1. **Introduction**

The Growth Management Act (GMA) provides:

“(a) Each county that designates urban growth areas under RCW 36.70A.110 shall review, according to the schedules established in subsection (5) of this section, its designated urban growth area or areas, and the densities permitted within both the incorporated and unincorporated portions of each urban growth area. In conjunction with this review by the county, each city located within an urban growth area shall review the densities permitted within its boundaries, and the extent to which the urban growth occurring within the county has located within each city and the unincorporated portions of the urban growth areas.

(b) The county comprehensive plan designating urban growth areas, and the densities permitted in the urban growth areas by the comprehensive plans of the county and each city located within the urban growth areas, shall be revised to accommodate the urban growth projected to occur in the county for the succeeding twenty-year period …”

[RCW 36.70A.130(3)]

Subsection (5) of section RCW 36.70A.130 requires Yakima County and its cities to complete these UGA reviews and revisions by June 30, 2017.

[RCW 36.70A.130(5)(c)]

The mandates mentioned above are being met by two reports:

a. **Report 1 - Yakima County Population and Employment Projections and Allocations** was issued on July 14, 2015 and establishes the number of people to accommodate in each of the County’s 14 UGAs in year 2040. **Attachment 2** is the excerpt from Report 1 showing the population projections for Mabton.

b. **Report 2 – Land Capacity Analysis** identifies the amount of land each of the County’s 14 cities has for future growth within their Urban Growth Areas. This staff report includes the **Land Capacity for Mabton’s UGA** (Attachment 3) and is part of Yakima County’s efforts to meet its obligations under the RCWs cited above. It constitutes a recommendation to the County Planning Commission as well as the County’s initial “show-your-work” exhibit as required by the GMA.


a. **Overview**

A Land Capacity Analysis (LCA) is an essential component in reviewing a UGA. A LCA is a quantitative estimate of how much vacant land (i.e., land available for future urban development) a city currently has and will require as it grows over the succeeding 20-year period. It begins with consultation between a county and each of its cities and towns to select a population growth projection from a range of population growth projections provided by
the state Office of Financial Management (OFM). The population projection, together with a county employment growth forecast, is then allocated primarily to UGAs, to assist in sizing UGAs to accommodate future urban growth.

After reviewing OFM’s most recent population projections for Yakima County, the Yakima County Planning Division issued a draft report on January 16, 2015 that allocated the projected population and employment growth among the county’s 14 cities. In sharing the report with the county’s cities and the Yakima Valley Conference of Governments, the Planning Division met with and requested comments on the draft allocations. After considering all comments received, the Planning Division issued a revised report dated July 14, 2015. This LCA report is based on the specific population projections for the City of Mabton as shown in Attachment 2.

Three terms will be used throughout this analysis. They will be used to describe potential growth as follows:

i. **Land in city.** This is used to describe lands within the city limits.

ii. **Land outside city.** This is used to describe the land between the UGA boundary and city limits.

iii. **Land in UGA.** This is used to describe the area inside the city limits AND the land outside the city. It could also be described as \( i + ii = iii \).

The LCA quantifies the amount of vacant land needed for Mabton’s growth according to the analytical process (see Attachment 1) outlined in the “Urban Lands” section in the Land Use Element of Yakima County’s Comprehensive Plan *Horizon 2040*. This acreage is then compared to the amount of vacant land currently within the UGA to determine if there is a surplus or a deficit of vacant land for future growth to year 2040. The general calculation is outlined below:

\[
\text{Acres Needed for Future Growth in the UGA}^1 = \frac{\text{Acres Currently Vacant in the UGA}^2}{\text{Surplus (or Deficit) of Vacant Land in the UGA}}
\]

b. **Quantity of land calculation for non-industrial uses**

Yakima County’s Division of Geographic Information Services (GIS) determined the current acreage of developed residential, commercial & retail, and community facilities. GIS also determined the acreage of current vacant land and partially vacant land in each zoning

---

1 Acres needed for Future Growth = Vacant acres needed for: Residential uses + Commercial uses + Community Facilities + Streets.

2 Acres currently vacant = Vacant acres zoned or owned for: Residential uses + Commercial uses + Community Facilities (this excludes Environmentally Constrained lands and Tribal lands).

3 Parcels classified as “partially vacant” are those greater than one acre and have more than $10,000 in assessed improvements. For such parcels GIS counts one acre as developed and counts the remainder acreage as vacant (i.e., available for development). Note: Not all parcel meeting these criteria are classified as partially vacant. Aerial photo interpretation, local knowledge, and city input are used to limit this classification mostly to residential parcels.
district to arrive at the figures used in the LCA spreadsheet (Attachment 3). These GIS data are reported and depicted geographically in Attachment 4.

The Land Capacity Analysis calculations are described below. The spreadsheet in Attachment 3 (“UGA Land Capacity Analysis”) performs the calculations and provides additional information.

1) Population and Households Analysis: Based on Mabton’s projected 2015-2040 population growth, this analysis estimates 75 additional households will be added to the city’s population by the year 2040.

- 2040 population forecast for city (County Planning) 2,649 people
- 2015 population in city (OFM’s April 1 estimate) 2,325 people
- Population increase in city 2015-2040 324 people
- Average household size in city (2010 Census) 4.31 people
- Additional households in city 2015-2040 (324 ÷ 4.31) 75 households

2) Future Residential Land Need: The acreage needed for future residential growth through 2040 was calculated by assuming an average future density of 8,500 sq. ft. of land for each household (i.e., 5.1 dwelling units per acre) and multiplying this amount by the number of projected new future households:

\[
8,500 \text{ sq. ft.} \times 75 \text{ households} = 637,500 \text{ sq. ft.} / 43,560 \text{ sq. ft.} (1 \text{ acre}) = 15 \text{ acres}
\]

3) Future Commercial & Retail Land Need: The acreage needed for future commercial and retail growth through 2040 was calculated by multiplying the projected population increase by the current per capita acreage of developed commercially-zoned lands within the city after subtracting the acreage classified for community facilities (as determined by GIS analysis):

\[
324 \text{ people} \times 0.0063 \text{ acres per capita} = 2 \text{ Acre}
\]

4) Future Community Facilities Land Need: The acreage needed for future community facilities growth through 2040 was calculated by multiplying the projected population increase by the current per capita acreage of developed community facilities land within the city (as determined by GIS analysis):

\[
324 \text{ people} \times 0.0222 \text{ acres per capita} = 7 \text{ Acres}
\]

5) Future Streets Land Need: The acreage needed for future rights-of-way to accommodate streets and utilities through 2040 was calculated by multiplying the acreage needed for future residential, commercial & retail, and community facilities by 15%:

- Residential acreage needed 15 Acres
- Commercial/retail acreage needed 2 Acre
- Community facilities acreage needed 7 Acres
- Subtotal 24 Acres
- Total streets acreage needed (Subtotal x 0.15) 4 Acres
6) Land Capacity Analysis for Non-Industrial Uses

Next, the needs for land identified above are compared with the amount of existing vacant land to determine if there is currently a surplus or a deficit of vacant land within the City and the UGA to accommodate projected growth through 2040. The calculations are shown in Attachment 3 under Section 6 – “Land Capacity Analysis” and summarized below:

Total amount of vacant land needed in UGA for future growth (excluding Industrial growth): Adding the needed acres from the categories above results in the total acreage calculated below:

| Acres needed for future residential uses | 17 Acres |
| + Acres needed for future commercial & retail uses | 2 Acres |
| + Acres needed for future community facilities | 8 Acres |

= Total vacant acres needed for future non-industrial uses | 27 Acres |

Using the figures in Attachment 3, Table 1 summarizes whether each zoning group has a surplus or a deficit of vacant land to accommodate growth through 2040.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Group</th>
<th>Within City Limits</th>
<th>Outside City Limits &amp; Within Current UGA</th>
<th>Total: Within City Limits and Within Current UGA</th>
<th>Outside City Limits and Within Proposed UGA</th>
<th>Total: Within City Limits and Within Proposed UGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residentially-zoned</td>
<td>Surplus: 40 acres</td>
<td>Vacant: 120 acres</td>
<td>Surplus: 160 acres</td>
<td>Vacant: 120 acres</td>
<td>Surplus: 160 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially-zoned</td>
<td>Surplus: 10 acres</td>
<td>Vacant: 0 acres</td>
<td>Surplus: 10 acres</td>
<td>Vacant: 9 acres</td>
<td>Surplus: 19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Surplus: 54 acres</td>
<td>Vacant: 26 acres</td>
<td>Surplus: 80 acres</td>
<td>Vacant: 26 acres</td>
<td>Surplus: 80 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of above Zoning Groups</td>
<td>Surplus: 104 acres</td>
<td>Vacant: 146 acres</td>
<td>Surplus: 250 acres</td>
<td>Vacant: 155 acres</td>
<td>Surplus: 259 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the figures in Attachment 3, Table 2 Summarizes whether the city and the UGA have a surplus or a deficit of vacant land to accommodate the growth through 2040.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yakima County LCA</th>
<th>Mabton Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Growth within City: 131 (Acres of currently vacant land in City) - 27 (Acres needed for growth) = 104 (Surplus vacant acres in City)</td>
<td>No changes within City Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Growth within the UGA: 146 (Acres of currently vacant land outside the City)</td>
<td>Proposed Capacity for Growth within the UGA: 155 (Acres of currently vacant land within the City)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Including associated streets
A map showing the current configuration and total land area within the UGA is included as Attachment 4. Proposed changes to the boundary and land area within the UGA are shown in Attachment 5.

**Computed Market Choice Factor (MCF) and “Years of Growth” (excluding Industrial growth)**

One way of quantifying the surplus (or deficit) of vacant land in a city and within its UGA is to express the surplus (or deficit) as a percentage of the amount of vacant land that is needed for growth over the 25-year period from 2015 to 2040. For example, if a city has 120 vacant acres and needs 100 vacant acres for future growth, it has 20% more vacant land than needed for growth. So the Computed MCF is 20%, as calculated below:

\[
\frac{\text{acres currently vacant}}{\text{acres needed for future growth}} - 1.00 = \text{Computed MCF}
\]

Example: \(\frac{125 \text{ acres}}{100 \text{ acres}} - 1.00 = 0.25 = 25\%

An additional way of quantifying the surplus (or deficit) of vacant land available for future growth is to express the surplus (or deficit) as the number of years it would take to fill all the vacant land at the projected future growth rate. This metric is a function of the MCF. For example, if a city has a 0% MCF, this means that the acres of vacant land are equal to the number of acres needed for growth over the 25 year period from 2015 to 2040, so it has enough land for 25 years of growth, as calculated below. If a city has a MCF of 100%, this means that it has twice the number of vacant acres available as are needed for 25 years of growth, so it has enough vacant land for 50 years of growth, as calculated below:

\[(\text{Computed MCF} + 1) \times 25 \text{ years} = 25 \text{ years of growth available}\]

Example 1: \((0\% \text{ MCF} + 1) \times 25 \text{ years} = 25 \text{ years of growth available}\)

Example 2: \((100\% \text{ MCF} + 1) \times 25 \text{ years} = (1 + 1) \times 25 \text{ years} = 50 \text{ years of growth available}\).

The figures for both the MCF and “years of growth” metrics for Mabton are provided in Table 3.

| Table 3: Mabton’s Computed MCF and Years of Growth Available (Excluding Industrially Zoned Lands) |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Lands within the city | Lands outside the city | Growth in UGA | Proposed Growth in UGA |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Computed MCF         | 387%                 | N/A          | 929%                 | 961%             |
| Years of growth available | 122 years      | 135 years    | 257 years            | 265 years        |
c. **Future Industrial Land Needs**

As provided by the analytical process (see Attachment 1) outlined in the “Urban Lands” section in the Land Use Element of Yakima County’s Comprehensive Plan *Horizon 2040*, the amount of land needed for future industrial uses “is based on the city’s economic development strategy and is not contingent on future population.”

The GIS analysis provides the following current acreages of industrially-zoned lands (Attachment 3, Section “7 – Future Industrial Land Need”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current developed industrially-zoned land in city</td>
<td>89 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current developed industrially-zoned land outside city</td>
<td>1 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant industrially-zoned land in city</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant industrially-zoned land outside city</td>
<td>240 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial acres to add to UGA</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial acres to remove from UGA</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Mabton is not proposing any changes to their Industrial land at this time.

3. **Review of Densities Permitted in the UGA**

In addition to reviewing Mabton’s UGA as done above, RCW 36.70A.130(3)(a) requires Yakima County to review the densities permitted within both the incorporated and unincorporated portions of the UGA to ensure project growth may be accommodated.

The City of Mabton has three Land Use Designations listed in its Comprehensive Plan that identify residential growth identified as: Single-Family Residential (R-1), Multi-Family Residential (R-2), and Rural Residential (R-R). The County has two Residential zoning districts within the UGA and outside of the City. The zoning districts and corresponding densities are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Mabton Zoning</th>
<th>Min. Lot Size</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>7-8 dwelling units (du)/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>8,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>26 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-R</td>
<td>No information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yakima County Zoning in Mabton’s Urban Growth Area (YCC Title 19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential)</td>
<td>4,000 – 10,000 sq. ft. (depending on use)</td>
<td>7 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,000 sq. ft. for single family residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2 (Two-Family Residential)</td>
<td>7,000 – 10,000 sq. ft. or 1,750 sq. ft. per unit (depending on density)</td>
<td>12-18 du/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming a minimum density of 5.1 dwelling units per acre, the vacant 40 acres of residentially zoned land in the City of Mabton will accommodate over 204 dwelling units (including associated streets). Therefore, the 75 dwelling units projected through 2040 could be accommodated by the City’s current development regulations.
Assuming the County’s maximum density of 5.1 dwelling units per acre, the existing 160 acres of residentially-zoned land outside of the city would accommodate an additional 816 dwelling units. Therefore, the 75 dwelling units projected through 2040 could be accommodated by the City’s and County’s current development regulations. This amendment is not proposing to change the amount of residentially zoned land within the UGA. In addition, the LCA indicates that future commercial and community facilities could also be accommodated within the city and UGA.

4. City/County Collaboration
County staff met with Mabton’s representatives and representatives for Yakima Valley Farm Workers Clinic on several occasions. County staff were also provided the information on the proposed projects (as shown in Attachment 6) on the following dates:

August 8, 2018 (Attachment 9) – Yakima County staff received a request from Hordan Planning Services (who represent Yakima Valley Farm Workers Clinic (YVFWC)) requesting an emergency request to change the UGA boundary, a similar letter from YVFWC, a copy of a City of Mabton Resolution (Reso. No. 2018-10) where the City approved an emergency application for amendment to the UGA boundary, in addition to some project proposal maps.

September 7, 2018 (Attachment 9) – Planning staff received a letter from Hordan Planning Services identifying the zoning they are requesting, in addition to general information on the proposed project.

The proposal to add land to the city is based on a request from YVFWC to construct a mixed-use (commercial and residential) development to serve the city of Mabton. The mixed-use development would consist of a medical care facility, community center, outdoor playfields and residential/senior housing component.

5. Proposed Revised Plan Designations Within the Unincorporated UGA
Attachment 7 (“Mabton Proposed Urban Plan Designations and Zoning Map”) depicts the detailed urban comp plan designations and zoning that County planning staff are proposing for the unincorporated UGA. No changes to current zoning are proposed, and these proposed comp plan designations are based on existing zoning.

6. Major Rezone and Plan Amendment Review Criteria
YCC 19.36.040 provides that amendments to the zoning map that are contingent upon legislative approval of a comprehensive plan amendment shall be considered a major rezone and are subject to the procedures outlined in YCC 16B.10. Specifically, YCC 16B.10.090 requires that rezones completed as part of the plan amendment process shall be reviewed against the criteria as for plan amendments in Section 16B.10.095; and 16B.10.095 provides the following approval criteria when considering proposed amendments to Yakima County’s comprehensive plan:

\( (1) \) The following criteria shall be considered in any review and approval of amendments to Yakima County Comprehensive Plan Policy Plan Maps:

\( (a) \) The proposed amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act and requirements, the Yakima County Comprehensive Plan, the Yakima Urban Area Comprehensive Plan and applicable sub-area plans, applicable city comprehensive plans, applicable capital facilities plans and official population growth forecasts and allocations;
Findings: The proposal is consistent with all plans regarding the inclusion into the Urban Growth Area. An updated capital facilities plan would be needed.

(b) The site is more consistent with the criteria for the proposed map designation than it is with the criteria for the existing map designation;

Findings: The site is more consistent with the criteria for the proposed map designation than the existing designation since the property is not being used as an agricultural use at this time and has environmental constraints. The property is currently developed in a retail nursery/garden center. The location to the city limits, including utilities, also make the site idea for an urban designation.

This site was also previously in the UGA. In 1997 it was included in the UGA with an Urban land use designation (at that time, all land in the UGA had an Urban designation regardless of zoning). In 2000, when zoning was applied, the property was zoned Single-Family Residential. In 2006-2007, when the UGAs were updated, the property was removed from the UGA and the pre-1997 zoning, which was Agricultural. Aerial photos from 1992 show that the structures associated with the wholesale nursery were located on the property prior to the inclusion in the UGA with residential zoning.

(c) The map amendment or site is suitable for the proposed designation and there is a lack of appropriately designated alternative sites within the vicinity;

Findings: The proposal is for a mixed use development to service Mabton, which includes: a medical facility, a housing component (low income/senior) and recreational opportunities. To accomplish this, the property needed to be approximately 10-acres in size with public utilities available. Although other parcels would meet the size requirement that were already in the city, they would not meet the requirements of public utilities and road infrastructure to the site.

(d) For a map amendment, substantial evidence or a special study has been furnished that compels a finding that the proposed designation is more consistent with comprehensive plan policies than the current designation;

Findings: No specific study was provided regarding the need for the inclusion of this land into the UGA; however, the applicants have provided information that there is no other land available in the UGA that would suit the needs of their project that would provide enough land and the necessary public facilities. Additionally, as described above, this property was previously in the UGA; zoned for residential use.

(e) To change a resource designation, the policy plan map amendment must be found to do one of the following:
   (i) Respond to a substantial change in conditions beyond the property owner’s control applicable to the area within which the subject property lies; or
   (ii) Better implement applicable comprehensive plan policies than the current map designation; or
   (iii) Correct an obvious mapping error; or
(iv) Address an identified deficiency in the plan. In the case of Resource Lands, the applicable de-designation criteria in the mapping criteria portion of the land use subchapter of Yakima County Comprehensive Plan, Volume 1, Chapter I, shall be followed. If the result of the analysis shows that the applicable de-designation criteria has been met, then it will be considered conclusive evidence that one of the four criteria in paragraph (e) has been met. The de-designation criteria are not intended for and shall not be applicable when resource lands are proposed for re-designation to another Economic Resource land use designation;

Findings: The proposal has been reviewed with the agricultural de-designation criteria (Attachment 8).

(f) A full range of necessary public facilities and services can be adequately provided in an efficient and timely manner to serve the proposed designation. Such services may include water, sewage, storm drainage, transportation, fire protection and schools;

Findings: Public utilities such as water and sewer are adjacent to the property. Hwy 241 (Boundary Road) is adjacent to the eastern property line and State Highway 22 is to the south of the property. The City of Mabton also has paved city roadways that lead to the subject property.

(g) The proposed policy plan map amendment will not prematurely cause the need for nor increase the pressure for additional policy plan map amendments in the surrounding area.

Findings: Yakima County staff does not foresee that this UGA update will increase pressure for additional UGA boundary changes. It will more likely spur infill development in the smaller, vacant parcels within the City of Mabton.

Overall Findings: The proposal is mostly consistent with the above criteria.

(2) The following criteria shall be considered in any review and approval of changes to Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundaries:

(a) Land Supply:
   (i) The amount of buildable land suitable for residential and local commercial development within the incorporated and the unincorporated portions of the Urban Growth Areas will accommodate the adopted population allocation and density targets;
   (ii) The amount of buildable land suitable for purposes other than residential and local commercial development within the incorporated and the unincorporated portions of the Urban Growth Areas will accommodate the adopted forecasted urban development density targets within the succeeding twenty-year period;
   (iii) The Planning Division will use the definition of buildable land in YCC 16B.02.045, the criteria established in RCW 36.70A.110 and .130 and applicable criteria in the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations;
(iv) The Urban Growth Area boundary incorporates the amount of land
determined to be appropriate by the County to support the population
density targets;

(b) Utilities and services:

(i) The provision of urban services for the Urban Growth Area is prescribed,
and funding responsibilities delineated, in conformity with the
comprehensive plan, including applicable capital facilities, utilities, and
transportation elements, of the municipality;

(ii) Designated Ag. resource lands, except for mineral resource lands that
will be reclaimed for urban uses, may not be included within the UGA
unless it is shown that there are no practicable alternatives and the lands
meet the de-designation criteria set forth in the comprehensive plan.

Findings: Yakima County staff analysis above supports the conclusion that this proposal
is consistent with the above criteria. The proposal has also been reviewed under the
agricultural resource de-designation process, outlined in Horizon 2040 Chapter 5.10.3.
That analysis can be reviewed in Attachment 8.

(3) Land added to or removed from Urban Growth Areas shall be given appropriate policy
plan map designation and zoning by Yakima County, consistent with adopted
comprehensive plan(s).

Findings: Lands added to the UGA (identified in Attachment 6) will be consistent with
Yakima County land use designations and County zoning.

(4) Cumulative impacts of all plan amendments, including those approved since the original
adoption of the plan, shall be considered in the evaluation of proposed plan amendments.

Findings: The impacts of the proposed use will be reviewed as part of the SEPA process.

(5) Plan policy and other text amendments including capital facilities plans must be
consistent with the GMA, SMA, CWPP, other comprehensive plan goals and policies,
and, where applicable, city comprehensive plans and adopted inter-local agreements.

Findings: Not applicable. The changes to Mabton’s UGA are map amendments rather
than policy or text amendments.

(6) Prior to forwarding a proposed development regulation text amendment to the Planning
Commission for its docketing consideration, the Administrative Official must make a
determination that the proposed amendment is consistent with the GMA, CWPP, other
comprehensive plan goals and policies, and, where applicable, city comprehensive plans
and adopted inter-local agreements.

Findings: Not applicable. The changes to Mabton’s UGA are map amendments rather
than policy or text amendments.

7. Conclusions

a. The County’s Land Capacity Analysis for Mabton calculates a surplus of 105 acres of vacant
land available for future growth (excluding industrial growth) in the City, which presents
available vacant land for 122 years of growth. The LCA calculates a surplus of 251 acres of
vacant land available for future growth (excluding industrial growth) in the UGA, which
represent available vacant land for 257 years of growth. The City of Mabton’s UGA proposal would represent a slight increase in the vacant land available for future growth (excluding industrial growth) representing available land for 265 years of growth. Although this is an increase from the current vacant land in the UGA, it is still an overall decrease of the total years of growth and acreage from the previous UGA update (an overall decrease of 17 years). The existing UGA is able to accommodate the densities and projected non-industrial growth through 2040.

b. Mabton is proposing to include a 10-acre parcel into the UGA as Urban Commercial/General Commercial land. This results in an increase of 9 acres of commercial land and a total increase of years of growth for the UGA. Although this represents a slight increase in years of growth, this is in alignment with their economic development strategy and will provide a benefit to the community as a whole. This property was also previously included in the UGA from 1997-2007.

c. Given the Mabton proposal is still an overall decrease since the last UGA update (2015-2016) and serves a public interest, the changes proposed should be considered for approval.

8. **Recommendations**
   a. Yakima County planning staff recommendations to the City of Mabton’s proposed UGA changes are outlined in the Table below: (A map showing each area is included as Attachment 6.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (as shown in Attachment 6)</th>
<th>Mabton Proposal</th>
<th>County Planning Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add To UGA</td>
<td>Remove From UGA</td>
<td>Current Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>10 Acres</td>
<td>Agricultural Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   Note: Acres are approximate.

Attachments:
1. *Horizon 2040*’s description of the analytical process for the UGA Land Capacity Analysis
2. County’s Population Projection for City of Mabton, 2015-2040
3. UGA Land Capacity Analysis (spreadsheet)
4. Mabton Current UGA Analysis 2016 (GIS map & report)
5. Mabton Proposed UGA Analysis 2016 (GIS map & report)
6. Mabton Proposed UGA Changes
7. Mabton Proposed Urban Plan Designations and Zoning Map
9. Mabton UGA Amendment Submittal
5.8.1 Urban Lands Sub-Element Purpose
The Urban Lands Sub-element serves several purposes. It first outlines the Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements with respect to urban lands and the process used to establish an Urban Growth Area (UGA) around each of the County’s fourteen cities. This is followed by a discussion of the major issues confronting urban area growth. The Sub-Element goes on to describe the land use character of the UGAs, their population and the future growth projections that must be used by each. Although more recent population estimates are available, the 2015 data is used because it is the baseline for establishing the Urban Growth Areas. Projections are then compared to current consumption patterns to determine if an appropriate urban land base has been designated to meet various future needs.

The Sub-Element briefly discusses how Yakima County will work with the cities to plan for and facilitate urban area growth. It concludes with a series of goals and policies to guide future development within the unincorporated urban areas.

5.8.2 Urban Lands - Growth Management Act Requirements
The Growth Management Act (GMA) includes the following goals that directly relate to urban land use:

1. Urban Growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.  
2. Reduce Sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.  
3. Transportation. Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.  
6. Property Rights. Property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners shall be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.  
12. Public Facilities and Services. Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

5.8.3 Urban Lands – Urban Growth Areas
General Description Urban lands are the areas located within UGA boundaries, which are established by the County in consultation with the cities and towns. In general, each of Yakima County’s UGA’s includes one of Yakima County’s fourteen cities and towns plus additional area extending beyond the city or town. Since the cities have historically developed in the valley floors, they tend to be surrounded by irrigated agriculture, and are likely to include geologically hazardous areas, wetlands and other wildlife habitat, or river gravels suitable for mining. "Urban growth" means that land is used so intensively for buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces that viable agriculture, forestry or mining is not feasible. Urban governmental services are either available, or could be provided without excessive public cost. Urban governmental services typically include water and sewer systems, street cleaning services, fire and police protection services, and public transit services. Based on their respective comprehensive, subarea or neighborhood plans, cities and other service providers must be able to demonstrate both ability and willingness to supply designated urban areas with these services within the twenty-year planning period. The Growth Management Act, RCW 58.17
5.8.3.1 Urban Growth Area Designation Process
GMA requires counties to designate Urban Growth Areas (UGA) where development is encouraged and outside which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature. At a minimum, each city within the County must be included within a UGA. Additionally, a UGA may include land outside of a city but only if it is already characterized by urban growth. Lands not characterized by, or next to, urban growth may be included within a UGA only if the need for it is shown based on projected growth. Perhaps the most important aspect of designating UGA boundaries is the demonstration by cities and towns that they may feasibly serve these lands with urban level services over a twenty-year period.

As required by the GMA, and consistent with desired future settlement patterns, most new housing and jobs will be created within Yakima County’s fourteen UGAs. Likewise, most investment in public facilities and services will occur here to ensure the most cost-efficient use and operation of necessary utility systems.

In unincorporated areas within UGA boundaries, Horizon 2040 establishes several urban land use designations to implement the Growth Management Act’s Planning Goal 1: "Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner." In determining areas to be set aside for future urbanization, the County and cities mutually endorsed a County-Wide Planning Policy. It states that areas designated for urban growth should be determined by preferred development patterns, residential densities, and the capacity and willingness of the community to provide urban governmental services.

UGAs are intended to include land that is characterized by urban growth or will be needed for urbanization, consistent with forecasted population growth and the ability to extend urban services. UGA boundaries are intended to establish the areas within which incorporated cities and towns may grow and annex over the next twenty years. Yakima County’s UGAs are also intended to implement Washington Administrative Code, which states that "the physical area within which that jurisdiction's vision of urban development can be realized over the next twenty years." The process for which Urban Growth Areas are designated is outlined below:

- **Population Allocation**
  Development of population projections for the Growth Management Act (GMA) is a shared responsibility. As directed by state statute, the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) prepares a reasonable range of possible population growth for Washington counties participating in GMA. Yakima County, also by law, is responsible for selecting a 20-year GMA planning target from within the range of high and low prepared by OFM. The County must select the county planning target; then the population planning targets for each city or town, and unincorporated areas. Once the population is allocated the projections are used by each jurisdiction as part of the GMA comprehensive planning update and in conjunction with the Land Capacity Analysis.

- **Land Capacity Analysis**
  The purpose of the Land Capacity Analysis is to determine how much land, if any, is needed beyond the incorporated limits of each city and town to accommodate the urban growth and development
that is projected to occur during the 20-year planning horizon. It begins with determining the existing supply of existing vacant and partially vacant lands zoned for future development that can accommodate additional growth. In evaluating the quantity of land necessary for urban growth, the following analytical process should be followed:

1. **Determine how much housing is necessary for 20 years of growth.**
   Subtract the City’s current year population from the projected 20 year population figure to determine the additional number that represents 20 years of growth. Based on a city’s average household size, calculate the number of additional dwelling units to allow for.

2. **Determine the necessary residential acreage.**
   Determine the desired and appropriate housing densities in collaboration with the cities. Calculate how many acres are needed to accommodate the number of new dwelling units based on the desired and appropriate densities. A percentage can be added to allow for market choice and location preference.

3. **Determine the necessary commercial and retail acreage.**
   Divide the existing commercial and retail acreage by the current population to arrive at a commercial/retail acreage per capita figure. Multiply this per capita number by the additional population identified in Step #1. This will give you the amount of additional commercial/retail acreage needed. A percentage can be added to allow for market choice and location preference.

4. **Determine the net amount of total additional acreage needed for non-industrial uses.**
   Determine the currently available undeveloped acreage within the existing UGA for both residential and commercial/retail. Subtract these figures from the acreage identified in Steps #2 and #3 to determine if acreage is needed for UGA expansion for residential or commercial/retail. Factor in additional acreage needed for open space, critical areas, parks, and other public facilities such as schools and libraries based on appropriate level of service standards. Add appropriate acreage to allow for streets.

5. **Identify areas needed for Industrial zoning.**
   Industrial zoning is based on the city’s economic development strategy and is not contingent on future population.

6. **Identify areas that are desired and appropriate for expansion.**
   Identify the areas desired for UGA expansion based on the amount of acreage needed as identified in Steps #4 and #5. Ensure the requisite acreage is accurately allocated to residential, commercial/retail, and industrial. Areas desired for expansion should avoid Agricultural and Mineral Resource areas if possible. If Resource areas are unavoidable, justification for encroaching into the Resource area will be required.

7. **Capital Facilities Plan.**
   Approval of any UGA expansion by Yakima County will be subject to adoption of an adequate and appropriate Capital Facilities Plan by the respective elected legislative body to ensure
necessary facilities and services will be provided to the entire expanded UGA within the 20 year period. All capital and public facilities needed for future growth must be included in the Capital Facilities Plan. These needed facilities may be identified in comprehensive plan elements, in the jurisdiction’s functional plans, or in the plans of other entities that provide services or facilities.

- **Mapping Criteria for New UGA areas:**
  1. Lands contiguous with other properties that are, or should be, included in an urban growth area.
  2. Lands that take advantage of physical features to help provide a clear separation between urban and rural areas. No physical barriers (e.g., rivers, railroads, irrigation ditches, freeways) are present that would make the area difficult to serve at an adopted level of service standard.
  3. The County and the respective city or town have mutually determined that urban services will be present within the 20-year time frame of the plan, as illustrated within the city’s capital facilities plan.
  4. Lands with ready access to urban services (e.g., major roads, schools, public safety, water or sewer utilities), or lands needed to achieve local economic development goals / plan policies and where there is a plan and financial strategy for putting these services in place in accordance with the jurisdiction’s comprehensive, subarea or neighborhood plan.
  5. Lands needed for public capital facilities and utilities.
  6. Lands that do not have long term commercial significance for commercial agricultural or mineral production and should be able to develop without having a detrimental effect on nearby resource lands outside the Urban Growth Area; or, lands needed for urban growth and it has been conclusively demonstrated that significantly better alternatives to the development of productive resource lands are not available.
### Table 1. US Census and OFM Population Estimates
Yakima County and Mabton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>222,581</td>
<td>231,902</td>
<td>243,231</td>
<td>244,700</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>247,250</td>
<td>248,800</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>249,500</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>93,192</td>
<td>87,019</td>
<td>83,755</td>
<td>84,300</td>
<td>84,800</td>
<td>84,910</td>
<td>85,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Total</td>
<td>129,389</td>
<td>144,883</td>
<td>159,476</td>
<td>160,400</td>
<td>161,200</td>
<td>162,340</td>
<td>163,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, Office Financial Management (OFM).

### Table 2. Yakima County Preferred Alternative Twenty-year Population Projection Growth Rates
(See Table 21 in Section II.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>OFM Population Estimates 2010-2014 Annual Growth Rate (Step 2.)</th>
<th>Yakima County Adjusted Annual Growth Rate (Step 3.)</th>
<th>Adjusted Growth Rates Used Showing Decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Yakima County.

### Table 3. Yakima County’s Preferred Alternative Twenty-year Projected Population
Town of Mabton (See Tables 22a-e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>256,341</td>
<td>258,730</td>
<td>261,462</td>
<td>264,150</td>
<td>266,780</td>
<td>269,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>2,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>271,956</td>
<td>274,512</td>
<td>277,037</td>
<td>279,530</td>
<td>282,057</td>
<td>284,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>2,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>287,148</td>
<td>289,615</td>
<td>292,046</td>
<td>294,445</td>
<td>297,036</td>
<td>299,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>2,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>301,896</td>
<td>304,276</td>
<td>306,636</td>
<td>309,052</td>
<td>311,443</td>
<td>313,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>316,161</td>
<td>318,494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office Financial Management (OFM) and Yakima County.
Table 4. Yakima County Preferred Alternative Medium Population Projections for Yakima County, Mabton and Unincorporated Areas (2040)  
(See Table 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>248,800</td>
<td>318,494</td>
<td>69,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Total</td>
<td>85,410</td>
<td>117,983</td>
<td>32,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Total</td>
<td>163,390</td>
<td>200,511</td>
<td>37,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office Financial Management (OFM) and Yakima County.

The Office of Financial Management (OFM) has Mabton at an estimated population of 2,310 for 2014. Yakima County is projecting Mabton’s population at 2,649 in the year 2040. That is an increase of 339 individuals over the twenty-six year timespan. This allocation of 339 individuals will be used by Yakima County and Mabton as part of the upcoming Urban Growth Area analysis and for other comprehensive planning needs.

Table 5. Yakima County Preferred Alternative 2040 Employment Projection and Allocation  
(Table 25 Section III.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Civilian Labor Force#</th>
<th>Yakima County Preferred Alternative 2040 Projected Population</th>
<th>Yakima County Preferred Alternative 2040 Employment Projection</th>
<th>Number of Additional Jobs Needed by 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>110,603</td>
<td>318,494</td>
<td>143,322</td>
<td>32,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The 2008-2012 American Community Survey US Census has Mabton at an estimated civilian labor force of 877 for 2012. Yakima County is projecting Mabton’s civilian labor force at 1,015 in the year 2040. That is an increase of 138 jobs over the twenty-eight year timespan. This allocation of 138 jobs will be used by Yakima County and Mabton as part of the upcoming Urban Growth Area analysis and for other comprehensive planning needs.
### 1 - Population and Households Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Malton Previous UGA 2015</th>
<th>Malton Adopted 2015</th>
<th>Malton Proposal 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040 population for City (County's preferred alternative medium projection)</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>2,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 population in City (OFM's April 1 estimate)</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>2,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's projected population increase, 2015-2040 (a - b)</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's average household size (2010 Census)</td>
<td>people per household</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional households projected for City, 2015-2040 (c + d)</td>
<td>households</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 - Future Residential Land Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired average density of future housing, 2015-2040 (5.1 dwelling units per acre)</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land needed for future housing (e + f + 43,560 sq. ft. per acre)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 - Future Commercial & Retail Land Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current commercial &amp; retail land in City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land needed for future commercial &amp; retail (h + b)</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 - Future Community Facilities' Land Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current developed community facilities land in City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land needed for future community facilities (m + c)</td>
<td>0.0211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 - Future Streets Land Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal of land needed for future residential, commercial, &amp; retail, and community facilities (g + j + n)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land needed for future streets (p • 15%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6 - Land Capacity Analysis

**Residentially-zoned capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant residentially-zoned land in City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minus) Land needed for future housing and associated streets (g + 115%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) of vacant residentially-zoned land in City (r = s)</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant residentially-zoned land outside City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(plus) Surplus (Deficit) of vacant residentially-zoned land in City (t)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) of vacant residentially-zoned land in UGA (u + v)</strong></td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commercially-zoned capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant commercially-zoned land in City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minus) Land needed for future commercial &amp; retail and associated streets (j • 115%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) of vacant commercially-zoned land in City (x = y)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant commercially-zoned land outside City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(plus) Surplus (Deficit) of vacant commercially-zoned land in City (z)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) of vacant commercially-zoned land in UGA (aa = bb)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Facilities capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant community facilities land in City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minus) Land needed for future community facilities and associated streets (n • 115%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) of vacant community facilities in City (dd + ee)</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant community facilities land outside City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(plus) Surplus (Deficit) of vacant community facilities land in City (ff)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) of vacant community facilities land in UGA (gg + hh)</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity for growth in City (excluding Industrial growth)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for growth in City (excluding Industrial growth)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of vacant land for residential, commercial, &amp; streets (t + z + ff)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computed Market Choice Factor in City (MCF)</strong></td>
<td>407%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of vacant land for community facilities, &amp; streets (w + cc + ii)</td>
<td>387%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computed Market Choice Factor in City (MCF)</strong></td>
<td>387%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of growth available in City (6k + 1) • 25</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of growth available in City (6k + 1) • 25</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity for growth outside City (excluding industrial growth)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of growth available outside City (y • - mm)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of growth available outside City (y • - mm)</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of growth available outside City (y • - mm)</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity for growth in UGA (excluding Industrial growth)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit) of vacant land for residential, commercial, community facilities, &amp; streets (w + cc + li)</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computed Market Choice Factor in UGA (MCF)</strong></td>
<td>1026%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of vacant land for community facilities, &amp; streets (w + cc + li)</td>
<td>929%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computed Market Choice Factor in UGA (MCF)</strong></td>
<td>961%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of growth available in UGA (6q + 1) • 25</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of growth available in UGA (6q + 1) • 25</strong></td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of growth available in UGA (6q + 1) • 25</strong></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7 - Future Industrial Land Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current developed industrially-zoned land in City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current developed industrially-zoned land outside City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant industrially-zoned land in City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant industrially-zoned land outside City (from GIS analysis)</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial acres to add to UGA (based on City's economic development strategy)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial acres to remove from UGA (based on City's economic development strategy)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Community Facilities such as parks, schools, libraries, city halls, fire stations, churches

**Vacant acres in City + needed acres): 1 = (r + x + dd) + (s • y • ee) - 1

**Vacant acres in UGA + needed acres): 1 = (r + u + x + aa + dd + gg) + (s • y • ee) - 1

Note: numbers in parentheses are negative
Mabton UGA Analysis Current 2018

Total Acres: 860.22

Total Acres Within City: 408.04
Total Acres Outside City Limits Within UGA: 452.19

Total of acres that are Developed: 315.15
Total of acres that are Vacant: 418.44
Total of acres that are Partially Vacant: 126.63

Vacant Acres: 98.63
Developed Acres: 28.00

Acreage by Zone Groupings

RESIDENTIAL
Total Residential: 362.28
Total Residential Within the City: 178.37
Total Residential Outside City Limits: 183.91

Total Vacant: 177.27
Total Vacant Within the City Limits: 56.98
Total Vacant Outside City Limits: 120.29

Total Developed: 185.02
Total Developed Within the City Limits: 121.39
Total Developed Outside City Limits: 63.62

Commercial
Total Commercial: 26.85
Total Commercial Within the City: 26.85
Total Commercial Outside City Limits: 0.00

Total Vacant: 12.15
Total Vacant Within the City Limits: 12.15
Total Vacant Outside City Limits: 0.00

Total Developed: 14.70
Total Developed Within the City Limits: 14.70
Total Developed Outside City Limits: 0.00

Industrial
Total Industrial: 329.39
Total Industrial Within the City: 88.84
Total Industrial Outside City Limits: 240.55

Total Vacant: 239.55
Total Vacant Within the City Limits: 0.00
Total Vacant Outside City Limits: 239.55

Total Developed: 89.84
Total Developed Within the City Limits: 88.84
Total Developed Outside City Limits: 1.00

Community Facilities
Total Community Facilities: 141.66
Total Community Facilities Within the City: 113.93
Total Community Facilities Outside City Limits: 27.73

Total Vacant: 88.10
Total Vacant Within the City Limits: 62.37
Total Vacant Outside City Limits: 25.73

Total Developed: 53.55
Total Developed Within the City Limits: 51.55
Total Developed Outside City Limits: 2.00
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Mabton City Limits
Vacant
Partially Developed
Developed
Residential
Commercial
Industrial
Community Facility
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Total Acres: 879.72
Total Acres Within City: 408.04
Total Acres Outside City Limits Within UGA: 471.69
Total of acres that are Developed: 315.15
Total of acres that are Vacant: 418.44
Total of acres that are Partially Vacant: 146.13
Vacant Acres: 116.13
Developed Acres: 30.00

Acres & Groupings

Residential
Total Residential: 362.28
Total Residential Within the City: 178.37
Total Residential Outside City Limits: 183.91
Total Vacant: 177.27
Total Vacant Within City Limits: 56.98
Total Vacant Outside City Limits: 120.29
Total Developed: 185.02
Total Developed Within the City Limits: 121.39
Total Developed Outside City Limits: 63.62

Commercial
Total Commercial: 36.82
Total Commercial Within the City: 26.85
Total Commercial Outside City Limits: 9.97
Total Vacant: 21.12
Total Vacant Within City Limits: 12.15
Total Vacant Outside City Limits: 8.97
Total Developed: 15.70
Total Developed Within the City Limits: 14.70
Total Developed Outside City Limits: 1.00

Industrial
Total Industrial: 329.39
Total Industrial Within the City: 88.04
Total Industrial Outside City Limits: 240.55
Total Vacant: 239.55
Total Vacant Within City Limits: 0.00
Total Vacant Outside City Limits: 239.55
Total Developed: 89.84
Total Developed Within the City Limits: 88.84
Total Developed Outside City Limits: 1.00

Community Facilities
Total Community Facilities: 141.66
Total Community Facilities Within the City: 113.93
Total Community Facilities Outside City Limits: 27.73
Total Vacant: 88.10
Total Vacant Within City Limits: 62.37
Total Vacant Outside City Limits: 25.73
Total Developed: 53.55
Total Developed Within the City Limits: 51.55
Total Developed Outside City Limits: 2.00
Area 1) ADD 9.53 Acres
AG to UC (Zone GO)

Proposed UGA (New)
Proposed UGA (Existing)

Comprehensive Plan Designations
U - Urban
UR - Urban Residential
UP - Urban Public
UC - Urban Commercial
UI - Urban Industrial

Urban Growth Boundary

September 29, 2018
Attachment 8

Agricultural Resource De-designation Analytical Process – Mabton Proposed UGA Expansion (Yakima Valley Farm Workers Clinic)

The Agricultural Resource De-designation Analytical Process is found in the Land Use subchapter of Horizon 2040, Chapter 5.10.3, immediately following the mapping criteria for Agricultural Resource Areas. Adopted in 2017, Mapping Criterion #7 states the purpose of the De-designation Analytical Process as follows:

The agricultural resource de-designation criteria will be used for plan amendments and updates to change a land use from Agricultural Resource to another land use designation.

The analytical process considers 10 variables listed in WAC 190-365-050 that could adversely impact commercial agriculture. These variables are considered in light of the GMA’s goal to protect AG land of long term commercial significance. When the answer to whether or not a variable has an adverse effect on commercial agriculture is “yes,” the number of “yes” answers must reach a total of eight before the determination can be made that the impacts are overwhelming and significant to the point where the property can no longer be considered AG land of long term commercial significance.

The 10 factors in Horizon 2040 are quoted below in italics, followed by the staff’s analysis of impacts to the subject site.

Quantitative Analytical Process

1. Soils
Soils considered to be an Agricultural Resource of Long Term Commercial Significance are primarily those soils listed as “Prime” in the Soil Survey of Yakima County dated May 1985. This list of soils, however, does not include similar soils as those listed as Prime that are located on slopes with a gradient higher than 2 degrees. Slopes with a gradient up to and including 15 degrees are considered suitable for growing tree fruit and grapes based on good drainage and the ability for cold air to fall down gradient. The limiting factor for slopes is one of safety when operating machinery. Slopes above 15 degrees may not be suitable to the safe operation of equipment needed for commercial agriculture. As a result of these considerations, these additional soils on slopes are included based on their listing as suitable for the various crops grown in Yakima County. All selected soils are then rated by their anticipated crop yield into five equal breaks, based on the crop the soil is most suited for. For soils suitable for tree fruit, for example, these breaks are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Yield Range</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000 to 867 bu/ac</td>
<td>4 points [Highest]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866 to 733 bu/ac</td>
<td>3 points [Above Average]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732 to 599 bu/ac</td>
<td>2 points [Average]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598 to 465 bu/ac</td>
<td>1 point [Below Average]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
464 to 330 bu/ac crop yield 0 points [Lowest]

Other crop types that have suitable soils within the Yakima County Soil Survey, such as various row crops and hay/alfalfa, are also rated by anticipated crop yield into five equal breaks and assigned the appropriate number of points.

Staff analysis: The subject site is located within the boundary of the Yakama Nation; therefore, it does not fall within the Soil Survey of Yakima County. The soils have been mapped under the Soil Survey of Yakima Indian Reservation Irrigated Area. Although it is a different soil survey, the soil classifications are the same in both studies.

The subject site, as described by the Soils Survey of the Yakima Indian Reservation Irrigated Area, has 2 different soil classification:

182 – Warden fine sandy loam (WeC), 5 to 8 percent slopes – irrigated corn 100 bu/acre = 0 points (Lowest)

176 – Warden silt loam (WfA), 0 to 2 percent slopes – Irrigated apples 800 bu/acre = 3 points (Above Average)

As shown in the Map below, approximately half the site’s acreage has soils that is considered Prime Farm Soils (WfA). The Warden soil type WfA has an Above Average soil value, while the Warden WeC has the lowest value. It should be noted that the area with the higher soil value is already developed in a wholesale nursery and the soils that is lower value is primarily covered in critical areas. Under the Ag de-designation criteria, an impact in favor of de-designation results from below average scores. A majority of the site’s acreage is Prime Soils and scored the highest, therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Soil</td>
<td>Average crop yield per Soil Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Proximity to the Urban Growth Area**

Parcels are evaluated by their distance from an Urban Growth Area (UGA). The further away from the Urban Growth Area the less influence it has on a parcel to develop at some higher use. Thus, a higher numerical value for agriculture is assigned to parcels further away as follows:

- **Within ¼ mile of the UGA**: 0 points [Lowest]
- **Between ¼ and ½ mile**: 1 point [Below Average]
- **Between ½ mile and 1 mile**: 2 points [Average]
- **Between 1 mile and 2 miles**: 3 points [Above Average]
- **Greater than 2 miles from UGA**: 4 points [Highest]

**Staff analysis:** The subject property is located adjacent to the Mabton UGA and town limits (0 Points [lowest]). Under the Ag de-designation criteria, an impact in favor of de-
designation results from below average scores (i.e., 1 point and less). Therefore, the “Impact to Ag” for this site is “Yes.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Proximity to Urban Growth Area</td>
<td>Within ¼ mile of the UGA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Predominant Parcel Size**

Larger parcels are thought to be more suitable for commercial agriculture. Smaller parcels have a greater pressure to develop as a residential lot or some other higher use. Parcels under contiguous ownership, while certainly having an effect on the probability for commercial agriculture, ought not be considered during the five-year update process due to the inherent fluidity of property ownership. Contiguous ownership, however, should be a consideration when evaluating property for possible removal from a resource area during the amendment review process. Parcels were assigned a numeric value, with higher values for agriculture given to larger parcels as follows:

- Less than 5 acres: 0 points [Lowest]
- Between 5 and 10 acres: 1 point [Below Average]
- Between 10 and 20 acres: 2 points [Average]
- Between 20 and 40 acres: 3 points [Above Average]
- Greater than 40 acres: 4 points [Highest]

**Staff analysis:** This subject parcel is approximately 10 acres in size. Under the Ag de-designation criteria, an impact in favor of de-designation results from below average scores (i.e., 1 point and less). Therefore, the “Impact to Ag” for this site is “Yes.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Predominant Parcel Size</td>
<td>Smaller than 10 acres</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Analytical Process**

Once the field evaluation has been conducted the remaining criteria to be considered under WAC 365-190-050 are considered individually.

4. **Availability of Public Facilities**

Of the list of various public facilities provided by the County and Cities, roads, sewer and water are the three whose presence could possibly add pressure to develop at a higher use. These facilities can be mapped and a study area evaluated for its proximity to them and a determination as to the effect they would have regarding pressure to develop. If facilities are within a reasonable distance to the majority of the parcels within the study area (1000’), then they are determined to have an effect. Water and sewer are normally confined to the city and its urban growth area. The only exception to this is in close proximity to the City of Yakima where sewer and water services may extend out into some rural and agricultural areas.
Staff analysis: At this time, the subject property is not serviced by public water or sewer service; however, the property is adjacent to the UGA and public sewer and water are within the 1000’ of the property. The City of Mabton roads adjacent and leading to the property are paved. Timelines on when the property would be annexed by the City of Mabton if approved is unknown. This availability of public facilities indicates “Yes” impact to Ag.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Availability of Public Facilities</td>
<td>Within 1000’ of water, sewer or paved road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Tax Status
Tax Status indicates the current land use and tax rate being claimed by the property owner and reported by the Assessor. An inference can be made by looking at the current tax status as to the property owners’ intent for the land. This intent alone cannot be considered when determining the appropriateness of the land for designation as Agricultural Land of Long-term Commercial Significance, but may be another indicator of the possibility of a more intense use of the land. When the majority of the parcels within the study area have a tax status other than Agriculture, then it is considered one factor for possible removal of the area from resource designation.

Staff analysis: The subject property is assessed as Service – Business. This indicates “Yes” impact to agriculture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Tax Status</td>
<td>Predominance of a tax status other than ag</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Availability of Public Services
Public services include police, fire, and library services to the name the obvious. Police and Fire are the primary services considered for the purposes of this analysis. The County has established Level of Service standards for both the police and fire departments. These levels are calculated according to the number of calls for service, which in turn dictates the average response time throughout their service areas. New development accounts for additional calls for service at a predetermined rate per dwelling unit. Absent of any specific amplifying data to the contrary, any new development must be assumed to decrease the applicable levels of service. This decrease would then dictate that the public services are not available for any new development and therefore cannot be said to represent pressure for the area to develop and thus impact agriculture.

Staff analysis: The subject property is located adjacent to the City of Mabton. The property’s proximity to the City and its services including Fire District #5 (with Fire Station #15), police department, library (Mabton Community Library as part of the Yakima Valley Libraries system) and Mabton School District, presents “Yes” impacts to agriculture.
### Variable Review Criteria Impact to Ag - Yes or No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Availability of Public Services</td>
<td>Presents an adverse impact to ag</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. & 8. Land Use Settlement Patterns and Their Compatibility with Agricultural Practices and Intensity of Nearby Uses

Land Use Settlement Patterns and the Intensity of Nearby Uses provide similar information as Proximity to Urbanized Areas in that they show residential or other development that may represent prohibitive impacts to commercial agriculture. However, there are development areas outside of the urban growth areas that require consideration for their potential impact to agriculture. In those areas, **Land use settlement patterns and their compatibility with commercial agriculture** deals with those uses adjacent to a study area that may represent a level of incompatibility and impact the ability to conduct agriculture. If this pattern is of such a significant amount, it may represent a factor. **Intensity of nearby land uses** explains the adjacent land use patterns that, due to their size, density and proximity, cause an overwhelming pressure for the study area to develop at some higher use above commercial agriculture. In these cases, that intensity may also be counted as a factor.

**Staff analysis:** There are 28 parcels immediately surrounding the subject property. The statistics for the sizes of those parcels are:
- 144 acres – total of 28 parcels
- 74.94 acres – largest parcel
- 5.16 acres – mean size of 28 parcels
- 0.1 acre – smallest parcel

The statistics above indicate a variety of lot sizes adjacent to the subject property and a lack of a specific settlement pattern and the intensity of use that would adversely impact agricultural practices on the subject property. This would typically indicate a “No” impact to agriculture because of the lack of a clear distinction either way. However, the fact that the subject property is located directly adjacent to both the UGA boundary and the Mabton’s city limits would indicate that both the land use settlement patterns and intensity of land uses will increase and ultimately generate a “yes” impact to agriculture. The “yes” response also fits considering that the subject property itself is a partially developed, with the existing wholesale retail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Land Use Settlement Patterns</td>
<td>Impact on ag</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Intensity of Nearby Land Uses</td>
<td>Impact on ag</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **History of Land Development Permits Issued Nearby**

The History of Development Permits Issued Nearby may also serve as evidence of pressure to develop at some higher use. A history of permitting activity is a way of looking at nearby permitting patterns, which may give an indication of things to come for the study area. Regardless, nearby permitting history requires individual scrutiny to determine if there may have been a significant surge in permitting, absent sufficient time for a significant development pattern to form. If there is a record of 15 or more subdivision permits within a half-mile radius, within the County’s permit history database, it can be assumed that it is a sufficient number to be considered a factor.

**Staff analysis:** The Planning History coverage in GIS indicates there hasn’t been any short plats within one-half mile of the subject site. There are old plats, some of which have been vacated, from the early 1900s within one half mile (Mabton Garden Tracts and McQuesten’s Addition’s). It should be noted that although there hasn’t been subdivisions in the County jurisdiction, the area to the east of the property within the City has a high density. This indicates “no” impact to agriculture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. History of Land Development</td>
<td>15 or more subdivisions within ½ mile</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Land Values Under Alternative Uses**

Agricultural lands are generally valued at a rate significantly lower than other uses. If land values within the study area are being assessed at a higher rate than that normally associated with agriculture, then this higher rate can be considered a factor. The prevailing agricultural rate is determined by similar properties outside of the study area that are known to be actively involved in agriculture.

**Staff analysis:** Of the 28 parcels adjacent to the subject site only 2 are in the current use agriculture tax program, which equates to roughly 93% of the neighboring property are being tax assessed at a higher rate. Therefore, the overwhelming majority of adjacent land values are generally being assessed at a higher rate than associated with agriculture, which indicates “Yes” impact to agriculture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Land Values under Alternative Uses</td>
<td>Assessed value indicates non-ag use</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Assessment**

A final assessment of a particular area’s relative value as Agricultural Land of Long Term Commercial Significance is based on a combined quantitative and qualitative analysis considering all allowable variables. The question must be answered, “Is there sufficient pressure due to nearby parcelization and the possibility of a more intense use of the land...
to affect a study area or parcel to the point that commercial agriculture is no longer practical?"

Those factors that can be evaluated through the quantitative process will provide a preliminary indication as to the possible current value of the land as an agricultural resource. It will also provide evidence of those specific areas within a general study area that require closer evaluation. However, a physical site evaluation as well as consideration of the remaining variables must be completed before any final assessment can be made.

Each area may offer unique circumstances that may be considered in the evaluation process and that cannot be evaluated quantitatively. As an example, proximity to an Urban Growth Area may appear to have provided pressure for an area to be removed from Agricultural Resource designation. However, a closer review may indicate that properties within the Urban Growth Area, and adjacent to the area being studied, have not begun to develop and thus represent no pressure for the study area to develop at some higher use.

Unique physical characteristics of a particular area may also provide additional evidence for possible removal from Agricultural Resource designation. This evidence may include information concerning topographical limitations, the physical availability of irrigation water (not water rights), or any other characteristic associated with the land that was not included in the basic analytical process. It may not be practical for this evidence to be considered in the broader context of an area wide update, but may be relevant when evaluating smaller areas during a Map Amendment process.

During the basic analytical process, when the answer to whether or not a variable has an effect on commercial agriculture is “yes,” the number of “yes” answers must reach a total of eight before the determination can be made that the impacts are overwhelming and significant to the point where the property can no longer be considered agricultural land of long term commercial significance.

At least eight impacts to agriculture are needed to determine that a site should be removed from AG land of long term commercial significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Impact to Ag - Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Soil</td>
<td>Below Average crop yield per USDA’s Soil Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proximity to Urban Growth Area</td>
<td>Less than ½ mile</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Predominant Parcel Size</td>
<td>Smaller than 10 acres</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Availability of Public Facilities</td>
<td>Within 1000’ of water, sewer or paved road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tax Status</td>
<td>Predominance of a tax status other than ag</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Availability of Public Services | Presents an adverse impact to ag | Yes
7. Land Use Settlement Patterns | Compatibility of land uses with ag | Yes
8. Intensity of Nearby Land Uses | Impact on ag | Yes
9. History of Land Development | 15 or more subdivisions within ½ mile | No
10. Land Values under Alternative Uses | Assessed value indicates non-ag use | Yes

| Total | 8 |

**Change in Circumstances**
The change in circumstance since the previous UGA updates is that YVFWC has received funding for this proposed medical facility (with housing component). The funding will not be available during the next UGA update cycle.

**Final Determination**
The Ag de-designation criteria outlined above was developed to ensure that lands primarily devoted to or important for the long-term commercial production of agriculture would not be converted to rural or non-resource uses without the proper consideration of the goals and requirements of the GMA. GMA requires counties to protect and designate agricultural lands and at the same also requires counties to designate UGA. These two requirements can compete with each other if a city needs to add to its current UGA boundary and the only option is land designated for agriculture, which is exactly what the case is here with the Mabton’s proposal.

In 2002, Yakima County developed the Ag de-designation criteria to protect against the inappropriate conversion of designated agricultural land to rural or other non-resource land uses. The criteria was designed to protect agricultural lands that are producing high-value crops (orchard, vineyards, hops, specialty crops, dairies, lands with prime soils and irrigation, etc.). This meant that an agricultural parcel located adjacent to an existing UGA boundary would be treated the same as a parcel located far from a UGA boundary. However, the agricultural operation adjacent to the UGA has different levels of development pressure than the one located ten miles out. The de-designation criteria does provide measures to consider the location of agricultural parcel in relation to an UGA, but that measure is just one of ten different criterion to consider and each have the same weight. The design of the de-designation’s analytical process heavily favors agricultural land and limits the chances of de-designating agricultural land for UGA expansions.

**Horizon 2040**’s provides the agricultural de-designation criteria to review when changing the Agricultural land use designation. The Mabton proposed expansion area is zoned Agricultural and is adjacent to the existing UGA boundary. A portion of the property is already developed in a wholesale nursery. Adding this property to the UGA allows the property owner to extend water and sewer for the medical/residential project that the community needs.
Yakima County Planning Staff is recommending de-designation recognizing the need of the community and the location of the property in relation to urban facilities. This recommendation is based on the rationale listed above, and within the City of Mabton UGA expansion staff report. Although it is always a conflict between the two GMA goals of protecting agricultural lands and designating the UGAs. The Planning Commission will need to make their recommendation on this issue at their deliberations.
August 7, 2018

Mr. Thomas Carroll  
Yakima County Public Services  
Planning Division  
128 North Second Street  
Yakima, Washington 98901

Dear Mr. Carroll:

Please consider this letter a request for an emergency comprehensive land use amendment to add property to the City of Mabton’s Urban Growth Area. For nearly two years, the Yakima Valley Farm Worker’s Clinic has been searching for property suitable to locate a new medical facility with a housing component for low-income and senior residents. The facility would also include a community center with outdoor recreational playfields. The search for a site in the Mabton vicinity has been ongoing because Mabton and its surrounding area are severely underserved with medical services, affordable housing and recreational opportunities. YVFWC’s exhaustive search has been unable to locate any property within the City Limits of Mabton or the immediately surrounding area that can accommodate the project and meets its siting criteria.

YVFWC is specifically looking for a single campus of approximately 10-acres in size within the Mabton vicinity that is served with all necessary urban services and facilities, provides ease of access and has high visibility. This emergency amendment request is being submitted for your consideration because YVFWC believes it has found a site that meets its criteria, as well as the needs of the community. Unfortunately, the property is not within the Mabton City Limits or its Urban Growth Area but does lie adjacent to the City Limits. A project of this nature needs to be located within either the Urban Growth Area or a city’s corporate limits because it is necessary that the facility be served with urban infrastructure such as public water and sewer. Due to these circumstances (inclusion in the Mabton Urban Growth Boundary or City Limits) an amendment is needed to bring the property into the Mabton Urban Growth Area. In addition to inclusion within the Mabton Urban Growth Area, a change is required to the Future Land Use Map amendment and rezoning of the property is necessary.

Based on the desired criteria and concept of the medical facility, its housing and recreational components, YVFWC has located a site currently within the jurisdiction of Yakima County and adjacent to the City of Mabton. The project site is Assessor’s Parcel Number 220801-12002, also known as the “Gannon Property”. The site is approximately 10 acres in size and can
accommodate the entire project at a single location. For reference, the project concept proposes a single 10 acre campus that would consist of a medical facility (8,125 sq. ft.), senior housing component (45-000 to 50,000 sq. ft.), multi-family component (45-units), community-center (9,300 sq. ft.) and outdoor recreational playfields.

This site has been chosen because it is adjacent to the existing commercial city center of the City of Mabton and can easily be included within the City’s Urban Growth Area. The subject site is also located on a major arterial (Sunnyside-Mabton Road) and has the high visibility and easy access that the YVFWC desires. Domestic water mains and sanitary sewer mains adjoin the subject property along its eastern boundary and connection to those mains can be easily accomplished or extended. All other services and facilities such as fire and police are also located in the immediate area.

At the time of this request, it is the understanding of YVFWC that there is adequate water and sewer service available to serve this project. However, YVFWC is currently working with the City’s engineering firm (Grey & Osborne) to confirm availability of these services.

In its search to be thorough, YVFWC has looked at other sites within the City Limits of Mabton and within its Urban Growth Area. None of the existing sites are large enough to accommodate the facility’s size. YVFWC has also looked at combining several parcels to come up with a 10 acre parcel but have not been able to find a block of 10 acres that meets their criteria. Combining available properties is also problematic because of poor access to major arterials and would pass traffic through existing residential neighborhoods with local access streets.

County Planning staff has also indicated that it is their belief that the “Gannon Property” was previously located within the Mabton Urban Growth Boundary. However, it was “swapped” for additional industrial property to the south of town. If this is true, eliminating the Gannon property from the Urban Growth Area effectively limits Mabton’s ability to attract a mixed-use type of development to the City’s core area.

A swap of property within the existing Urban Growth Area for property outside the Urban Growth Area has also been considered as part of the overall property search. This process fails because most of the vacant property available for a swap is designated Urban Industrial and zoned Industrial, which has its own intended purpose and does not permit the proposed use.

The “Gannon” site has been chosen because it is approximately 10 acres in size, adjacent to the existing commercial city center of the City of Mabton and can easily be included within the City’s Urban Growth Area. The subject site is also located on a major arterial (Sunnyside-Mabton Road) and has the high visibility and easy access that the YVFWC desires. Domestic water and sanitary sewer mains adjoin the subject property along its eastern boundary and connection to those mains can be easily accomplished or extended, as necessary. All other services and facilities such as fire and police are also located in the immediate area.

The emergency that exists has to do with funding the project. The funding available to YVFWC for this project has a drop-dead date. The funding does not last until the next Comprehensive
Plan Update which means that the current funding will be lost, unless the Urban Growth Boundary is expanded to include this site.

Based on the above, the YVFWC is requesting that an emergency comprehensive plan amendment be conducted to include the property within the Mabton Urban Growth Area and that the Future Land Use Map and zoning be changed to accommodate this project.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (509) 249-1919.

Sincerely,

Bill Hordan
June 20, 2018

Ron Anderson
County Commissioner District 2
Yakima County
128 North 2nd Street
Yakima, WA 98901

Dear Commissioner Anderson:

I want to thank you for taking the time to discuss with me the rezoning request from the City of Mabton. As we briefly discussed, we and three other agencies, have embarked in the development of a project that it is focused on three distinct and significant projects to improve the overall community, not only in the City of Mabton but in its surrounding communities as well.

We are contemplating the development of a 50 unit low income housing that will be primarily managed and financed by one of the partners, who is currently looking for an has submitted several applications, to finance the project and believe that we could potentially start this project as early as 2019. As you know, the shortage of low income housing in the lower valley continues to be a significant problem and we are hopeful that this element of our project will alleviate some of that shortage.

The second project is the development of a 20 unit senior adult living facility and a community center that will house a Medicare driven program called PACE that manages of the care for this population. We have chosen this area because it is centrally located and we will be able to draw patients from Grandview, Prosser, Sunnyside and Toppenish. We are looking for funding under the tax credit opportunity and without ownership of the property this and other projects are difficult to continue.

The last project is the development of a medical clinic that would facilitate the care of patients without the need to travel extensively to receive it. As you know, that community lacks public transportation and Yakima Valley Farm Workers Clinic today serves almost 80% of the people that reside in the Mabton area. We are attempting to ensure that services are provided to them in proximity to their homes, making it more accessible to them.

I am enclosing, for your review, the documents that the City of Mabton has put together around the resolution and the requests for the emergency rezoning process. As you can see by the nature of the project, it is imperative that we look for land that has a least 10 acres or more and there is no such land available in Mabton outside of the one the City is requesting zoning modifications.

We, as organizations, have possible alternatives that would then move the project into District 3, however, the cost would significantly escalate and the population we are trying to target will have a much more difficult time accessing those services, therefore, you consideration to support Commissioner Rand Elliot in moving this project forward would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Juan Carlos Olivares
Chief Executive Officer

Central Administration
604 West 1st Avenue / P.O. Box 190 / Toppenish, WA 98948
Phone: 509.865.5898 / Fax: 509.865.4337
RESOLUTION NO. 2018-10

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MABTON SUPPORTING AN EMERGENCY APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF THE URBAN GROWTH AREA BOUNDARY

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act ("the Act"), codified as RCW 36.70A, requires counties planning under the Act to designate urban growth areas "within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature"; and

WHEREAS, the Act at RCW 36.70A.1 10(7) states, "An urban growth area designated in accordance with this section may include within its boundaries urban service areas or potential annexation areas designated for specific cities of towns within the county"; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton regularly reviews its Urban Growth Area, reviewing economic development strategies, land use inventories and needs, evaluating amendments and adjustments to its Urban Growth Area; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton recognizes circumstances presently exist that require amendment of the Urban Growth Area on an emergency basis in order to support and address community needs for medical, dental and health care services as well as additional affordable housing options in the context of efficiently providing public services over the planning period; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton has engaged in collaborative discussion with Yakima County long-term planning staff regarding the proposed urban growth area boundary amendment, and in this process includes a land capacity analysis, economic development planning, and capital facility planning; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton has engaged Gray & Osborne, Inc. Consulting Engineers to develop and submit cost-to-serve estimates for the proposed Urban Growth Area expansion;

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Urban Growth Area are illustrated in "City of Mabton, Wastewater Facility Plan, Figure 2-5, Sewer Map" attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, all costs and expenses shall be paid by property owner:
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NO W. THE REFERE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MABTON, AS FOLLOWS:

1. City Council for City of Mabton has reviewed and fully supports the planning proposals and adjustments to the Urban Growth Area set forth on the attached map and authorizes Mayor and staff to continue efforts to secure such amendments.

2. City Council further recognizes the significance of these long-term planning efforts and the urgency for implementation in order to facilitate and respond to immediate economic needs and opportunities. The immediate potential impact is significant and opportunities may be lost if the City is unable to respond in a prompt and efficient manner.

3. City Council notes that the request to amend the boundaries of the Urban Growth Area shall be submitted to a public participation and hearing processes before Yakima County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners and the proposals have been met with strong community support.

4. The City of Mabton has reviewed the proposed amendments to the Urban Growth Area and resolves to continue to support the Urban Growth Area amendments.

Passed by the City Council and approved by the Mayor this 24 day of April, 2018.

Laura Vazquez, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sylvia Sanchez, City Clerk / Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney Jamie Carmody

[Handwritten notes included: "Debbie G. Mabton City of 2018 Resolution Urban Growth Area Resolution"]
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RESOLUTION NO. 2018-10

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MABTON
SUPPORTING AN EMERGENCY APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT
OF THE URBAN GROWTH AREA BOUNDARY

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act ("the Act"),
codified as RCW 36.70A, requires counties planning under the Act to designate
urban growth areas "within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside
of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature"; and

WHEREAS, the Act at RCW 36.70A.110(7) states, "An urban growth area
designated in accordance with this section may include within its boundaries urban
service areas or potential annexation areas designated for specific cities or towns
within the county"; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton regularly reviews its Urban Growth Area,
reviewing economic development strategies, land use inventories and needs,
evaluating amendments and adjustments to its Urban Growth Area; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton recognizes circumstances presently exist
that require amendment of the Urban Growth Area on an emergency basis in order
to support and address community needs for medical, dental and health care
services as well as additional affordable housing options in the context of
efficiently providing public services over the planning period; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton has engaged in collaborative discussion
with Yakima County long-term planning staff regarding the proposed urban
growth area boundary amendment, and in this process includes a land capacity
analysis, economic development planning, and capital facility planning; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton has engaged Gray & Osborne, Inc.
Consulting Engineers to develop and submit cost-to-serve estimates for the
proposed Urban Growth Area expansion;

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Urban Growth Area are
illustrated in "City of Mabton, Wastewater Facility Plan, Figure 2-5, Sewer Map." attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, all costs and expenses shall be paid by property owner:
NO W. THE REFERE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MABTON, AS FOLLOWS:

1. City Council for City of Mabton has reviewed and fully supports the planning proposals and adjustments to the Urban Growth Area set forth on the attached map and authorizes Mayor and staff to continue efforts to secure such amendments.

2. City Council further recognizes the significance of these long-term planning efforts and the urgency for implementation in order to facilitate and respond to immediate economic needs and opportunities. The immediate potential impact is significant and opportunities may be lost if the City is unable to respond in a prompt and efficient manner.

3. City Council notes that the request to amend the boundaries of the Urban Growth Area shall be submitted to a public participation and hearing processes before Yakima County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners and the proposals have been met with strong community support.

4. The City of Mabton has reviewed the proposed amendments to the Urban Growth Area and resolves to continue to support the Urban Growth Area amendments.

Passed by the City Council and approved by the Mayor this 24 day of April, 2018.

[Signature]
Laura Vazquez, Mayor

ATTEST:
[Signature]
Sylvia Sanchez, City Clerk/Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
[Signature]
City Attorney Jamie Carmody
Yakima County GIS - Washington
Department of Assessment

PROPERTY PHOTO

PROPERTY INFORMATION AS OF 9/18/2017 11:01:50 PM

Parcel Address: 8301 SUNNYSIDE MABTON RD, MABTON, WA 98935
 Parcel Owner(s): TOSHIKO GARDENS LLC
 Parcel Number: 2208012002 Parcel Size: 9.97 Acre(s)
 Property Use: 63 Service - Business

TAX AND ASSESSMENT INFORMATION

Tax Code Area (TCA): 424 Tax Year: 2018
 Improvement Value: $99400 Land Value: $50800
 CurrentUse Value: $0 CurrentUse Improvement: $0
 New Construction: $0 Total Assessed Value: $150200

RESIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Quality Year Built Stories Main SqFt Upper SqFt Bsmt SqFt Bedrooms Bathrooms (full/3,4,1/2) Garages (bsmnt/att/bblin) Carport

No Residence Information Found.

SALE INFORMATION

Excise Sale Date Sale Price Grantor Portion
380232 1/25/2006 $100000 GANNON NURSERIES INC N

VALUE HISTORY INFORMATION

| Tax Year | TCA | Land Improvement New Construction CurrentUse CurrentUse Improvement |
|---------|-----|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| 2017    | 424 | $50000             | $101800              | $0              | $0                  |
| 2016    | 424 | $50000             | $102900              | $0              | $0                  |
| 2015    | 424 | $50000             | $31600               | $0              | $0                  |
| 2014    | 424 | $50000             | $31600               | $0              | $0                  |
| 2013    | 424 | $50000             | $31600               | $0              | $0                  |
| 2012    | 424 | $50000             | $31600               | $0              | $0                  |
| 2011    | 424 | $50080             | $32800               | $0              | $0                  |
| 2010    | 424 | $55450             | $34200               | $0              | $0                  |

DISCLAIMER

While the information is intended to be accurate, any manifest errors are unintentional and subject to correction. Please let us know about any errors you discover and we will correct them. To contact us call either (509) 574-1100 or (800) 572-7354, or email us.

OVERLAY INFORMATION

Zoning: AG Jurisdiction: County
Urban Growth Area: Not in a UGA Future Landuse Designation: Ag Resource (Yakima County Plan 2015)
FEMA: 100 Yr Floodplain (A) FIRM Panel Number: 53077C2259D

LOCATION INFORMATION

+ Latitude: 46° 12' 50.955" + Longitude: 120° 0' 08.574" Range: 22 Township: 08 Section: 01
Narrative Description: GOV LOT 1 LY N'LY OF S'LY R/W OF STATE HIGHWAY NO. 3-A (NOW SR-22), E5 NORTHER PACIFIC RAILWAY & STATE HIGHWAY & COUNTY ROAD R/W's

DISCLAIMER

MAP AND PARCEL DATA ARE BELIEVED TO BE ACCURATE, BUT ACCURACY IS NOT GUARANTEED; THIS IS NOT A LEGAL DOCUMENT AND SHOULD NOT BE SUBSTITUTED FOR A TITLE SEARCH, APPRAISAL, SURVEY, FLOODPLAIN OR ZONING VERIFICATION
September 7, 2018

Ms. Noelle Madera  
Yakima County - Planning Division  
128 North 2nd Street  
Yakima, Washington 98901

RE: City of Mabton – UGA Expansion Request

Dear Ms. Madera:

This letter and attachments are intended as a formal Letter of Intent to request an emergency comprehensive plan amendment to add lands to the City of Mabton Urban Growth Area. After meeting with you on August 29, 2018, I have prepared this letter to address the items you requested for this proposal to be considered by the Yakima County Planning Commission.

REQUEST
The proposal is a request for an emergency amendment to the Mabton Urban Growth Area (UGA). The application is being made by the Yakima Valley Farm Worker’s Clinic (YVFWC). The specific request is to change the comprehensive plan designation from Agricultural Resource to Urban Commercial and the zoning from Agriculture to General Commercial. This proposal would add approximately 10 acres (Parcel Number 220801-12002 – see Exhibit 1) of property to the Mabton UGA.

STATEMENT
This application is being made to construct a mixed-use commercial and residential development for YVFWC. The mixed-use development would consist of a medical care facility, community center, outdoor playfields and residential/senior housing component (see Exhibit 2). Based on this mixed-use, a commercial land use designation and zoning district is needed for the project. The emergency application is being requested at this time because there is currently funding available for the project. The funding will not be available in 2020 when the next UGA comprehensive plan update is anticipated.

To date, the property owner and YVFWC, have worked with the City of Mabton and Yakima County to acquire Resolutions (see Exhibits 3 & 4) from those jurisdictions in support of processing the emergency amendment request. Based on this, YVFWC is proceeding with this amendment request.

RATIONALE FOR REQUEST
Below is a brief summary of the rationale for the comprehensive plan amendment request. Additional testimony will be provided during the public hearing process to further support this amendment.

This amendment is needed for several reasons. There is a need for medical services and housing in the Mabton area, as the community is underserved with both. There is a time-frame in which funding is
available for this project and the funding will expire prior to the next UGA comprehensive plan update. During the last UGA update (2015), it was determined that the City of Mabton has a shortage of Commercial property within its city limits and UGA. The last update indicated there was only 17 years of Commercial property available for future development. Interesting to note, there is no commercially designated or zoned property within the current Mabton UGA, so it is not possible to remove any like-kind property as part of this amendment request. All available Commercial property is located within the city limits. Unfortunately, the search for property within the city limits has proven that a single 10 acre parcel could not be found, or multiple smaller parcels assembled, to construct the project. Since there is a known project for this amendment, the project would be constructed and the UGA would still have 17 years of Commercial property available for future development.

This proposal meets the comprehensive plan criteria to be included within the Mabton UGA because the site is adjacent to the existing city limits and fronts on SR 241 (Mabton-Sunnyside Rd). The site has access to water and sewer main lines which either front the property or can be easily extended to accommodate the proposed project. All other urban facilities and services are available to serve the site. The property has historically been used as a wholesale nursery. However, the size of the property (approximately 10 acres) limits the potential growth of the site and is too small to qualify for agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. The property is encumbered by a 100-year floodplain, which has been incorporated into the proposed project and is to be used for recreational purposes. The property is also surrounded by small parcels on the north, west and east which are not used for agricultural purposes (except a portion of the north property line). Lands to the south are generally railroad and state highway road right-of-ways.

CONCLUSION
It has been the intent of the YVFWC to establish its presence in the Mabton area for several years. A search for an approximate 10 acre site to establish a single mixed-use campus has been unsuccessful. The subject site meets the needs and criteria of the proponent (i.e. adequate access to transportation network, high visibility, access to urban services and facilities). The proponent believes this request meets the criteria of the Yakima County Comprehensive Plan criteria for the proposed amendment. This request also recognizes a deficit in commercially designated and zoned land within the Mabton UGA. Based on the above, the YVFWC is requesting the emergency amendment be considered for approval.

Thank you for your help in this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at 509-249-1919.

Sincerely,

Bill Hordan
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-06

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MABTON SUPPORTING AN EMERGENCY APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF THE URBAN GROWTH AREA (UGA) BOUNDARY

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act ("the Act"), codified as RCW 36.70A, requires counties planning under the Act to designate urban growth areas "within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature"; and

WHEREAS, the Act at RCW 36.70A.110 (7) states, "An urban growth area designated in accordance with this section may include within its boundaries urban service areas or potential annexation areas designated for specific cities or towns within the county"; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton is in the process of updating its Urban Growth Area, reviewing economic development strategies, and evaluating amendments and adjustments to its Urban Growth Area; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton recognizes circumstances presently exist that require amendment of the Urban Growth Area on an emergency basis in order to support and develop the City's economic development opportunities and more efficiently provide public services over the planning period; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton has engaged in collaborative discussion with Yakima County long-term planning staff regarding the proposed urban growth area boundary amendment, and in this process has undertaken land capacity analysis, economic development planning, and capital facility planning; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton has engaged Gray & Osborne, Inc. Consulting Engineers to develop and submit cost-to-serve estimates for the proposed Urban Growth Area expansion; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Urban Growth Area are illustrated in "City of Mabton, Wastewater Facility Plan, Figure 2-5, Sewer Map," attached,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MABTON, AS FOLLOWS:

1. City Council for City of Mabton has reviewed and fully supports the planning proposals and adjustments to the Urban Growth Area set forth on the attached map, and authorizes Mayor and staff to continue efforts to secure such amendments.

2. City Council further recognizes the significance of these long-term planning efforts and the urgency for implementation in order to facilitate and respond to immediate economic opportunities. The immediate potential impact is significant and the economic opportunities may be lost if the City is unable to respond in a prompt and efficient manner.

3. City Council notes that the request to amend the boundaries of the Urban Growth Area has been submitted to the public participation and hearing processes before the Mabton Planning Commission and the proposals have been met with strong community support.

4. The City of Mabton has reviewed the proposed amendments to the Urban Growth Area and resolves to continue to support the Urban Growth Area amendments.
Passed by the City Council and approved by the Mayor this 8th day of September, 2015.

Mario Martinez, Mayor

ATTEST: Walt Bratton, City Administrator

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Jamie Carney, City Attorney

Jeremy List
BOARD OF YAKIMA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

IN THE MATTER OF CONSIDERING
A REQUEST FROM THE CITY OF MABTON
FOR AN EMERGENCY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE CITY'S URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

RESOLUTION 288-2018

WHEREAS, the Growth Management Act (GMA) under RCW 36.70A.130, allows comprehensive plan amendments to occur no more frequently than once per year except in certain circumstances, including whenever an emergency exists; and,

WHEREAS, the Yakima County Planning Division announced that applications for the 2018 Biennial Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle must be submitted to the County by Wednesday, January 31, 2018 to be considered in that calendar year; and,

WHEREAS, Yakima County's procedures and schedules for amendments to the comprehensive plan are established by YCC Title 16B.10, which also provides that applications to amend Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) boundaries will only be considered at five-year intervals; and,

WHEREAS, Yakima County last reviewed the City of Mabton's UGA boundaries in December 2015, making the next regular review cycle in 2020; and,

WHEREAS, on April 24, 2018 Mabton's City Council approved a resolution supporting an emergency application for amendment of their UGA boundary (City of Mabton Resolution 2018-10); and,

WHEREAS, on August 7, 2018 the City of Mabton submitted a request to the Board of Yakima County Commissioners to allow the city to apply for an amendment outside of the regular amendment cycle, to expand their UGA boundary to include a 10-acre parcel (Assessor’s Parcel Number 220801-12002); and,

WHEREAS, the City of Mabton urgently insists that their proposed plan amendment constitutes an emergency and needs to be considered prior to the next county review of Mabton’s UGA boundary scheduled to take place in 2020; and

WHEREAS, the proposed UGA boundary expansion is intended to accommodate the Yakima Valley Farm Worker’s Clinic (YVFWC), that has received funding to develop a medical facility with a housing component for low-income and senior residents, in addition to a community center with outdoor recreational playgrounds in the Mabton area; and,

EXHIBIT 4
WHEREAS, since GMA requires, under RCW 36.70a.110(4), that urban services (water and sewer) not be extended outside of UGA’s, the proposed 10-acre parcel is located outside the city limits and the UGA boundary, which would prevent sewer services from being extended; and,

WHEREAS, the GMA, RCW 36.70A.130(2)(b), also allows counties to adopt comprehensive plan amendments after appropriate public participation whenever an emergency exists; and

WHEREAS, after careful consideration the Board believes that an emergency exists due to a need to consider resolving the urgent plight of the medical and housing needs in the City of Mabton prior to the next UGA boundary and Comprehensive Plan Amendment cycle, and now therefore,

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Yakima County Commissioners than an emergency, within the meaning of RCW 36.70A.130(2)(b), exists with regards to the City of Mabton’s application to amend its UGA boundary.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Services Division is hereby directed to initiate consideration of the City of Mabton’s request as soon as possible in accordance with RCW 36.70A.130(2)(b).

DONE this 21st day of August 2018.

Ron Anderson, Chairman

Michael D. Leita, Commissioner

Attest: Rachel Michael
Clerk of the Board

J. Rand Elliott, Commissioner

Excused

Constituting the Board of County Commissioners for Yakima County, Washington