the community plan in the Advance Planning Division. Following the list of meetings, a list of studies utilized in the development of the plan and EIS is provided.

Meetings and Community Workshops

Information regarding Community Planning Board meetings, open houses, surveys and the design charette, and other community input is discussed in the Introduction section of the Key Peninsula Community Plan.

Studies Produced/Used for the Community Plan

The Pierce County Critical Areas Atlas Maps were used to identify potential critical areas within the community plan area. In addition to the Critical Area Atlas mapping information, the following sources were used to compile background information, develop policies, and define standards:

“Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan, Pierce County Planning and Land Services, December 2002”

“Draft WRIA 15 Watershed Plan for the Kitsap Peninsula and Islands, Kitsap County Development Services, 2005

“Key Peninsula, Gig Harbor, Islands Watershed Action Plan,” Pierce County Public Works and Utilities Department, 2002

“Key Peninsula, Gig Harbor, and Islands Watershed - Nearshore Salmon Habitat Assessment, Pierce County Public Works and Utilities, Environmental Services, Water Programs, July 2003

“Key Peninsula – Islands Basin Plan,” Pierce County Public Works and Utilities Department, December 2006

“Pierce County Biodiversity Network Assessment,” Pierce County Planning and Land Services, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and University of Washington, August 2004

“Pierce County Comprehensive Plan - Open Space Map,” Pierce County Planning and Land Services, January 1995 as amended

“Pierce County GAP Application Pilot Project: A Biodiversity Plan for Pierce County, Washington,” Pierce County Planning and Land Services Department, January 2000

Pierce County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan,” Pierce County Department of Emergency Management, October 2004

“Pierce County Site Development and Stormwater Management Manual, Chapter 10-Low Impact Development,” Pierce County Public Works and Utilities, March 2005

“Pierce County Storm Drainage and Surface Water Management Master Plan,” Pierce County Public Works and Utilities Department, March 1991

Pierce County Critical Areas Atlas

Pierce County Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) webpage

“Puyallup River Basin Comprehensive Flood Control Management Plan,” Pierce County Public Works and Utilities Department, May 1991

“Soil Survey of Pierce County Area, Washington.” Allen S. Zulauf. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with the Washington Agricultural Experiment Station. February, 1979

“Soil Survey of Snoqualmie Pass Area, Parts of King and Pierce Counties, Washington.” Alan Goldin. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and Washington State University Agricultural Research Center.

United States Census Bureau website

United States Department of Agriculture website

APPENDIX A

Distribution List