

YAKIMA COUNTY PUBLIC SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Planning Division, Long Range Planning Section

TO: Yakima County Planning Commission

STAFF CONTACT: Olivia Story – Yakima County Planning Division

DATE: August 13, 2025

ISSUE: Periodic Update – Land Use Element

Introduction

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), passed in 1990, requires Yakima County to plan thoughtfully and deliberately for long-term growth. To meet these obligations, the County must adopt a countywide planning policy (RCW 36.70A.210), identify and protect resource lands like agriculture, forests, and mineral (RCW 36.70A.060), establish and maintain Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) (RCW 36.70A.110), and adopt a comprehensive plan along with consistent development regulations (RCW 36.70A.040). At its core, the GMA aims to direct growth toward areas with existing infrastructure and public services, while discouraging scattered, low-density development that can chip away at agricultural land. The expectation is that new development will be focused primarily within cities and UGAs. While some growth is still allowed in rural and agricultural areas, it must occur at a scale that doesn't promote sprawl or interfere with agricultural viability.

In addition to the annual docket process that allows for regular updates to the comprehensive plan, the GMA also requires a broader, periodic review of both comprehensive plans and development regulations. This periodic update, called for under RCW 36.70A.130, is intended to ensure that local plans stay aligned with state law, reflect updated data and land use trends, and incorporate new population forecasts. Yakima County's deadline for completing the current periodic update is December 31, 2026.

Yakima County adopted its first GMA compliant comprehensive plan, Plan 2015, on May 20, 1997, after years of community engagement since 1990. That early effort produced both Upper Valley and Lower Valley Vision Statements, which helped shape the final policies and goals in the plan.

The County completed its last full GMA periodic update on June 27, 2017. Since then, ***Horizon 2040*** has been updated through the annual amendment process, which allows both the County and private applicants to propose changes once per year.

Analysis

As part of the required periodic update under the Washington State GMA, Yakima County is conducting a thorough review of the Land Use Element using the Department of Commerce's Periodic Update Checklist. This checklist is designed to help jurisdictions evaluate their comprehensive plans for consistency with current GMA requirements, recent legislative changes, and updated planning guidance.

It provides a structured framework for identifying where the plan aligns with the law and where additional updates or refinements may be needed.

The following section walks through each checklist item in detail, assessing how well the existing Land Use Element meets the applicable requirements and noting any revisions to ensure full compliance.

Land Use Checklist item a.

“The element integrates relevant county-wide planning policies into the local planning process, and ensures local goals and policies are consistent. For jurisdictions in the central Puget Sound region, the plan is consistent with applicable multi-county planning policies.”

Horizon 2040 incorporates the Yakima Countywide Planning Policy (CWPP) throughout the Land Use Element, with key references in Section 5.1 (pg. 5-1) and again in Section 5.6.1, UGAs. For instance, the plan states:

“Countywide Planning Policies provide a framework for interjurisdictional planning and establish the basis for consistent comprehensive plans across jurisdictions.” (Section 5.1)

Staff finding: No updates are recommended at this time. The existing goals and policies remain aligned with the Yakima CWPP and continue to support a coordinated approach to regional land use planning.

Land Use Checklist Item b.

“A future land use map showing city limits and UGA boundaries.”

Staff finding: The Yakima County Comprehensive Plan includes a Future Land Use Map that clearly delineates city limits and UGA boundaries for the 12 incorporated cities and two towns in the County. These maps are currently undergoing review and refinement as part of the County’s Land Capacity Analysis (LCA), which is being developed in collaboration with each jurisdiction. Updated versions of the Future Land Use Map will be finalized and adopted as part of the comprehensive plan update by the state mandated deadline of December 31, 2026, in accordance with the GMA.

Land Use Checklist Item c.

“Urban Growth Area review: based on the population projection made for the County by OFM, the county and each city must include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth projected to occur in the county or city for the succeeding twenty year period, except UGAs completely within a national historic reserve.”

Staff finding: Staff are currently reviewing the adequacy of its UGAs in collaboration with 12 incorporated cities and two towns. The report provides a review of the county’s Annual Average Growth Rates (AAGRs) calculated from OFM’s 2024 medium projection. This work is being carried out as part of the LCA, which is evaluating whether existing UGA boundaries and planned densities can accommodate expected urban growth over the next 22 years (2024 to 2046). Although the analysis is ongoing, any necessary adjustments to UGA boundaries, policies, or maps will be completed and adopted by the December 31, 2026, deadline to ensure compliance with the GMA.

Land Use Checklist Item d.

“If there is a UGA expansion into the 100-year floodplain of a river segment that is located west of the Cascade crest and when the river has a mean annual flow of 1,000 or more cubic feet per second, it meets the statutory exceptions to the general ban on such UGA expansions.”

Staff finding: This requirement does not apply to Yakima County because the County lies east of the Cascade crest.

Land Use Checklist Item e:

“Is there consideration of urban planning approaches that increase physical activity and reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) within the jurisdiction, but without increasing greenhouse gas emissions elsewhere in the state?”

While **Horizon 2040** includes a number of goals and policies that promote physical activity and aim to reduce per capita VMT, it falls short of fully addressing the intent of this checklist item, specifically, the part that cautions against shifting greenhouse gas emissions to other parts of the state. This conclusion is based on a review of the Land Use and Transportation Elements of the plan. There are clear efforts to support compact, walkable development patterns through infill, complete streets, and non-motorized transportation options. However, the requirement also asks jurisdictions to consider whether these strategies unintentionally lead to increased emissions elsewhere, for example, by pricing out residents or displacing growth to more car-dependent areas. Currently, **Horizon 2040** does not clearly reflect this concern or include policies to address it.

Suggested Text:

[LU-U 6.4: Reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled and increasing physical activity through land-use patterns, while considering the statewide implications of local land-use and transportation strategies and avoiding the displacement of greenhouse gas emissions to other areas of Washington.](#)

Staff finding: Staff recommends adding a new policy to the Land Use Element that explicitly addresses this issue (see Attachment A). Including such a policy would not only meet the GMA requirement, but also reinforces the County’s commitment to equitable, climate-conscious planning that considers regional impacts as well as local outcomes.

Land Use Checklist Item f.

“A consistent population projection throughout the plan which should be consistent with the county’s sub-county allocation of that forecast and housing needs.”

Chapter 5 includes references to population growth and UGA planning, but it does not explicitly cite or reinforce the specific population forecasts that underpin the rest of the plan. While these projections are detailed in Chapter 7 (Housing), those connections aren’t made clear when reviewing the Land Use Element independently. To fully meet the intent of this checklist item, Chapter 5 should directly acknowledge that its assumptions about land use, UGA sizing, and development capacity are built on the same countywide population forecast and sub-county allocation used elsewhere in **Horizon 2040**.

Suggested Text:

Section 5.1

The Land Use Element is based on the countywide population projection adopted by the Board of Yakima County Commissioners and consistent with the Office of Financial Management (OFM) medium-range forecast. Urban Growth Area sizing, rural development assumptions, and zoning designations reflect the county's sub-county allocation of population growth and housing needs, as applied in coordination with the Housing and Capital Facilities Elements.

Section 5.7

Yakima County's designated UGAs were evaluated using a LCA consistent with the adopted population projections. The assumptions used in estimating residential and employment capacity align with those in the Housing and Capital Facilities Elements. This approach ensures that designated UGAs have sufficient capacity to accommodate projected growth through the 2046 planning horizon.

Staff finding: Staff recommends adding language to Sections 5.1 and 5.7 affirming that land use decisions are based on the same demographic forecast that inform the County's overall growth strategy. These targeted edits will ensure internal consistency and bring Chapter 5 into alignment with Checklist Item f. (See Attachment A)

Land Use Checklist Item g.

"Estimates of population densities and building intensities based on future land uses and housing needs."

The Land Use element satisfies this requirement through the addition of the Land Capacity Analysis (LCA). The LCA identifies the amount of developable land within each Urban Growth Area and rural designation, applies adopted density and building intensity assumptions for each land use category, and projects the total housing units and nonresidential development that can be accommodated. These estimates are directly tied to the County's 2046 population allocations and housing needs, ensuring that adopted land use designations provide sufficient capacity to meet projected growth. The Land Use Element incorporates these findings through updated population tables, density assumptions, and policy language that link future growth to specific land use designations, thereby demonstrating consistency with Commerce's criteria.

Staff finding: No updates are recommended at this time. The existing Land Use Element incorporates density and building intensity estimates derived from the LCA, which are based on adopted population allocations and housing needs. These provisions remain consistent with the Washington State Department of Commerce criteria and continue to ensure sufficient capacity for projected growth within designated land use categories.

Land Use Checklist Item h.

"Provisions for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies."

While Section 5.9.5.1 of the Land Use Element addresses water availability and outlines the County's Water Resource System (YCWRS) to ensure legal water rights and mitigate impacts to senior water-right holders, it does not sufficiently address the protection of groundwater quality, nor does it directly reference public water supplies in the context of rural land use decisions. RCW 36.70A.070(5) requires rural elements to protect groundwater resources, and Commerce's checklist item (h) further emphasizes the need to safeguard both quantity and quality of groundwater used for public water supply systems.

The current narrative focuses on legal and hydrologic availability, but omits discussion of contamination risk, aquifer protection strategies, or the relationship between zoning and wellhead and source water protection. Without this, the plan does not clearly demonstrate how land use policies are being used to protect the drinking water supply of rural and unincorporated residents.

Suggested Text:

[5.9.1 Rural Lands – Water Availability](#)

In addition to addressing water quantity and legal availability, Yakima County also recognizes the importance of protecting groundwater quality, particularly for the many rural and unincorporated communities that rely on groundwater for public water supplies. The County's land use designations and zoning provisions support aquifer recharge, manage development intensity, and help reduce risks of contamination from septic systems, agricultural runoff, and other land uses.

To safeguard groundwater quality, the County implements several protective strategies, including minimum lot sizes in rural zones, development limitations in designated Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARA's) and coordination with state and local agencies responsible for wellhead protection. In addition to protecting potable water supplies, CARA's function as critical areas for flood storage, water availability in general, and are especially important during extreme weather events (flooding) and climate trends (drought). Aquifer recharge is a key component of the County's GMA Natural Settings and Hazards elements to improve resiliency against climate change, and as a sustainability measure to protect the agricultural economy. These measures are reinforced through the County's Critical Areas Ordinance (YCC Title 16C), which governs development in areas that provide recharge to potable aquifers. Together, these provisions ensure that land use decisions align with the long-term sustainability of drinking water supplies and the health of rural communities.

Staff finding: Staff recommends adding paragraphs that more explicitly connects land use designations, zoning provisions, and critical areas protections to the County's responsibility to protect groundwater quality for public consumption.

Land Use Checklist Item i.

“Identification of lands useful for public purposes such as utility corridors, transportation corridors, landfills, sewage treatment facilities, storm water management facilities, recreation, schools, and other public uses.”

Chapter 5 references public facilities like schools and parks in relation to urban development and UGA planning. However, it does not specifically identify or categorize lands set aside for the full range of public uses outlined in this checklist item. Since the requirement calls for a clear statement about lands designated for utilities, transportation corridors, treatment plants, and similar facilities, adding a concise subsection that summarizes the County's approach would clarify how these needs are addressed and bring the plan into alignment with GMA standards.

Suggested Text:

[5.9.7 Lands for Public Purposes](#)

Yakima County recognizes the importance of identifying and planning for lands intended for public purposes such as schools, parks, utility corridors, stormwater and wastewater infrastructure, landfills, transportation corridors, and other essential facilities and services. These land uses are foundational to

the functioning of both urban and rural communities and must be considered in long-range land use planning policy decisions.

Public purpose lands are addressed through coordination with city partners, utility providers, school districts, the Yakama Nation, and other public agencies. In urban areas, these lands are typically designated under Public/Institutional or Utility land use categories and are incorporated into the County's land capacity analysis. While such lands are not available for private development, they play a critical role in ensuring infrastructure and services keep pace with population growth.

In rural areas, siting of public facilities is guided by rural character policies and constraints related to topography, access, environmental sensitivity, and service provision. These facilities are generally limited to those necessary to support rural communities, immediate public health issues, or to serve broader regional needs (such as solid waste management or regional utility infrastructure).

This section supports coordination between the Land Use Element and the Capital Facilities, Utilities, and Transportation elements of Horizon 2046, ensuring that land use designations reflect the spatial needs of essential public services.

Staff finding: Staff recommends adding a new subsection titled "Lands for Public Purposes" within Section 5.9.7, as detailed in Attachment A.

Land Use Checklist Item j.

"Identification of open space corridors and green spaces within and between urban growth areas, including lands useful for recreation, wildlife habitat, trails and connection of critical areas, and urban and community forests within the UGA."

Chapter 5 mentions open space primarily in relation to rural land use and community character, but does not clearly identify open space corridors or green space systems within or linking UGAs. The GMA emphasizes these features not just as amenities but as essential landscape elements that support wildlife habitat, recreation opportunities, trail networks, and climate resilience. Including a subsection that highlights these corridors and networks will define the County's goals for open space and strengthen the plan's consistency with this checklist item.

Suggested Text:

5.8.3.3 Open Space Corridors and Green Infrastructure

Yakima County recognizes that open space corridors serve a vital role in maintaining livability, supporting ecosystem health, and providing recreational opportunities within and across UGAs. These corridors can also serve as buffers between incompatible land uses and help mitigate stormwater impacts and the urban heat island effect. In coordination with the Parks and Recreation Element, the Natural Settings Element, and individual city comprehensive plans, Yakima County identifies and encourages the preservation and connection of key open space corridors. These include:

- Riparian corridors such as the Yakima and Naches Rivers;
- Designated wildlife habitat areas, including the Cowiche Canyon;
- Urban greenways such as the Yakima Greenway and future trail extensions;
- Urban tree canopy and street tree programs forming community forest infrastructure.

The County will work with cities and other jurisdictions to support the designation and connectivity of these spaces across UGA boundaries. Mapping of existing and potential corridors may be included in

[future plan amendments, capital facility plans, and park and trail planning efforts.](#)

LU-U 2.8

[Yakima County shall identify, preserve, and enhance open space corridors within and between Urban Growth Areas that connect recreational lands, wildlife habitat, critical areas, and community forests, and shall coordinate this planning effort with applicable city, regional, and state plans.](#)

Staff finding: *Staff recommends adding a new subsection titled “Open Space Corridors and Green Infrastructure” to Section 5.8.3.3, as outlined in Attachment A. This addition will help illustrate Yakima County’s commitment to protecting natural systems and enhancing residents’ quality of life across both urban and rural settings.*

Land Use Checklist Item k.

“Criteria for designating natural resource lands consistent with minimum guidelines to classify agricultural, forest, mineral lands, and critical areas.”

Horizon 2040, Land Use Element meets the requirements by providing designation criteria for agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands that align with the minimum guidelines in WAC 365-190, as required under RCW 36.70A.170.

Specifically:

- Agricultural Resource Lands designation criteria are detailed in Section 5.10.3. The plan considers soil types (prime and unique soils), parcel size, existing land use, zoning compatibility, water availability, and the long-term commercial significance of the land. The plan recognizes the importance of irrigated farmland and the role of market conditions in maintaining agricultural viability.
- Forest Resource Lands designation is addressed in Section 5.10.4, where the County identifies large blocks of privately owned timberland, considers ownership size and management history, and evaluates compatibility with adjacent uses. The designation emphasizes long-term commercial significance, accessibility, and separation from incompatible uses, consistent with the guidance in WAC 365-190-060.
- Mineral Resource Lands are designated in Section 5.10.5, which outlines criteria including geologic mapping, existing permits, material types (e.g., sand, gravel, aggregate), proximity to infrastructure, and land use compatibility. The plan identifies lands of long-term commercial significance and addresses potential land use conflicts with adjacent residential or agricultural uses.

Together, these sections provide a clear and transparent rationale for how Yakima County designates and maps its natural resource lands under the GMA framework.

Critical Areas, however, are not directly addressed in the Land Use Element. Instead, Yakima County complies with RCW 36.70A.170(2) through the adoption and implementation of Yakima County Code Title 16C, Critical Areas Ordinance, and by referencing these protections in the Natural Settings Element of **Horizon 2040**. This separation of critical areas criteria from the land use designations is a common and acceptable planning approach under GMA, as critical areas are regulated through environmental protection ordinances and technical studies rather than mapped future land use designations.

Staff finding: *Staff finds that **Horizon 2040** substantially meets the requirements. The plan includes clear, documented designation criteria for agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands, consistent with the*

minimum classification guidelines under WAC 365-190 and the requirements of RCW 36.70A.170. While designation criteria for critical areas are not included in the Land Use Element, they are fully addressed through Yakima County's Critical Areas Ordinance (YCC Title 16C) and the Natural Settings Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Land Use Checklist Item l.

"Policies for agriculturally designated lands limiting nonagricultural uses to lands with poor soils or otherwise not suitable for agricultural purposes, and policies limiting the allowable range of accessory uses to those allowed by statute."

While the **Horizon 2040** Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element demonstrates a clear intent to preserve agricultural resource lands and limit incompatible development, it does not fully satisfy the requirements. Specifically, while existing policies such as LU-ER-AG 1.4 and LU-ER-AG 1.5 addresses the need for compatibility and acknowledge the role of accessory uses, they do so in general terms and without reference to measurable criteria. The GMA requires counties to limit nonagricultural uses on designated agricultural lands to those areas that are demonstrably unsuitable for commercial agriculture, typically due to poor soils or significant site constraints. The Land Use Element, however, does not define what constitutes "unsuitable" land, nor does it establish a threshold or standard for making such determinations. As a result, the policy framework currently allows for a high degree of discretion and subjectivity, which may lead to inconsistent application and increased risk of agricultural land conversion.

Suggested Text:

LU-ER-AG 1.22

Non-agricultural uses on designated Agricultural Resource Lands shall only be considered when the subject parcel meets one or more of the following criteria:

- a. Mapped as "poor" or "very poor" soils for agriculture by NRCS (USDA); or
- b. Is subject to physical constraints (e.g., steep slope > 30%, floodway, wetland) significantly reducing crop viability.
- c. Demonstrates that the proposed use does not displace or fragment adjacent productive farmland.
- d. Requires Conditional Use Permit approval, including findings that agricultural productivity is not materially reduced.

Staff finding: Staff recommends adding new policy language that sets forth criteria for determining when non-agricultural uses may be permitted on designated Agricultural Resource Lands. This includes identifying soil types classified as "poor" or "very poor" by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and recognizing physical constraints such as steep slopes, floodplains, or wetlands that would substantially limit the site's agricultural productivity. These criteria provide a rational and defensible basis for limiting non-agricultural development to only those areas that are demonstrably unsuitable for farming, as required by state guidance.

Land Use Checklist Item m.

"Policies encouraging the conservation of productive forest and agricultural lands and discouraging incompatible uses."

Section 5.10.3 (Agricultural Resource Areas Land Use Category) speaks to the designation and protection of agricultural lands. Policies LU-ER-AG 1 (1.1-1.22) establish a foundation for agricultural land conservation, however, they lack specificity regarding the prevention of incompatible uses. Nowhere do the policies explicitly discourage land use patterns or developments that conflict with ongoing agricultural or forestry operations, such as rural residential sprawl, urban utility extensions, or rezoning pressures.

Additionally, the Forest Resource Areas Land Use Category (5.10.4) contains only one policy (LU-ER-F 1.1), which encourages the continuation of forest activities. This statement is general and passive, offering no guidance on how to protect forest lands from conversion or incompatible adjacent uses.

In short, while the intent to protect economic resource lands is evident, the policy framework does not meet the GMA's expectation for actively discouraging incompatible uses or ensuring the long-term viability of these lands.

Suggested Text:

LU-ER-AG 1.23

Discourage the introduction of incompatible residential, commercial, or industrial development on or adjacent to designated agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance

LU-ER-AG 1.24

Limit infrastructure extensions, including public water and sewer, that would increase pressure to convert agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses, unless necessary to support existing agricultural operations.

LU-ER-AG 1.25

Promote land use compatibility by requiring buffers, disclosure notices, and other mitigation measures to minimize conflicts between agricultural operations and nearby non-farm uses.

LU-ER-F 1.12

Discourage land uses adjacent to designated forest lands that are incompatible with commercial forestry, including residential subdivisions and urban infrastructure.

LU-ER-F 1.13

Coordinate with the Yakama Nation, Department of Natural Resources and private landowners to identify and mitigate land use conflicts that threaten long-term forest productivity or increase wildfire risks.

Staff finding: Staff recommends that the County expand its policy language (attachment A) to directly address land use conflicts. Policies should discourage residential subdivision adjacent to agricultural or forest resource areas, limit infrastructure extensions that create development pressure, and encourage mitigation strategies for unavoidable conflicts.

Land Use Checklist Item n.

“If there is an airport within the county: policies, land use designations (and zoning) to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports.”

The **Horizon 2040** Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element does address the requirement of Checklist Item “n” from the Department of Commerce’s periodic update checklist. Specifically, the plan includes a suite of policies that reflect a clear intent to discourage incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports and to protect aviation-related land uses from encroachment.

Within the Land Use Element, Policy LU-R 4.1 states that “Enact overlay zoning to protect the airspace around state and federal system airports from airspace obstructions and incompatible land uses where approach and clear zones have been recommended by the FAA,” providing broad direction to limit encroachment. This is further reinforced in Goal LU-ER-AG 2, “Provide airfields with reasonable protection from airspace obstructions, incompatible land uses and nuisance complaints that could restrict operations.” Taken together, these policies form a coherent framework that demonstrates Yakima County’s intent and effort to preserve the function of general aviation airports by discouraging incompatible land uses nearby. While the document doesn’t use the checklist’s exact phrasing, the policies cited reflect clear compliance in both spirit and substance.

*Staff finding: Staff finds that the **Horizon 2040** Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element is in compliance with Checklist Item “n.” The plan includes multiple policies that address the compatibility of land uses near general aviation airports. The policy reflects a consistent approach to discouraging incompatible development near airports through land use designations, zoning, and hazard area protections. No amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is required at this time.*

Land Use Checklist Item o.

“Where applicable, a review of drainage, flooding and stormwater run-off in the area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state.”

Yakima County addresses drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff within the Flood Hazard and Management section of the Comprehensive Plan, which establishes a coordinated framework for reducing flood risk and protecting water quality. This section recognizes the county’s floodplain areas, identifies risks from seasonal flooding, and outlines strategies to manage development in a manner that preserves natural drainage functions and minimizes pollutant discharges to state waters. Policies direct the use of best management practices (BMPs), compliance with the Yakima County Flood Hazard Management Plan, and coordination with state and federal agencies to maintain and improve flood control infrastructure. The plan also supports development standards in flood-prone areas that control stormwater runoff volume and rate, thereby preventing erosion, sedimentation, and contamination of water resources. Through these measures, the county provides the necessary policy guidance to mitigate and cleanse discharges from stormwater that may affect waters of the state, consistent with the Department of Commerce’s requirement.

Staff finding: Staff recommends no amendments to the Land Use Element are recommended at this time. The Flood Hazard and Management policies adequately address drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff by providing clear guidance to minimize pollutant discharges to waters of the state.

Recommendations

Staff finds that **Horizon 2040** substantially addresses the GMA and Department of Commerce requirements for the Land Use Element. The plan establishes a strong framework for guiding growth, conserving agricultural and forest lands, and coordinating infrastructure and public services. However,

staff wrote new sections and policies for the Land Use Element to more clearly align with statutory requirements and state guidance.

Staff recommends adopting the amendments outlined in Attachment A. These edits reflect a comprehensive review of the Land Use Element against GMA requirements and Department of Commerce guidance. Recommended changes include new and revised policies to clarify resource land designation criteria, protect agricultural viability, reduce land use conflicts, support infill and compact development, promote active transportation, strengthen coordination across jurisdictions, and improve guidance on stormwater, flooding, and climate resilience. These refinements enhance consistency with state law, improve internal plan coherence, and provide clearer direction for future land use decisions.

These refinements do not alter the County's overall policy direction but enhance its clarity, consistency, and compliance with the GMA. Adopting the recommended edits will ensure that **Horizon 2040** continues to serve as a legally defensible and forward-looking blueprint for sustainable land use planning in Yakima County through 2046.

\\\nt2\Planning\Long Range\Projects\Comp Plan GMA Update\Horizon 2046\ELEMENTS\Chapter 5 Land Use\Land Use white paper - periodic update.os.doc