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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNSF</td>
<td>Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Critical Areas Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBP</td>
<td>Columbia Basin Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFP</td>
<td>Capital Facilities Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>Cascade Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Washington Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Grant County Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWPP</td>
<td>County-Wide Planning Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSP</td>
<td>Coordinated Water System Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCTED</td>
<td>Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>Washington State Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Washington State Department of Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA</td>
<td>Growth Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>Grant Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWMA</td>
<td>Ground Water Management Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADL</td>
<td>Instrumental Activities to Daily Living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADL</td>
<td>Limitations to Activities to Daily Living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMIRRD</td>
<td>Limited areas of more intense rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPAIS</td>
<td>National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>Washington State Office of Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORV</td>
<td>Off-Road Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Palouse River and Coulee City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Participation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Public Utility District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUADCO</td>
<td>Quad County Regional Transportation Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCW</td>
<td>Revised Code of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>State Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>Shoreline Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWMP</td>
<td>Solid Waste Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDC</td>
<td>Unified Development Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>urban growth area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULID</td>
<td>Utility Local Improvement District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBR</td>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Reclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>volume to capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSP</td>
<td>Voluntary Stewardship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC</td>
<td>Washington Administrative Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDFW</td>
<td>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDOH</td>
<td>Washington Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIA</td>
<td>Water Resource Inventory Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>Washington State Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSHFC</td>
<td>Washington State Housing Finance Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUTC</td>
<td>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
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</table>
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1 Introduction

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), adopted by the state legislature in 1990, requires local governments to develop comprehensive plans to address local and statewide planning issues. "The legislature finds that uncoordinated and unplanned growth, together with a lack of common goals expressing the public’s interest in the conservation and wise use of our lands, pose a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the health and safety, and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state" (Revised Code of Washington [RCW] 36.70A.010).

The Grant County Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan) was developed to reflect the County’s values and plan for future growth consistent with the GMA and guide County decisions on land use, transportation, infrastructure, housing, economic development, and the environment.

This Comprehensive Plan builds on the last update completed by the County in 2006 (minor amendments have been completed since then). The updated plan addresses citizen input during visioning, refines goals and policies, incorporates recent analyses and findings in applicable plan elements, and reflects changes to more fully address the latest GMA requirements. The Comprehensive Plan also addresses planning in the unincorporated and urban growth areas (UGAs) that are not yet annexed to cities. However, the County-Wide Planning Policies (CWPP; see Section 1.5.1) address regional planning issues and coordinate growth among all jurisdictions.
1.1 Purpose and Intent of the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan’s purpose and intent is to provide for local needs relating to the use of land and infrastructure, including the protection of property and water rights, and in so doing, to meet the State’s minimum planning law requirements. Comprehensive planning for Grant County will help ensure that the following goals will be accomplished:

- Tax dollars invested in public roads, water and sewer systems, fire stations, parks and other public services are spent wisely.
- Funding for development and capital improvement projects is secured.
- Long-range considerations are incorporated into decisions on short-range actions.
- Public interests, and the interest of the community at large, are promoted rather than the interests of individuals or special groups within the communities.
- Interests of property owners are protected.

The analyses of existing conditions, issues, facilities, population projections, and other factors within the Comprehensive Plan will aid Grant County officials and the County Commissioners in their decision-making role. It seeks to establish a clear intent and policy base that can be used to develop and interpret municipal regulations. The Comprehensive Plan is also intended to maintain reasonable continuity in future decision-making as turnover occurs within the County’s legislative body. However, the plan must be periodically reviewed and updated to reflect technological, social, economic, and political changes that may invalidate certain plans and policies.

1.1.1 Authority to Plan

The Comprehensive Plan provides a legally recognized framework for making decisions about land use and other planning and policy priorities; however, it is fundamentally a policy document providing direction for how land use goals, policies, and regulations should be applied for the next 10 to 20 years in Grant County. The policies are required by the GMA to be implemented through the use of such regulatory tools as zoning and subdivision ordinances, as well as other innovative techniques. These regulations must be developed and maintained in accordance with the goals and policies of this Comprehensive Plan.

1.1.2 Growth Management Act Goals and Required Elements

The GMA requires Grant and the cities and towns within the County along with other counties and cities in the state to plan in accordance with the following goals (RCW 36.70A.020):

- **Urban Growth.** Encourage development in UGAs where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.
- **Reduce Sprawl.** Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.
• **Transportation.** Encourage efficient multi-modal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.

• **Housing.** Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing.

• **Economic Development.** Encourage economic development throughout the state that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, promote the retention and expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new businesses, recognize regional differences impacting economic development opportunities, and encourage growth, all within the capacities of the state's natural resources, public services, and public facilities.

• **Property Rights.** Private 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.

• **Permits.** Applications for both state and local government permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.

• **Natural Resource Industries.** Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural and fisheries industries.

• **Open Space and Recreation.** Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks.

• **Environment.** Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air, water quality, and the availability of water.

• **Citizen Participation and Coordination.** Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

• **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.

• **Historic Preservation.** Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical or archaeological significance.

• **Shoreline Management.** Additionally, the goals and policies of a Shoreline Master Plan (SMP) for a county or city approved under developed under the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW) shall be considered a part of the county or city's comprehensive plan.
1.2 Planning Process

1.2.1 Growth Management and the State Environmental Policy Act

The GMA requires compliance with both the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and GMA in the comprehensive planning process. Due to their similarities, integration of SEPA with GMA eliminates duplication of effort and assures consistency between them.

The Comprehensive Plan Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum (Chapter 12) provides an environmental analysis of two alternatives to support the Comprehensive Plan: a “No Action” alternative and a “Proposed Action” alternative. Alternative 1, the “No Action” alternative, calls for keeping the County’s existing Comprehensive Plan without modifications. Alternative 2, the “Proposed Action” alternative, allows for changes in the Comprehensive Plan to land use designations and other plan elements consistent with public input received during visioning, updated analyses for the plan, and development trends.

1.2.2 Community Involvement

One cornerstone of successful implementation of the GMA is citizen participation. The County updated its Public Participation Plan (PPP) in 2017 (Appendix B). Cities and counties planning under the GMA must establish “…procedures providing for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans and development regulations implementing such plans.”

In 2017 and 2018, the County conducted multiple meetings and provided opportunities for public involvement. The County established a Comprehensive Plan webpage to disseminate information to, and gather input from, the public. The County also held Planning Commission and County Commissioners’ workshops. Planning Commission and County Commissioners’ hearings were held with published notices. Public participation activities for the Comprehensive Plan update are described in the PPP Addendum included in Appendix B.
1.2.3 Definition of Terms

In concert with the Future Land Use Designation Map (Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 5 – Future/Proposed Land Use Designations Map), the vision, goals, and policies within the Comprehensive Plan are the primary directives for land use decision-making and long-range planning and guide the implementation of regulations.

These terms are generally defined as:

- **Vision** is a collective value and target of a county, it is what a county wants to become.
- **Goals** are broad statements of intent and philosophy expressing county-wide values and attitudes. Goals are used as a general guide for action by the County. A goal may never be completely attained, but is a target towards which to strive over time.
- **Policies** provide the basis for decision-making and specific courses of action, which move the County toward the attainment of its adopted goals. Policies have major influence because decisions, actions, and programs should neither conflict, nor be inconsistent with an adopted policy. Policies should be operable on a continuous basis and applied consistently over time.
- **Regulations**, codes, and ordinances implement policies.

Vision, goals, and policies are also the principal directives to County decision-makers and staff relative to what planning and public works actions, studies, and other projects should be undertaken during the plan's 20 year "horizon" to address current and future growth and development and resource issues.

1.2.4 Visioning

The County conducted two public workshops on September 13 and 14, 2017, providing an overview of the plan update process and receive input from the County Planning Commission and members of the public on key topics, vision elements, and other ideas to incorporate into the updated plan. Following the workshops, the Visioning Workshops Summary (Appendix C) was developed and used as an important input to the update of the Comprehensive Plan.
Grant County residents’ visioning priorities include the following elements:

- Preserving the rural lifestyle, friendly people, and recreational opportunities available
- Preserving agriculture and agricultural lands
- Preserving historical locations and promoting them as tourism efforts
- Increasing job opportunities to provide local employment opportunities for future generations
- Promoting economic growth in industry, recreation and tourism, and commercial development
- Identifying and protecting environmentally-sensitive areas and wildlife habitat, such as the Columbia River, wetlands, Potholes Reservoir, and Moses Lake
- Guiding elected and appointed officials toward orderly growth and development

Grant County resident’s cultural attributes include the following characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The people of Grant County are:</th>
<th>We believe in:</th>
<th>We value:</th>
<th>We encourage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>Traditional American values</td>
<td>Human dignity</td>
<td>Respect for human dignity and equal opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Our quality of life</td>
<td>Balanced growth and development in harmony with the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td>Government serving the people</td>
<td>Our rich, diverse cultural heritage</td>
<td>Balance between too little and too much government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Strong rural communities</td>
<td>Our history, customs and traditions</td>
<td>Preservation and protection of the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>Service to the community</td>
<td>Equity, honesty, and integrity</td>
<td>Protection of private property rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Preservation of our way of life</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Economic development and prosperous communities, cities, and towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Democracy and individual freedom</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Best use of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td></td>
<td>The land, environment, and natural resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Takers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law, justice, and order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.4.1 Vision Statement
Grant County seeks to maintain and enhance its quality of life while achieving benefits of growth and minimizing any negative impacts. Grant County’s vision defines its future and how it will respond to growth and change, as reflected in the Comprehensive Plan’s Goals and Policies (Chapter 3).

The County’s vision is comprised of the following basic values:

- Promote a healthy, diversified, and sustainable local and regional economy by supporting existing local businesses and agri-tourism, making prudent infrastructure investments, and encouraging new business that is compatible with and complementary to the community.
- Protect and preserve the natural beauty, rural character, and variety of lifestyles that define the community.
- Incorporate County historical locations into tourism efforts to leverage appeal of the community.
- Protect and conserve agricultural resources, and prevent inappropriate conversion of prime agricultural lands.
- Manage growth effectively to prevent inappropriate or premature conversion of undeveloped land and to minimize incompatible land uses and the cost of public and private services.
- Encourage infill development within UGAs, and enhance the sense of “community” around traditional population centers.
- Provide a variety of residential living opportunities, ranging from urban to rural, small town, rural settlement, shoreline, and agricultural.
- Promote healthy, safe, and productive communities with a variety of housing for all economic levels including housing for temporary agriculture workers.
- Encourage opportunities for quality community education and technology to meet the educational and training needs of all residents.
- Promote open, responsive, and accountable local government that works to create a true sense of community and to create democratic processes on all levels.

1.3 Intergovernmental Coordination
Coordination and cooperation among various jurisdictions, service providers, cities and towns, and other agencies were required during the development of this Plan, and will be essential for its successful implementation and subsequent amendment. In addition to Grant County, these agencies include each of the 15 cities and towns, various service providers, and various state and federal agencies.

1.3.1 Coordination with Local Governments and Agencies
The County reached out to each of the cities and towns during the plan update process, coordinating with them on important topics and issues to address in the plan update and on population
projections. The County coordinates regularly with the cities, towns, and local agencies serving areas in Grant County, and this coordination will continue during plan implementation.

1.3.2 Coordination with State and Federal Agencies

The GMA states that “the drafting of plans and development regulations under the Act should involve a consideration of numerous state and regional regulatory and planning provisions affecting land use, resource management, environmental protection, utilities, or public facilities.” The following state agencies have been involved in the growth management planning process. Each department has its specific role in the review of this Comprehensive Plan. Coordination with each of these agencies is also important to successfully implement this plan. Affected state agencies include the Departments of:

- Ecology (Ecology)
- Health (WDOH)
- Corrections
- Transportation (WSDOT)
- Natural Resources (DNR)
- Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
- Parks and Recreation Commission
- Social and Health Services
- Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Commerce (Commerce)

RCW 36.70A.103 states that “State agencies must comply with the local comprehensive plans and development regulations and amendments that are adopted under the Act.”

The GMA states that “the drafting of plans and development regulations under the Act should involve a consideration of the effects of federal authority over land or resource use within the planning areas including:

a. Treaties with Native Americans;
b. Jurisdiction on land owned or held in trust by the federal government;
c. Federal statutes or regulations imposing national standards; and
d. Federal permit programs and plans.”

The following federal agencies have been involved in the growth management planning process:

- U.S. Department of Energy
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR)
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management
1.4 Plan Organization and Format

This Comprehensive Plan consists of 8 plan elements and several appendices that address the vision, goals, policies, and analysis for plan elements.

The progression of each chapter generally flows in the following order:

- Introduction
- Existing Conditions
- Needs and Opportunities

This Comprehensive Plan is designed to be user-friendly and includes a Map Folio in Appendix A, and an introductory outline of the County’s goals and policies (Chapter 3).

1.4.1 Plan Organization

This Plan is organized into five parts:

- **Comprehensive Plan Overview, Goals, and Policies (Chapters 1 through 3).** Provides an overview of the plan development process under the GMA, a profile of Grant County, and a statement of the Comprehensive Plan’s vision, goals, and policies.

- **Plan Elements (Chapter 4 through 11).** Includes the mandatory elements required by the GMA: Land Use (includes Rural Element), Economics, Housing, Transportation, Capital Facilities (includes Parks and Recreation element), Utilities, and Essential Public Facilities elements. The Natural Setting Element is also included in the plan's Elements.

- **Environmental Review (Chapter 12).** Constitutes the environmental review required under SEPA for the Comprehensive Plan. Chapter 12, Environmental Review evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed “non-project” action contemplated by this Plan. This chapter also identifies potential mitigation measures for and unavoidable adverse impacts of the actions of this Plan.

- **Appendices.** Include the Map Folio and additional documents that are incorporated as a part of the Comprehensive Plan.

1.5 Consistency and Relationship to Other Plans and Regulations

The GMA requires that the Comprehensive Plan be internally consistent across objectives, goals, policies, text, and maps. At the same time, the comprehensive plans of adjacent jurisdictions must also be consistent and capital budget decisions must conform to each jurisdiction’s adopted comprehensive plan.
Consistency progresses from the broad goal, through its policies, and then to specific actions. The maps of the Comprehensive Plan augment the text, goals, and policies. The following plans are adopted by reference and discussed in further detail in the sections below:

- CWPP (Appendix D)
- Comprehensive plans of incorporated cities and towns
- County development regulations
- Grant County SMP (Anchor QEA and Oneza & Associates 2014)
- Grant County Voluntary Stewardship Program (VSP) Work Plan (Anchor QEA 2017)
- Grant County Transportation Improvement Program, 2017 – 2022 (Appendix E) and the most recently adopted Six-Year Transportation Improvement Programs¹
- Grant County Capital Facilities Plan Addendum, 2017 – 2022 (Appendix F) and future amendments

1.5.1 County-Wide Planning Policies

Managing growth can be ineffective if it is carried out in a patchwork fashion. Therefore, the GMA provides a framework for regional coordination. Counties planning under the GMA prepare CWPP and establish UGAs. Cities and counties are required to be consistent with the CWPP in their comprehensive planning. Grant County and the cities in the County coordinate their planning to avoid conflicts and ensure that infrastructures that cross jurisdictional boundaries are functionally integrated.

In 1993, the Grant County Planned Growth Committee, which included a representative from Grant County and each of its cities and towns, developed as series of CWPP intending to incorporate the requirements of the GMA. The CWPP support, promote, and enforce the GMA’s mandated planning goals. These CWPP were adopted by the Grant County Board of Commissioners on May 6, 1993, and revised in 2002 and again in 2009. The Comprehensive Plan, with associated goals and policies, maintains consistency with Grant County’s adopted CWPP.

The Comprehensive Plan: 1) conforms with the Quad County Regional Transportation Plan; 2) is internally consistent; and 3) is, to the greatest extent practicable without compromising the requirements of the GMA, consistent with the CWPP prepared by the Grant County Planned Growth Committee. The Comprehensive Plan meets the mandatory requirements of the GMA and furthers all of the goals of the GMA.

1.5.2 Comprehensive Plans of Incorporated Cities and Towns

This Comprehensive Plan serves as the plan for the unincorporated areas within the urban growth boundaries of cities and towns. The individual city and town comprehensive plans serve as the plans

¹ Available at: http://www.grantcountywa.gov/GCPW/index.htm
for the incorporated areas within the urban growth boundaries of incorporated cities. The city and town comprehensive plans are integral parts of this plan, although they appear in separate documents. Coordination with the cities and towns has occurred during this plan update to verify population projections, achieve compatibility along jurisdictional boundaries, and also to give more stability to planning and zoning as County lands are annexed into the cities. The County will continue to consult with the cities and towns during plan implementation.

1.5.3 Development Regulations
Under the GMA, “development regulations” means “the controls placed on development or land use activities by a county, including, but not limited to, zoning ordinances, critical areas ordinances, shoreline master programs, official controls, planned unit development ordinances, subdivision ordinances, and binding site plan ordinances.” The County’s development regulations included in its Unified Development Code (UDC; Grant County UDC Titles 22 through 25) are intended to implement the Comprehensive Plan. Grant County assumes a responsibility to ensure consistency of zoning, development regulations, and other official controls with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

1.5.4 Shoreline Master Program
The County adopted an SMP update in 2014 pursuant to the Shoreline Management Act. The goals and policies of the SMP are considered a part of the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies included in Chapter 3, with the rest of the SMP regulations and administrative procedures included in Grant County UDC Chapter 24.12. The policy chapter provides the framework for future decision-making and is a guide for future development of lands within the County’s shoreline jurisdiction boundaries.
1.5.5 Voluntary Stewardship Program
Grant County opted in to the VSP, a new, non-regulatory, incentive-based approach that balances the protection of critical areas on agricultural lands, while promoting agricultural viability, as an alternative to managing agricultural activities in the County under the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). The County’s VSP Work Plan (Anchor QEA 2017) was approved in 2017 and implementation is underway by the Grant County Conservation District to meet the Work Plan’s goals to protect critical areas, maintain and enhance agricultural viability, and promote voluntary enhancement of critical areas through the promotion of incentive-based measures. The County’s VSP Work Plan is adopted by reference.

1.5.6 Other Planning Documents in the County
This Comprehensive Plan maintains consistency with other planning and facilities documents and relies on the data and resources of some of these documents.

County planning and facilities documents adopted by reference include:

- Grant County Transportation Improvement Program, 2017 – 2022 (Appendix E) and the most recently adopted Six-Year Transportation Improvement Programs
- Grant County Capital Facilities Plan Addendum, 2017 – 2022 (Appendix F) and future amendments

Additionally, as referenced in Section 1.5.4 and Chapter 3, the goals and policies of the County’s SMP are included as part of the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies.

1.6 Local Government Planning and Implementation Roles and Responsibilities
Grant County and its cities and towns are each involved in planning activities related to their statutory authority and responsibility.

Grant County is the regional government within the County boundaries providing various services within unincorporated and incorporated areas. Grant County is responsible for the following activities:

- Developing, adopting, and implementing comprehensive plans and development regulations and the processing of land use permits within the unincorporated portions of the County
- Entering into interlocal agreements with each city and town when deemed necessary or prudent to address joint issues within UGAs and other matters agreed to be of mutual interest

\[^{2}\text{Available at: http://www.grantcountywa.gov/GCPW/index.htm}]

Grant County Comprehensive Plan Update 12 June 2018
• Defining and implementing procedures that assure opportunities for public participation throughout planning efforts
• Coordinating with other agencies as appropriate in multi-jurisdictional planning activities

Cities within Grant County provide a variety of services primarily to residents within their respective municipal boundaries. Cities also are responsible for the following activities:

• Providing urban governmental services as identified in the GMA and adopted interlocal agreements
• Developing, adopting, and implementing comprehensive plans and development regulations and the processing of land use permits within the incorporated city and within unincorporated portions of UGAs, as may be agreed upon through interlocal agreements with the County
• Entering into interlocal agreements with Grant County to address joint issues within UGAs and other matters agreed to be of mutual interest
• Defining and implementing procedures that assure opportunities for public participation throughout planning efforts
• Coordinating with other agencies as appropriate in multi-jurisdictional planning activities

1.7 Concurrency

The GMA defines concurrency to mean that needed improvements for water, sewer, and transportation are in place at the time of development; or in the case of transportation, that a financial commitment exists to complete the improvements within 6 years.

There must be a baseline standard established to use when evaluating the anticipated impacts of new development to determine if concurrency can be met. The minimum acceptable performance level has been chosen as the baseline, and is defined as the level of service (LOS). LOS should be realistic. Setting them too high could result in little or no growth, and would be contrary to the GMA. Setting them too low could cause unmanaged growth without optimum service.

Based upon variables, including the projected levels of traffic from build-out of the Land Use Map, the County has designated LOS on its major traffic routes and programs its capital expenditures to maintain that LOS as traffic demand on those routes increases.

1.8 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are legislative actions requiring County Commission approval. Amendments must be approved as prescribed by the GMA. With a few exceptions, they cannot be considered more often than once per year and in accordance with specific procedures. Major updates occur by legislative action on an 8-year cycle as established by RCW 36.70A.130 (4)(c).
Amendments can be requested by the County or by private individuals. Multiple applications for amendments will be considered in a single legislative review process in order to evaluate the potential cumulative effect of the requests. All amendment requests require a public hearing with the Planning Commission, which then makes a recommendation to the County Commission. The County Commission will approve or deny the amendments in a public hearing. Public involvement with this process is required and encouraged through direction of the County PPP.

Annual amendments will address the issues of major or minor land use classification changes; changes to the goals, policies, and text of the Comprehensive Plan; changes to supporting data and implementation; changes to the Land Use Maps; and changes to the inventories and technical documents.

Every 8 years, the annual amendment review may be combined with the required review of the UGAs to determine the next 20-years' anticipated growth. This review will use the County and individual city comprehensive plans and the permitted densities of the incorporated and unincorporated areas pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(3).

Exceptions to the annual amendment limitation, according to RCW 36.70A.130, include the adoption of a subarea plan; the development of an initial subarea plan for economic development located outside of the 100-year floodplain in a county that has completed a state-funded pilot project that is based on watershed characterization and local habitat assessment; SMPs; or the amendment of the Capital Facilities Element occurring concurrently with the adoption or amendment of the County’s budget.

Additionally, counties are allowed under RCW 36.70A.130(2)(b) to consider emergency amendments that conform with Chapter 36.70A, after appropriate public participation has been observed, whenever an emergency exists.
2 Grant County Profile

2.1 Physical Setting

Grant County is located within the Columbia River Basin in central Washington and is the fourth largest county in the State. Approximately 2,791 square miles in area, the County is comprised of 2,681 square miles of land and 110 square miles of water (Anchor QEA 2013). The County is bordered on the west by Douglas and Kittitas counties, on the south by Yakima and Benton counties, on the north by Okanogan County, and on the east by Adams and Lincoln counties (Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 1 – Vicinity Map).

The Columbia River flows in a deep valley along the west and southwestern boundary of the County. The terrain varies from steep and rocky to rolling hills and tabletop plateaus. The northern part of the County is characterized by loess mantled hills that have been dissected by the Channeled Scablands. The southern part in general is smooth, southward sloping plain that is deeply dissected and interrupted by the Saddle Mountains and Frenchman Hills, which create a distinct valley called Royal Slope and one reverse slope area called the Wahluke Slope. Babcock Ridge and Beezley Hills border the northern part of the plain.
2.2 Columbia Basin Project
Agriculture, land use, hydrology, and habitat in the County are heavily influenced by the Columbia Basin Project (CBP), which delivers water from the Grand Coulee Dam for agricultural and municipal uses. The CBP also brought about major changes to the hydrology and land use in the region through the diversion of water to the historically semi-arid region. Nearly 65% of the County is considered productive farmland using both dryland and irrigation techniques. See Section 11.2.2 for additional discussion on the CBP.

2.3 Land Use Pattern
With a large area of 2,791 square miles and a 2017 population of 95,630 people, Grant County is very much a rural county. With its wide expanses of open lands—diverse farmlands and arid foothills—Grant County’s rural environment is one of its most attractive features. See the Land Use Element (Chapter 4) for more detailed discussion on the profile of land use in the County.

Grant County’s 15 incorporated cities and towns, and their surrounding urbanized areas constitute the UGAs. Outside the UGAs is a significant amount of land comprising the natural resource base of the County’s economy. Scattered outside the UGAs and among the resource lands are areas of land neither well suited for agriculture nor suitable for urban level development. These non-resource, non-urban areas comprise the rural land base of Grant County.

Of all the lands under County jurisdiction, agriculture as a land use constitutes the highest percentage (67%). As indicated in Table 5-2, nearly 1,144,417 acres are devoted to some form of agricultural production.

Agricultural areas are concentrated throughout Grant County. In general, the location of agriculture has been strongly influenced by the construction of irrigation facilities. Authorized in 1943, the CBP provided reclamation water to much of the area in 1952. Development increased rapidly during the 1960s and early 1970s. Significant areas of dryland agriculture also exist throughout the County, primarily in the north. See Section 4.4.4.6 for additional discussion on the economic importance of agriculture in Grant County.
2.3.1 **Major Land Use Designations**

The Comprehensive Plan defines the following four major land use classifications, each of which has distinct and unique characteristics:

- **Urban Growth Areas.** Those areas designated for growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of such lands for producing food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources.

- **Rural Lands.** Those lands that are not within a UGA and are not designated as resource lands having long-term commercial significance for production of agricultural products, timber, or the extraction of minerals.

- **Resource Lands.** Those agricultural, timber, or mineral resource lands designated as having long-term commercial significance.

- **Open Space.** Any land, the protection of which in its present use would conserve and enhance natural or scenic resources; protect streams or water supplies; promote conservation of soils, wetlands, beaches or tidal marshes; enhance the value to the public by abutting or neighboring parks, forests, wildlife preserves, nature reservations, or sanctuaries or other open space; enhance recreation opportunities; or preserve historic sites.
3 Goals and Policies

3.1 Plan Interpretation
This Comprehensive Plan provides a guide and regulatory framework for development in Grant County that reflects the community’s collective vision of the attributes of a desirable community. The various elements of the plan are intended to be internally consistent and integrated into a whole. However, due to the general nature of this plan, conflicts and discrepancies between elements may exist, just as apparent conflicts exist within the goals of the GMA.

3.2 Purpose of the Goals and Policies
This goals and policies section serves as a framework for County decision-makers, the development industry, and the public covering a broad array of issues of both short- and long-term importance. Goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan establish guidelines for future work toward achieving the broader vision for the County and ensures that Grant County complies with the planning goals of the GMA.

The Comprehensive Plan manages growth by directing urban development to designated areas, including UGAs and rural areas of more intensive development, while protecting and conserving natural resource areas and retaining rural landscape features and lifestyles. The plan is also intended
to guide planning for a broad range of public and private users, including County officials, community groups, other government agencies and even land developers.

### 3.2.1 Planning Concepts and Principles

Several concepts, and their underlying principles, are basic to the planning approach embodied in this Comprehensive Plan. The plan has the following characteristics:

1. **Long Range.** The Comprehensive Plan is based on a 20-year vision of the County, as defined through a public participation process.
2. **Predictability.** Citizens, interest groups, agencies, and decision-makers planning for the use of land, making financial decisions, or trying to influence the course of a land use decision need to understand the plan and the standards for its application and review.
3. **Consistency.** The Comprehensive Plan is internally consistent and coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions in an attempt to also be externally consistent.
4. **Comprehensiveness.** The plan interrelates people, land, resources, natural environmental systems, and public facilities in such a way as to protect the future health, safety, and welfare of County citizens.
5. **Flexibility.** After its adoption, the Comprehensive Plan will continue to evolve to reflect growth experience and citizen input on growth trends. Through annual updates and major, periodic reviews, the plan will be adjusted to changing needs, unforeseen circumstances, or new local and regional trends.
6. **Goal-oriented.** Goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan will trace the vision for the future for sustaining and improving the quality of life advocated by County citizens. Goals and policies will also be consistent with and balance the planning goals of the GMA.
7. **Financially Feasible.** The plan is financially feasible and generally capable of implementation.

The Comprehensive Plan also includes the following underlying principles:

1. Focus population growth toward urban centers where public services and facilities are present.
2. Jointly designate future land use within UGAs by the cities and Grant County. Land use planning is a shared responsibility within the unincorporated portions of the UGA, although the County retains land use jurisdiction. The County’s objective for land within the UGA should be to manage the transition from rural to urban use and minimizing public costs and uses that could prevent development consistent with the adopted future land use plans.
3. Provide for development choices consistent with rural character in rural areas.
4. Protect the long-term viability of the County’s agricultural-based economy and discourage residential development unrelated to agriculture on lands designated as agricultural.
5. Implement the plan in various ways, including through the goals and policies included in the plan itself, action items or strategies identified in the plan, and measures consistent with the plan’s goals and policies. Implementation will be guided by the following principles:
a. Reduce the cost of public services by focusing development in areas where services, utilities, and access are provided in adequate capacity, or can reasonably be upgraded to provide necessary capacity
b. Maintain flexibility, locational choice, and preferences while explicitly specifying service expectations and limitations for each of the development areas
c. Streamline and integrate the regulatory review process for land use decisions to achieve more predictable process and time frames
d. Emphasize a coordinated partnership approach to funding and providing service and financing development between the public and private sectors as well as across jurisdictional boundaries

3.3 Grant County Goals and Policies

Goals and policies will follow the shared vision for the future of Grant County for sustaining and improving our quality of life. Goals and policies will also be consistent with the Planning Goals of the GMA. Goals and policies do not apply to incorporated cities, but rather, only to unincorporated areas of the County, including the unincorporated portions of UGAs.

Goals are broad statements of a community’s aspirations, tell us where we want to go, and are “milestones” or achievements that we must attain to reach our vision.

Policies express a commitment to a course of action, provide overall direction for implementation of a strategy, and provide clear guidance for decision-making. Policies form the basis for revised development regulations, such as zoning and subdivision ordinances.

3.3.1 Land Use

Goal LU-1: Establish an effective public involvement system in the land use planning and decision making process.

Policies

LU-1.1: Development permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.

LU-1.2: Communications between the County and citizen groups should be facilitated by providing information on programs, regulations, and development projects impacting various areas of the County.

LU-1.3: The County should provide for public involvement early and continuously throughout the process of developing and amending plans and regulations and should use a variety of public participation and information strategies in keeping with adopted public participation policies.
Goal LU-2: Encourage public health, safety, and general welfare without unduly jeopardizing private property rights, to develop a system of coordinated plans that direct the County’s physical development.

Policies
LU-2.1: Prevent regulations that create undue adverse economic impacts or unnecessarily restrict the use of private property.

LU-2.2: The Comprehensive Plan should guide the County’s physical development and the preparation of the County’s sub-area plans, comprehensive plans of incorporated cities, and plans for special services, functions, or issues.

LU-2.3: The Comprehensive Plan should establish the framework of goals and policies for future developments in UGAs and rural areas.

LU-2.4: Sub-area plans can be developed to identify the area-specific land use and transportation plans for geographic sub-areas of the County. Sub-area plans may accommodate unique features or needs of a discrete portion of the rural area, or areas of more intense rural development.

LU-2.5: Develop agreements between the County and incorporated cities for consistency and certainty about how the area will be planned and developed in the future. The agreements should be prepared and used according to the following principles:

- The future land use pattern and transportation systems identified in these agreements should be honored as development in the County and annexations to the cities take place
- These agreements should provide for phasing of development and the orderly extension of city services and annexations

Goal LU-3: Recognize development approvals that have not yet been constructed or acted upon, when they do not threaten public health and safety.

Policies
LU-3.1: Legal lots of record with residential development rights that exist on the effective date of this Comprehensive Plan should retain their development rights, provided the following remain true:

- Public health or safety is not threatened
- The scope of the non-conforming use or inconsistent land development, land activity, and/or land use does not expand

LU-3.2: The continuing validity of variances, special use permits, Planned Unit Developments, and conditional use permits that were approved prior to the effective date of this Comprehensive Plan should be evaluated on an individual basis.
Goal LU-4: Support a Comprehensive Plan that is adaptable to changing conditions yet promotes certainty, and maintain the Comprehensive Plan through County programs and regulations.

Policies
LU-4.1: The Grant County Comprehensive Plan should be reviewed, evaluated, and revised periodically and as changing circumstances require.

LU-4.2: Consistency, understanding, and efficiency of the permitting process should be promoted.

Goal LU-5: Conserve or enhance important natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources.

Policies
LU-5.1: The Open Space land use designations should support the following goals:

• Protect streams, stream corridors, wetlands, natural shorelines, and aquifers
• Protect soil resources
• Protect unique, diverse, or critical wildlife and native plant habitat
• Promote conservation principles by example or by offering educational opportunities
• Enhance the values and functions of parks, wildlife preserves, nature conservancies or sanctuaries, or other Open Space lands
• Enhance recreational opportunities and public access to open spaces
• Preserve scenic vistas and historic, cultural, and archaeological sites

LU-5.2: The County should inventory Open Space lands and define those to conserve. The County should consider development of a comprehensive parks, open space, and recreation plan to identify, evaluate, and designate additional appropriate open space.

Goal LU-6: Encourage open space conservation.

Policies
LU-6.1: The County should support public and private land trusts in acquiring conservation easements that provide open space attributes, consistent with the intents of property owners.

LU-6.2: The County should support the conservation of unique environmental features through the use of cluster subdivisions and planned unit developments.

LU-6.3: The County should support the retention of open space and open space corridors through the use of education and incentives, such as transfer of development rights, density bonuses, cluster development, and acquisition of easements.

LU-6.4: The County should support the conservation of Open Space and Agricultural Resource lands through enrollment in the County’s open space taxation program.
Goal LU-7: Identify and protect open space corridors within and between UGAs. These corridors should include trails and other lands useful for recreation, while emphasizing wildlife habitat, and connection of critical areas, where feasible.

Policies
LU-7.1: Grant County should identify and protect riverine and other riparian corridors, floodplains, lakes, and rivers as essential elements of open space corridors through establishment of reasonable setbacks and buffers.
LU-7.2: Grant County should support the incorporation of greenbelts into subdivision design as common open space.
LU-7.3: Encourage provision of neighborhood parks and play areas within new developments in the unincorporated portions of UGAs.

Goal LU-8: Promote coordination among the County, State, cities, Grant County Public Utility District (PUD), and other appropriate jurisdictions in order to protect linked greenbelts, parks, and open spaces.

Policies
LU-8.1: Coordinate with Grant County PUD on recreational and tourism facilities in Grant County.
LU-8.2: Link County open space corridors with those of adjacent jurisdictions where viable.

3.3.2 Urban Lands

Goal UR-1: Encourage urban growth within designated UGAs.

Policies
UR-1.1: Provide urban governmental services within UGAs prior to or concurrent with development.
UR-1.2: Reduce the unit cost of urban public services by requiring urban density development within UGAs and rural densities outside the UGAs.
UR-1.3: Encourage urban infill where possible to avoid sprawl and leapfrog development thereby conserving fringe open lands.
UR-1.4: Encourage growth in areas already characterized by urban growth that have existing urban-level public services and facilities consistent with adopted plans and interlocal agreements.

Goal UR-2: Designated UGAs should cumulatively provide the area and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the County over the succeeding 20 years.

Policies
UR-2.1: Designation of UGAs should be consistent with the following general goals:
• Discourage the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development
• Provide efficient and appropriate public services
• Protect significant cultural and natural resources, environmentally-sensitive areas, and rural lands
• Encourage a clear distinction between urban and rural lands
• Support variety, choice, and balance in living and working environments
• Promote a variety of residential densities
• Include sufficient vacant and buildable land to meet residential, industrial, and commercial needs
• Consider citizen preferences for inclusion in a UGA, based on broad-based community interests

UR-2.2: Designation of UGAs should be consistent with the following specific criteria:
• Urban services should be provided by cities within UGAs
• Urban services should generally not be provided outside UGAs
• Lands included within UGAs should either be already characterized by urban growth or adjacent to such lands
• Land within a UGA should not contain areas designated for long-term agricultural resource use
• UGAs should provide a balance of residential, commercial, industrial, and public lands and open space
• Natural features and cultural resources should be used to define boundaries
• Each city should have the anticipated financial capability to provide the services and facilities needed to serve the UGA over the planning period
• Provision of urban services must be economically feasible in a UGA

UR-2.3: Residential development in the unincorporated portions of UGAs should occur at densities such that an average density of four units per acre is maintained throughout the unincorporated portions of the UGA. Minimum residential density should be one unit per two acres.

UR-2.5: The County should coordinate with each incorporated city as designated in this Comprehensive Plan regarding the location and expansion of UGA boundaries.

UR-2.6: Encourage commercial and industrial development to locate in well-defined centers throughout the urban areas suitable to their type of business and the population they will serve.
Goal UR-3: Provide for an orderly, phased transition from rural to urban uses within and adjacent to UGAs.

Policies

UR-3.1: Designate Urban Reserve areas adjacent to UGAs where appropriate to preserve the opportunity for efficient transition from rural to urban land uses if and when needed.

UR-3.2: Urban Reserve areas should abut a UGA and should not generally include designated agricultural resource lands. Resource lands included within an Urban Reserve area should be limited in size to less than 500 acres.

UR-3.3: In designating Urban Reserve areas, consideration should be given to the efficiency and economic feasibility with which the Urban Reserve area can be provided with urban services in the future, and the efficiency and economic feasibility with which the area can be urbanized.

UR-3.4: In designating Urban Reserve areas, consideration should be given to the expressed desires of property owners.

Goal UR-4: The County's designated UGAs should concentrate urban-level residential, commercial, and industrial developments in a way that ensures livability and orderly transition of land from County to city.

Policies

UR-4.1: Infilling should be encouraged in areas already characterized by urban growth that have the capacity, and provide public services and facilities to serve urban development.

UR-4.2: Land use plans within UGAs should recognize neighborhood character and support variety and choice in living and working environments.

UR-4.3: Overall residential densities in UGAs should be high enough to support efficient public services and provide for housing choices.

UR-4.4: Industrial and commercial development of all types may occur in UGAs, particularly the larger and more intensive types of development that require higher levels of public services and facilities. Within the UGAs around the incorporated cities, the industrial and larger commercial development should take place inside the cities themselves in order to support their roles as the economic centers of their areas.

UR-4.5: A variety of densities and housing types should be provided in UGAs.

UR-4.6: The highest levels of public services and facilities should be provided in UGAs, but may be provided at lesser levels in the UGAs that do not contain an incorporated city within their boundaries. Some services and facilities may only be provided after areas incorporate or are annexed to adjacent cities. These urban services and facilities may include sanitary and
storm sewers; police and fire protection; paved streets with curbs, sidewalks, and street lights; and public transit and bicycle paths. Other services may include community and neighborhood parks, government offices, libraries, medical facilities, manned fire stations, and animal control.

**Goal UR-5: The County’s annexations and UGA expansion processes should evaluate impacts on County land use, traffic circulation, public services and facilities, fiscal impacts, and integrity and continuity of service areas and boundaries.**

**Policies**

**UR-5.1:** Cities and the County should support reasonable annexations of areas within UGAs that are contiguous to an existing UGA or city limits and includes or has plans for necessary public facilities. A proposal is considered reasonable if, unless otherwise agreed to by the city and County, it contains the following conditions:

- Includes all adjacent roadways
- Is contiguous to the existing city limits
- Provides for efficient provision of emergency services without conflict between providers
- Conforms with current regulations
- Does not deliberately exclude less desirable properties

**UR-5.2:** Annexations of unincorporated islands within a UGA should be actively encouraged and creation of new unincorporated islands should be discouraged.

**UR-5.3:** Cities may require an annexation commitment as a condition of utility service within designated UGAs.

**UR-5.4:** New city incorporations should provide adequate facilities and services for urban growth consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

**UR-5.5:** Cities and the County should jointly develop annexation agreements which define policies, including sharing of revenue of annexation reimbursement for capital projects developed by the County, maintenance of infrastructure, inclusion of roads and streets, and other issues.

**UR-5.6:** Cities intending to expand their UGAs should demonstrate that the expansion area can and will be served in an economically feasible manner by municipal sewer and water systems.

**UR-5.7:** Expansion of a UGA boundary should be allowed when either of the following conditions are present:

- There is insufficient land within the existing UGA to permit the urban growth that is forecast to occur in the succeeding 20 years
• An overriding public interest is shown for moving the UGA boundary in order to gain a public benefit related to protecting public health, safety, and welfare; or enabling more effective, efficient provision of sewer or water service

UR-5.8: Areas for any UGA expansion should be contiguous to an existing UGA boundary.

UR-5.9: Reductions in any UGA boundary should ensure that sufficient land will remain within the reduced UGA to permit the urban growth that is forecast to occur in the succeeding 20 years.

UR-5.10: Expansion or reductions in any UGA should take into consideration the presence of natural resource lands and critical areas.

UR-5.11: The designation of or change to UGAs should be consistent with the Grant County CWPP.

Goal UR-6: Recognize the transitional nature of agricultural uses within UGAs.

Policies
Policy UR-6.1: Recognize the right to farm and farm use as a legitimate activity within a UGA prior to conversion of property to urban use.

3.3.3 Rural Lands

Goal RU-1: Encourage rural development that maintains the rural character of the land and protects the land and water resources required by natural resource-based economic activities, fish and wildlife habitats, rural lifestyles, outdoor recreation, and other open space.

Policies
RU-1.1: Land uses related to farming, mining, rural residential development, tourism, outdoor recreation, and other open space activities are preferred in rural areas.

RU-1.2: Residential use near designated long-term agricultural resource areas should be developed in a manner that minimizes potential conflicts and reduces unnecessary conversion of resource land. Mechanisms such as clustering, buffering, and deed notification should be used.

RU-1.3: Provide for a variety of rural densities to support the following goals:

• Maintain rural character, farming, and mining
• Buffer natural resource lands
• Retain open space
• Minimize the demand and cost of public infrastructure improvements
• Provide for future UGA expansion if needed
• Allow rural property owners reasonable economic opportunities for the use of their land
RU-1.4: The amount of development in rural areas should be limited through density requirements that protect and maintain existing rural character, natural resource lands, open space, critical areas, significant cultural resources, and water resources.

RU-1.5: Rural lands should provide sites for homes, while at the same time provide protection of the resource land from encroachment of more intensive residential activity.

RU-1.6: Within rural areas, proposed new residential development should not negatively affect farm activities. Farm activities should be allowed if they are operating in a reasonable manner and within applicable regulations.

RU-1.7: Buffers should be provided between the residential uses and the natural resource based uses.

RU-1.8: Residential development adjacent to farm and mineral resource activities should be designed in a manner which minimizes potential conflicts and reduces unnecessary conversion of these resource lands.

RU-1.9: Residential development in areas designated as Shoreline Development should be conducted so as to protect water quality of adjacent water bodies. Development standards, including performance requirements and mitigation measures, should be in accordance with the shoreline development regulations.

**Goal RU-2: Rural areas should generally be developed at low levels of intensity so that demands will not be created for high levels of public services and facilities. Existing areas of more intense development should be acknowledged and maintained.**

**Policies**

RU-2.1: Provide rural area designations that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Areas not designated for urban growth or resource lands of long-term commercial significance and where a possibility exists for less intensive agricultural utilization
- Areas not needed during the next 20 years to provide land for population or employment growth
- Areas that provide a buffer between resource activities and potentially incompatible land uses
- Areas where the open-space character of the land is to be protected for scenic qualities, significant cultural resources, recreational activities, and environmental functions
- Areas where significant environmental constraints make the area generally unsuitable for urban development
- Areas where existing and future uses do not typically require urban-level services and facilities and where such services and facilities are not readily available or expected to be available during the next 20 years
RU-2.2: Residential development in rural areas should be provided on lands that can physically support it without requiring urban services. Densities should be low enough to discourage urban sprawl.

RU-2.3: Designated Urban Reserve lands should be considered as “joint planning areas” subject to a joint planning process between the County and the affected city or cities intended to resolve issues regarding potential land uses.

RU-2.4: The County may develop and consider a clustering program for residential development in rural lands using density incentives, transfer of development rights, planned unit developments, and long platting procedures.

Goal RU-3: Promote the continuation and enhancement of the existing rural activity centers in order to preserve their multi-use function to serve the rural community of Grant County.

Policies

RU-3.1: Limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRD) should be provided on land exhibiting existing intense patterns of development and lifestyle preferences. Mixed-use areas comprised of high-density residential, small-scale industries and businesses, and public facilities may be located in rural areas that meet the following criteria:

- Where historic, unincorporated communities with an existing mix of higher density land uses already exists, and where some new adjacent residential, commercial, and industrial development is expected to continue to occur
- Where soil conditions are able to handle the cumulative long-term impacts of on-site sewage disposal without adverse impacts to ground and surface waters
- Additional undeveloped land may be included in these areas to allow for limited growth. This designation provides for the infill, development, or redevelopment of lands within the boundaries established

RU-3.2: Provide “Rural Areas of More Intensive Development” designations consistent with the Grant County Future Land Use Map.

Goal RU-4: Provide for continued existing and new small-scale commercial and industrial developments outside UGAs that are compatible with and continue to preserve, maintain, and enhance the vital rural and agricultural uses in the County.

Policies

RU-4.1: Home-based occupations and cottage industries should be allowed throughout the rural area provided they do not adversely affect the surrounding residential uses. Site-specific standards should be considered through the permitting process.

RU-4.2: Industrial uses in rural areas (other than small scale home-based industries) should generally be those appropriate for location in rural areas, such as the following examples:
• Independent contracting services
• Industries related to and dependent on natural resources of agriculture and minerals
• Industries requiring large secluded areas away from population centers and not requiring urban services
• Commercial recreational uses

RU-4.3: New rural commercial uses should be permitted within appropriate “Limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRD)” designated areas. Rural commercial uses should be limited in size to serve the areas in which they are located.

RU-4.4: Recreational/tourist and highway-oriented commercial facilities may be located within a natural resource designation or a rural designation if, at a minimum, the following criteria are met:
  • The location of the facility would not adversely impact the natural resource production in the area
  • The facility is of size and scale for their intended use and the surrounding area
  • The use does not require extension of urban services

Goal RU-5: Support and facilitate agricultural and mineral productions.

Policies
RU-5.1: Allow related processing facilities, limited direct resource sales, and limited natural resource support services that support natural resource activities and are not harmful to the long term natural resource.

RU-5.2: Natural resource support services to be located within the rural land designations should maintain the rural character of the area and be permitted through a conditional use process. Such uses should be directly related to natural resource enhancement, production, or utilization. Such uses should generally not require extension of urban governmental services. If particular urban services are necessary, conditions should be established to ensure that urban growth will not occur in adjacent rural or resource lands.

RU-5.3: The siting of a major industrial development outside of a UGA should comply with the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.367 and this Comprehensive Plan.

Goal RU-6: Provide for the siting of Fully Contained Communities and Master Planned Resorts.

Policies
RU-6.1: The siting of a fully contained community or master planned resort outside of a UGA should comply with the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.350 and 360, as applicable, and this Comprehensive Plan.
Goal RU-7: Assure that the provision of public facilities, services, roads, and utilities are consistent with rural character and lifestyles.

Policies
RU-7.1: Public spending priorities for facilities, services, and utilities within rural areas should be primarily to maintain or upgrade existing facilities, services, and utilities to serve existing development at rural service level standards. New facilities, services, roads, and utilities that support planned rural growth should be allowed at rural service level standards.

RU-7.2: Road services and utility standards should be consistent with rural densities and uses.

RU-7.3: Urban governmental services should not be extended to or expanded in rural areas except in those limited circumstances shown to be necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development.

RU-7.4: Residential sewage generated from rural development should be treated via individual on-site septic systems, or other method approved by the Grant County Health Officer. Community systems or de-centralized treatment systems may be used in Rural Villages and Rural Communities. Municipal sewer collection and/or treatment systems should only be extended outside the boundary of a UGA in response to an identified public health hazard.

RU-7.5: The County should promote wise use of public funds in rural areas by allowing service providers to establish rural facility and service standards that are consistent with rural densities and uses.

3.3.4 Agricultural Resource Lands

Goal RE-1: Preserve Agriculture Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

Policies
RE-1.1: Identify, classify, and designate Agriculture Land of Long-Term Commercial Significance.

RE-1.2: Pursuant to RCW 58.17.310, the County should require Irrigation District and USBR approval of all proposed land divisions of Designated Irrigated Agricultural Lands within an Irrigation District. The County should notify said Irrigation Districts and USBR of proposed subdivisions and should adopt subdivision standards that incorporate the approval requirements of these agencies.

RE-1.3: Residential uses adjacent to farms should be developed in a manner that minimizes unnecessary conversion of farmland.
RE-1.4: In order to reduce development pressure on Designated Agricultural Lands areas, future development in the County should be directed toward designated areas of more intense development where existing and planned services can more easily accommodate growth.

RE-1.5: Prohibit “spot rezoning” of non-agricultural uses on Designated Agriculture Lands.

RE-1.6: Support and encourage the maintenance of agricultural lands Agricultural Current Use Classification property tax classification pursuant to Chapter 84.34 RCW. Commercial farmland owners should be encouraged to retain their lands in commercial farm production and enroll their land in available agriculture tax programs.

RE-1.7: The County discourages the establishment or expansion of utility local improvement districts, or sewer, water, or PUDs on designated agricultural lands which result in the imposition of assessments, rates, or charges on designated agricultural land.

RE-1.8: Support the continued designation and use of agricultural lands for agricultural activities to maintain the viability of the agricultural economy in the County.

**Goal RE-2: Mitigate conflicts between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses in designated agricultural resource lands.**

**Policies**

RE-2.1: Maintain a “Right-to-Farm” Ordinance and apply its provisions to all Designated Agricultural Lands.

RE-2.2: Residential uses in designated rural areas adjacent to Designated Agricultural Lands should be developed in a manner that minimizes potential conflicts and reduces unnecessary conversion of farmland.

RE-2.3: Anticipated conflicts between a proposed new or modified land use and existing agricultural activities should be mitigated by the newer proposed use prior to issuance of development permits.

RE-2.4: The primary use of any parcel on Designated Agricultural Lands should be agricultural production and related processing and agricultural support services. Residential uses in these areas should recognize that the primary use of the land may impact residential uses such as noise, odor, dust, smoke, glare, pests, rodents, and spraying of chemicals. Residential uses should be located in areas where such impacts can be avoided.

RE-2.5: Require setbacks and buffers as part of new, non-agricultural development proposals on lands within or adjacent to Designated Agricultural Lands. Such buffer areas should be of sufficient size to protect Designated Agricultural Lands from the impacts of incompatible development and to mitigate against the effects of agricultural operations on adjacent land uses. Such buffers should occur on the non-agricultural parcel for which a development right or permit is being sought.
RE-2.6: The Grant County Zoning Ordinance should address new residential developments within 200 feet of a boundary of Designated Agricultural Lands.

RE-2.7: In order to reduce development pressure on farm and rural areas, future development should be directed toward areas of more intense development where existing and planned services can more easily accommodate growth. Outside these areas, densities should remain low.

RE-2.8: Encourage efficient agricultural operations and production methods that are based on sustainable agricultural and best management practices.

RE-2.9: Impacts from public festivals (e.g., fairs, rodeos) conducted on or adjacent to Designated Agricultural Lands should be mitigated.

Goal RE-3: Provide for reasonable, limited use of Designated Agricultural Lands that are compatible with the long-term production of agricultural products.

Policies

RE-3.1: Designated Agricultural Lands should be used for commercial agricultural and agricultural support services, and limited residential development having a maximum density of one dwelling unit per forty acres.

RE-3.2: One residential unit may be allowed on any parcel of less than forty acres within Designated Agricultural Lands, provided that the parcel was created legally prior to adoption of this Comprehensive Plan.

Goal RE-4: Facilitate a healthy, diverse, and competitive agricultural industry.

Policies

RE-4.1: In Designated Agricultural Lands, allow agricultural processing facilities, limited direct farm sales, and limited agricultural support services that support local agricultural activities that are not detrimental to the long-term agricultural use.

RE-4.2: Promote agri-tourism related uses on agricultural lands and on Agricultural Service Centers.

RE-4.3: Allow for agricultural support services in Designated Agricultural Lands if there are no reasonable alternatives for siting agricultural support services, including industrial and commercial uses, and if agricultural production activities are not undermined. The following guidelines should be considered for approving requests for siting agricultural support services on Designated Agricultural Lands:

- The use does not substantially detract from agricultural production on site or in the area
- The use is directly related to agricultural enhancement or production
• The proposed site is located or of such size that traffic and other impacts can be mitigated by application of design criteria

RE-4.4: Permit on-farm enterprises including, but not limited to, direct marketing of unprocessed and value-added agricultural products and agricultural support businesses, to allow farmers to supplement the farm income, improve the efficiency of farming, and provide employment for farm family members.

RE-4.5: Consider development of incentives for continued agricultural resource use, including but not limited to the following:

• Promoting economies of scale through cooperative resource management and marketing for small landowners
• Developing expedited permit review processes for agricultural-related activities that involve development approvals
• Support voluntary stewardship actions on agricultural lands, including habitat restoration, resource management plans that include “best management practices,” and conservation strategies
• Establishing incentives for consolidation of non-conforming and non-buildable lots
• Requiring subdivision site designs to minimize conflicts with nearby agricultural activities

**Goal RE-5: Promote innovative planning and land use techniques to conserve agricultural land.**

**Policies**

RE-5.1: Encourage the voluntary donation of conservation easements or other development restrictions to the County or a qualified, private non-profit organization for the purpose of preserving the perpetual agricultural use of the Designated Agricultural Lands where development of legally subdivided land would promote incompatible residential development.

RE-5.2: The County may develop and consider a clustering program for residential development in Designated Agricultural Lands consistent with the development regulations.

RE-5.3: Support the County’s VSP to maintain the viability of agriculture and to protect and enhance critical areas.
3.3.5  Mineral Resource Lands

Goal RE-6: Mineral resource lands of long-term commercial significance should be preserved in order to encourage an adequate resource base for long-term use.

Policies

RE-6.1: Commercial quality mineral resource deposits are recognized as non-renewable resources and identified, classified, and designated as Mineral Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance.

RE-6.2: Recognize sites holding valid surface mining permits from DNR as Designated Mineral Lands.

RE-6.3: Designate sufficient mineral lands to ensure a 50-year supply of aggregates, sands, gravels, and rock based on appropriate criteria, including:

- Quality of the resource
- Volume of resource
- Topographic characteristics of the site
- Compatibility with land use patterns in the area
- Proximity to urban and rural development and markets

Goal RE-7: Mitigate conflicts between mining and other land uses in designated mineral resource lands.

Policies

RE-7.1: Residential uses in designated rural areas adjacent to Designated Mineral Lands should be developed in a manner that minimizes potential conflicts with mineral extraction operations.

RE-7.2: Anticipated conflicts between a proposed new or modified land use and existing mineral extraction activities should be mitigated by the newer proposed use prior to issuance of development permits.

RE-7.3: The primary use of any parcel on Designated Mineral Lands should be mineral extraction and related processing. Residential uses near these areas should recognize that the primary use of the land may have impacts such as noise, dust, glare, vibrations, and truck traffic.

RE-7.4: Appropriate setback and buffer requirements should be required as part of new, non-mining development proposals on lands within or adjacent to Designated Mineral Lands.

RE-7.5: Designated Agriculture Lands should not be used for mining purposes unless they can be restored to their original agricultural production capacity as mining occurs.
Goal RE-8: Provide for reasonable, limited use of Designated Mineral Lands that are compatible with the long-term production of mineral products.

Policies
RE-8.1: Designated Mineral Lands should be used for commercial mining and mining support services, and limited residential development having a maximum density of one dwelling unit per forty acres.

Goal RE-9: Ensure public health and safety and minimize off-site disturbances associated with mining operations, including noise, dust, glare, vibrations, and truck traffic.

Policies
RE-9.1: Extraction industries should not adversely impact the following resources:
   - Adjacent or nearby land uses
   - Significant cultural or archaeological resources
   - Fish and wildlife habitat
   - Air and water quality
   - Community aesthetics and reclamation
   - Public health and safety

RE-9.2: Require new or expanded mineral resource operations to minimize and mitigate adverse impacts of mineral-related activities on surrounding affected uses.

Goal RE-10: Ensure that water quality protection standards associated with mining operations comply with best management practices.

Policies
RE-10.1: Mineral extraction, processing, and reclamation activities should not negatively affect or endanger surface and groundwater flows and quality.

RE-10.2: Reclamation of mineral extraction sites should occur consistent with best management practices, DNR reclamation requirements, and other requirements as the site is being mined. The site should be reclaimed for appropriate future use and should blend with the adjacent landscape and contours.

RE-10.3: Mineral processing waters should not be discharged to natural streams without adequate water quality treatment to meet all discharge standards of state and federal jurisdictions.
3.3.6 Economic Development

Goal ED-1: Encourage diverse employment opportunities that satisfy the socioeconomic needs of Grant County residents.

Policies

ED-1.1: Facilitate the creation and retention of family wage jobs that meet the needs and demands of Grant County residents.

ED-1.2: Encourage business investment as a means to provide job opportunities for Grant County residents.

ED-1.3: Make necessary public infrastructure investments in transportation, water and sewer, telecommunications, and other utilities to leverage private investments that ultimately create jobs.

ED-1.4: Encourage diverse job options and entrepreneurial opportunities.

ED-1.5: Encourage educational opportunities for residents of all ages to develop and upgrade skills required for employment, advancement, and entrepreneurship.

ED-1.6: Work cooperatively with the Grant County Economic Development Council, Big Bend Community College, and other local jurisdictions to address employment needs consistent with county-wide regional policies.

ED-1.7: Encourage and accommodate home-based businesses and cottage industries that are consistent with the character of adjoining properties and neighborhoods.

ED-1.8: Cooperate with education providers and employers in developing facilities and programs meeting a continuum of educational needs at the K-12, college, and continuing education levels.

Goal ED-2: Encourage economic growth through planning and development of the region’s public services and facilities’ capacity.

Policies

ED-2.1: Public service providers in Grant County should provide those services and facilities necessary to support a high quality of life and attract business investment.

ED-2.2: Review land use and permitting procedures to assure that regulatory processes are understandable, predictable, and can be accomplished within reasonable time periods in a manner that meets or exceeds state statutory requirements.
Goal ED-3: Ensure an adequate supply of commercial and industrial sites to provide opportunity for new and expanding businesses to locate or remain in Grant County.

Policies

ED-3.1: Encourage a range of commercial retail and service businesses to meet local resident needs and serve visitors to Grant County.

ED-3.2: Plan for a diversity of ready-to-build sites with sufficient support infrastructure and services needed to meet the demand for industrial land for the duration of the planning period.

ED-3.3: Encourage low-cost, easily accessible, state-of-the-art telecommunications services throughout the County.

ED-3.4: Facilitate the retention and expansion of existing local businesses and start-up of new businesses particularly those that provide family wage job opportunities and operate in compliance with applicable regulatory requirements.

ED-3.5: Industrial sites designated under this Comprehensive Plan should be protected from encroaching incompatible uses.

ED-3.6: Jurisdictions in Grant County should regularly update inventories of land utilization, land demand, and suitable available properties for residential, industrial, commercial, public facility, and agricultural uses.

Goal ED-4: Preserve the strength of the existing agricultural industry while diversifying the local economy by strengthening manufacturing and promoting producer services and other basic industries.

Policies

ED-4.1: Focus business recruitment and development on firms that will diversify the local economy and can effectively serve state, national, Pacific Rim, and other global markets from a Grant County location.

ED-4.2: Encourage high value-added resource based products and businesses.

ED-4.3: Encourage the establishment of industrial parks and other light manufacturing facilities and provide zoning of facilities engaged in producer services, including computer, health services, and telecommunications.

Goal ED-5: Maximize the positive economic impact of tourism and recreational development.

Policies

ED-5.1: Promote visitor opportunities that are compatible with or complement the character and existing uses of natural resource lands and critical areas or the rural lifestyles of Grant County.

ED-5.2: Support local jurisdiction efforts to improve and market visitor services.
ED-5.3: Visitor facilities should be sited at locations that can be served with necessary public infrastructure and that are compatible with neighboring uses.

ED-5.4: Provide for siting and development of Master Planned Resorts.

**Goal ED-6: Improve Grant County’s economy by supporting efforts to improve human and social services.**

**Policies**

ED-6.1: Encourage development of human and social service facilities that create job opportunities, meet community needs, and maintain Grant County’s quality of life.

ED-6.2: Support development and maintenance of human and social service facilities including, but not limited to, health care, education, transportation, and other services for persons with special needs.

**Goal ED-7: Promote economic growth that conserves natural resources and open spaces, maintains environmental quality and rural character, and enhances the overall quality of life.**

**Policies**

ED-7.1: Encourage commercial and industrial developments that incorporate innovative and/or experimental applications and demonstrate an ability to conserve natural resources and/or protect or enhance environmental quality.

ED-7.2: Long-term commercially significant natural resource lands or lands in urban settlements should be protected from encroachment from conflicting uses.

**3.3.7 Housing**

**Goal H-1: Meet the housing needs of the existing and projected population, including rental and purchase opportunities for all income levels, as well as housing to support temporary agricultural labor.**

**Policies**

H-1.1: Land use should not prohibit government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, farmworker housing (including federal programs such as H-2A), single family housing, manufactured housing, and residential care facilities.

H-1.2: Encourage a variety of housing densities and types within rural areas, such as detached single family housing, cluster housing, duplexes, and a residence in conjunction with commercial uses within areas of more intense development.

H-1.3: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)-compliant manufactured housing should be permitted in the same manner as site built housing.

H-1.4: Local development standards and regulations should be evaluated to reduce factors that add to housing costs. The following are strategies for consideration:
• Review regulations to find those that cause excessive costs and determine if they can be revised, replaced, or eliminated.
• Make regulations and permit processing more predictable, to remove some uncertainty for both builders and lenders.

H-1.5: The County should work with the cities to accommodate low- and moderate-income families, recognizing that affordable housing is best located within urban areas due to the greater accessibility to transportation systems, jobs, support services, shopping, and businesses.

Goal H-2: Encourage the provision of housing in a wide range of costs, with emphasis on housing units for low-and moderate-income households; also encourage housing for the special needs populations.

Policies
H-2.1: Promote a variety of residential land use densities on rural and urban lands.
H-2.2: Encourage residential care facilities and other group homes serving special needs populations.
H-2.3: Any proposed County housing programs/assistance should be financed through federal, state, or private sources rather than from funds raised through local taxes.

Goal H-3: Preserve the existing housing stock to the extent practicable.

Policies
H-3.1: Conserve existing housing stock in the County through code enforcement, appropriate zoning, and the possible participation in federal, state, and regional rehabilitation programs.
H-3.2: The County should encourage the preservation and rehabilitation of historic structures through the adoption of building code amendments for historic structures.

3.3.8 Transportation

Goal T-1: Provide safe and efficient access to land while maintaining the integrity of transportation systems.

Policies
T-1.1: Provide sufficient travel lane capacity based on industry standards for safe vehicular travel in major corridors.
T-1.2: Support expanding and maintaining air, rail, and surface freight handling facilities as required to attract and accommodate economic growth. Support a county-wide transportation network, which integrates all modes of transportation into an efficient system.
T-1.3: Consider the needs of agricultural and other resource-based lands and activities when planning for and building road improvement projects.

T-1.4: Adopt standards that channel traffic where possible to local or collector roadways connecting to arterials.

T-1.5: Developments should have adequate access and circulation for all public service vehicles.

T-1.6: Maintain compatible street and road standards among Grant County jurisdictions.

T-1.7: Coordinate with relevant organizations for special event traffic management and to minimize the disruption of normal use of transportation facilities during special events and festivals.

**Goal T-2: Establish LOS for transportation facilities and identify improvements needed to serve the existing and future population.**

**Policies**

T-2.1: Specify the standards for LOS in the Transportation Element.

T-2.2: The County should determine the need for public facilities based in-part on the adopted standards for LOS, the demand, and the inventory of existing serviceable facilities.

T-2.3: Evaluate the transportation facilities periodically.

T-2.4: Factors such as Comprehensive Plan policies, the County’s priorities, LOS, and the project selection criteria of funding agencies should be considered for transportation improvements.

T-2.5: Special purpose districts providing transportation facilities and services should conduct at least a basic level of transportation planning consistent with this Comprehensive Plan.

**Goal T-3: The transportation system should complement the land use and rural areas element of the Grant County Comprehensive Plan.**

**Policies**

T-3.1: Land use should determine the types and levels of transportation facilities to be provided within the unincorporated County. Land use and transportation goals and decisions should be integrated with one another and coordinated with adjacent jurisdictions.

T-3.2: Future land use projections based on County and jurisdiction comprehensive plans should be used to identify and provide for adequate rights-of-way and other possible improvements.

T-3.3: Ensure the compatibility between land use activities and transportation facilities and services.
T-3.4: Incorporate standards within the land development regulations to ensure that new development and redevelopment provide adequate transportation facilities within and adjacent to such development.

Goal T-4: The transportation system should be coordinated with neighboring cities and other transportation providers.

Policies
T-4.1: Work with other jurisdictions to plan multi-jurisdictional projects necessary to meet shared transportation needs (including right-of-way preservation and purchase).

T-4.2: Each city should be responsible for identifying any standard and specification above County standards to be applied to transportation improvements within UGA boundaries.

T-4.3: For County-funded road improvement projects within UGA boundaries, the County will be responsible for funding only those improvements to meet County standards. All other costs associated with the improvements necessary to meet city standards should be the responsibility of the city.

T-4.4: Upon annexation of an unincorporated area within UGA boundaries, the County and city should consider the fiscal impacts of providing service, including, but not limited to, the value of investments in infrastructure made.

T-4.5: Work with the WSDOT, the Quad County Regional Transportation Planning Organization (QUADCO), and through other appropriate avenues to ensure that appropriate investments are made in the state transportation system to ensure the adequacy of the overall transportation system of the County.

Goal T-5: The transportation system should provide mobility for all citizens regardless of age, handicap, or income.

Policies
T-5.1: Promote bicycle and pedestrian facilities, wherever reasonable, to provide access between schools, recreation areas, business areas, public facilities, and activity centers.

T-5.2: Provide public transit service in urban areas, rural residential areas, and other areas of the County when potential demand and public or private support justifies it.

Goal T-6: The costs of transportation improvements associated with new development should be within the County’s funding capacity and equitably assigned to the developer and County.

Policies
T-6.1: New developments should be prohibited unless transportation improvements to accommodate the impacts of development or funding strategies for such improvements
are made concurrent with the development or will be financially planned to be in place within 6 years.

T-6.2: The peak period volumes generated by such development should be used as the primary measurement in establishing the proportionate share of street improvements which a proponent will be required to assume.

T-6.3: If the County is faced with transportation funding shortfalls, alternative mechanisms, such as the following, should be considered to balance revenues and public facility needs, such as increased revenue through bonds, rates, taxes, and decreased demand for public services:

- Increase revenues through use of bonds, new or increased user fees or rates, new or increased taxes, regional cost sharing, or voluntary developer funds.
- Decrease LOS standards if consistent with GMA Goals.
- Reprioritize projects to focus on those related to concurrency.
- Decrease the cost of the facility by changing project scope or finding less expensive alternatives.
- Decrease the demand for the public service. This could involve instituting measures to slow or direct population growth or development, for example, developing only in areas served by facilities with available capacity until funding is available for other areas, or by changing project timing and phasing.
- Revise the Comprehensive Plan’s Land Use and Rural Areas elements to change types or intensities of land use as needed to match the amount of transportation facilities that can be provided.

T-6.4: A “working reserve” fund balance is desired to be maintained in the County Road Fund for emergencies, unanticipated safety upgrades, or similar County road needs.

T-6.5: The County may wish to consider the fiscal impacts of road maintenance services, especially snow removal and sanding, through the adoption of service routes prioritized using land use density as a consideration.

**Goal T-7: Establish a systematic process for reviewing and updating the Transportation Improvement Program.**

**Policies**

T-7.1: Incorporate the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program into the County’s Capital Facilities Plan by reference. Evaluate proposed transportation improvement projects annually and prepare a proposed Transportation Improvement Program.

T-7.2: Encourage public involvement in transportation facilities planning.
### 3.3.9 **Capital Facilities**

*Goal CF-1: Establish LOS for public facilities and determine what capital improvements are needed in order to achieve and maintain the standards for existing and future populations.*

**Policies**

**CF-1.1:** Specify the standards for LOS in this Comprehensive Plan.

**CF-1.2:** Determine the need for public facilities based on the adopted standards for LOS, the demand, and the inventory of existing serviceable facilities.

**CF-1.3:** Prioritize and evaluate capital facilities annually.

**CF-1.4:** Priorities for capital improvements should be consistent with this Comprehensive Plan.

**CF-1.5:** Provide non-capital alternatives to achieve and maintain the adopted standard for LOS. Non-capital alternatives may be programs, strategies, or methods other than traditional physical capital projects, such as telecommuting as an alternative to commuting to work and natural drainage in managed flood basins as an alternative to diking.

*Goal CF-2: The costs of proposed County-owned capital facilities should be within the County’s funding capacity and equitably distributed between users and the County in general.*

**Policies**

**CF-2.1:** The Capital Facilities Plan should integrate all of the County’s capital project resources (grants, bonds, general County funds, donations, real estate excise tax, conservation futures property tax, fees and rates for public utility services, and any other available funding).

**CF-2.2:** The estimated costs of all needed capital improvements should be consistent with the current statutes.

**CF-2.3:** Assess additional operations and maintenance costs associated with the acquisition or development of new capital facilities in order to determine feasibility of providing such services.

**CF-2.4:** Existing and future development should both pay for the costs of needed capital improvements.

**CF-2.5:** Capital improvements financed by County enterprise funds, such as solid waste, should be financed by one of the following mechanisms:

- Debt to be repaid by user fees and charges and/or connection or capacity fees for enterprise services
- Current assets, including reserves, equity or surpluses and current revenue, including grants, loans, donations, and interlocal agreements
- A combination of debt and current assets
CF-2.6: Capital improvements financed by non-enterprise funds should be financed from either current assets, debt, private sources, or a combination thereof. Financing decisions should consider which funding source or combination of sources will be: 1) most cost-effective; 2) consistent with prudent asset and liability management; 3) appropriate to the useful life of the improvement; and 4) the most efficient use of the County’s ability to borrow funds.

CF-2.7: Efficient and joint use of facilities should be encouraged with neighboring governments and private citizens through such measures as interlocal agreements and negotiated use of privately and publicly owned lands or facilities (such as open space, stormwater facilities, or government buildings).

CF-2.8: Regional funding strategies should be explored for capital facilities to support comprehensive plans developed under the GMA.

CF-2.9: Agreements should be developed between the County and cities for transferring the financing of capital facilities in the UGAs to the cities when they annex the contributing lands.

CF-2.10: Special purpose districts providing public facilities and services should conduct at least a basic level of capital facilities planning consistent with this Comprehensive Plan.

CF-2.11: Public utility services should be provided at the lowest possible cost, but take into account both construction and operation and maintenance costs.

CF-2.12: New public utility services should provide adequate growth capacity and avoid expensive remedial action.

CF-2.13: Finance capital facilities within the County’s financial capacity. If the County is faced with capital facility funding shortfalls, any combination of the following strategies should be used to balance revenues and public facility needs:

- Increase revenues through use of bonds, new or increased user fees or rates, new or increased taxes, regional cost sharing, or voluntary developer funds.
- Decrease LOS standards if consistent with GMA Goals.
- Reprioritize projects to focus on those related to concurrency.
- Decrease the cost of the facility by changing project scope or finding less expensive alternatives.
- Decrease the demand for the public service or facility. This could involve instituting measures to slow or direct population growth or development, for example, developing only in areas served by facilities with available capacity until funding is available for other areas or by changing project timing and phasing.
- Revise the Comprehensive Plan’s Land Use and Rural Areas elements to change types or intensities of land use as needed to match the amount of capital facilities that can be provided.
Goal CF-3: Public facilities and services should be provided commensurate with planned development intensities without unduly impacting current service levels.

Policies
CF-3.1: Land use decisions as identified in the comprehensive plans of the County and cities should be the determinants of development intensity rather than public utility decisions and public utility planning.

CF-3.2: Review the plan and zoning regulations where land use plans and zoning regulations conflict with long-range plans for public utilities.

CF-3.3: Extension of services and construction of public capital facilities should be provided at levels consistent with development intensity identified in this Comprehensive Plan.

CF-3.4: Public utility services within UGAs and areas of more intense development should be phased outward from the urbanizing core in order to promote infilling.

Goal CF-4: Operate and maintain facilities in a manner that will ensure their longevity, provide for user access and safety, and foster user respect and care for resources and facilities.

Policies
CF-4.1: Conduct major rehabilitation work on the Grant County Courthouse and other significant historic buildings owned by the County in reasonable conformance with state and federal requirements.

Goal CF-5: Public entities and utility providers should mitigate adverse impacts on the environment and other public facilities.

Policies
CF-5.1: Impacts on water resources, drainage systems, natural habitat, significant cultural resources, geologically hazardous areas, other sensitive areas and transportation systems should be considered and adverse impacts avoided or mitigated.

3.3.10 Parks

Goal CF-6: Coordinate planning of parks, trails, and natural preserves with other local, state, and federal government within the County to serve all residents of the County.

Policies
CF-6.1: Work with cities, Grant PUD, state and federal agencies, and other local governments to coordinate park needs throughout the County and to identify regional funding strategies.
CF-6.2: Acquisition of parks, paths, trails, and preserves should occur in a coordinated manner, within an overall plan that identifies priorities, funding sources, and a timetable for acquisition.

CF-6.3: Cooperate with other public agencies to share public facilities for park and year-round recreation use by County residents.

3.3.11 Government Facilities

Goal CF-7: County government facilities should consider efficient use of public resources, convenient access to residents, and adaptive re-use of historic buildings.

Policies

CF-7.1: LOS standards must be realistic and attainable. LOS standards should be based on the following criteria:
- Consideration of national, state, and professional standards for the applicable space
- Applicable federal and state laws
- Cost effectiveness and consideration of the ability of the County to fund ongoing costs of operations and maintenance

CF-7.2: Efficiency in design and use should be a goal for new facility development. Building design and function must promote flexibility to accommodate a variety of uses and interior spatial changes.

CF-7.3: Consider adaptive reuse of historic buildings when feasible.

3.3.12 Schools

Goal CF-8: Work with school districts to ensure that new school facilities are coordinated with growth and their impacts on roads and neighboring uses are considered.

Policies

CF-8.1: Where the size of a single proposed development warrants, the developer should identify at the first stage of project review proposed school sites meeting school district standards such as topography, acreage requirements, location, and soil quality. Such sites should be dedicated for school use.

CF-8.2: Where practical, schools should be located along non-arterial roads, or should include frontage and off-site improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Availability of sewer and water facilities should also be considered in siting schools, as well as location in areas not subject to safety hazards.
### Utilities

**Goal U-1**: Ensure that necessary energy and communication facilities and services are available to support current and future development.

#### Policies

**U-1.1**: Coordination with utility service providers about future plans, population forecasts, and relevant data as available.

**U-1.2**: Encourage the location of necessary utility facilities within existing and planned transportation and utility corridors.

**U-1.3**: Coordinate land use planning with the planning activities of electrical, telephone, and cable providers for existing and future facilities.

**U-1.4**: New city-provided utility service area boundaries should not be extended beyond their associated UGA unless to address a public health safety concern.

**U-1.5**: Encourage energy conservation by informing citizens of available Bonneville Power Administration conservation programs.

**U-1.6**: Encourage improvement and extension of telecommunication services, including the entrance of new qualified providers, throughout the County.

**Goal U-2**: Minimize impacts associated with the siting, development, and operation of utility services and facilities on adjacent properties, significant cultural resources, and the natural environment.

#### Policies

**U-2.1**: Electric power substations should be reasonably sited, designed, and buffered.

**U-2.2**: Encourage implementation of resource conservation practices and best management practices during the construction, operation, and maintenance of utility systems.

**U-2.3**: Work cooperatively with surrounding municipalities in the planning and development of multi-jurisdictional utility facility additions and improvements.

**U-2.4**: Where practical, utilities should be encouraged to place facilities underground and encourage the reasonable screening of utility meter cabinets, terminal boxes, pedestals, and transformers in a manner reasonably compatible with the surrounding environment.

**U-2.5**: Where possible, the joint use of transportation rights-of-way and utility corridors should be encouraged, provided that such joint use is consistent with limitations as may be prescribed by applicable law and prudent utility practice.

**U-2.6**: The County should maintain updated County ordinances for regulating use of rights-of-way by utilities to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal laws.
U-2.7: Develop mechanisms to notify interested utilities of road maintenance, upgrades, and new construction to facilitate coordination of public and private utility trenching activities.

**Goal U-3: Maintain consistency, compatibility, and concurrency between utility providers.**

**Policies**

U-3.1: The extension and sizing of distribution system components should be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

U-3.2: Coordinate between plat approvals, building permit approvals, and availability of utilities.

**Goal U-4: Coordinate and encourage timely, safe, cost-effective, and reliable installations of utility systems through improved permit procedures, joint use of utility corridors, and interlocal agreements.**

**Policies**

U-4.1: Agreements should be developed with private utility providers and public agencies as required to facilitate the following activities:

- Joint use of utility corridors and public rights-of-way
- Coordination between this Comprehensive Plan and utility capital facility plans
- Timely notices of new road construction and maintenance of existing roads with utility construction activities
- Coordinated permit applications and meetings to include all necessary utilities affected by related projects
- Coordination of land acquisition, land use, and enhancement of utility corridors where appropriate, for pedestrian and equestrian trails and wildlife corridors

U-4.2: New facility designs should include joint usage where possible.

U-4.3: Processing of utility permits should be done in a timely and cost-effective manner.

**Goal U-5: Site utility facilities in conformance with the Land Use Element.**

**Policies**

U-5.1: Utility providers should avoid placement of facilities in areas designated as environmentally sensitive or critical areas unless no feasible alternative exists and only after a site assessment and mitigation plan has been approved under the provisions of Grant County’s Resource Lands and CAO.

U-5.2: Utility facilities should be permitted in all land use designations as necessary when and where utility franchises exist and if they are in compliance with this Comprehensive Plan.

U-5.3: Siting of wireless technologies should minimize the visual and noise impacts and use existing sites and structures where possible, adequate setbacks, and appropriate buffering and landscaping.
Goal U-6: Provide public water and sewer systems in rural areas only to address public health problems.

Policies
U-6.1: Allow sewer systems in designated UGAs. They should be allowed in rural areas only to address identified health hazards or water quality problems in areas of existing development.

U-6.2: The County should be the primary sewer system provider in unincorporated rural areas where sewer systems are being provided.

U-6.3: In unincorporated areas inside the UGAs around cities, the cities should be the primary water and sewer provider. As exceptions, the County could provide sewers in this area on an interim basis if the cities are unable to provide the service or to protect water quality.

U-6.4: In order to resolve documented health hazards, safety, or pollution problems in areas of existing rural development, the County may serve as the water utility owner, or develop a proactive assistance program focused on keeping small distribution systems in private ownership.

Goal U-7: Manage the solid waste system in a manner that cost-effectively preserves the environment and protects the public health.

Policies
U-7.1: Practice integrated and efficient management of solid waste in accordance with the Washington State waste management priorities, with adequate resources to manage solid wastes safely, efficiently, and equitably while recognizing local conditions.

U-7.2: Provide for solid waste disposal services at a publicly or privately owned and operated, legally permitted disposal facility, either within Grant County or at a location remote from the County, in the most cost-effective manner possible. Environmental and economic impacts should be considered and balanced when determining disposal practices.

U-7.3: Provide a recycling program with goals of reducing or recycling the County's waste stream as defined in the 2008 Grant County Solid Waste Management Plan Update and subsequent amendments. Reducing per capita waste consumption should be supported through educational and legislative efforts that are directed towards changing consumer and industrial practices.
3.3.14 Essential Public Facilities

Goal EPF-1: Establish a process and siting criteria for Essential Public Facilities that complies with this Comprehensive Plan.

Policies

EPF-1.1: Implement requirements for siting essential public facilities through relevant development regulations.

EPF-1.2: The County should not exclude the siting of essential public facilities, provided that any essential public facility should be required to comply with the following criteria:

- Meet existing federal, state, and County land use regulations, development standards, and mitigation measures
- Conform to this Plan
- Address all SEPA provisions and environmental issues, including concurrency of supporting facilities

EPF-1.3: Siting of essential public facilities should be done with public participation.

Goal EPF-2: Identify and provide adequate, well-located public lands for public purposes, including essential public facilities.

Policies

EPF-2.1: The County should obtain or secure (e.g., by obtaining a right of first refusal for desired property) sites needed for County public facilities as early as possible in the development of an area, to ensure that the facilities are well-located to serve the area and to minimize acquisition costs.

EPF-2.2: The County should support regional coordinating efforts in identifying shared needs for lands for public purposes to maximize the efficient use of public capital resources.

3.3.15 Natural Setting – Critical Areas

Goal NS-1: Wetlands should be protected for the important ecological functions they provide.

Policies

NS-1.1: Wetland areas should be identified and delineated by the development applicant and reviewed by the County prior to development.

NS-1.2: Consider accepting written determinations, delineations, and mitigation plans only from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Ecology, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), or a qualified critical areas professional. Consider requiring that mitigation plans for unavoidable wetland impacts to be based on a wetland functional assessment.
NS-1.3: Wetlands should be protected from alterations due to land use changes that may create adverse impacts to the wetland consistent with the Resource Lands and CAO.

NS-1.4: Rely on wetland ratings from Washington State Wetlands Rating system for Eastern Washington.

NS-1.5: Whenever feasible, innovative techniques that enhance a wetland and promote it as a useful, functioning part of the development should be encouraged, such as conservation practices under the County’s VSP program, along with other applicable programs.

NS-1.6: Support wetland preservation strategies and efforts, such as establishing and maintaining wetland banking, wetland protection and enhancement through conservation practices, and other measures.

NS-1.7: Wetland protection and enhancement strategies should be coordinated with appropriate local, state, and federal agencies and private conservation organizations to take advantage of both technical and financial assistance and to avoid duplication of efforts.

Goal NS-2: Areas demonstrated to be critical aquifers and/or which play a crucial role in recharging groundwater supplies should be preserved to protect potable water sources.

Policies

NS-2.1: Identify critical groundwater supply areas, aquifer recharge areas, and areas with a high groundwater table and/or unconfined aquifers that are used for potable water.

NS-2.2: Encourage cluster developments that implement shared community sewage disposal systems instead of dispersed individual septic systems.

NS-2.3: Incorporate best management practices concerning waste disposal, fertilizer use, pesticide use, and stream corridor management in agricultural activities, including commercial and hobby type activities, consistent with the County’s VSP implementation strategies.

NS-2.4: Fertilizer and pesticide management practices of schools, parks, golf courses, and other recreational or institutional facilities that maintain large landscaped areas should be evaluated at the time of development in relation to best management practices. Existing facilities are strongly encouraged to also incorporate best management practices.

NS-2.5: Within aquifer recharge areas, divisions of land and subsequent developments should be evaluated for their impact on groundwater quality.

NS-2.6: Development that could substantially and negatively impact the quality of an aquifer should not be allowed unless it can be demonstrated that these negative impacts can be mitigated.

NS-2.7: The installation of underground fuel or storage tanks within a known critical recharge area should be prohibited. Installation in any other areas should be subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations.
Goal NS-3: Frequently flooded areas that are known to be critical parts of the natural drainage system should be protected by adopting policies and regulations to prevent potential alterations and obstructions to those areas.

Policies

NS-3.1: Frequently flooded areas should be identified and mapped.

NS-3.2: The natural flood storage function of floodplains should be preserved where practicable through applicable programs, practices, and planning processes.

NS-3.3: Protect floodplains by locating roads and structures above the flood level. Where filling is allowed, development should mitigate impacts, such as the existing flood storage capacity and fish and wildlife habitat lost to filling.

NS-3.4: Encourage growth and development compatible with natural drainage features, and discourage alteration of natural drainage features.

NS-3.5: Encourage control of erosion at its source as a means of controlling water pollution, flooding, and habitat damage downstream.

NS-3.6: Development in frequently flooded areas that poses a threat to human health and property by reason of flooding, unsanitary conditions, or other hazards should be limited and/or mitigated.

Goal NS-4: Take appropriate measures to either avoid or mitigate significant risks to public and private property and to public health and safety that are posed by geologically hazardous areas.

Policies

NS-4.1: Require documentation of probable significant adverse impacts from geologically hazardous areas identified during the review of a development application, which fully addresses potential impacts and identifies alternative mitigation measures to eliminate or minimize the impacts.

NS-4.2: Grading and clearing for both private developments and public facilities or services should be limited to the minimum necessary to accomplish engineering design, with reclamation of disturbed areas being a top priority.

NS-4.3: To minimize blowing soil during development, appropriate water and mulch material should be required on any areas without a vegetative cover, as indicated in an approved erosion control plan.

NS-4.4: To maintain the natural integrity of landslide hazard areas, protect the environment, and protect the public health and safety, an adequate buffer of existing vegetation should be maintained around all sides of landslide hazard areas.
NS-4.5: Development on steep slopes should prevent damage to property and public safety and environmental degradation.

NS-4.6: In areas subject to erosion, native ground cover should be retained or replaced after construction, special construction practices should be used, and allowable site coverage may need to be reduced to prevent erosion and sedimentation. Limitations on the time when site work can be done may also be appropriate.

NS-4.7: Protect and enhance critical areas through agricultural conservation practices that maintain soil on agricultural lands in higher erosion risk areas.

Goal NS-5: Protect fish and wildlife habitat areas as an important natural resource, particularly in regard to their functions and economic, ecological, aesthetic, and quality of life values.

Policies
NS-5.1: Identify critical fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas within the County.

NS-5.2: Consider the impacts of new development on the quality of land, wildlife, and vegetative resources as part of the environmental review process, and require appropriate mitigating measures. Such mitigation may involve the retention and/or enhancement of habitats.

NS-5.3: Encourage the preservation of blocks of habitat and the connections between them, as well as the restoration of lost and damaged fish habitat.

NS-5.4: Encourage proper riparian management that maintains existing riparian habitat and is consistent with conservation practices implemented under VSP.

NS-5.5: Land uses adjacent to naturally occurring water bodies and other fish and wildlife habitat areas should not negatively impact the habitat areas. If a change in land use occurs, adequate buffers should be provided to the habitat areas.

NS-5.6: Activities allowed in fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and open space should be consistent with the species located there, and in accordance with all applicable state and federal regulations and/or best management practices for the activity regarding that species.

NS-5.7: Support implementation of conservation practices on agricultural lands through the VSP that protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.

3.3.16 Natural Setting – Water Resources

Goal NS-6: Privately-held certificates of water right should be recognized as an important natural resource and protected, to the extent practicable, through County planning decisions, which encourage continued use for rural activities.
**Goal NS-7: Development should be conducted in a manner that protects surface and groundwater quality and habitat, prevents chronic flooding from stormwater runoff, maintains natural stream hydrology, and protects aquatic resources.**

**Policies**

NS-7.1: The County should attempt to limit potential damage, dangers, or public costs associated with inappropriate land development by reasonable regulation of and application of uniform surface water and erosion control standards.

NS-7.2: New development activities, including site designs and construction practices, should make provisions for surface water and erosion and sedimentation control during and after construction.

NS-7.3: Consistent and appropriate implementation of physical aspects of land alteration should be encouraged.

NS-7.4: Land uses compatible with the preservation of natural vegetation should be encouraged.

NS-7.5: Public improvements and private developments should not alter natural drainage systems without acceptable mitigating measures that limit the risk of flooding or negative impacts to water quality.

NS-7.6: Natural surface water storage sites that help regulate streamflows and/or recharge groundwater should be preserved and their water quality protected.

NS-7.7: Surface water runoff from development adjacent to steep slopes, ravines, or bluffs should be routed so it does not cause erosion or landslides. Runoff should be sufficiently diffused so that flows do not create erosion.

NS-7.8: Natural stream channels should be preserved, protected, and enhanced for their hydraulic, ecological, and aesthetic functions through development regulations, land dedications, easements, acquisition, and other means.

**NS Goal-8: Conserve, maintain, and manage existing ground and surface water resources to meet existing and future water supply needs for cities, farms, industry, and rural growth.**

**Policies**

NS-8.1: Support efforts to secure long-term, sustainable water supplies that are consistent with the Grant County Comprehensive Land Use Plan or the comprehensive land use plans of the municipalities within Grant County.

NS-8.2: Encourage water reuse, conservation, and responsible stewardship through the development of voluntary conservation programs, educational outreach, and alterations to current water policy that provide incentives for common sense approaches to stewarding water resources.
NS-8.3: Support increasing water storage by increasing capacity in existing reservoirs, developing new aboveground water storage capacity, and the development of storage capacity through aquifer storage and recovery, enhanced water recharge, and other groundwater management strategies.

NS-8.4: Support groundwater management strategies that permit the responsible development of groundwater resources, while protecting the long-term sustainability of aquifers.

NS-8.5: Encourage water management practices that will allow and provide incentives for reclaiming water resources that retain economic and recreational resources. Such practices include reclaiming waters used for food processing to irrigate crops or reclaiming wastewater to support industrial uses and developed open spaces, such as parks or golf courses.

NS-8.6: Encourage voluntary conservation of water resources through xeriscape (low water use landscape plantings) and other low water use methods.

NS-8.7: Encourage water marketing (the trading of water rights as commodities) providing there are sufficient controls in place to protect the basic needs of Grant County citizens and industries.

NS-8.8: Support the Water Conservancy Board in reviewing and facilitating the transfer of water rights and approving water right change applications.

NS-8.9: Support selective continued issuance of new water rights from groundwater sources where new water rights will not impair existing rights and are consistent with the long-term sustainability of aquifers.

**Municipal Water Supply Policies**

NS-8.10: Endorse responsible stewardship of municipal water supplies.

NS-8.12: Work to identify opportunities for water conservation on County property and at County facilities.

NS-8.13: Encourage the use of irrigation water for non-potable uses in housing units, parks, and other developed lands within water service areas.

NS-8.14: Acknowledge that municipal governments and other water utilities, as applicable, are the best long-term water supply service providers within designated UGAs.

NS-8.15: Consider existing public or private water purveyors first when the need arises for a rural domestic water supplier.

NS-8.16: Look to Satellite Management Agencies first for assistance with operations and management of failing or troubled water systems throughout the County. Encourage an increase in the number of approved Satellite Management Agencies in the County.
**Rural Domestic Water Policies**

NS-8.17: Public and private purveyors, along with exempt wells operated by individual households, adequately provide for water needs in rural areas of the County. The County will not seek to become a residential water purveyor except where mandated by the state under RCW 43.70.195.

NS-8.18: Recognize that new rural water right permit exempt wells in the unconfined aquifer are junior to senior surface water rights, and may have potential for impairment. As applicable, support implementing mitigation strategies to offset impacts from exempt wells that allow for continued growth and development.

NS-8.19: Provide for future reservations, water banks, or other dedicated rural water supply sources necessary to support continued rural growth in unincorporated areas of the County.

**Agriculture Policies**

NS-8.20: Encourage efforts to secure long-term water supplies to support the County’s strong and diverse agriculture economy.

NS-8.21: Encourage the continued development of water transfers and changes to meet changing agricultural production needs.

*NS Goal 9: Protect and enhance surface and groundwater water quality for human health, drinking water supply, and to meet water quality standards.*

**Policies**

NS-9.1: Prohibit developments that have the potential for significant individual or cumulative impacts on ground and surface water quality or, alternatively, site and design developments to avoid or mitigate such impacts.

NS-9.2: Protect surface and groundwater quality as a resource essential to the public health, safety and welfare, economic growth, and prosperity of Grant County.

NS-9.3: Support development and management of County-owned storm water systems that protect surface and groundwater quality consistent with local conditions.

NS-9.4: Support the Grant County Health District to develop and implement septic tank and drain field standards that protect surface and groundwater quality and human health.

NS-9.5: Encourage educational programs and voluntary efforts of agricultural producers, processors, irrigation districts, and municipal users to responsibly manage return flows to improve surface and groundwater quality.
NS Goal 10: Support continued multi-purpose uses of the Columbia River.

Policies
NS-10.1: Encourage use of the Columbia River and its reservoirs as a key element in ensuring long-term availability of water supply, power generation, and flood control and support for population growth, agricultural production, industry, fisheries, and economic development.

NS-10.2: Support water resource policy decisions based on defensible science to meet the needs of people and fish and wildlife.

NS Goal 11: Protect and enhance surface water resources to support rivers, streams, and wetlands that support fish and wildlife species and associated habitats.

Policies
NS-11.1: Support strategies that improve flows for anadromous fish and other fish and wildlife during all types of water years on the Columbia River and other applicable streams in Grant County.

NS-11.2: Promote a balanced response to listings of threatened and endangered species that provides improved conditions for species maintenance and recovery, while maintaining and allowing sustainable development of water resources for economic growth.

3.3.17 Natural Setting – Cultural Resources

Goal NS-12: Identify, preserve, and protect historic, cultural, and archaeological resources found to be significant by recognized local, state, or federal processes.

Policies
NS-12.1: Identify known, recorded archaeological, cultural, and historic resources.

NS-12.2: Develop a local process for evaluating the significance of historic, cultural, and archaeological resources.

NS-12.3: Preserve areas that contain valuable historical or archaeological sites of federal, state, tribal, or local significance. Maintain and enforce provisions to the Resource Lands and CAO requiring conditioning of project approval on findings made by a professional archaeologist for development activities on sites of known cultural, historical, or archaeological significance.

NS-12.4: Prior to demolition, moving, or alteration to any designated historic, cultural, and archaeological landmark, ensure that due consideration is given to its preservation or, at a minimum, documentation of its historic, cultural, or archaeological value.
3.3.18 Natural Setting – Fire Hazards

Goal NS-13: Protect life and property in rural and resource areas of the County from fire hazards.

Policies

NS-13.1: The County should prepare an implementation plan for fire safety, fire prevention for rural and resource lands, and development standards.

3.3.19 Natural Setting – Shoreline Management

Protecting Grant County’s shoreline environment is important for preserving the community’s economic, environmental, and cultural resources. The shoreline policies that follow have been crafted to recognize these unique and valuable shoreline resources and to protect them for the benefit of future generations. These policies are intended to be consistent with the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW).

Economic Development Element

Goal NS-14-A: Support water-oriented uses to maximize the positive economic impact of tourism and recreational development.

Goal NS-14-B: Preserve existing agricultural industry with sensitivity to the environment and aesthetic character that incorporates low impact technologies and provides opportunities for public enjoyment of the shoreline.

Goal NS-14-C: Promote economic growth that conserves natural resources and open spaces, and maintains environmental quality and rural character.

General Economic Development Policies

NS-14.1: Ensure healthy, orderly economic growth by allowing those economic activities that will be an asset to the local economy, and for which the adverse effects on the quality of the shoreline and surrounding environment can be mitigated.

NS-14.2: Develop, as an economic asset, the recreation and tourism industry along shorelines in a manner that will enhance public enjoyment.

NS-14.3: Give preference to economic activities, which either leave natural or existing shoreline features such as trees, shrubs, grasses, and wildlife habitat unmodified, or which modify them in a way that enhances human awareness and appreciation of the shoreline and other natural and non-natural surroundings. Prohibit the introduction of invasive plant species along shorelines and encourage the removal of noxious and invasive weeds and trees.

NS-14.4: Encourage new water-dependent, water-related, and water-enjoyment economic development in priority order.
NS-14.5: Ensure that any economic activity taking place along the shoreline operates without causing irreparable harm to the quantity of the site’s environment or adjacent shorelands.

NS-14.6: Where possible, developments are encouraged to incorporate low impact development techniques into new and existing projects and integrate architectural and landscape elements that recognize the river environment.

NS-14.7: Require non-water-oriented commercial or recreational developments provide for ecological restoration and public access as appropriate.

NS-14.8: Assure that commercial and agricultural uses will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions or have significant adverse impacts on navigation, recreation, and public access.

Commercial Development Policies:
NS-14.9: Promote water-oriented commercial uses in shoreline areas that support recreation and tourism.

Agricultural Development Policies:
NS-14.10: Maintain current agricultural uses as a major economic strength of the County.

NS-14.11: Protect current agricultural land uses of long-term commercial significance and provide for the development of new agricultural uses for which adverse environmental effects can be mitigated.

NS-14.12: Support implementation of conservation practices on agricultural lands that protects shorelines and critical areas while maintaining the viability of agriculture.

Public Access and Recreation Element

good NS-15-A: Implement a public access system that increases the amount and diversity of public access consistent with private property rights, public safety, and the natural shoreline’s character.

Goal NS-15-B: Provide opportunities and space for diverse forms of water-oriented recreation in Grant County shoreline areas.

Policies
NS-15.1: Ensure that developments, uses, and activities on or near the shoreline do not impair or detract from the public’s access to the water. Where practicable, public access to the shoreline should be enhanced (Existing SMP policy (5)(A)).

NS-15.2: Design public access such that it provides for public safety and minimizes potential impacts to private property and individual privacy (Existing SMP policy (5)(B)).

NS-15.3: Locate, design, manage, and maintain public access and recreation facilities in a manner that protects shoreline ecological functions and processes and public health and safety.
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NS-15.4: Encourage federal, state, and local governments to enhance existing shoreline properties in Grant County for public access and recreational use.

NS-15.5: Identify opportunities for public access on publicly owned shorelines. Preserve, maintain, and enhance public access afforded by shoreline street ends, public utilities, and rights-of-way.

NS-15.6: Provide physical and visual public access in the shoreline jurisdiction in association with the following uses when feasible: residential developments with five or more dwellings; commercial development; and public agency recreational development.

NS-15.7: Provide public access and interpretive displays as part of publicly funded restoration projects where significant ecological impacts are addressed.

NS-15.8: Allow for passive and active shoreline recreation that emphasizes location along shorelines in association with the County's and other public agencies' parks, recreation, wildlife habitat, and open space plans.

NS-15.9: Encourage a variety of compatible recreational experiences and activities to satisfy the County's diverse recreational needs.


NS-15.11: Integrate and link recreation facilities with linear systems, such as walking trails, bicycle paths, easements, and scenic drives when feasible.

NS-15.12: Promote non-intensive recreational uses that avoid adverse effects to the natural and CBP-enhanced hydrology of aquatic systems, do not contribute to flood hazards, and avoid damage to the shoreline environment through modifications such as structural shoreline stabilization or native vegetation removal.

Circulation Element

Goal NS-16: Implement multi-modal transportation improvements that provide for mobility and access and that minimize adverse impacts on the shoreline environment.

Policies

NS-16.1: Provide safe, reasonable, and adequate circulation systems to shorelines where routes will minimize adverse effects on unique or fragile shoreline features and existing ecological systems, while contributing to the functional and visual enhancement of the shoreline (Existing SMP policy (3)(A)).

NS-16.2: Within the shoreline jurisdiction, locate land circulation systems that are not shoreline oriented as far from the land-water interface as practicable to reduce interference with
either natural shoreline resources or other appropriate shoreline uses (Existing SMP policy (3)(B)).

NS-16.3: Allow for maintenance and improvements to existing roads and parking areas. Allow for necessary new roads and parking areas where other locations outside of shoreline jurisdiction are not feasible.

NS-16.4: Plan and develop a circulation network that is compatible with the shoreline environment, and respects and protects ecological and aesthetic values in the shoreline of the state as well as private property rights.

NS-16.5: Include in circulation system for pedestrian, bicycle, equestrian, and public transportation where appropriate. Circulation planning and projects should support existing and proposed shoreline uses that are consistent with the SMP.

NS-16.6: Promote existing transportation corridors for reuse for water-dependent uses or public access when they are abandoned.

NS-16.7: Encourage relocation or improvement of those circulation elements that are functionally or aesthetically disruptive to the shoreline, public waterfront access, and ecological functions.

NS-16.8: Plan parking to achieve optimum use. Where possible, parking should serve more than one use (e.g., recreational use on weekends and commercial uses on weekdays).

NS-16.9: Encourage low-impact parking facilities, such as those with permeable pavements and bioswales.

NS-16.10: Encourage trail and bicycle paths along shorelines in a manner compatible with the natural character, resources, and ecology of the shoreline.

NS-16.11: Encourage the linkage of shoreline parks, recreation areas, and public access points with linear systems, such as hiking paths, bicycle paths, easements, and/or scenic drives.

**Shoreline Uses and Modifications Element**

*Goal 17-A: Encourage shoreline development that recognizes Grant County's natural and cultural values and the unique aesthetic qualities offered by its variety of shoreline environments.*

*Goal 17-B: Grant County recognizes and protects the functions and values of the shoreline environments of statewide and local significance. For shorelines of state-wide significance, protection and management priorities are to:*

1. **Recognize and protect the state-wide interest over local interest**
2. **Preserve the natural character of the shoreline**
3. **Provide long-term over short-term benefit**
4. **Protect the resources and ecology of shorelines**
5. **Increase public access to publicly owned areas of shorelines**
6. **Increase recreational opportunities for the public in shoreline areas**
General Policies
NS-17.1: Maintain areas within the shoreline jurisdiction with unique attributes for specific long-term uses, including agricultural, commercial, industrial, residential, recreational, and open space uses.

NS-17.2: Ensure that proposed shoreline uses are distributed, located, and developed in a manner that will maintain or improve the health, safety, and welfare of the public when such uses occupy shoreline areas.

NS-17.3: Ensure that activities and facilities are located on the shorelines in such a manner as to retain or improve the quality of the environment.

NS-17.4: Ensure that proposed shoreline uses do not infringe upon the rights of others, upon the rights of private ownership, upon the rights of the public under the Public Trust Doctrine or federal navigational servitude, and treaty rights of Indian tribes.

NS-17.5: Minimize the adverse impacts of shoreline uses and activities on the environment during all phases of development (e.g., design, construction, management, and use).

Shoreline Environment Designation Policies
NS-17.6: Provide a comprehensive shoreline environment designation system to categorize Grant County's shorelines into environments based upon their primary characteristics to guide their use and management.

NS-17.7: Designate properties as Natural to protect and restore those shoreline areas that are relatively free of human influence or that include intact or minimally degraded shoreline functions that are sensitive to potential impacts from human use. Natural areas should be managed consistent with the policies in Section 24.12.120 of the SMP.

NS-17.8: Designate properties as Shoreline Residential to accommodate higher-density residential development and recognize existing and proposed land uses. This designation is appropriate for residential uses on lands with zoning classifications for detached and attached residential.

NS-17.9: Assign appropriate environment designations for agricultural land uses of long-term commercial significance for which adverse environmental effects can be mitigated.

NS-17.10: Assign appropriate environment designations for preservation of wildlife habitat areas, natural resources, and public agency operations.

NS-17.11: Designate properties within each environment designation based on the designation criteria in SMP Section II, Article II.
Agriculture Policies
NS-17.12: This Comprehensive Plan recognizes the importance of agriculture in Grant County and supports its continued economic viability. This plan allows for ongoing agricultural activities and should protect agricultural lands from conflicting uses such as intensive or unrelated residential, industrial, or commercial uses, while also maintaining shoreline ecological functions and processes.

NS-17.13: New agricultural development should be conducted in such a manner as to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions and processes.

NS-17.14: Maintain a vegetative buffer between agricultural lands and water bodies or wetlands, along with voluntary conservation practices that can be implemented under the VSP and other applicable programs.

NS-17.15: Conversion of agricultural uses to other uses should comply with all policies and regulations for non-agricultural uses.

Aquaculture Policies
NS-17.16: Aquaculture is a water-dependent use and, when consistent with control of pollution and avoidance of adverse impacts to the environment and preservation of habitat for resident native species, is a preferred use of the shoreline (Washington Administrative Code [WAC] 173-26-241(3)(b)).

NS-17.17: Give preference to aquaculture operations that minimize environmental impacts through use of fewer visible structures or less extensive substrate and vegetation modifications.

NS-17.18: Aquaculture should not be allowed in areas where it would degrade water quality, result in a loss of shoreline ecological function, impair navigation, or conflict with other water-dependent uses.

NS-17.19: Design aquaculture facilities to minimize nuisance odors and noise, as well as visual impacts on surrounding shoreline development.

NS-17.20: The rights of treaty tribes to aquatic resources within their usual and accustomed areas should be addressed through the permit review process. Direct coordination between the applicant/proponent and the tribe should be encouraged.

Boating Facilities Policies
NS-17.21 Locate and design boating facilities so that their structures and operations will be compatible with the area affected, such as environmental conditions, shoreline configuration, access, and neighboring upland and aquatic uses.

NS-17.22: Require restoration activities when substantial improvements or repair to existing boating facilities is planned.
NS-17.23: Boating facilities that minimize the amount of shoreline modification are preferred.

NS-17.24: Boating facilities should provide physical and visual public shoreline access and provide for multiple uses, including water-related use, to the extent compatible with shoreline ecological functions and processes and adjacent shoreline use.

NS-17.25: Boating facilities should be located and designed to avoid adverse effects upon riverine and nearshore processes such as erosion, littoral or riparian transport, and accretion, and should, where feasible, enhance degraded, scarce, and/or valuable shore features including accretion shoreforms.

NS-17.26: Location and design of boating facilities should not unduly obstruct navigable waters and should avoid adverse effects to recreational opportunities such as fishing, shellfish gathering, pleasure boating, commercial aquaculture, swimming, beach walking, picnicking, and shoreline viewing.

**Breakwaters, Jetties, Groins, and Weirs Policies**

NS-17.27: To the extent feasible, limit the use of breakwaters, jetties, groins, weirs, or other similar structures to those projects providing ecological restoration or other public benefits. These structures should avoid and minimize significant ecological impacts. Impacts which cannot be avoided should be mitigated.

**Dredging and Dredge Material Disposal Policies**

NS-17.28: Dredging and dredge material disposal should avoid and minimize significant ecological impacts. Impacts which cannot be avoided should be mitigated.

NS-17.29: Design and locate new shoreline development to avoid the need for dredging.

NS-17.30: Limit dredging and dredge material disposal to the minimum necessary to allow for shoreline restoration, flood hazard reduction, and maintenance of existing legal moorage and navigation. Dredging to provide for new navigation uses is prohibited.

NS-17.31: Allow dredging for the primary purposes of flood hazard reduction only as part of a long-term management strategy consistent with an approved flood hazard management plan.

NS-17.32: Ensure that dredging operations are planned and conducted in a manner that will minimize interference with navigation and that will lessen adverse impacts to other shoreline uses.

**Fill Policies**

NS-17.33: Limit fill waterward of the ordinary high water mark to support ecological restoration or to facilitate water-dependent or public access uses.

NS-17.34: Allow fill consistent with floodplain regulations upland of the ordinary high water mark provided it is located, designed, and constructed to protect shoreline ecological functions.
and ecosystem-wide processes, including channel migration, and is the minimum necessary to implement an approved project.

**In-Stream Structures Policies**

NS-17.35: Locate, plan, and permit in-stream structures only when consistent with the full range of public interests, ecological functions and processes, and environmental concerns, with special emphasis on protecting and restoring priority habitats and species.

**Mining Policies**

NS-17.36: Locate mining facilities outside shoreline jurisdictions whenever feasible.

NS-17.37: Do not allow mining in any location waterward of the ordinary high water mark.

NS-17.38: Design and locate mining facilities and associated activities to prevent loss of ecological function. Give preference to mining uses that result in the creation, restoration, or enhancement of habitat for priority species.

NS-17.39: Protect water bodies from sources of pollution, including but not limited to, sedimentation and siltation, chemical and petrochemical use, and spillage and storage/disposal of mining wastes and spoils.

NS-17.40: Mining operations should be located, designed, and managed so that other appropriate uses are not subjected to substantial or unnecessary adverse impacts from noise, dust, or other effects of the operation. The operator may be required to implement measures such as buffers, limited hours, or other mitigating measures for the purpose of minimizing adverse proximity impacts.

**Private Moorage Facilities Policies**

NS-17.41: Moorage associated with a single-family residence is considered a water-dependent use provided that it is designed and used as a facility to access watercraft, and other moorage facilities are not available or feasible. Moorage for water-related and water enjoyment uses or shared moorage for multifamily use should be allowed as part of a mixed use development or where it provides public access.

NS-17.42: New moorage, excluding docks accessory to single family residences, should be permitted only when the applicant/proponent has demonstrated that a specific need exists to support the intended water-dependent or public access use.

NS-17.43: As an alternative to continued proliferation of individual private moorage, mooring buoys are preferred over docks or floats. Shared moorage facilities are preferred over single user moorage where feasible, especially where water use conflicts exist or are predictable. New subdivisions of more than two lots and new multifamily development of more than two dwelling units should provide shared moorage where feasible.
NS-17.44: Docks, piers, and mooring buoys, including those accessory to single family residences, should avoid locations where they will adversely impact shoreline ecological functions or processes, including currents and littoral drift.

NS-17.45: Moorage should be spaced and oriented in a manner that minimizes hazards and obstructions to public navigation rights and corollary rights thereto such as, but not limited to, fishing, swimming, and pleasure boating, as well as private riparian rights of adjacent land owners.

NS-17.46: Moorage should be restricted to the minimum size necessary to meet the needs of the proposed use. The length, width, and height of piers and docks should be no greater than that required for safety and practicality for the primary use.

NS-17.47: Pile supports are preferred over fills because piles do not displace water surface or aquatic habitat and are removable and thus more flexible in terms of long-term use patterns. Floats may be less desirable than pile structures where aquatic habitat or littoral drift are significant.

NS-17.48: The use of buoys for small craft moorage is preferred over pile or float structures because of lesser long-term impact on shore features and users; moorage buoys should be placed as close to shore as possible to minimize obstruction to navigation.

NS-17.49: Piers and docks should be constructed of materials that will not adversely affect water quality or aquatic plants and animals in the long term.

NS-17.50: New pier and dock development should be designed so as not to interfere with lawful public access to or use of shorelines. Developers of new piers and shared moorage should be encouraged to provide physical or visual public access to shorelines whenever safe and compatible with the primary use and shore features.

Recreational Development Policies

NS-17.51: Shoreline recreational development should be given priority for shoreline location to the extent that the use facilitates the public's ability to reach, touch, and enjoy the water's edge, to travel on the waters of the state, and to view the water and the shoreline. Where appropriate, such facilities should be dispersed along the shoreline in a manner that supports more frequent recreational access and aesthetic enjoyment of the shoreline for a substantial number of people.

NS-17.52: Recreational developments should facilitate appropriate use of shoreline resources while conserving them. These resources include, but are not limited to: accretion shoreforms, wetlands, soils, groundwater, surface water, native plant and animal life, and shore processes.
NS-17.53: Recreational facilities should be a combination of active and passive types. Location of such facilities should consider the ecological function and sensitive nature of the shorelines in order to avoid adverse impacts. For example, wildlife and habitat preservation areas with sensitive shoreline natures should have low impact recreational uses.

NS-17.54: Recreational developments and plans should provide the regional population a varied and balanced choice of recreation experiences in appropriate locations. Public agencies should coordinate their plans and activities to provide a wide variety of recreational opportunities without needlessly duplicating facilities.

NS-17.55: Encourage the linkage of shoreline parks, recreation areas, and public access points with linear systems, such as hiking paths, bicycle paths, easements, and/or scenic drives.

NS-17.56: When feasible, recreation facilities should incorporate public education regarding shoreline ecological functions and processes, the role of human actions on the environment, and the importance of public involvement in shoreline management. Opportunities incorporating educational and interpretive information should be pursued in design and operation of recreation facilities and nature trails.

NS-17.57: Locate and design recreational developments to preserve, enhance, or create scenic views and vistas in accordance with Section 24.12.260, Public Access of the SMP.

Residential Development Policies

NS-17.58: Consider single-family residential development as a priority use only when developed in a manner consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment.

NS-17.59: Locate and construct residential development in a manner that assures no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

NS-17.60: Ensure the overall density of development, lot coverage, and height of structures is appropriate to the physical capabilities of the site and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

NS-17.61: Ensure new residential development provides adequate buffers or open space from the water to protect or restore ecological functions and ecosystem-wide processes, to preserve views, to preserve shoreline aesthetic characteristics, to protect the privacy of nearby residences, and to minimize use conflicts.

NS-17.62: Make adequate provisions for services and infrastructure necessary to support residential development.

NS-17.63: Design and locate residential development to preserve existing shoreline vegetation, to control erosion, and to protect water quality.
NS-17.64: Design and locate new residences so that shoreline stabilization will not be necessary to protect the structure. The creation of new residential lots should not be allowed unless it is demonstrated the lots can be developed without the following criteria:

1. Constructing shoreline stabilization structures (such as bulkheads)
2. Causing significant erosion or slope instability
3. Removing existing native vegetation within shoreline buffers

**Shoreline Habitat and Natural Systems Enhancement Projects Policies**

NS-17.65: Include provisions for shoreline vegetation restoration or enhancement, fish and wildlife habitat enhancement, and low impact development techniques in projects located within shoreline jurisdiction, where feasible, along with conservation practices implemented under the VSP.

NS-17.66: Encourage and facilitate implementation of projects and programs included in the SMP Shoreline Restoration Plan.

**Shoreline Stabilization Policies**

NS-17.67: Locate and design new development, including subdivisions, to eliminate the need for new shoreline modification or stabilization.

NS-17.68: Design, locate, size, and construct new or replacement structural shoreline stabilization measures to minimize and mitigate the impact of these modifications on the County’s shorelines.

NS-17.69: Give preference to non-structural shoreline stabilization measures over structural shoreline stabilization, and give preference to soft structural shoreline stabilization over hard structural shoreline stabilization.

NS-17.70: Allow location, design, and construction of riprap and other bank stabilization measures primarily to prevent damage to existing development or to protect the health, safety, and welfare of Grant County residents.

NS-17.71: Encourage fish-friendly shoreline design during new construction and redevelopment by offering incentives and regulatory flexibility.

**Utilities Policies**

NS-17.73: Allow for utility maintenance and extension with criteria for location and vegetation restoration as appropriate.

NS-17.74: Plan, design, and locate utility facilities to minimize harm to shoreline functions, preserve the natural landscape, and minimize conflicts with present and future planned land and
shoreline uses while meeting the needs of future populations in areas planned to accommodate growth.

NS-17.75: Do not permit new non-water-oriented primary utility production and processing facilities, or parts of those facilities, such as power plants, solid waste storage or disposal facilities within shoreline jurisdiction unless no other options are feasible. Primary utility facilities, such as wastewater treatment plants and including expansion of existing facilities, should be located in shoreline jurisdiction only if no practical upland alternative or location exists. Such facilities and expansions should be designed and located to minimize impacts on shoreline ecological functions, including riparian and aquatic areas, and to the natural landscape and aesthetics. Public health and safety should be the highest priority for the planning, development, and operation of primary utility facilities.

NS-17.76: Locate utility transmission facilities for the conveyance of services, such as power lines, cables, and pipelines, outside of shoreline jurisdiction where feasible. Where permitted within shoreline jurisdiction, such facilities should be located within existing or approved road crossings, rights-of-way and corridors, or in such a way as to minimize potential adverse impacts on shoreline areas. Joint use of rights-of-way and corridors in shoreline areas should be encouraged.

NS-17.77: Locate new utility facilities so as not to require extensive shoreline protection works.

NS-17.78: Locate utility facilities and corridors to protect scenic views from public parks and trails. Whenever possible, such facilities should be placed underground, or alongside or under bridges.

NS-17.79: Design utility facilities and rights-of-way to preserve the natural landscape and to minimize conflicts with present and planned land uses.

**Existing Uses Policies**

NS-17.80: Allow nonconforming existing legal uses and structures to continue in accordance with the SMP. Residential structures and appurtenant structures that were legally established and are used for a conforming use, but that do not meet standards for the following should be considered a conforming structure: setbacks, buffers, or yards; area; bulk; height; or density.

NS-17.81: Allow alterations of nonconforming structures, uses, and lots in consideration of historic development patterns, when occupied by preferred uses, and when consistent with public safety and other public purposes.

NS-17.82: Encourage transitions from nonconforming uses to conforming uses.

NS-17.83: Allow for nonconforming structures to expand when they do not increase the nonconformity according to SMP requirements.
NS-17.84: Allow for existing roads, driveways, and utility lines to continue and expand when they do not increase the nonconformity according to SMP requirements.

NS-17.85: Consider the objective of no net loss of ecological function to guide review of proposed expansions or other changes to nonconforming uses and new development on nonconforming vacant lots. This objective may be addressed in an area-wide manner consistent with the SMP cumulative impacts analysis.

**Conservation Element**

*Goal 18: Protect the natural and CBP-enhanced hydraulic, hydrologic, and habitat functions, and scenic as well as recreational values of Grant County’s shorelines.*

**Policies**

NS-18.1: Develop and implement management and voluntary conservation practices that will ensure a sustained yield of renewable resources of the shorelines while preserving, protecting, enhancing, and restoring unique and nonrenewable shoreline resources, environments, or features.

NS-18.2: Reclaim and restore areas that are biologically and aesthetically degraded to the greatest extent feasible.

NS-18.3: Preserve scenic vistas, aesthetics, fisheries and wildlife habitat, and other critical areas.

NS-18.4: Protect shoreline processes and ecological functions through regulatory and non-regulatory means that may include acquisition of key properties, conservation easements, regulation of development within shoreline jurisdiction, voluntary conservation practices, and incentives to private property owners to encourage ecologically sound design and implementation of best land management practices.

NS-18.5: Protect and manage shoreline-associated wetlands, including maintenance of sufficient volumes of surface and subsurface drainage into wetlands, to sustain existing vegetation and wildlife habitat.

NS-18.6: Work with other jurisdictional agencies in the region and with the private sector to deal effectively with regional and watershed-wide natural environment issues and the protection, preservation, and enhancement of all shorelines as fish and wildlife habitat.

NS-18.7: Manage development to avoid risk and damage to property and loss of life from geological conditions.

NS-18.8: Regulate development within the 100-year floodplain to avoid risk and damage to property and loss of life.

NS-18.9: Prohibit the introduction of invasive plant species along shorelines, and encourage the removal of noxious and invasive weeds and trees.
NS-18.10: Protect, enhance, and maintain healthy vegetation consistent with the local climate and nature of shoreline.

NS-18.11: Enhance and restore areas that are biologically and aesthetically degraded to the greatest extent feasible while maintaining appropriate use of the shoreline.

**Historic, Cultural, Scientific, and Educational Resources Element**

_Goal 19A: Identify, preserve and protect historic, cultural, and archaeological resources found to be significant by recognized local, state, or federal processes._

_Goal 19B: Encourage educational and scientific projects and programs that foster a greater appreciation of the importance of shoreline management, water-oriented activities, environmental conservation, and local historic connections with Grant County shoreline._

**Policies**

NS-19.1: Identify, protect, preserve, and restore important archeological, historical, and cultural sites located in shorelands.

NS-19.2: Encourage educational projects and programs that foster a greater appreciation of the importance of shoreline management, maritime activities, environmental conservation, and maritime history.

NS-19.3: Prevent public or private uses and activities from destroying or damaging any site having historic, cultural, scientific, or educational value without appropriate analysis and mitigation.

**Flood Hazard Management Element**

_Goal 20: Protect public safety within rivers' and creeks' floodways and floodplains and protect natural systems by preserving the flood storage function of floodplains._

**Policies**

NS-20.1: Manage development proposed within floodplains and floodways consistent with the Shoreline Management Act, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards, and the Critical Areas Regulations for frequently flooded areas contained within the SMP.

NS-20.2: Work with cities and towns and state and federal agencies to deal effectively with regional flooding issues.

NS-20.3: Control stormwater runoff in a manner consistent with low impact development practices which use natural detention, retention, and recharge techniques to the maximum extent possible.
NS-20.4: Prohibit any development within the floodplain which would individually or cumulatively cause any increase in the base flood elevation beyond FEMA standards.

Private Property Right Element

*Goal 21: Recognize and protect private property rights in shoreline uses and developments consistent with the public interest.*

Policies

NS-21.1: Shoreline uses should be located and designed to respect private property rights, maintain privacy of private property, be compatible with the shoreline environment, protect ecological functions and processes, and protect aesthetic values of the shoreline.

NS-21.2: Public access to the shoreline such as trails, bikeways, or roads should consider privacy when locating them near privately-owned properties.
4 Land Use Element

4.1 Introduction

The Land Use Element provides the framework for future growth and development consistent with community objectives and GMA requirements. The Land Use Element designates the proposed general distribution, location, and extent of land uses for agriculture, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, general aviation airports, public utilities, public facilities, and other functions, as applicable, and describes development densities and projections for future population growth. The Land Use Element can be considered the “driver” of this Comprehensive Plan. Each of the other elements is interrelated with the Land Use Element.

Growth and land development carry with it certain ongoing financial responsibilities for all taxpayers. Roads, water, sewer, public safety, and other services all have costs associated with land development. Since fiscal resources are generally limited, it is crucial to carefully consider how and when land is developed. With thoughtful, long-term planning, the substantial investment of both the public and private sector can be better protected.

Planning for appropriate intensity of development within unincorporated areas will make good use of public funds, maximize economic benefit, and protect the environment and quality of place that Grant County residents treasure.
The challenge of the Comprehensive Plan is to set forth a course for Grant County that will preserve its rural character while encouraging growth. This growth must be sensitive to the environment with provisions for protecting groundwater and surface waters, while providing the services and employment base necessary for Grant County to continue to be a wonderful place to live.

This Land Use Element addresses land use in unincorporated Grant County for the next 10 to 20 years.

### 4.1.1 Organization of this Element

The Land Use Element is organized as three sub-elements, each dealing with one of the three major land use categories: 1) Urban Lands; 2) Rural Lands; and 3) Natural Resource (resource) Lands. *Urban Lands* are those lands included within the UGAs of each of Grant County’s 15 incorporated cities and towns. These areas are characterized by growth patterns that have made or are expected to make intensive use of land for buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces. As a result, other land uses such as food production become incompatible. *Resource Lands* are those lands important for their ability to sustain the long-term commercial production of agricultural goods, forest products, and mineral extraction activities. *Rural Lands* are those lands outside of both UGAs and Resource Lands.

Goals and policies for each of the sub-elements are developed in Chapter 3. It is the intent of this section to promote a clearer and more complete view of the issues affecting development in each land use category.

The Land Use Element presents an analysis of existing conditions through an inventory of land use, area, and ownership. This inventory data is used throughout the three sub-elements as well as in many other chapters of the Comprehensive Plan.

### 4.2 Relationship to Growth Management Act and Other Planning Efforts

#### 4.2.1 Growth Management Act Requirements

RCW 36.70A.070 establishes the following requirements for completing a Land Use Element:

- Designate the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of uses of land, where appropriate, for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open space, public utilities, public facilities, and other land uses
- Include population densities, building intensities, and estimates of future population growth
- Provide for the protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies
• Where applicable, review drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff in the area and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state.

The GMA also requires comprehensive plans to address rural lands or those lands not designated for urban growth or resource lands. The GMA also allows LAMIRDs subject to guidelines and criteria. This allows a variety of densities and uses in rural land that are compatible with the existing rural character.

4.2.2 City and Town Comprehensive Plans

Each of the 15 incorporated cities and towns of Grant County has prepared comprehensive plans in either draft or final form. These plans identify current city or town limits and urban growth boundaries for the 20-year planning period. These plans will serve as the comprehensive plans for the incorporated areas within the UGA boundaries. Although they appear in separate documents, they are integral parts of this Comprehensive Plan. Urban land use designations are described in each jurisdiction’s respective comprehensive plan which generally includes uses such as low, medium, and high density residential, industrial, commercial, public facilities, open space.

4.2.3 Airports

Grant County currently hosts seven airports. These essential public facilities function as transportation centers to neighboring cities and the County. All airport plans are sent to the WSDOT Aviation Division for review and certification. Land uses around airports require special considerations to ensure that future growth is not limited and that public safety is protected. In order to achieve efficient land use, the County, airport operators/owners, cities, and all interested parties were invited to participate in the Comprehensive Plan update process as it related to existing and future airport plans and operations. Outreach to each airport was conducted as part of the update, to identify whether there were any incompatible land uses that may affect properties adjacent to the airports in Grant County. No incompatibilities were identified. For additional information on airports see the Transportation Element (Chapter 7).

4.2.4 Stormwater

Storm events are rare within Grant County with an average annual rainfall of approximately 9 inches per year. Ecology's Stormwater Manual for Eastern Washington provides the guidance necessary to ensure that “waters of the state” are not impacted by development. Review of each development through the permit process and SEPA should include stormwater review. Furthermore, when or if areas of stormwater run-off, drainage, or flooding become known, the County and other jurisdictions will review options to public health and safety.
Best practices for stormwater include:

- Provisions to retain natural hydrology and processes, such as limiting effective impervious surfaces, clustering, preserving open spaces, and promoting low impact development practices
- Protection measures identified for specific drainage areas
- Provisions to protect open space, wetlands, habitat, and hydrologic processes

### 4.3 Existing Conditions

#### 4.3.1 Land Ownership

Of the approximately 1,700,634 acres of land in Grant County, about 29% (493,747 acres) is owned and controlled to some extent by the state or federal government. Major public land ownership is depicted in Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 2 – Publicly Owned Lands and tabulated in Table 4-1. The largest single publicly owned parcel is the Wahluke Slope portion of the Hanford Reach National Monument, which is owned by the U.S. Department of Energy. Wahluke Slope is 66,580 acres in total, and is part of the larger U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service managed County land of 90,664 acres.

#### Table 4-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Public Land Ownership</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Owner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area (Acres)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>52,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBR</td>
<td>199,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
<td>2,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Defense</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>90,664¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Federal</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,775</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDFW</td>
<td>40,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>95,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>6,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal State</strong></td>
<td><strong>142,268</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County PUD</td>
<td>8,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or Municipal Government</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The County does not have jurisdiction over federal land. However, land use designations are coordinated with federal agencies’ uses and activities in Grant County. The County has jurisdiction and responsibility for land use planning over state lands, and planning on such lands should be coordinated with the appropriate state agencies.

Although planning in the Hanford area is not under the County’s jurisdiction, this federally funded and operated area influences the local land use. A Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site was prepared and adopted by the U.S Department of Energy in 1999, with participation by the County, state agencies, tribes, and other stakeholders. Several supplemental analyses and amendments have been approved since 1999, with the most recent in 2015. The plan includes Industrial-Exclusive, Industrial, Research and Development, High-Intensity Recreation, Low-Intensity Recreation, Conservation (Mining), and Preservation land uses. These land uses were identified by the public, cooperating agencies, and consulting Tribal governments as being important to the region (DOE 1999). The land use indicates Preservation lands on the Wahluke Slope area within Grant County.

4.3.2 Land Use Inventory

In conjunction with this planning effort, a land use inventory was prepared based on a number of sources, including tax parcel data obtained from the Grant County Assessor’s Office, land use mapping interpretation, and site reconnaissance of specific areas. Parcel mapping obtained from the Assessor was used both for Comprehensive Plan mapping and land use analysis purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification¹</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>47,304</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4,132</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Trade</td>
<td>13,256</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>13,189</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>15,563</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Land Use Classification includes Residential, Commercial Miscellaneous, Commercial/Trade, Service, Transportation, and Recreational.
### Land Use Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Agriculture, Mining, Fishing</td>
<td>1,147,553</td>
<td>67.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved/Vacant</td>
<td>448,581</td>
<td>26.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved Other</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,700,634</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. Classification based on Grant County tax parcel code. Does not include water areas and rights of way.

Much of the land in Grant County serves multiple uses and thus is often difficult to classify in a single category. For example, a large agricultural parcel may contain either a single-family residence, farmworker housing, a processing plant, or all three. Some parcels may be vacant. For planning purposes, the tax use recorded by the Assessor was grouped based on the predominant use into the following major land use categories:

**Residential** – Land occupied by single-family residences, multi-family residences and apartments, condominiums, and mobile home parks

**Commercial/Industrial** – Land occupied by buildings for the primary purpose of retail sale of goods and services and by buildings, materials, or equipment for the storage, manufacturing, or transportation of a product

**Transportation** – Land used for roads, highways, access and related services

**Recreational** – Land used for various recreational opportunities such as parks, trails, and viewpoints

**Resource Agriculture** – includes dry and irrigated agricultural lands and rangeland

  - **Dryland Agriculture** – Land currently in use for producing commercial crops or related activities without the benefit of irrigation
  - **Irrigated Agriculture** – Land currently in use for producing commercial crops or related activities with the benefit of irrigation
  - **Rangeland** – Land currently in use as rangeland for raising or grazing of livestock

**Vacant or Unimproved** – Land currently undeveloped and vacant

**Open Space** – Land in use as parks, natural open space, and recreation areas

#### 4.3.3 Population Growth

Population in Grant County has seen a steady growth in the last decade with a slight increase in 2010. Figure 4-1 reflects the population trend in the last 10 years in Grant County.
The average annual rate of population growth in Grant County between 2010 and 2017 was 1.1%, based on Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) data. Since this indicates a relatively slower growth trend, the growth projected by OFM’s medium series is used. To ensure that the County and its incorporated cities and towns adequately address the economic challenges presented, and plan for housing, infrastructure, and services needed by the future population, it is reasonable to plan for the OFM medium series. Using the medium series will still have some cushion to allow for additional growth than the past trend, avoid tightening urban land supply and raising housing costs, and also make optimal use of public funds for future infrastructure improvements.

4.4 Land Use Categories

4.4.1 Overview

The GMA requires that the County “designate the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land, where appropriate, for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, general aviation airports, public utilities, public facilities, and other land uses” (RCW 36.70A.070(1)). Population densities, building intensities, and estimates of future population growth must also be included. This Land Use Element summarizes each of the land use designations depicted on the Future/Proposed Land Use Map (Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 5). Land uses are grouped into three categories Urban Lands, Rural Lands, and Resource Lands. Detailed discussion of each designation under these categories is contained in the respective
sub-sections. Each land use designation includes a statement of purpose and a description of characteristics typifying lands developed under each designation. The total land area within each of the designations is provided in Table 4-3.

**Table 4-3**
**Future Land Use Designations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Lands</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated UGA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Suburban</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Low Density</td>
<td>6,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Medium Density</td>
<td>3,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, High Density</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Urban)</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Urban)</td>
<td>4,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/ Recreation</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>1,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Moses Lake</td>
<td>4,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Lands Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Lands</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>2,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential 1</td>
<td>55,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential 2</td>
<td>13,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Remote</td>
<td>159,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Resource</td>
<td>295,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>124,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planned Industrial</td>
<td>2,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planned Resort</td>
<td>6,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMIRD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Village</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Community</td>
<td>1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Service Center</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Development</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Development</td>
<td>1,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Use Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Rural)</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Rural)</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Lands Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>664,813</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA Ag Dryland</td>
<td>239,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA Ag Irrigated</td>
<td>689,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA Ag Rangeland</td>
<td>33,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Lands Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>962,374</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining¹</td>
<td>3,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford Reservation</td>
<td>69,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,721,592</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

1. All permitted mining operations are designated as Mineral Resource Lands. The Mineral Resource Land designation is an “overlay” designation which overlays several other land use designations. Therefore, the area designated as mining is not included in the total area.

### 4.4.2 Urban Lands

#### 4.4.2.1 Introduction

Of the three land use categories addressed by this Plan, Urban Lands accommodate the most intense and varied land uses. Urban lands are located in the cities and the County’s unincorporated UGAs. Most of the current growth occurs within and around Grant County’s 15 cities and this is also where future growth is expected to occur.

The majority of Grant County’s residential dwellings, businesses, and workplaces are already found in the cities and their urban fringe areas. As this already intensive use of urban land increases, special attention will be needed to keep them healthy, thriving, and livable.

A chief characteristic of most urban lands is the diversity of uses and composition found there. This diversity is unique to each area and appeals to different people in different ways. Some enjoy the higher density urban lifestyle, while others prefer a little room between themselves and their neighbors. While not quite rural, urban fringe areas can offer a semi-rural atmosphere with some urban-level infrastructure and services. These fringe areas have experienced growth which is expected to continue and change in time.
A UGA is established through the designation of a boundary that separates existing and future urban areas from rural and resource lands. A UGA defines where developments will be directed and supported with urban public facilities and services, such as sanitary sewer systems, domestic water supply systems, storm sewers, street lighting, fire and police protection services, and public transit services.

4.4.2.2 Roles of Cities and Counties
One of the principles envisioned by the Washington State Legislature in adopting the GMA was to distinguish between the roles and purposes of county and city government provided in state law. According to this, counties are regional governments responsible for provision of regional services and for the conservation of natural resource lands, while cities are municipal governments responsible for cost-effective provision of urban services to areas characterized by population growth.

It is the intent of the GMA that cities provide most urban public services within a UGA, and that counties identify and protect natural resource lands, including agricultural, mineral, and forest lands that are essential to the state and regional economy over the long term. Further, the GMA requires that counties work with cities to influence the majority of population growth preferably onto urban lands within UGAs, but also onto rural lands not essential or productive to the resource base of the state or region. Population growth outside UGAs should be at rural densities that reflect the limited abilities of county government to provide cost-effective services and to discourage urban sprawl.

4.4.2.3 Urban Growth Areas
Designating UGAs recognizes both the historical and existing urbanizing development pattern in the County. A key component of the GMA and the Comprehensive Plan is to allow growth within the UGAs. These areas include cities and other areas characterized by urban growth or adjacent to such areas, and are designed to accommodate the projected population growth for 20 years. The GMA further specifies that urban growth should first be located in areas that already have adequate existing public facilities and service capacity and second, be located in areas where such services, if not already available, can be served adequately by a combination of both existing and future public and private sector facilities and services.

The CWPP establish a process between the County and cities to manage development within the cities and their UGAs, and a process of annexation of UGAs into the cities.
Significant future growth in Grant County will be located in the UGAs during the next 20 years, and public spending for facilities and services will be directed to the UGAs accordingly. This will promote efficient use of public infrastructure dollars and enhance community diversity and livability. Commercial and industrial activity will also be encouraged within the UGAs. Most services within UGAs will be provided by the cities. Other service providers are appropriate within UGAs for regional or countywide services.

Planning for UGAs that include incorporated municipalities is coordinated among the cities, towns, and County. Though incorporated lands within the UGAs remain under the County’s jurisdiction, it is beneficial to the cities, towns, and County to plan jointly for their future use. City and Town comprehensive plans are discussed in Section 4.2.2.

Grant County’s 59,277 total UGA acres includes 27,081 acres of unincorporated land (Table 4-4).

Table 4-4
Summary of Areas of Grant County Cities and Urban Growth Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Growth Area</th>
<th>Total UGA (Acres)</th>
<th>Unincorporated UGA (Acres)</th>
<th>% Unincorporated Area of the Total UGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coulee City</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric City</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrata</td>
<td>7,145</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Coulee</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartline</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krupp</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>30,583</td>
<td>18,170</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap Lake</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>3,292</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Creek</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,277</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2.4 Urban Land Use Designations
The County’s UDC governs land use within UGAs and outside of corporate limits in cooperation with the cities. Urban Land Use designations have been established for all UGAs, and provide for a
consistent transition from county to city or town as areas are annexed from unincorporated into incorporated. Designations include the following, as applicable, to the UGAs of cities and towns:

- Residential, Suburban (R1)
- Residential, Low Density (R2)
- Residential, Medium Density (R3)
- Residential, High Density (R4)
- Commercial
- Heavy Industrial
- Light Industrial
- Open Space/Recreation
- Public Facility
- Urban Reserve
- Port of Moses Lake

**Residential, Suburban (R1)** – provides for low-density, single-family estate residential housing that provides for larger lot uses and activities more suburban in character than those found in more concentrated, urban residential neighborhoods. Minimum density shall be 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres.

**Residential, Low Density (R2)** – provides for single-family residential housing and duplexes in varying densities ranging from 1 to 4 dwelling units per acre.

**Residential, Medium Density (R3)** – provides for single-family residential housing and duplexes in varying densities ranging from 4 to 8 dwelling units per acre.

**Residential, High Density (R4)** – provides for multi-family residential housing in varying densities ranging from 8 to 16 dwelling units per acre.

**Commercial** – provides for general commercial areas having a variety of retail, office, personal and professional services, and other commercial activities.

**Heavy Industrial** – provides for heavy manufacturing, processing, and industrial development generally not appropriate near residential areas.
**Light Industrial** – provides for office parks, medical services, and light industrial activities such as wholesaling and light manufacturing.

**Open Space/Recreation** – provides for open, undeveloped areas that are not suitable for intensive development. Such areas may be available for public uses, such as parks or recreation. These areas should generally not include areas designated as Resource Lands or critical areas under this plan or the County’s CAO.

**Public Facility** – provides for areas that are available for public facilities, such as governmental facilities, parks, schools, infrastructure facilities, and other developments intended primarily for public use.

**Urban Reserve** – provides for reservation of land anticipated to be required for urban purposes during the planning period, but for which urban services are not yet available. Prior to the provision of public services, the Urban Reserve designation is intended to maintain a low land use density to discourage the establishment of interim uses and land division patterns that may foreclose significant future planning alternatives pertaining to urban densities and the efficient provision of services. Low land uses densities will be maintained at a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres. Development regulations may include conditions, restrictions, and/or performance standards on the land held in Urban Reserve until such time as urban services are available and provided. Performance standards may include, but are not limited to, siting, location, and design requirements intended to allow realization of urban densities and planned, economical provision of infrastructure for the site and general area.

When urban services become available, development will occur at appropriate densities consistent with updated land use designations and with circulation networks that result in an orderly, economic transition from rural to urban land use.

**Port of Moses Lake** – provides for areas owned and operated by the Port of Moses Lake. This area is designated for the Port’s various aviation and commercial businesses. The Port maintains master planned land uses within this land use designation.

**4.4.2.5 Urban Growth Area Designation Process**

**4.4.2.5.1 Designation Process**
The County and cities have designated adequate lands necessary to accommodate projected population growth. Each city within the County has an established UGA and these areas, along with infilling within city and town limits have been determined to be adequate to accommodate projected growth through 2038.
The boundaries of a UGA are not determined solely by projected population growth. Considerations such as a city's need for commercial and industrial lands to meet its economic goals identified in its comprehensive plan may also be factors. Additionally, areas adjacent to a city or town may be included in a UGA, but only if it is already characterized by urban growth or adjacent to areas already characterized by urban growth.

The most important aspect of designating UGA boundaries is the demonstration by cities and towns that they may feasibly serve these lands with urban services over a 20-year period. The adoption of UGAs and the designation of land uses and densities within them is of vital importance to cities, public utilities, and other service providers. Such providers must be consulted to ensure that cost-effective service can be provided within the UGA.

Unincorporated land within a UGA is designated by the County for conversion to urban use and ultimately to city administrative jurisdiction through annexation under the normal process of urban growth. Cities cannot annex lands outside of their UGA.

The County and cities and towns periodically review land use demands for urbanization in order to designate additional rural lands for inclusion in UGAs when necessary to meet demands for urbanization. This is accomplished by amending both the County and city comprehensive plans following appropriate public process. The County and its cities and towns have developed CWPP that guide UGA reviews and updates (Appendix D).

4.4.2.5.2 Review of Urban Growth Areas
UGAs are reviewed by the County in cooperation with respective cities at least every 5 years and amended as necessary to accommodate urban growth projected to occur for the succeeding 20-year period. Review of a jurisdiction's proposal for an amendment to a UGA is made in accordance with the GMA and adopted CWPP. Areas adjacent to UGAs are mostly designated as Rural Residential or Urban Reserve in accordance with this Plan, and should be reviewed concurrently with UGA review.

The identification of growth assumptions and preparation of the urban lands analysis is only the first step in identifying UGAs in the County. In order to better quantify the UGA designation and
amendment process, the County includes a series of growth indicators and performance measures to allow for ready monitoring of UGA performance. The purpose of such a monitoring system is to:

- Provide an “early warning” system to ensure that the land supply is not being over constrained or that development is occurring in a manner inconsistent with the intent of the UGA
- Verify and adjust assumptions made in the urban growth analysis used to designate UGA boundaries
- Provide decision makers with objective data that can be used to evaluate the performance of the jurisdictional comprehensive plans in achieving the goals and policies that the plan intended to promote

It is not intended that data review will always trigger an adjustment to the UGA boundary. Instead, it is envisioned that this information would be used to assist in evaluating trends and assessing the performance of the comprehensive plans. If trends substantiate change from the assumption included in the urban growth analysis, and goals and policies of this Plan are not being met, adjustments should be recommended.

Indicators could include:

- **Population** – used to verify population growth rate assumptions and to identify unanticipated demographic trends. Annual data prepared by OFM’s Forecasting Division, can be used. Statistical data, including age-cohort, in-migration/out-migration, and other demographic indicators could be assessed.

- **Employment** – used to verify employment growth rate assumptions and to identify unanticipated economic trends. Indicators evaluated could include average annual wage rate, per capita income, average annual wage rate, and percentage of Grant County receiving employment assistance.

- **Price of Housing** – used to provide an early warning of over-constraint of land. This can be done by monitoring the price of new homes and resale homes, apartment rents, and vacancy rates. The Washington Center for Real Estate Research in Pullman is one source of data.

- **Land Absorption** – used to determine the rate land and housing units are being absorbed by the market. Indicators could include the number of new housing units (building starts), total square footage of residential and commercial construction, and vacancy rates. Conversion of vacant land could be monitored.

- **Other Indicators** – as identified. As periodic review takes place and data sources are identified or created, additional indicators can be added to the monitoring model.
4.4.2.6 Joint Planning Within Urban Growth Areas

Planning for UGAs that include incorporated municipalities should be coordinated among the cities, towns, and County. Though unincorporated lands within the UGAs remain under the County’s jurisdiction, it is beneficial to the cities, towns, and County to plan jointly for their future use.

The County and cities and towns are concerned about the type of land use activities and design standards that are permitted outside of incorporated boundaries since they have a direct impact on both the cities and the County. Many of the cities have developed land use plans that address areas currently under the County’s jurisdiction. For the cities and towns to meet their comprehensive plan goals, the County needs to ensure that it does not permit activity that would be inconsistent with the future plans of the cities and towns.

The County and each of its cities and towns should enter into an interlocal agreement to facilitate and accomplish joint planning in areas of mutual concern. Such an interlocal agreement enables the parties to work together to review and consider issues of mutual concern. Such agreements may have standard provisions that apply to every city, together with issues specific to the UGA of concern. Potential issues to be addressed in a interlocal agreement may include, among other things:

- Boundaries of the joint planning area
- Land use patterns, intensity, and density
- Zoning designations
- Development standards
- Housing
- Environmental standards and policies
- LOS standards
- Service providers
- Phased growth
- Public purpose lands
- Essential public facilities
- Capital facilities
- Review and approval of development projects
- Annexation and transition
- Revenue sharing on commercial and industrial land annexations
- Joint participation in infrastructure improvement projects
- Coordinated impact mitigation
- Critical area protection
- Significant cultural resource protection
- Single jurisdiction permit processing
In compliance with the CWPP, the cities and County have worked cooperatively to designate adequate land area for the expected growth over the planning period. Residential, commercial, industrial, public and open space land needs were considered in the development of the final UGAs.

4.4.2.7 Major Considerations

4.4.2.7.1 Urban Character
At one time, most of the land in Grant County’s UGAs was used for agriculture. Irrigated agriculture brought settlers to the County. Railroads provided transportation for crops and goods, and the cities developed to serve the agricultural areas along the rail lines. Consequently, urban expansion has occurred, and is still occurring, on the lands early settlers found desirable for agriculture.

The location of each of the 15 cities and their respective UGAs of Grant County is shown in Future/Proposed Land Use Map (Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 5). These areas take in most of the County’s population, as well as the major commercial, industrial, and employment centers. While each city and UGA share common features, each has a separate and distinct set of characteristics. They range in size from tiny Krupp, or Marlin, with a population of 50, to Moses Lake with a population of more than 22,720 within its city limits. Each offers a unique set of needs and opportunities.

Of interest is the town of Coulee Dam in the northeast corner of the County, whose corporate limits span three counties and a tribal reservation. Only a very small area of the town is located in Grant County. The area within Grant County is zoned as commercial land, which happens to include a motel in which only one family resides.

4.4.2.7.2 Transition of Land Uses
The inclusion of land within a UGA indicates that land will be developed with urban uses and densities over the next 20 years. This means much of the existing agricultural and vacant land within
the UGAs will be eventually converted to a use that serves an urban population. The sparsely populated rural land within UGAs will also become more urban in character. For example, Cities of Moses Lake and Mattawa UGAs include significant portion of land outside the city limits. These areas are expected to transition into more urban uses in future. Similarly, the UGA area between the Cities of Grand Coulee and Electric City is expected to be transformed into more intense urban use in future.

4.4.2.7.3 **Maintaining Livability**
Maintaining a livable urban environment is important for urban growth. To maintain and enhance livability, development will need to be sensitive to the surrounding uses as well as natural features. Urban areas should include a mix of uses, higher density, access to transit, safe sidewalks, streetscape elements, a network of paths and trails. Building orientation and articulation are also some considerations for creating a livable community. Urban areas connecting with the County’s various recreational features, trails, and open spaces will promote a healthy lifestyle for the communities.

4.4.2.7.4 **Concurrency**
To ensure that appropriate infrastructure is in place when the impacts of development occur, the GMA employs a concept called “concurrency.” Concurrency means that the necessary facilities and services required to serve development are already available or that a financial commitment has been made to provide the facilities or services within a specified time frame, as discussed further in the Capital Facilities element (Chapter 8).

4.4.3 **Rural Lands**

4.4.3.1 **Introduction**
With a large land base of 2,675 square miles and a 2017 population of 95,630 people, Grant County is very much a rural county. While the term “rural” is hard to define, rural lands under the GMA are those areas not intended for urban level development nor set aside for their importance to resource industries, such as agriculture or mining.

Rural lands are spread out throughout the County. Some rural lands in the LAMIRDS of Grant County have been developed at or near urban densities with commercial, industrial, and institutional uses. This rural development pressure has the potential for adverse impacts, including increased demands on sheriff, fire, and school services; traffic congestion on public roads; incompatibilities with agriculture; and groundwater impacts. The demand for inexpensive rural land combined with the
potential problems associated with its development make these areas a unique challenge for managing growth.

The purpose of designating rural land use areas is to provide for a variety of rural residential land use densities while maintaining overall lower than urban densities at rural service levels, encourage rural activities such as farming, and retain rural character. Designating rural land use areas minimizes service demands and costs on County government and taxpayers, preserves historic and cultural sites and structures and rural landscapes, and protects designated natural resource lands and identified critical areas.

Rural land use areas also provide a choice in living environments, through a mix of large lots and existing smaller lots in rural centers, such as Rural Communities and Rural Villages, where rural residents and others can gather, work, shop, entertain, and reside. Commercial and compatible industrial development may continue to locate and prosper in rural centers under limited conditions.

The purposes of rural areas are to:

- Support the rural uses of Grant County
- Protect areas with environmental constraints and preserve and buffer natural resource areas of agriculture, mineral deposits, and fish and wildlife habitats from encroachment by or irreversible conversion to more intense uses
- Allow low intensity residential uses which do not require a high level of public services and facilities
- Allow LAMIRDs, including the infill, development, or redevelopment of existing areas; the intensification of existing or development of new small-scale recreation or tourist uses; and the intensification of existing or development of new isolated non-residential development, cottage industries, and small-scale businesses. Public services may be provided to these areas.

4.4.3.2 Growth Management Act Provisions

The GMA requires counties to include in its comprehensive plan “a rural element that includes lands that are not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest, or mineral resources. The rural element permits appropriate land uses that are compatible with the rural character of such lands and provides for a variety of rural densities and uses. It may also provide for clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements, and other innovative techniques that will accommodate appropriate rural uses not characterized by urban growth” (RCW 36.70A.070(5)).

In order to achieve growth management, the GMA has provisions for allowing LAMIRDs within rural areas.
4.4.3.3 Rural Character

4.4.3.3.1 Rural Settlement Trends
The present rural development pattern in Grant County stems from settlement trends established decades ago. Many rural residential areas of the County were originally settled as large-tract farmsteads, with many that have been parceled off and sold in smaller pieces over time, or consolidated into larger farming operations. Many of these smaller parcels are not large enough to make a living at farming, but they do offer part-time farming opportunities for people employed elsewhere and seeking a country lifestyle. This settlement trend is perhaps the predominant distinguishing characteristic differentiating rural from urban areas.

Rural residential development can be found scattered throughout Grant County. It is characterized by a variety of development patterns largely determined by density and services available. Patterns range from areas of dispersed five- to ten-acre ranchettes on private wells and on-site septic systems to more densely settled rural community centers served by public water and/or sewer systems.

4.4.3.3.2 Rural Character of Grant County
Rural character refers to the following patterns of land use and development established by a county in the rural element of its comprehensive plan:

- Open space, the natural landscape, and vegetation predominate over the built environment
- Traditional rural lifestyles, rural-based economies, and opportunities to both live and work in rural areas are fostered
- Visual landscapes are provided that are traditionally found in rural areas and communities
- Land is compatible with use by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat
Inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development is reduced.

Urban governmental service extension is generally not required.

Natural surface water flows and groundwater and surface water recharge and discharge areas protection is consistent.

Rural areas are discrete, with each having a distinct environment and social texture uniquely created by factors such as origin, history, period of settlement, use capability of the land, and employment base of the residents.

Grant County’s “rural character” is defined by:

- Large areas of undeveloped land and open space
- Scattered low-density, single-family homes
- Clustered, dense residential housing, often nearby a recreational area
- Dense clusters of houses along beaches or shorelines
- Small-scale, recreational resorts
- Large-scale recreational facilities
- Many acres of agricultural lands and rangeland
- Small, part-time farms
- Agricultural industrial uses
- Limited, low-intensity commercial uses
- Many State parks

In rural lands, it is important to accommodate the demand for a rural lifestyle without diminishing the rural setting in the process.

The desirable rural density may vary among different areas of the County, ranging for new development from one dwelling per five acres to one dwelling per 40 acres.

### 4.4.3.4 Major Considerations

#### 4.4.3.4.1 Rural Character

Rural characteristics include access to open space and recreation; views of water, the Columbia River, and surrounding territory; and a quiet, relaxed atmosphere. The elements of rural character also include the abundance of natural resources that are vulnerable to human and natural change.
While the rural character of Grant County can be described in terms of landscape, environment, and land use, it is also defined as a philosophy of living and a quality of life. It is this multi-faceted character and lifestyle that residents of the County hope to maintain and enhance while accommodating the growth anticipated through this Comprehensive Plan.

4.4.3.4.2 Density
Maintaining rural density is important for rural character. Consistent with the GMA, Grant County promotes intense growth in urban areas, while its rural lands remain less dense. Grant County land use and development regulations include various lot sizes and densities in rural land as discussed in this section.

The increased housing densities that have occurred in some rural areas of the County have resulted in associated impacts, such as aquifer declines, surface runoff problems, and even traffic congestion.

4.4.3.4.3 Services
Another important consideration of rural development is the LOS necessary to protect public health and safety. In the past, subdivision of rural lands has usually occurred by means of short platting, which permits no more than four parcels to be created at one time. This has resulted in hundreds of small scale, piecemeal developments that fail to have their accumulative impacts assessed. The need for more services becomes acute as short platted parcels are themselves short platted, resulting in more lots, higher densities, and still little or no provisions for services.

The absence of adequate services poses many public health and safety problems. For instance, it increases the danger for septic system failures, well contamination, and congestion of roads.

4.4.3.5 Availability of Water Supply
Grant County has a plentiful groundwater supply, primarily from the CBP and associated irrigation systems that extend surface waters throughout much of the County, which in turn has been recharging groundwater aquifers for the past several decades. The County recognizes the need for developing and implementing a long-term strategy for water supply needed to support rural development consistent with State law (RCW 19.27.097, RCW 58.17.110, and others), meet the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, and ensure future domestic water supplies are both physically and legally available for water withdrawal.
New development is required to verify water supply is physically and legally available consistent with County development regulations (Grant County UDC 13.32 and 23.12) and state law. Infill development or other development in LAMIRDs and other higher density areas with existing water systems in place must verify with documentation from the water system provider that the proposed development will receive water service. For new development where an existing water system does not serve, rural water supply can be secured through an exempt well.

RCW 90.44.050 provides for the supply of rural domestic water through the use of “exempt wells,” which can pump up to 5,000 gallons per day for residential use. The permit well exemption also allows pumping of 5,000 gallons per day for industrial use, 5,000 gallons per day for irrigation up to half an acre, and an unlimited amount for stock water purposes. Permit exempt groundwater withdrawals do not require a water right permit. However, to the extent the groundwater is beneficially used, the water user withdrawing groundwater under the exemption establishes a water right that enjoys the same privileges as a water right permit or certificate obtained directly from Ecology.

4.4.3.6 Rural Land Use Designations
Rural areas are characterized by low density residential dwellings, concentrated mixed use areas, isolated commercial and industrial uses, farms, mining areas, outdoor recreation, and other open space activities. Commercial uses are generally small in scale. They may provide convenience services to the rural neighborhood, but are not principally designed to serve the rural population. Industrial uses will generally be those that are related to or dependent on natural resources such as agriculture, aquifer supply, timber, or minerals. Home-based occupations and cottage industries are allowed throughout the rural area provided they do not adversely affect the surrounding residential uses.

Grant County recognizes the following Rural Land Use Designations:
- Urban Reserve
- Rural Residential
- Rural Remote
4.4.3.7 Urban Reserve – 1 Unit per 5 Acres

The purpose of this designation is to recognize those areas that appear to be transitioning, at varying rates, from rural to urban, and are appropriate for areas of increasing density and potential future service from a municipal or privately-owned community water system. Such areas may include currently range in rural density only from rural, or contain a mix hybrid of rural and urban densities. Such areas are located in close proximity to an UGA, but are either beyond the present availability of city water and sewer service, or are not yet urban in character, making them inappropriate for inclusion in the UGA. Such areas are deemed necessary to hold in reserve for potential inclusion within a UGA in response to future needs as reflected in revised or updated population or employment forecasts or allocations.

These areas are given an interim low density designation of one dwelling unit per 5 acres as a means of preventing establishment of land uses or land use patterns that could foreclose planning options and eventual development or redevelopment at higher urban densities.

Designated Urban Reserve lands should be considered as “joint planning areas” subject to a joint planning process between the County and the affected city or cities intended to resolve issues regarding potential land uses. Such areas should undergo annual review of UGA assumptions and monitoring of growth indicator data to provide “early warning” to ensure that the land supply is not being over constrained or that development is occurring in a manner inconsistent with the intent of the UGA.

Designated Urban Reserve lands that are determined to not be needed or appropriate for urban development and future inclusion in an UGA, pursuant to a defined joint planning process, may be re-designated through the Comprehensive Plan amendment process.

Rural Residential (1 Unit per 5 Acres) – The purpose of this designation is to maintain the rural aspects of the County and to provide buffering or transitions between existing rural developments and urban developments. Rural Residential areas are characterized by activities including, but not limited to, small-scale farms, dispersed single-family homes, and open space. The maximum density is one dwelling unit per five acres. Lands are typically too far from the urban area to enable cost-effective provision of public services nor do typical uses require provision of urban services.

Rural Remote (1 Unit per 20 Acres) – The purpose of this designation is to differentiate from the higher density rural land use to reflect the area's remoteness and/or limited opportunity for development. Such areas are those not suitable for intensive farming and are generally not attractive for residential development. The primary land uses in the Remote Residential areas include, but are
not limited to, resource-oriented activities (farming and mineral extraction), open space, and residential. The maximum density is one dwelling unit per 20 acres.

**Rural Resource (1 Unit per 40 Acres)** – The purpose of this designation is to identify areas that have some agricultural opportunities in a rural setting. Such areas are those that are not as suitable for intensive farming as Agricultural Resource lands but some agricultural use can occur with land management. The primary land uses in these areas include, but are not limited to grazing, mineral extraction, limited dryland agriculture, open space, and residential. The maximum density is one dwelling unit per 40 acres. Lands are typically too far from the urban area to enable cost-effective provision of public services. Such areas require on-site water and sewer service, may be outside of fire service, or have other site constraints. They may be outside existing main road networks and distant from existing utilities.

4.4.3.8 **Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development**

Some rural areas in Grant County are currently characterized by a LAMIRD designation either in terms of the types of land uses or density and intensity of activities. Such areas may, for example, be developed at urban densities, possess urban services, and contain a mix of uses that are traditionally considered more urban than rural.

The GMA recognizes the need to maintain and protect the County’s rural character and existing land use patterns. GMA allows counties to define LAMIRDs subject to a number of guidelines and criteria (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)).

LAMIRDs in Grant County are identified as existing areas with established development patterns. These existing areas may be permitted to accommodate limited additional growth through infill, new development, or redevelopment. The types of rural development permitted include:

- Commercial
- Industrial
- Residential
- Mixed-use
- Intensification or new development of small-scale recreational or tourist uses that rely on a rural setting or location
- Intensification of development containing isolated non-residential uses or new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses

These areas may contain public facilities and services, but they must be limited to what is necessary to serve the limited area and such that low density sprawl does not occur.
Based on the characterization of the existing areas of more intensive development and the criteria defined above, the following designations have been established for LAMIRDs:

- Rural Community
- Rural Village
- Recreational Development
- Shoreline Development
- Agricultural Service Center
- Commercial
- Industrial
- Freeway Commercial

**Rural Community (1 Unit per Acre)** – This designation is designed to recognize the historic, unincorporated communities that are characterized by urban type densities and that may offer some urban services such as community water, limited commercial uses, and fire protection. Rural Communities are generally not self-sufficient. This designation provides for the infill, development, or redevelopment of lands within the Rural Community boundary. Rural Communities are generally small, compact, isolated rural centers that primarily exist to provide housing, convenience goods, and services to residents in and around the area. Rural Communities are characterized by activities including, but not limited to, single family residences, small-scale industries and businesses, public facilities such as post offices, schools, and fire departments, and open space. Industry and businesses do not necessarily provide services to neighboring residents, but do provide job opportunities. In addition, Rural Communities provide services to the traveling public.

It is intended that these areas continue to be a mixture of land uses including residential, commercial, and industrial. New residential development will be allowed at a maximum density of one dwelling unit per acre provided the land can physically support it without requiring public sewer or water services, if not currently available. Rural Communities will also accommodate needed commercial and light industrial uses, but only after a site-specific review process to determine and address potential impacts.

The Rural Communities to which this designation applies are:

- Schawana
- Beverly
- Wheeler
- Royal Camp
- Ridgeview Estates
- Wanapum Village
- Trinidad
- Marine View Heights
**Rural Village (4 Units per Acre)** – The purpose of this designation is to recognize the historic, unincorporated communities that are characterized by urban type densities, are self-sufficient villages offering a full range of consumer goods and services, and that may offer some urban services such as community water and fire protection. The Rural Village typically does not offer public sewer treatment services, but may have a community sewer system. This designation provides for the infill, development, or redevelopment of lands within the Rural Village boundary. The Rural Village is generally a compact, self-sufficient town that functions as a small urban center and provides housing, convenience goods, and services to residents in and around the area.

The Rural Village is characterized by activities including, but not limited to, single family residences; small-scale industries and businesses in a compact core; public facilities such as post offices, schools, and fire departments; and open space. Densities are limited by the capacity of area soils to support on-site sewage disposal. Industry and businesses do not necessarily provide services to neighboring residents, but do provide job opportunities. In addition, the Rural Village provides services to the traveling public.

It is intended that these areas continue to be a mixture of land uses including residential, commercial, and industrial. New residential development will be allowed at a maximum density of four dwelling units per acre provided the land can physically support such development without requiring public sewer or water services, if not currently available. The Rural Village will also accommodate needed commercial and light industrial uses, but only after a site-specific review process to determine and address potential impacts.

The Rural Village to which this designation applies is:

- Desert Aire

Table 4-5 indicates an estimated population in each of the Rural Communities and Rural Villages.
Table 4-5
Population in Rural Communities and Villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAMIRD</th>
<th>2017 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schawana</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Camp</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Estates/Parker Springs Area</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanapum Village</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine View Heights</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Trail</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Aire</td>
<td>1,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,410</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recreational Development (1 Unit per Acre)** – The purpose of this designation is to recognize existing residential and commercial development related to seasonal, resort-related, or tourist activities in rural areas. Activities are often shoreline-related or centered on an amenity such as a golf course. This designation provides for commercial development, including hotels, condominiums, vacation home rentals, retail stores, restaurants, golf courses, marinas, open space, and similar recreational or tourist activities. This designation also provides for residential development on small parcels that can physically support such development without requiring urban service levels. The maximum residential density is one dwelling unit per acre.

Lands are often too far from the urban area to enable cost-effective provision of public services, nor do typical uses require provision of urban services. Water service is typically provided by individual or community water systems. Sewer service is typically provided by individual, community, or public systems.

The Recreational Developments to which this designation applies are:

- Crescent Bar
- The Gorge
- North Soap Lake

This designation is not intended to accommodate new, small-scale, recreationally oriented residential developments or master planned resorts.

**Shoreline Development (Variable Density)** – The purpose of this designation is to recognize existing residential development related to shorelines in rural areas. This designation provides for...
residential development on parcels that are surrounded by smaller lots and which can physically support such development without requiring urban service levels. The shoreline development areas are characterized by activities including, but not limited to, a predominance of existing small lots with single-family residences (seasonal and year-round use) and open space. Lands are typically too far from the urban area to enable cost-effective provision of public services nor do typical uses require provision of urban services.

The Shoreline Developments to which this designation applies are:

- McConihe Shore
- Mae Valley Shore
- Blue Lake Shore
- Sunland Estates

The maximum residential density for the designated Shoreline Development areas ranges from three dwelling units per acre to one dwelling unit per two acres as summarized in Table 4-6. These densities are based on the predominant parcel size of the existing platted environment as determined by an analysis of the 1998 Grant County Assessor's maps. Predominant parcel size is defined as those parcels comprising at least 60% of the total parcels within the logical outer boundary. The maximum densities will apply to all future development, allowing the Shoreline Development areas to infill at the predominant density of existing environment.

### Table 4-6
Shoreline Development Boundaries and Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoreline Development</th>
<th>Boundaries</th>
<th>Maximum Future Density (Dwelling Unit/Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McConihe Shore</td>
<td>Within 800 feet of shoreline</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae Valley Shore</td>
<td>Adjacent to shoreline; between shoreline and West Shore Drive; and adjacent to Fairway Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lake Shore</td>
<td>Within Rimrock Cove development; between shoreline and Moore Road; and adjacent to Palisades Road</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunland Estates</td>
<td>Between shoreline and bluff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type of designation is not intended to accommodate new, recreationally oriented residential developments or master planned resorts.

**Agricultural Service Center (1 Unit per Acre)** – The purpose of this designation is to recognize the historic, unincorporated communities that are characterized by agricultural processing facilities and limited local agricultural support services, including small and large scale agricultural industries and businesses in a compact core; single family residences; and open space. Residential densities are
limited by the capacity of area soils to support on-site sewage disposal. Industry and businesses do not necessarily provide services to neighboring residents, but do provide job opportunities.

Commercial elements of Agricultural Service Centers are generally small, compact, isolated businesses, such as restaurants, feed stores, farm and garden supplies, groceries and drug stores, gas stations, and other small-scale businesses, including residences in conjunction with such businesses. The Agricultural Service Center typically does not offer public sewer treatment services, but may have a community sewer system.

This designation provides for the infill, development, or redevelopment of lands within the Agricultural Service Center boundary. It is intended that these areas continue to be a mixture of land uses including agriculturally related residential, commercial, and industrial. New residential development will be allowed at a density of one dwelling unit per acre provided the land can physically support such development without requiring public sewer or water services, if not currently available.

The Agricultural Service Center will also accommodate needed commercial and industrial uses, but only after a site-specific review process to determine and address potential impacts. This type of designation is not intended to accommodate new, recreationally oriented residential developments or master planned resorts.

The Agricultural Service Centers to which this designation applies are:

- Winchester
- Ruff
- McDonald Siding
- Ballards Café
- Stratford

**Freeway Commercial Areas** – The County should consider designation of areas outside of UGAs suitable for highway-oriented commercial uses to serve the needs of the travelling public, require large acreage sites that have a high degree of visibility from I-90, that do not conflict with the rural character of the land, and are limited in size and scope so as not to significantly diminish commercial agricultural production.

Such Freeway Commercial areas should be limited to those I-90 interchanges outside of UGAs. No specific sites are designated in this Comprehensive Plan. Approval criteria should be developed by which potential sites could be evaluated during future amendments of this Comprehensive Plan. Approval criteria should include, but should not be limited to:

- The size and scale should be appropriate for the intended use and the surrounding area.
• The intended use should not require the extension of urban governmental services; however, if particular urban services are necessary, conditions to ensure that urban growth will not occur in adjacent lands;
• Off-site and on-site impacts to roads, other public facilities, and the natural environment shall be mitigated at the time of development
• Sites shall be subject to design and development standards relating to landscaping, buffers, setbacks, access and design review; such standards may govern permitted uses regarding their impacts on resource lands, drainage, critical areas, traffic generation, visual impact, noise, and other relevant criteria

The County should establish a process whereby landowners may request parcels to be designated as Freeway Commercial. A landowner shall submit data to substantiate the designation of the proposed site, including, but not limited to, the following:

• Traffic impact analysis and mitigation plan
• Site topographic map
• Site access plan
• Site drainage plan
• Parcel identification data

Data submitted together with other data compiled by the County should be evaluated based on the assessment criteria described above. Sites meeting the criteria should be considered for designation as Freeway Commercial in future Plan amendments.

Commercial and Industrial Areas – Commercial and industrial uses throughout rural, unincorporated Grant County will be guided by the goals and policies contained in this Comprehensive Plan. Such uses do not require a commercial or industrial land use designation under this Plan. Rather, existing and new commercial and industrial land uses will be subject to this Plan’s land use policies and subsequent development regulations.

Commercial (Rural) encompasses all commercial lands in Grant County. This includes general commercial uses. The purpose of this land use is to provide retail goods and services to regional trade areas, serve highway travelers, and provide convenience services to residents. Uses include motels, truck stops, service stations, restaurants, and fast food.

Industrial (Rural) includes both heavy and light industrial uses in the County. The primary purpose of this land use to provide land for industrial and supporting uses that will not present unmanageable conflicts with other land uses, that have access to necessary utilities and public facilities, and that have less environmental constraints. Some of the heavy industrial uses function at the fundamental economic level include rail transport and facilities operations, chemical products manufacturing and
shipment for agriculture, sand and gravel operations for construction, raw products processing, and waste products recycling.

Development regulations more specifically identify commercial and industrial development opportunities and limitations, and through ordinance and code language explain how the Comprehensive Plan policies are put into practice.

4.4.3.9 Master Planned Resorts

A master planned resort as defined by the GMA is a “self-contained and fully integrated planned unit development, in a setting of significant natural amenities, with primary focus on destination resort facilities consisting of short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of developed on-site indoor or outdoor recreational activities.” Other residential uses may be included within its boundaries, but only if the residential uses are integrated into and support the on-site recreational nature of the resort. An example could include a tourist-oriented community surrounding a golf course located adjacent to a scenic area, such as a lake or river.

Master planned resorts outside established UGAs may be allowed only if:

- The county’s comprehensive plan identifies policies to guide the development of master planned resorts
- The comprehensive plan and development regulations include restrictions that preclude new urban or suburban land uses in the vicinity of the master planned resort, except in areas designated as UGAs
- The county includes a finding in the plan approval process that the land is better suited, and has more long-term importance, for the master planned resort than for commercial agricultural production, if the resort is located on land designated as an agricultural resource
- Critical areas are protected
- On- and off-site infrastructure impacts are considered and mitigated

The intent of this Plan is to allow Master Planned Resorts having urban characteristics to be located outside of UGAs, subject to certain criteria specified in the Rural sub-element. It is the policy of Grant County to allow the development of fully integrated destination resorts at appropriate locations within the County to promote tourism and take advantage of the area’s scenic and natural amenities. Provisions will be made in the development regulations of the County that provide for the review and approval with conditions of master planned resorts.

4.4.3.10 Major Industrial Developments

A major industrial development is defined in the GMA as a master planned location suitable for manufacturing or industrial businesses that:

- Requires a parcel of land so large that no suitable parcels are available within a UGA
• Is a natural resource-based industry requiring a location near natural resource land upon which it is dependent
• Requires a location with characteristics, such as proximity to transportation facilities or related industries such that there is no suitable location in a UGA

A major industrial development outside UGAs is allowed under the GMA, subject to certain conditions. Location of manufacturing or industrial businesses in a major industrial development sited away from urban population centers may enhance public safety and health.

The major industrial development may not be used for the purpose of retail commercial development or multi-tenant office parks.

4.4.3.11 Master Planned Industrial
The intent of Master Planned Industrial land use is to allow industrial developments outside of UGAs, subject to certain criteria specified in the Rural sub-element. A Master Planned Industrial area would be designated in coordination with the cities, port districts, and other interested jurisdictions to develop a process for designation of major industrial developments.

Master Planned Industrial areas have been designated under RCW 36.70A.367. Future Industrial developments outside of the UGA may be considered following RCW 36.70A.365 requirements.

4.4.3.12 Measures Guiding Rural Development
Rural development, as defined by the GMA, refers to development outside UGAs and outside agricultural and mineral resource lands. Rural development can consist of a variety of uses and residential densities, including clustered residential development, at levels that are consistent with the preservation of rural character and the requirements of the Rural sub-element. Grant County is predominantly rural and includes a wide variety of densities, uses, and natural resources. To maintain a balance between growth, lifestyle preferences, economic development, and protection of these resources and the environment, the County has established measures to govern rural development. It is the intent that the existing rural character of the diverse regions of the County described in the land use inventory of this sub-element is protected by the measures described below.

4.4.3.12.1 Containing Rural Development
Preservation of Grant County’s open space and low density rural areas is a high priority, and proper planning that will preserve the area’s rural character is essential. The land use designations contained in this sub-element as shown in (Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 5 – Future/Proposed Land Use Designations), provide for a variety of rural land uses. These are primarily low density rural residential and resource land designations. As discussed before, the County has several types of existing, higher density residential and commercial development within the rural areas such as Rural Community, Rural Village, Shoreline Development, Recreational Development, Agricultural Service Center,
Commercial, and Industrial areas. Areas with these designations are existing land uses as defined by RCW 36.70A.070. Several measures have been taken to assure containment of these LAMIRDs.

**Logical Outer Boundaries:** The primary method of containing these higher density development patterns is through the establishment of logical outer boundaries and preparation of the land use map. Any deviation from the boundaries shown on the adopted land use map will require an amendment to this Comprehensive Plan. Logical outer boundaries were established first by delineating the area of existing development. A detailed analysis was performed based on existing land use, population projection, topography, physical features, water bodies, and critical areas.

This was accomplished through site reconnaissance and review of Grant County Assessor maps. Next, estimates of buildable land were developed, taking into account current residential land use, tracts of land dedicated to public use, topography, and critical areas. In controlling rural development, it is essential that residential areas provide adequate buildable land area to meet projected land use needs. Population forecasts were then developed to estimate the number of building sites needed over the planning period. The outer boundaries were then adjusted to better match these projections, and to coincide with physical features such as bodies of water, streets, and land forms. Adjustments were also made to avoid irregular boundaries, providing a block of land rather than ribbons that could potentially house strips of development. Final logical outer boundaries include some undeveloped lands but predominately delineate the built environment.

**Provision of Urban Services:** Rural development will also be controlled through the provision of urban services. Development and increased densities tend to occur in areas offering easy access and full utility services. Currently, such amenities are only available within the County’s UGAs. Grant County’s low density rural areas are typically served by private water and on-site sewage disposal systems. Access is provided by County roads with design standards reflecting low volumes. By continuing to provide urban type services only in UGAs, low density sprawl will be curtailed.

### 4.4.3.12.2 Assuring Visual Compatibility

Rural areas in Grant County will typically border UGAs, LAMIRDs, or resource lands. Often times, they are in a position of providing a transition between these distinctly different types of areas. To assure visual compatibility, a transition of uses and densities has been designated whenever possible. Rural areas adjacent to UGAs and LAMIRDs are typically designated as Rural Residential with a density of one dwelling unit per five acres. Rural lands adjacent to designated resource lands are typically designated as Agricultural Transition with a density of one dwelling unit per 20 acres. However, because such a significant portion of the County is designated as Resource lands, it is not always possible to locate low density rural lands along these vast borders.

While a gradual transition of densities generally improves compatibility, it is also necessary to control visual impacts within LAMIRDs (e.g., Rural Villages, Rural Communities, Recreational Developments),
particularly at boundaries. Development controls can help to assure that LAMIRDs continue to fit their rural surroundings, making them an attractive place to live and providing a unified image for visitors. There are generally a number of unifying elements that can be found in an existing rural center. These include common height and scale, use of local construction materials, and provisions for parking and pedestrians. Development controls should be implemented to encourage efficient, concentrated development within the rural centers and to assure that landscaping, natural features, and other buffering methods are used along boundaries.

4.4.3.12.3 Reducing Inappropriate Conversion of Undeveloped Land
Undeveloped lands in the County are of significant value, primarily as resource lands, but also as the low density, natural areas that characterize rural Grant County. Sprawling, low-density development promotes an inefficient and unattractive use of developable land and frequently destroys significant environmental, cultural, historic, and/or natural resources. To reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land, the County has taken the following actions:

- Approximately 56% of the County’s land area has been designated as agricultural land of long term commercial significance. The maximum density has been designated as one dwelling unit per 40 acres. Agricultural and other resource lands are also protected by the County’s CAO.

When preparing the Future/Proposed Land Use Designations Map (Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 5), population forecasts were considered when determining logical outer boundaries for Rural Communities, Rural Villages, and UGAs. This was necessary to ensure that adequate developable land will be available for the projected population. The Future Land Use Map was also prepared so that clear boundaries exist between various land uses. This prevents ribbons or pockets of large lot residential development from being interspersed with, and posing a threat to, resource lands.

4.4.3.12.4 Protecting Critical Areas and Water Quality
Grant County hosts a wide variety of natural resources and scenic wonders. Wetlands, shorelines, wildlife habitat, and exceptional water quality are common features throughout the County. These features not only help to define the region’s rural character, but are the aspects of the area that residents treasure. The Grant County CAO protects wetlands, waterways, wildlife habitats, and frequently flooded, aquifer recharge (groundwater), and geologically hazardous areas. The SMP protects and guides developments along the County’s shoreline areas.

The Comprehensive Plan goals and policies outlines various protection measures provided by establishing land use designations and maximum densities. Within the various land use types, sewage disposal is a primary concern, and all rural development is subject to a review of soil conditions. Further, the County desires to promote development that is laid out to preserve land for open space and that protects critical areas and natural processes. In addition, the Natural Setting/
Water Resource Element of this Plan (Chapter 11) guides protection by establishing permit review procedures, goals, and policies.

4.4.3.12.5 Protecting Resource Lands
The Future/Proposed Land Use Designation Map (Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 5) identifies resource lands and evaluates potential conflicts between resource lands and rural uses. Resource lands have been designated in large blocks with changes of topography and other natural features used as boundaries whenever possible. This eliminates ribbons and islands of residential areas and potential incompatible development. The large blocks also serve to isolate resource lands from rural residential uses so that roads and utilities servicing development do not cross expanses of resource lands. This also allows resource uses to be excluded from special tax assessments for improvements and services needed to support residential development.

In addition, resource lands are protected under Grant County’s CAO and Chapter 11, Natural Setting/Water Resources Element of this Comprehensive Plan.

4.4.4 Resource Lands

4.4.4.1 Introduction
The Resource Lands sub-element addresses three primary types of land based natural resources: agriculture, forest, and mineral lands. This sub-element complements Chapter 3, Goals and Policies, by defining the purpose and intent of land use policies for each resource land designation.

The economic health and stability of Grant County have long been dependent on the products of agricultural resource areas. The GMA recognizes the importance of resource lands by requiring counties to “classify, designate and conserve” them as “resource lands of long-term commercial significance.” The GMA recognizes the vital role these resource lands play in defining the quality of life in Grant County and seeks to avoid their irrevocable loss.

Within each of these designations, the primary and preferred uses will be the growing, managing, harvesting or extracting, and processing of natural resources. In cases where residential activity is allowed on natural resource lands, development will occur in a manner that minimizes both the amount of land converted to non-resource uses, and the disincentives faced by landowners wishing to continue to manage their land for natural resource purposes.

4.4.4.2 Definition of Resource Lands
Grant County’s definition of resource lands is guided by the “Minimum Guidelines to Classify Agriculture, Forest, Mineral Lands and Critical Areas” established by Commerce. Each resource area is defined below:
Agricultural Resource Areas are “those lands primarily devoted to or important for the long-term commercial production of horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, dairy, apiary, vegetable, or animal products or of berries, grain, hay, straw, turf, seed, Christmas trees not subject to the excise tax imposed by state law, finfish in upland hatcheries, or livestock, and that have long-term commercial significance for agricultural production” (RCW 36.70A.030(2)).

Forest Resource Areas are “those lands primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on land that can be economically and practically managed for such production, including Christmas trees subject to the excise tax imposed under state law, and that have long-term commercial significance” (RCW 36.70A.030(8)). Currently, there are no dedicated forest resource lands in Grant County.

Mineral Resource Areas are “those lands primarily devoted to the extraction of minerals, including gravel, sand, and valuable metallic substances, and that have long-term commercial significance for the extraction of minerals” (RCW 36.70A.030(11)).

Long-term Commercial Significance includes “the growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of the land for long-term commercial production, in consideration with the land’s proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more intense uses of the land” (RCW 36.70A.030(10)).

4.4.4.3 County Policy Statement
As required by the GMA, Grant County adopted regulations in the UDC to ensure the conservation of agricultural and mineral resource lands and to preclude land uses and developments, which are incompatible with resource lands. The County’s regulations prevent potential dangers or public costs associated with inappropriate use of such areas. Regulations have been designed to balance individual and collective interests. During this update cycle, the County has conducted a detailed analysis of its existing Agricultural Resource Lands. The County has adjusted the GMA Agricultural Land designation for areas of long-term commercial significance by adding some areas that have developed as agriculture since the last review and by removing large areas of land that are largely range or open space of limited economic value. The lands removed from the Agricultural Resource designation still maintain the same development density of one dwelling per 40 acres, but are now classified as Rural Resource (Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 5).

4.4.4.4 Review Procedures
No alteration of resource lands as defined or designated by this Comprehensive Plan or Grant County UDC should occur without County approval. Any alteration of resource lands should occur only through the issuance of a development permit.
4.4.4.5 Agricultural Resources Lands
The GMA (RCW 36.70A.160) requires counties to identify, classify, and designate agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. In addition, the GMA directs Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (DCTED) to provide guidelines to counties for designating such resource lands.

Grant County classifies Agricultural Lands of Long-term Commercial Significance as:

- GMA Ag Dryland Agricultural Land
- GMA Ag Rangeland
- GMA Ag Irrigated Agricultural Land

As discussed earlier, agriculture as a use constitutes the highest percentage (approximately 67%) in Grant County. Nearly 1,195,519 acres are devoted to agricultural production (Table 4-7).

Table 4-7
Agricultural Land Cover Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Cover</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Area in County</td>
<td>1,758,594</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Land Cover²</td>
<td>1,195,519</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>477,783</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryland</td>
<td>317,005</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangelands</td>
<td>400,731</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Does not include water area
2. Privately-owned agricultural lands

Source: Grant County VSP Work Plan 2017

Agricultural areas are concentrated throughout Grant County. In general, the location of agriculture has been strongly influenced by the construction of irrigation facilities. Authorized in 1943, the CBP provided reclamation water to much of the area in 1952. Development increased rapidly during the 1960s and early 1970s. The CBP is one of the largest agricultural irrigation projects in the western United States, encompassing about 552,000 acres. A second phase of the project as originally authorized by Congress would provide water to another 538,600 acres. Although additional expansion of the Columbia Basin Reclamation area has been proposed for years, there is currently a moratorium on additional irrigation.
4.4.4.6 Economic Importance of Agriculture

The connection between agriculture and the economic welfare of Grant County cannot be overstated. Grant County, as with several counties throughout the state, is well endowed with resources that create a strong comparative advantage for agricultural production. Due to abundant land, plentiful water for irrigation, and a mild climate, the County produces a cornucopia of food and fiber products. Grant County is part of the Columbia Basin, one of the nation's most productive and diversified agricultural regions.

Agriculture, a major component in the state's economy, is particularly important to Grant County, its communities, and residents. Grant County is a state and national leader in the production of wheat, corn, hay, potatoes and several tree fruits. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Census of Agriculture (2012), Grant County is the top producer of vegetables and cattle and calves and second highest producer of fruit in the state, with a market value from agricultural products of approximately $1.7 billion.

Grant County is a microcosm of the dual agricultural system of the Pacific Northwest. Certain portions of the Northwest produce high-valued specialty crops for fresh sales or processing. Such growing regions are characterized by a moderate winter climate and high rainfall. Western Washington, for instance, produces a wide range of specialty agricultural crops, including grass seed, tree fruits, nuts, vegetables, nursery products, and dairy products. This diversified agricultural subsector is reliant on off-farm labor and the farms are generally capital-intensive. Grant County—with its reliance upon irrigated agriculture—is a significant participant in this segment, leading the state in growing such crops as mint, grass seed, carrots, green peas, sweet corn (for processing) and onions (storage).

The other subsector of Pacific Northwest agriculture is more traditional in nature and is dominated by the production of grains (including potatoes), livestock, and forage crops. In general, much of Eastern Washington depends on this segment of agriculture for its economic base. Here again, Grant County is a dominant player in this segment, leading the state in the production of dry edible beans, potatoes, and hay.

Agricultural producers purchase services, fertilizers, seed, farm machinery, and credit within the County and deliver crops and livestock to local processors and marketers, who add considerable value to these crops before shipping them out of the County. In addition to generating income and
employment for Grant County, direct and related agricultural economic activity contributes to the County’s economic critical mass, making other unrelated businesses viable. For instance, without agricultural shipments, the local transportation sector (e.g., trucking, warehousing, rail transport) would be much smaller. Beyond the local area, agricultural-related traffic on the Snake-Columbia River helps support a viable waterway transport system.

4.4.4.7 Future of Agriculture
In general, structural changes are occurring within agricultural production regions. As agriculture has become more productive, the demand for needed labor has declined. Farmers are changing their procurement patterns, making major purchases in larger cities at the expense of smaller communities. For some of these smaller communities, certain agricultural-related businesses, such as farm implement, fertilizer, and pesticide dealers, and grain elevators, have disappeared altogether. A number of agricultural service and supply firms, for example, have left smaller communities to relocate in larger cities like Moses Lake, Quincy, and Ephrata.

Grant County, with its diversified agricultural base, is well positioned to adjust and respond to these changing economic conditions. Current depressed prices for leading agricultural commodities have hit some local growers and processors hard. However, much of the near-term outlook is strongly influenced by the pace of economic recovery in Asia—a major export market for Washington (and Grant County) agricultural exports.

In sum, the County’s economy will continue to be inextricably tied to the fortunes of the agricultural sector. Given the dependence of local agriculture on irrigated water, concern about greater regional issues has surfaced, particularly draw-downs on the Columbia-Snake River system and possible removal of dams.

4.4.4.8 Major Issues

4.4.4.8.1 Loss of Irrigable and Irrigated Land
The CBP’s irrigation and drainage system was constructed to provide irrigation water for the development of commercial agriculture. The vitality and sustainability of the Columbia Basin’s and Grant County’s agriculturally-based economies are inextricably tied to the continuing availability of irrigable lands and irrigation water. This public irrigation and drainage system, which developed an agricultural economy, was constructed at substantial public cost. Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of the irrigation and drainage system as well as the repayment of construction obligations is ongoing at significant expense to Columbia Basin and Grant County farmers. Continued repayment of this debt service is dependent upon an adequate irrigable land assessment base.
Subdivision of agricultural lands often creates parcel sizes that are too small for commercially viable agricultural production. Subdivision of irrigable lands can reduce the availability of such lands for commercial agriculture and can increase commercial agriculture’s share of system costs and construction cost obligations.

The small lot subdivision allowance of the Grant County Zoning Ordinance allowed agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance to be lost forever. While some of these small lots were created out of less productive farmland, the Zoning Ordinance allowed indiscriminate subdivision of the best farmland as well. While conversion of less productive farmland may be appropriate, it is crucial that the inventory of irrigable and irrigated lands be protected.

4.4.4.8.2 Incompatible Development
Perhaps the greatest threat to Grant County’s status as a national agricultural producer is subdivision and conversion of agricultural lands to residential development uses. While invaluable to the economy, agricultural operations can be noisy, odorous, and even dangerous places. Serious conflicts are inevitable when other kinds of development, especially residential housing, are allowed within or adjacent to an active agricultural land use. New residential neighbors not accustomed to agricultural practices may dislike the noise, dust, spraying, glare, and perceived diminishment of property value caused by the agricultural operations. The result is increased pressure on farmers from residential neighbors who did not like the impacts associated with normal farming operations.

4.4.4.8.3 Increased Property Taxes
An important issue addressed by the policies in this element is protecting farms from high property tax rates. Designating and conserving agricultural resource lands and removing pressures to convert
farmland to urban and suburban uses should help relieve speculative land values that drive up property tax assessments.

### 4.4.4.9 Classification and Designation

The GMA (RCW 36.70A.160) requires counties to identify, classify, and designate agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. WAC 365-190-050(1) states that “counties must approach the effort as a county-wide or area-wide process. Counties...should not review resource lands designations solely on a parcel-by-parcel process.” WAC 365-190-050(3) states that “lands should be considered for designation as agricultural resource lands based on three factors: 1) specifically is not characterized by urban growth, 2) is used or is capable of being used for agricultural production, and 3) has long-term commercial significance for agriculture.”

Consistent with the first factor, cities and towns and their associated UGAs were excluded from the analysis.

The second factor evaluates whether lands are well suited to agricultural production. Production capability is further detailed that lands currently used or capable to be used for agricultural production “must be evaluated for designation” (WAC 365-190-050(3)(b)(i)), and that counties “shall use the land-capability classification system of the USDA NRCS as defined in relevant Field Office Technical Guides” (WAC 365-190-050(3)(b)(ii)). The NRCS soil classifications were consulted to confirm agricultural production suitability. Several areas were included in the current designation that would require additional land management measures to make these lands productive, including large tracts of rangeland with rocky soils and in higher elevation areas with difficult access.

Other factors were also considered including water availability/precipitation, parcel size, land in conservation, food security, prime farmlands designated as of statewide importance, sufficiency, and local importance.

From this analysis, multiple areas in the County were reclassified. The areas that were removed from agricultural resource land designation are areas north of Quincy in the Beezley Hills area, north of Soap Lake and south of Coulee City in the Dry Falls area, areas around Wilson Creek in the Black Rock/Wilson Creek area, and areas east-northeast of Mattawa in the Saddle Mountain/Mattawa area. These areas are not currently farmed, require management to be suitable, and are not prime farmland, all of which threaten the long-term commercial significance of the land as agricultural land.

Areas that should be added to agricultural resource land designation are areas east of Mattawa and north of Coulee City, and totaling approximately 2,000 acres. These areas are currently farmed, are irrigated and in some cases have permanent crops in place, have suitable capability classes, are outside of UGAs, and are near existing land that is already designated as Agricultural Resource land.
Approximately 314,500 acres are proposed to be changed to Rural Resource from Agricultural Resource land. Although being removed from Agricultural Resource land designation, this new designation will preserve these lands for rangeland uses and agricultural production opportunity areas. Development densities remain identical to agricultural lands. The new designation can be considered an innovative zoning technique that fits RCW 36.70A.177(1) as being designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy. See Appendix G for additional detail.

Agricultural Resources lands are classified as follows:

**GMA Ag Dryland Agricultural Land** – used primarily for grain or feed crop production, including ground in the Federal Conservation Reserve Program.

**GMA Ag Irrigated Agricultural Land** – used for the production of hard and soft fruits as well as forage and grain crops and vegetables, and pasture for grazing livestock.

**GMA Ag Rangeland** – used primarily for livestock raising and as rangelands for grazing livestock mostly surrounded by GMA Ag Dryland and GMA Ag Irrigated land.

### 4.4.4.10 Mineral Lands

The GMA (RCW 36.70A.170) states that "...each county...shall designate where appropriate...mineral resource lands that are not already characterized by urban growth and that have long-term significance for the extraction of minerals." Mineral lands in Grant County are identified as land that has long-term significance for the extraction of minerals. Mineral lands are further classified as any area in Grant County presently covered under a valid DNR surface mining permit, excluding those that are located within:

1. Any designated UGA boundary in Grant County
2. Any designated boundary of a Rural Village, Rural Community, Shoreline Development, Recreational Development, Agricultural Service Center, Commercial Area, Industrial Area, or any other area designated as a LAMIRD in Grant County

Grant County’s mineral resource areas of long-term commercial significance, therefore, focus on gravel, sand and rock deposits that are vital to construction and road projects. Commercial quality deposits should be recognized as non-renewable resources and managed accordingly.

These operations are important from the standpoint of providing vitally needed construction materials. Residential, commercial, and industrial construction, in addition to road construction and repair, depend on a stable, low-cost source of gravel. Conservation of these resources must be assured through measures designed to prevent incompatible development in or adjacent to resource lands.
At this time, information on commercial quality deposits is limited. Areas with mineral deposits have been identified primarily through the use of surface mining permits issued by DNR.

4.4.4.10.1  **Economic Importance of Mining**
While not a major employer in Grant County, mining operations provide vitally important construction materials, to manufacture concrete, asphalt, and other products. Sand and gravel deposits and bedrock may be mined or quarried to produce these raw materials known as aggregate. In Washington State, aggregate is the most valuable mineral commodity. The State contributes about 363 million dollars’ worth of aggregate annually. Grant County’s surface mining operations are located throughout the County and include aggregate, basalt, and diatomaceous earth mining. See Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 7 for locations of current surface mining operations in Grant County.

4.4.4.10.2  **Current Zoning Practices**
There is currently no special zoning of mining operations in Grant County.

4.4.4.10.3  **Major Issues**

**Incompatible Development** – Mining operations are often considered poor neighbors and nuisance claims against operators are common. To assure the long-term use of these resources, residential and other incompatible uses should be prevented from locating adjacent to these deposits. Because of this potential conflict, mineral extraction sites are primarily located in rural areas. While this will serve to lessen the impact on neighboring land uses, the movement of large amounts of mineral resources necessitates good roads capable of handling significant numbers of heavily-loaded trucks.

**Potential Environmental Impacts** – Loaded trucks enroute from the extraction site may lose a very small, but potentially hazardous portion of their load, and track dirt or mud onto public roadways. Therefore, better prevention of such mining impacts on county residents is also needed.

Just as sand and gravel is a natural resource, so too is surface and groundwater. Mining operations should minimize adverse impacts on the environment, and specifically, should minimize its effect on surface and groundwaters. Restoration of mining sites is a crucial element of such protection measures. Existing, non-operating or abandoned mining sites pose a concern because they may leave aquifers vulnerably exposed, and invite illegal waste dumping.

4.4.4.10.4  **Mineral Lands Assessment Criteria**
If a resource lands assessment is required by the Grant County UDC, or as subsequently amended, the following criteria may be considered when reviewing a proposed activity in areas designated as mineral lands of long-term commercial significance:

- Type and extent of mineral deposits
• Use in mineral production
• Proposed reclamation plan
• Parcel size
• Availability of public facilities and services
• Proximity of proposed activity to UGAs and LAMIRDs;
• Compatibility of proposed activity with adjacent land use
• Local and regional economic conditions and market trends
• Environmental impacts of proposed activity
• Impact of proposed activity on commercial agricultural structure of area
• Impacts of proposed activity to public rights-of-way
• Suitability to accommodate on-site wastewater disposal and domestic water supply facilities

4.4.4.11 Resource Land Residential Density Policy
A maximum residential gross density of 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres shall be allowed in designated agricultural and mineral resource lands.

4.4.5 Open Space and Recreation

4.4.5.1 Introduction
Grant County owns and operates the Moses Lake Sand Dunes Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) park located on the southern tip of Moses Lake. There are no other major park services provided by the County. The County provides ORV patrol at the Beverly Dunes ORV park (a State facility) in the southern portion of the County, but the County does not own nor operate that site. The County owns multiple vacant lands, some of which are being used as shoreline public access points, but are not designated as parkland. However, there are numerous state parks in the County, including Potholes State Park, Sun Lakes State Park, Summer Falls State Park, and Steamboat Rock State Park. There are also many wildlife refuges and privately-owned resorts and recreational destinations associated with the water bodies and other outdoor opportunities of the County. Grant County PUD also owns multiple park and recreational facilities near the Crescent Bar, Sunland Estates, Desert Aire, Vantage, and Crab Creek areas.
The Columbia River, Beezley Hills, Potholes Reservoir, Ancient Lakes area, Crab Creek drainage area, Grand Coulee recreational area, Wahluke Slope, Saddle Mountains, Moses Lake, Priest Rapids and Wanapum reservoirs, Lenore Lake, Banks Lake, Lake Roosevelt, Billy Clapp Lake, trails, farmlands, riparian corridors, lakes, and shorelines contain the natural beauty and character of Grant County’s landscape. This setting contributes greatly to the quality of life enjoyed by county residents who value its elements of environmental quality, scenic beauty, and recreational opportunities. Open spaces are essential components to the health and well-being of individuals and communities.

With its unique range of outdoor recreational opportunities, Grant County has much to offer outdoor recreationists. The climate, unique geological formations, and large holdings of public land have made this area an increasingly popular place in which to recreate. Fishing and hunting, boating, camping, hiking, biking, and simply walking on trails are some of the more popular types of recreational activities in the County.

4.4.5.2 Purpose
This Open Space and Recreation section of the Land Use Element serves two related purposes: 1) to identify the County’s unique and important natural areas, open spaces and corridors, and scenic and natural resource lands; and 2) to clarify the broader functions and benefits of the County’s open spaces. Open Space, in this instance, includes resource lands, greenbelts, wetlands, geologically hazardous areas, and other areas covered under the Grant County CAO. All these areas contribute to the County’s appearance, but are not parks in the traditional sense.

This section defines which open space lands should be designated and protected now, and how it should be done. It also establishes a framework for considering other lands for future designation and protection.

4.4.5.3 Open Space Designation
The purpose of the Open Space land use designation is to identify and protect unique and outstanding examples of publicly-owned areas pertaining to recreation, fish and wildlife habitat conservation, or unique geologic features. This land use designation also acknowledges the ongoing responsibility of the county, state, and federal government to protect critical areas and other valued resources on lands within this designation. These lands are owned by a federal, state, or local governmental entity and are maintained as closely as possible to their natural state. With various recreational opportunities, the Open Space land use provides opportunities for physical activity and promotes creating a healthy lifestyle for County residents.

Appendix A: Map Folio, Figures 3 and 5 show existing open space land cover (Figure 3) and areas designated in this as Open Space (Figure 5), which includes those areas designated as “Conservancy Environment” in Grant County’s SMP and lands owned and/or managed by the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission.
The Open Space designation includes both publicly-owned and privately-owned lots of record. The Comprehensive Plan does not specifically provide for residential development of privately-owned parcels overlaid by the Open Space designation. Reasonable, limited use of privately-owned parcels overlaid by the Open Space designation should be allowed, provided that such development is reasonably compatible with open space recreation and fish and wildlife habitat conservation. Limited residential development having a maximum density of one dwelling unit per 40 acres is appropriate for privately-owned parcels overlaid by the Open Space designation.

4.5 Population Projection

Based on the OFM 20-year projection, Grant County’s countywide population is estimated to be 130,272 in the year 2038. The unincorporated areas of the County currently include about 44% share of the total countywide population. The OFM “medium” series estimates project a Grant County population increase of 37,299 by the year 2038. Considering an annual growth rate of 1.0% in the unincorporated County, which includes both the existing unincorporated UGA areas and all other unincorporated areas, this part of the County is estimated to add 10,178 additional people. This growth represents approximately 27.3% of the County’s total population increase (37,299) projected for 2038, and would result in about 40% of the total County population living in the unincorporated area. The other 72.7% of the growth will occur within the cities and towns, and associated UGAs in the County, with a major portion, about 42%, projected within Moses Lake and more about 10% in Mattawa.

The countywide population projections for cities, towns, and the County were developed in coordination with the cities and towns, and reflect the recent years’ growth trends. Table 4-8 indicates projected population and distribution of future growth in each jurisdiction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 Population</th>
<th>2038 Projected Population</th>
<th>2038 Allocation (%)</th>
<th>20 Year Population Increase</th>
<th>Increased Population (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coulee City</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric City</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrata</td>
<td>8,005</td>
<td>10,719</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Coulee</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartline</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krupp</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>8,494</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>9.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>22,720</td>
<td>38,553</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>15,833</td>
<td>42.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>10,075</td>
<td>7.58%</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap Lake</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Creek</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Grant County</td>
<td>42,422</td>
<td>52,600</td>
<td>39.57%</td>
<td>10,178</td>
<td>27.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95,630</td>
<td>132,929</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>34642</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Medium Series 5 Year projection</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>130,272</td>
<td>37,299</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OFM data

4.6 Future Land and Housing Needs

As discussed earlier, Cities of Moses Lake and Mattawa are projected to be major growth centers in the County. In addition, the Cities of Quincy and Ephrata are expected to experience considerable growth. Consistent with the GMA, Grant County UGAs are expected to include the major share of the future growth. UGAs in most cases offer necessary public facilities and infrastructure for developments, and include a variety of job opportunities to promote growth. For example, Moses Lake UGA is anticipated to have a major growth in the future. All other unincorporated UGAs, such as Quincy, Ephrata Coulee City, Electric City and Grant Coulee City are anticipated to grow in the future. Within the County, the Crescent Bar area is expected to continue to grow with new residential developments. Potholes area is in the process of a Planned Unit Development for approximately 700 new residential lots.

At an estimated ratio of 3 residents per household, the additional 10,178 people in the next 20 years would require 3,393 new homes. To project future land availability in the urban and rural lands of the
County, a land use analysis was conducted for each land use category. The analysis used GIS data to identify vacant lands. This vacant land excludes an estimated 20% of land for roads, infrastructure, and critical areas. The buildable vacant land data was multiplied with allowable land use densities in order to identify projected number of units (Table 4-9). For Urban lands, a density of 2 dwelling units per acre was generally used for all vacant lands for the purpose of this analysis. Since Urban lands allow a variety of densities ranging from 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres, to 8 to 16 dwelling units per acre, it is expected that some areas would experience higher densities.

### Table 4-9
**Land Availability for Future Housing Units in Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
<th>20% Roads/Infrastructure</th>
<th>Buildable Land (acres)</th>
<th>Projected Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coulee City</strong></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electric City</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ephrata</strong></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Coulee</strong></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hartline</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Krupp</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lakeview</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mattawa</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moses Lake</strong></td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>377.4</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>3,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quincy</strong></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Royal City</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soap Lake</strong></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warden</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilson Creek</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>3,822</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>6,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County tax parcel data

A land capacity analysis on vacant Rural and Urban lands indicates the County has adequate land supply to accommodate future land use and housing demand (Table 4-10). In addition to land availability, future growth is also dependent upon the availability of water, which is plentiful in most areas of the County, largely due to the CBP. More discussion on water resources is available under the Natural Setting/Water Element Chapter 11.
### Table 4-10

#### Land Availability for Future Housing Units in the County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Estimated Buildable Land (acres)</th>
<th>New Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Lands</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>6,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Community</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Remote</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Resource</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Village</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Development</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Lands Total</td>
<td>6,978</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,036</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,815</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County GIS and tax parcel data

A residential land capacity analysis for cities and unincorporated UGAs (Appendix H) indicates that lands in the existing city limits and UGAs are adequate to accommodate urban residential growth for the next 20 years.

### 4.7 Maps and References

Existing Land Use Designations are included in Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 4. Future/Proposed Land Use Designations included in this Comprehensive Plan are shown in Appendix A: Map Folio, Figure 5 and represent an interpretation of the classification criteria defined in this Land Use Element and the sub-elements based on current conditions. The Future/Proposed Land Use Designation Map is intended to provide guidance to the Administrator and/or Review Authority in determining the extent of designated lands in relation to a site-specific development proposal. In addressing any ambiguities or inaccuracies, the County’s UDC 23.04, Boundary Interpretation, appropriate provisions will be applied.

### 4.8 Historic Plats

Historic plats are those that were platted prior to enactment of a new State platting code in 1969 (Laws of 1969, Ex. Sess., Chapter 271, Codified as Chapter 58.17 RCW). Historic plats are often referred to as "paper plats," because many have never been developed. Many of these historic plats are comprised of very small lots, often too small to construct a house to meet current land use laws, such as zoning requirements, on-site septic, and other land development requirements. In Grant County, there exist a number of historical plats, many of which are undeveloped and others that are partially developed.
Pursuant to the provisions of the Attorney General Opinion 1996 No. 5, the Grant County Board of Commissioners finds that development of lots located within undeveloped historic plats where more than 5 years has passed since approval, filing and recording of the final plat map shall be subject to development regulations, including zoning requirements and densities, lot size, access requirements, requirements regarding on-site septic system design and approval, and other design and performance standards in effect at the time a building permit application is determined to be complete. To meet current land use and public health requirements consolidation of two or more platted lots may be required.

Development of lots located within undeveloped historic plats where less than 5 years has passed since approval, filing and recording of the final plat map shall be subject to development regulations in existence at the time of approval or recording of the final plat map, unless the Grant County Board of Commissioners or other legislative body having jurisdiction finds that a change in conditions creates a serious threat to public health or safety.

In order to appropriately reflect the GMA goal of protection of private property rights, development of lots located within developed historic plats shall be subject to development regulations in existence at the time of approval or recording of the final plat map, unless the Grant County Board of Commissioners or other legislative body having jurisdiction finds that a change in conditions creates a serious threat to public health or safety. An historic plat shall be considered as developed if 25% to one-half or more of the platted lots contain an existing structure suitable for occupancy.

Application of current development regulations to undeveloped historic plats taken together with other limiting factors on development, including limited water availability, sufficiently limits the ultimate development of historic lots in the interest of the GMA goal of reducing urban sprawl.

An historical lot and lot consolidation ordinance should be adopted as part of the process of establishing development regulations to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
5 Economic Development Element

5.1 Introduction and Purpose
A healthy economy is essential to the vitality and quality of life in Grant County. While the natural setting of the County largely determines the parameters within which economic development may occur, virtually every other feature of community life is dependent on the area’s economy.

This Element places economic development within the context of the County’s other goals and policies. To be able to provide adequate employment opportunities for the projected population growth during the planning period, the economy must grow. Growth, however, is subject to the constraints, opportunities, and vision of the community.

Economic growth also requires investment in County infrastructure, including transportation facilities, water and sewer systems, and private utilities. Having industrial and commercial sites available and ready-to-develop at an affordable price is a prerequisite to effectively compete for new companies. Changes in the County’s economic development may impact its demographic composition and affect the type and location of needed housing. Activities that are not sustainable within the constraints of the County do not contribute to the overall wellbeing of the County.

This Element is related to many other elements of this Plan. The Natural Setting, Land Use, Capital Facilities, Utilities, and Housing Elements describe plans and policies for infrastructure development.
and land use. These elements lay the groundwork and form the “building blocks” for economic development.

5.2 Grant County’s Economic Vision for the Future

Grant County seeks to maintain and enhance its quality of life while achieving benefits of growth and minimizing its negative effects. The Comprehensive Plan vision defines the future and how the County will respond to growth and change. The vision centers on the following basic economic value:

“Promote a healthy, diversified, and sustainable local and regional economy by supporting existing local businesses, making prudent infrastructure investments, and encouraging new business that is compatible with and complementary to the community.”

Grant County is composed of an agriculture, tourism, commercial, and light industrial based economy. Grant County’s vision for its economic future focuses on vitality, diversity, quality-of-life, sustainability, and growth. Its vision is based on its intent to preserve agriculture and agricultural lands, promote economic growth in industry, recreation and tourism, and commercial development, and to preserve historic locations and protect natural settings unique to Grant County. Grant County has the opportunity to excel and enjoy the benefits of balanced economic growth without compromising its quality-of-life. Effective local economic development planning and well-informed decision-making and actions should be continued to achieve these goals.

5.3 Existing Conditions – An Economic Profile of Grant County

Like many rural counties in Eastern Washington, Grant County’s economy is largely dependent upon agriculture and its value-added companion of food processing. These include production of tree fruit, irrigated farming of a variety of crops, and associated food processing industries. In 2016, food processing provided 43.2% of the 4,866 manufacturing jobs in Grant County. Some of the major food manufacturers located in Grant County are Lamb Weston BSW, Washington Potato Co., and Pacific Coast Canola in Warden; Con Agra Foods and Quincy Foods in Quincy; and J. R. Simplot Co. and National Frozen Foods in Moses Lake (ESD 2017a). As discussed in Chapter 4, according to the USDA Census of Agriculture (2012), Grant County is the top producer of vegetables and cattle and calves and second highest producer of fruit in Washington, with a market value from agricultural products of approximately $1.7 billion.

The following list provides an overview and summary of some of the key elements affecting the economy of Grant County:

- Population. Grant County’s population has increased at a steady rate in the last decade with a slightly higher growth rate in 2010. The average annual rate of population growth in Grant
County between 2010 and 2017 was 1.1%, based on OFM data. In terms of the highest population, it is ranked 13th among the 39 counties in the state.

- **Labor force and employment.** During the recent recession, the unemployment rate in Grant County was 9.9% in 2009 and 10.9% in 2010. The unemployment rate fell to 7.3% in 2015 (ESD 2017b). The most recent data indicates Grant County’s unemployment rate at 4.3% (ESD 2017b), compared to the State’s unemployment rate at 4.2% (ESD 2017b).
  - Grant County’s non-farm sector is dependent upon the goods-producing industries of agriculture, construction, and manufacturing, as well as the service-producing industries of trade, transportation and utilities, education and health services, and government. Agriculture and food processing remains the County’s leading employer and the largest component of the local economy. Grant County has water and other resources that have created a significant comparative advantage in agricultural production. The County is part of one of nation’s most productive and diversified agricultural regions. The growth of the overall manufacturing sector is expected to remain same. However, some sectors such as nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing, machinery manufacturing, and food and beverage manufacturing are expected to grow by 2025. Much of this growth is expected to take place in Quincy and Moses Lake area.
  - Grant County has lagged behind the state in emerging technology sectors as well as trade and services sectors.

Table 5-1 shows Grant County’s top five sectors in terms of employment in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of Jobs</th>
<th>Share of Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agriculture, forestry, and fishing</td>
<td>10,009</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local government</td>
<td>6,591</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manufacturing</td>
<td>4,866</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Retail trade</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Health services</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other industries</td>
<td>11,274</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total covered payrolls</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,795</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESD 2017a

- **Personal income.** Personal income includes earned income, investment income, and government payments such as Social Security and Veterans Benefits. Investment income includes income imputed from pension funds and from owning a home. Per capita personal income equals total personal income divided by the resident population. In 2015, Grant
Grant County inflation-adjusted per capita personal income was $38,081, which is less than figures for the state ($51,898) and the nation ($48,112). According to the 2015 Census data, median household income in Grant County is $48,714, which is less than the state median of $61,062. The total covered payroll in 2016 in Grant County was approximately $1.496 billion. The average annual wage was $38,795 or 65.7% of the state average of $59,090 (ESD 2017a).

Table 5-2 indicates the top five Grant County industries in 2016 in terms of payrolls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Payroll</th>
<th>Share of Payrolls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Local government</td>
<td>$330,724,053</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agriculture, forestry, and fishing</td>
<td>$269,491,660</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manufacturing</td>
<td>$253,157,621</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Health services</td>
<td>$96,265,247</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Retail trade</td>
<td>$94,334,044</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other industries</td>
<td>$452,481,215</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total covered payrolls</td>
<td>$1,496,453,840</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESD 2017a

5.3.1 Composition of Grant County’s Economic Base

Recent analysis of Grant County’s economy found that a number of sectors comprise the economic base of the local area. Also known as the export base, these sectors sell their products and services to non-local markets and bring new dollars into the local economy. These export-oriented sectors, in turn, support a cast of non-export sectors within the local area. The following sectors, in rank order, represent the key elements of Grant County’s economic base.

Agriculture. Grant County is one of the state’s leading counties in agricultural production. As discussed above, Grant County is the top producer of vegetables and cattle and calves and second highest producer of fruit in the state, with a market value from agricultural products of approximately $1.7 billion. With abundant land, plentiful water for irrigation as part of the CBP, and a mild climate, Grant County has become a diversified agricultural production powerhouse, with a significant portion of the state’s total agricultural production coming from producers in the County.

The agricultural production in the County’s irrigated land, dryland, and rangelands is summarized in Table 5-3.
### Table 5-3
**Agricultural Activity and Products (Private Lands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural Type</th>
<th>Percent of County</th>
<th>Primary Crops/Livestock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>• Vegetables&lt;br&gt;• Wheat&lt;br&gt;• Vineyards&lt;br&gt;• Dairy&lt;br&gt;• Potatoes&lt;br&gt;• Tree fruit (e.g., apples and cherries)&lt;br&gt;• Legumes&lt;br&gt;• Corn&lt;br&gt;• Hay&lt;br&gt;• Seed Crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryland</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>• Wheat&lt;br&gt;• Canola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>• Cattle&lt;br&gt;• Horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Anchor QEA 2017

Agricultural industry involves an intricate system of producers, processors, wholesalers, and services. Agricultural producers in Grant County purchase services, fertilizers, seeds, farm machinery, and credit in the area and deliver crops to local processors and marketers, who add further value to the products before shipping them out of the County. In addition to generating income and employment for the region, direct and related agricultural activity contributes to the County’s economic critical mass, making other unrelated businesses viable. Figure 5-1 indicates the predominance of workforce in the Farming, Fishing, and Forestry industry in the north central region that includes Grant County.

### Figure 5-1
**Occupational Makeup of the Workforce in the North Central Washington, 2014**

Source: ESD 2017c
Manufacturing. Manufacturing in Grant County is dominated by food processing firms, but other categories such as machinery manufacturing (e.g., transportation equipment) and nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing also significantly contribute to the manufacturing sector. Most of these manufactured products—particularly processed food products, primary metals, and transportation equipment—are exported outside of the County.

Table 5-4 indicates major manufacturing employers in Grant County in 2014. As discussed under agriculture sub-section above, employers in other sectors such as agriculture and service industries also play important roles for the County’s economy.

Table 5-4
Largest Manufacturing Employers, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Product or Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genie Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>Aerial Work Platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConAgra Foods Inc.</td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>Frozen Potato Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC Silicon</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>Polysilicon Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Foods, LLC</td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>Frozen Vegetable Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Simplot Co.</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>Frozen Potato Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takata Corporation</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>Automotive Airbags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb Weston BSW</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Frozen Potato Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Frozen Foods Corp.</td>
<td>Moses Lake &amp; Quincy</td>
<td>Vegetable Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake Industries</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>Corp headquarters &amp; Industrial Chemicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Potato Co.</td>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>Dehydrated Potato Flake Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; L Foundry, Inc.</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Cast Iron Foundry Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGL Automotive Carbon Fiber</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Carbon Fiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldorado Stone</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>Stone &amp; Brick Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic American Foods</td>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>Dehydrated Potato Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Paper</td>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>Corrugated Box Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celite Corp.</td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>Mineral Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckenberg Hay</td>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>Hay Cubes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Oro Agribeef</td>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>Cattle Feedlot or Finishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemi-Con Materials Corp.</td>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>Electrolytic Aluminum Foil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AstaReal</td>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical &amp; Medicine Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahluke Produce</td>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>Agricultural Seed Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Polymer Corp.</td>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>Potato Starch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akzo Nobel Pulp &amp; Performance Chemicals Inc.</td>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>Sodium Chloride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grant County Economic Development Council 2014
**Agricultural services.** Based on the broader Columbia Basin region’s comparative advantage in agricultural production, Grant County has seen vigorous growth in agricultural service firms over the years. These agricultural services—ranging from crop preparation, planting and harvesting, veterinary services, and farm labor and management services—are part of the critical mass of agricultural activity within the County.

**Transportation and utilities.** Transportation—most notably trucking and warehousing—has grown over the years as part of the County’s agricultural complex. Transportation provides a critical service in delivering crops and livestock to regional processors and marketers, and later to deliver value-added products to markets outside of the region. Trucking and warehousing is the largest transport sector in Grant County, one that has shown steady growth.

Although utilities, like transportation, are often viewed as supportive sectors within the local economy, electrical generation in Grant County is a part of the economic base. The Grant County PUD owns two generating dams, Wanapum Dam and Priest Rapids Dam, with a combined generating capacity of over 2,000 megawatts. Besides offering one of the lowest power rates to industry in the nation, Grant County PUD sells much of its power to other utilities. Over 35% of Grant County PUD’s power is sold to utilities in Washington and Oregon.

Unlike elsewhere, Grant County’s export base is oriented toward natural resources and related value-added processing. The broader changes in the national and state economies indicate that service and trade sectors have become important drivers of economic growth and are generating a sizeable share of export income. Widespread attention has been given to the shift in the national and state economy from goods production to services provision in recent years. Although Grant County is dependent on upon goods-producing industries of agriculture and manufacturing, it exhibits the same trend towards growth in service employment (Figure 5-2).
Figure 5-2
Percentage of Services-Producing and Goods-Producing Jobs in Grant County, 2007-2016

Note: Goods-producing industries consist of the natural resource sectors of agriculture, forestry, fishing, and mining; in addition to construction and manufacturing. Services-producing sectors include transportation, communications, and utilities; finance, insurance, and real estate; wholesale and retail trade; services; and government.

Source: ESD 2017c

5.3.2 Changing Composition of Employment

Figure 5-3 shows some of the employment trends in the Grant County economy. Over the past years, the sectors that have shown the most balanced growth are government services, retail trade, and manufacturing. Farming is still the leading employer in terms of number of jobs in Grant County. With continued agricultural diversification in the County, farming employment is projected to increase slightly over the next 10 years. Grant County’s economy had posted year-over-year increases in non-farm jobs for 36 months (from October 2012 through September 2015) until non-farm employment decreased during each month of the 4th Quarter 2015. In December 2015, employers provided 28,330 jobs, a 750 job and 2.6% decrease from the 29,080 recorded in December 2014 (ESD 2017c).

Services—composed of personal, business, auto and miscellaneous repair, lodging, amusement and recreation, health, legal, social and education, membership organizations, and engineering and accounting—are slated to become the County’s leading employer within 10 years.

Manufacturing has grown evenly in the last decade, but is expected to slow down in the next 10 years, primarily due to the drop in primary metal manufacturing and machinery manufacturing.
Wholesale trade has grown during the last decade and is expected to continue the trend in the next decade. Although retail trade has increased its presence during this period, the County is still underserved in most retail trade categories. Transportation, communications, and utilities are slated to grow in pace with the overall economy, while finance, insurance and real estate, and government are expected to have more moderate growth compared to other sectors in the local economy. The leisure and hospitality economic sector is also expected to grow in the next decade as Grant County tourism and recreation opportunities further develop.

5.3.3 Workforce in Grant County
Grant County has experienced a significant economic growth in the last two decades. Once designated as an “economically distressed” county, Grant County’s annual unemployment rate in 2017 was lower than adjoining Benton and Franklin counties (ESD 2017c) and only slightly higher than the state’s (Table 5-5, Figure 5-4).
Table 5-5
Labor Force, Employment, and Unemployment, Selected Areas, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/County</th>
<th>Civilian Labor Force</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>3,762,673</td>
<td>3,603,713</td>
<td>158,960</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Washington (Okanogan, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, and Adams counties)</td>
<td>142,566</td>
<td>134,518</td>
<td>8,048</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>9,261</td>
<td>8,914</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>97,888</td>
<td>93,466</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>40,734</td>
<td>38,793</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>47,256</td>
<td>45,227</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>132,295</td>
<td>126,170</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESD 2017c

Figure 5-4
Employment and Unemployment in Grant County and Washington State, 2017

Source: Eastern Washington University 2017

Grant County has fewer residents with college degrees, 15.6% compared to 33.6% in the State in 2016 (U.S. Census Bureau 2017). Education has become an important determinant of workers’ future earnings. There is a shortage of skilled educated workers in the agriculture and manufacturing
sectors, as well as in the corporate offices in Grant County. Additionally, there is lack of adequate field training opportunities to train young workers with field experience in the processing, manufacturing, and marketing sectors.

Table 5-6 indicates median earning in 2016 by education level in Grant and adjoining counties.

### Table 5-6
Median Earning by Educational Attainment, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Benton</th>
<th>Franklin</th>
<th>Yakima</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Median Household Income</td>
<td>50,145</td>
<td>47,554</td>
<td>61,147</td>
<td>58,284</td>
<td>45,700</td>
<td>62,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income (25 years or older)</td>
<td>29,092</td>
<td>28,930</td>
<td>39,429</td>
<td>31,009</td>
<td>27,807</td>
<td>40,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>22,203</td>
<td>25,321</td>
<td>20,753</td>
<td>22,521</td>
<td>20,413</td>
<td>23,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>29,631</td>
<td>28,650</td>
<td>32,027</td>
<td>27,243</td>
<td>27,038</td>
<td>31,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or associates degree</td>
<td>31,782</td>
<td>30,304</td>
<td>36,213</td>
<td>35,921</td>
<td>31,475</td>
<td>36,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>41,378</td>
<td>45,625</td>
<td>60,760</td>
<td>55,761</td>
<td>44,990</td>
<td>55,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>66,337</td>
<td>56,645</td>
<td>70,402</td>
<td>54,265</td>
<td>62,350</td>
<td>71,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2017

### 5.3.4 Stagnant Real Earnings

Annual earnings include both proprietor income and worker wages and salaries. The annual average earnings figure is derived by dividing the total earnings within the County by the total employment (both proprietors and wage and salary workers) in the County.

The per capita income in Grant County in 2015 was $38,081, significantly lower than the State’s per capita income of $51,898. However, Figure 5-5 indicates an upward income trend similar to the statewide trend.

The earnings gap between the state and Grant County has been a subject of considerable discussion, for in general this rural-statewide gap is a national trend as well as one occurring in Grant County. Each of the following factors have contributed to this phenomenon:

- Earnings declines within industries facing international competition, restructuring, and other factors
- Relative increase in lower-paying trade and services jobs compared to higher-paying goods-producing jobs
- Increase in part-time workers, particularly in trade and services
- Increase in seasonal labor, particularly farm labor
- Instability of earnings from natural resource activities, including farming
5.4 Major Issues and Opportunities

As part of preparing an Economic Development Element, an economic assessment (or SWOT analysis) is conducted. The SWOT analysis summarizes Grant County’s strategic economic position, addresses major issues faced by the County, and provides a springboard for an implementation framework for economic development. Essentially, a SWOT analysis addresses such questions as: what are the County’s economic strengths and weaknesses or comparative advantages and disadvantages? In what activities and/or resources does the County excel, and where does it lag behind? What are the external threats and opportunities faced by Grant County as it plans for the next 20 years? Upon review of Grant County’s economic profile and existing economic conditions, and through public outreach and visioning, several economic development aspects were identified. Agriculture continues to be a strong basis of Grant County’s economy. Grant County also aims to leverage its natural landscape and heritage to create sustainable economic development opportunities. The following is a summary of the primary concerns and opportunities related to Grant County’s economy.
**Strengths** Grant County has a number of assets for continued economic expansion and development.

- **A substantial resource endowment.** Grant County is situated within the Columbia Basin, one of the nation’s most productive agricultural growing regions. The County’s growers have capitalized on the long-growing season and availability of irrigated water to produce a rich cornucopia of crops, from traditional grains and cattle to a wide array of high-value specialty crops.

- **A growing agriculture-related complex.** Agricultural production is the leading industry in Grant County. However, there is more than just agricultural growers. A critical mass of agricultural service and supply firms reside within Grant County providing productive inputs to agricultural producers. Grant County has also attracted food processors—especially in the preserved fruits and vegetables sector—adding further value to farm products produced within the County.

- **A first-rate transportation network.** The efficient movement of both goods and people is critical for continued economic development. The County is bisected by the state’s major east-west interstate (I-90) and by Burlington Northern/Santa Fe Railroad’s main east–west rail line. In addition, the County’s major international airport has one of the longest runways east of the Mississippi River. Access to a multitude of transportation modes helps regional shippers remain competitive in the delivery of their products to respective markets.

- **Grant County International Airport.** The Grant County International Airport is one of the largest airfields in the country. It has the capacity of accepting the largest aircraft in the world. The facility is used by military and commercial flight test programs. It has capacity to accommodate much more given its five runways and on-site Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) control tower for commercial, military, and general aviation use (Port of Moses Lake 2018). The airport plays an important role in the regional economy by providing easy access to the rest of the country as well as bringing aviation training related jobs.

- **Significant cost advantages in doing business.** Grant County boasts one of the cheapest electric power rates in the United States. Grant County PUD has the opportunity to retain more of its generated power for the County’s growing industrial base. In addition, Grant County has substantial land zoned for industrial purposes. Land costs (for assembly and purchase, and development) are relatively inexpensive within Grant County.

- **Quality of life factors and relative low cost-of-living.** Grant County is an attractive area for relocation and expansion. Housing within the County is highly affordable compared to similar areas.

- **Presence in the global economy.** Grant County has been a player within the international economy. A number of agricultural producers and processors already export a significant share of their product to foreign markets. The County boasts a high level of foreign investment in manufacturing, assisted by a foreign trade zone and international airport.
facility. In addition, Grant County International Airport is used by Japan Airlines and other air carriers and aerospace firms for flight crew training.

- Grant County has been successful in competing and attracting various sectors of the market. In the last decade, the County successfully secured various global technology companies such as The Automotive Carbon Fiber Plant, Microsoft, Yahoo!, Intuit, and Amway. This gives the County a competitive advantage to attract new technology based companies.

- **Export opportunities.** Washington State increased exports in 2014, reaching an all-time high. The increase in statewide exports is due almost exclusively to an increase in exports from the aerospace industry. The fruit and vegetable preserves industry experienced a downturn in 2014 of 8.1%, or about $73 million in inflation-adjusted value. This is only the second downturn for fruit and vegetable preserves since 2002. Dairy products experienced the largest gain from 2013. Exports increased by 16.7%, or almost $30 million. Grain and oilseed milling products experienced a gain of 8.4% (Cassey and Sage 2016). As discussed above, Grant County is the top producer of vegetables and cattle and calves and second highest producer of fruit in the State, with a market value from agricultural products of approximately $1.7 billion.

- **H-2A and other temporary farm worker housing and labor supply.** Farm worker housing programs and farm worker labor supplies in Grant County contribute to the local economy in two ways. They provide economically viable labor force to local farms, keeping the agricultural market competitive. Additionally, the temporary concentrations of farm workers help local retail sales on a seasonal basis. Housing programs help effectively serve farming operations with the needed labor supply in Grant County contributing to the County’s agricultural economic base.

- **Grant County’s rich cultural history.** Foreign exchanges and sister city relationships have fostered local economic development, particularly Japanese investment in manufacturing. Moses Lake has the highest level of foreign investment in manufacturing of any community its size. The airport also has a foreign trade zone, due in large part to the foreign manufacturing investment.

- **Reasonably well-positioned for expansion within emerging industries.** The emerging industries of health services, technology, tourism, and producer services will not only expand the local economy, but also provide economic diversity. Some issues need further clarity before the County places substantial effort at targeting certain producer services (e.g., remoteness and small scale may be significant limiting factors for some producer services); but health services, technology, and tourism present significant opportunities.

- **A growing reputation for local cooperation in economic development.** Grant County, Ports, Grant PUD, and local jurisdictions have a coordinated approach in dealing with entitlement or any development issues.
Weaknesses  Grant County also has some liabilities compared with other counties, against which it
must inevitably compete for scarce public and private investment dollars.

- **Limited capacity for wastewater treatment and water distribution facilities in certain areas.** Available treatment capacity and water distribution facilities is limited in some cities within Grant County, potentially limiting future growth and future economic development. One or both of these conditions exists in George, Moses Lake, Mattawa, Quincy, and Warden. In these urban areas, adequate public facilities are not available concurrently for growth to take place.

- **Limited legal mandate to influence some areas of economic development policy.** The County lacks the legal mandate to address some key elements of economic development such as education, lending of credit, and statewide laws and policies.

- **Limited retail growth in many communities.** Although retail in Grant County is not viewed as part of the local economic base, a weak retailing sector has broader implications for attracting future development, including retirees, “lone eagle” entrepreneurs, and relocating industrial firms. Grant County experiences significant leakage on retail sales to nearby regional areas in Tri-Cities, Spokane, and Wenatchee. An increased number of local consumers are shopping in these regional retail centers, mostly due to the lack of adequate retail opportunities in the County.

- **Lack of adequate skilled labor.** There is a shortage of labor to meet existing job opportunities. This skilled labor shortage is especially acute for industries wanting to expand in Grant County. As discussed above, demand is unfilled for skilled workers for entry level jobs in the agriculture and manufacturing sectors.

- **Weakness in developed tourism and recreational facilities.** Although the County has many natural resources, there is a limited supply of recreational resources (e.g., urban amenities) that would allow the County to meet potential demand. One outcome is the many dispersed areas for recreation and fishing.

- **Lack of efficiency in the air service.** Due to the limited aircraft currently serving the airport, it has been difficult to efficiently get in and out of the region. Local traffic faces expensive and limited choices due to lack of air providers and competition.

Opportunities  In addition to inherent economic assets and liabilities, Grant County faces a number of general opportunities.

- **Internationalization of the local economy.** Grant County can continue to compete successfully against low-wage competition at the low end of the market as well as the high end of the market using highly skilled workers to produce high value products. The County can build on its recent success in securing global companies such as The Automotive Carbon Fiber Plant, Microsoft, Yahoo!, Intuit, and Amway. The large and expanding role of small businesses can also be important in the Grant County’s economy. Future economic success
will depend upon the ability of these businesses to compete successfully in the global marketplace. However, these small firms often lack the depth of resources—research and development, marketing (especially foreign markets), training, technology, and finance—needed to compete effectively in the global economy. More training opportunities can be created for local businesses to place them in the global market.

- **Increased technology-oriented economic development.** Building off of the recent successes as described above, the County should continue to position for growth of hi-tech industries using low-cost power, lower cost of land and development, existing hi-tech industries, and an increasingly trained and skilled workforce. Due to the presence of global hi-tech companies such as Microsoft and Yahoo!, Grant County has the opportunity to grow through spin-off businesses.

- **Trained labor force.** Additional training and education opportunities are needed to capture future growth of hi-tech industries as the County continues to expand its global market. A trained labor force would improve the potential of attracting new industries into the region.

- **Value-added agricultural products.** Further processing of agricultural commodities has become a key tenet of economic development organizations in agricultural-dependent regions. The additional processing of these commodities not only create high-wage jobs, opportunities are increased for the local economy. Economic stability, diversity of markets, and the skill base of the local labor force are enhanced. Grant County continues to increase processing capabilities for agricultural commodities, and additional opportunities exist for further vertical integration.

- **Broad state government commitment to rural economic development.** State government has increased its effort to ensure that rural areas participate within the economic growth enjoyed by urban Washington State. Increased assistance—in the form of tax incentives, grants for infrastructure improvements, and smoothing of regulatory processes—will help to improve the state’s rural economies, including Grant County.

- **Increased cost for development in Puget Sound.** The increased cost for development and lack of buildable space in the Puget Sound area may lead to companies seeking low cost alternatives in Grant County. For instance, Quincy is experiencing hi-tech industry growth through its Microsoft satellite location and server farms to support the information technology-based sector of the economy.

- **Increased orientation toward leisure and recreation.** Nearly two-thirds of American households take a traditional 1- to 2-week vacation each year. Significant portions of Americans purchase second vacation homes; most of these vacation homes are within a day’s drive of their permanent residence. Other trends including an increased orientation toward destination “full-service” resorts, gambling, and early retirement spell opportunities for the undeveloped tourism industry in Grant County. Additionally, Grant County’s natural landscape provides tourism and recreational opportunities such as hiking and fishing. Grant PUD has
multiple locations along the Columbia River with recreational opportunities, such as Crescent Bar, Gorge Amphitheater, and Wanapum Dam Park. Some of these can be further improved according to the Grant PUD’s recreation plan.

- **Growth in retirees.** An economic opportunity that is often overlooked by many communities is attracting and retaining residents. New residents indirectly contribute to economic growth by not only providing labor for businesses, but supporting local schools and public facilities with taxes, and spending dollars for locally-provided retail goods and services. Retirees, in particular, bring into the County social security checks, private pensions, and property income. Recognizing their importance as an income source, a number of rural communities are adding to their economic base by actively recruiting and retaining retirees. Clearly, the presence of affordable quality housing in Grant County is one of the attractive features in successfully recruiting and retaining residents. Another important aspect to attracting and retaining residents, especially retirees, is improving the availability of health care and human and social services within the County.

- **Columbia Basin Project.** Irrigated water for agriculture has transformed the economy of Grant County, and some expansion efforts are underway to serve areas of the Odessa aquifer currently relying on deep groundwater wells. The Webber Siphon construction and the Crab Creek feeder canal project, along with additional water conveyance along the eastern portion of the County are helping to strengthen the County’s agricultural based economic sectors. Plans for expanding the CBP are still being pursued through efforts of the Columbia Basin Development League.

**Threats** Grant County also faces some external threats that could impinge upon their future economic prospects.

- **Farm and manufacturing labor supply.** Maintaining adequate farm labor supply will continue to be a challenge for the future. H-2A and other programs help the agricultural economy by providing adequate labor supply at an economically viable level. However, potential further restrictions on immigration could limit labor supply and affect the competitive advantage of Grant County’s agricultural economy in the global market.

- **Removal of dams on Columbia-Snake River system.** The once-time unthinkable—dismantling the dams on the Columbia-Snake River system—is now being seriously considered by state and federal policymakers. Although Grant County would not be directly impacted (i.e., current discussion does not include the Grant County PUD-operated dams at Priest Rapids and Wanapum), the indirect negative impacts would be felt far and wide within eastern Washington. Regional industries of agriculture and food processing currently enjoy comparative advantages via a balanced multi-modal transportation system; removal of dams would result in the erosion of many cost advantages.
• **PUD dams and transmission/distribution infrastructure.** Aging infrastructure, power
distribution, and transmission facilities are expensive to maintain and are inefficient in
meeting demand. For example, the Wanapum Dam’s recent major repair resulted in a lower
pool for several months. It resulted in limits to power production and expensive upgrades.
Additionally, it impacted recreation and tourism opportunities and caused other impacts to
the environment. These power distribution and transmission facilities need to be upgraded to
meet existing and projected future demand in the County.

5.5 Economic Development Objectives
This section presents six realistic economic development options for Grant County based on the
County’s economic SWOT assessment and discussion with County officials and civic leaders. These
options will help serve as guides for the County to develop and implement a formal economic
development action plan.

5.5.1 **Opportunity 1: Attract New Employers**
Attracting new basic employers for whom there is a comparative advantage to the County will add
employment and income directly. Through the economic multiplier effect, other jobs and income will
also be added within the County. Basic employers can include: a) manufacturing;
b) nonmanufacturing, such as tourist attractions, computer services, and wholesale warehouses; or
c) non-local government. Action steps/policies to meet this goal include the following:

- Identify basic employer(s) with greatest potential through targeted research
- Encourage value-added agricultural production and processing
- Provide adequate, serviced, and environmentally acceptable sites that would meet the full
  range of industrial/business needs and opportunities
- Make the necessary infrastructure investments in transportation, water and sewer,
telecommunications, and other utilities as needed to leverage private investments that create
  jobs
- Identify and organize financial capital resources to assist in attracting new business (e.g.,
  industrial revenue bonds, infrastructure grant/loans)

5.5.2 **Opportunity 2: Cultivate Home-Grown and Start-Up Businesses**
Once overlooked, small cities and rural counties are now discovering that a strong home-grown
business development strategy can often become their most powerful business attraction strategy.
For many smaller communities and rural areas, a more appropriate and realistic approach may be to
grow their own industries job by job than to recruit outside industry.

Every community and area has the opportunity to develop home grown businesses. Most of these
businesses have modest beginnings. They start small and keep overhead to a minimum and remain
flexible. Keeping costs low, these local entrepreneurs can compete effectively with larger, more established competitors. As they gain experience and market visibility, many expand and hire employees. For local economic developers, the bottom line is growth job by job.

Historically, little has been done to take advantage of this opportunity. However, there is much an area or community can do to cultivate and nourish home grown businesses:

- For many areas and communities, a realistic starting point is to identify individuals living in the vicinity who have either recently started a business or have a business idea that they would like to develop. This may include an established business with an interest in developing a new product or business line. First-time entrepreneurs seldom have much knowledge of business management, marketing, business plans, and applicable government regulations. A valuable local area role is establishing a mentoring program—simply matching individuals with business ideas to those able to help develop their ideas. Another possible avenue is to encourage the local high school to establish an entrepreneurship program for students.
- Local area studies of market potential for new retail, wholesale, service, or industry input-providing businesses may identify opportunities for new local establishments.
- Organizing local area capital resources assists new business formation by encouraging investment of private funds locally through the formation of capital groups, or the use of secondary capital markets.
- Providing small business incubators nurtures new local businesses. Typically, these incubators are community- or port-owned facilities that provide low-cost space and technical assistance to help local entrepreneurs turn a hobby into a full-time business and successful component of the local business community.
- Grant County (or Big Bend Community College) should assess the prospects of developing a telecenter. Among the fastest growing occupations into the next century will be within information-based businesses such as data processing, legal research, computer-assisted engineering design, and accounting. A telecenter is similar in concept to a business incubator. Both provide the necessary support for start-up businesses. Telecenters, however, specialize in information-based jobs that can be performed using computers and telecommunication technologies. Individual businesses in Moses Lake, for example, could provide data processing services for large companies located in Olympia, Tacoma, Portland, and Seattle.

5.5.3 Opportunity 3: Diversify the Existing Economic Base

The economy of Grant County has been dependent upon the natural resource-based industries of agriculture production and processing. Agriculture, however diverse, can be seriously affected by market conditions. Much can be done to assist these basic firms; by increasing their competitiveness,
there is a greater likelihood that firms will be retained or expanded within the local area. Action steps/policies recommended include:

- Strengthen the management capacities of existing growers and processors through educational programs
- Encourage business growth through the identification of equity and loan capital sources
- Increase knowledge of new technology through educational programs in agricultural science and engineering
- Assist employers in improving workforce quality through vocational and technical education, employment counseling, and supportive social services
- Develop local infrastructure and technical expertise that improve local business efficiency and access to nonlocal markets
- Sponsor business and industry recognition or appreciation events; although such events do little per se to increase competitiveness, they are effective stimulants in encouraging business leaders to stay within the local area and to expand

5.5.4 **Opportunity 4: Promote Grant County as a Destination for Tourists**

Tourism in the United States has expanded steadily in the past. Driving factors of tourism are more people with greater leisure time and higher income levels. Tourism has become an important economic opportunity for small towns and rural areas that are able to offer travelers a unique experience. Rural tourism can range from bed and breakfast inns to farm vacations to harvest festivals. A common thread to most successful rural tourism efforts is the promotion of rural qualities and natural resources of small town USA. For instance, many rural areas exploit their natural resource heritage or early settlers' ancestry with interpretive centers.

Thousands of vehicles pass through Grant County on U.S. I-90 and U.S. Route 2 each day. Thousands more traverse the County on state routes. The Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development estimates that visitors and tourists spend over $104 million each year in Grant County. Grant County has yet to tap its enormous tourism potential by capturing dollars spent by area travelers and bringing additional tourists to the area.

5.5.5 **Opportunity 5: Promote Local Retail Opportunities**

A serious problem facing many rural areas like Grant County is an increasing tendency by local residents to travel to larger cities for shopping. Residents shopping outside Grant County results in lost business for local merchants. Can Grant County merchants regain some of these shopping dollars lost to surrounding regional shopping areas? It may be possible for Grant County retailers to regain a significant share of its local market within 5 years.
Rural areas and small communities across the nation have successfully implemented a four-point retailing program to bring shoppers back to the local community. These four points are:

3. **Organization.** Early and active participation by merchants, residents, and local government is essential for success in recapturing lost retail sales. Strong organization is the key to achieving the necessary community involvement.

4. **Appearance.** Cleanliness of streets and sidewalks, attractive stores and buildings, interesting window displays, simple but effective in-store merchandising are some elements of community efforts to encourage local shopping.

5. **Promotion.** Shopping locally is partly out of habit. Local businesses must encourage people to patronize their stores by offering special promotions, providing friendly service, supporting local events, and investing in regular advertisements. These efforts help people develop the habit of shopping locally.

6. **Business development.** One of the major reasons why businesses fail is that the needs of their customers’ change, but the businesses don’t. To bring shoppers back, each business needs to make a realistic appraisal of their business. Often by changing long established merchandise lines, improving store appearances, and bettering service, new life can be restored to declining retail businesses.

This approach is not only a prescription for new economic health for local retailers; it may have broader economic development implications. For instance, these requisite steps in bringing back local shoppers are also needed to attract tourists and visitors to the community. Recruiting a major new employer to the area may be unsuccessful unless steps are taken to promote more local shopping.

### 5.5.6 Opportunity 6: Increase Educational Opportunities

As discussed before, educational attainment directly impacts personal earning. For Grant County, multiple educational opportunities should be planned to create a skilled labor force to support a diversified economy. Big Bend Community College offers 2-year degrees on a variety of academic curricula. It offers opportunities for 4-year degrees on certain majors from the Central Washington University, which has a branch campus in Moses Lake. More opportunities and access to college education, and vocational training should be promoted in Grant County.
6 Housing Element

6.1 Introduction
The Housing Element is integrated with all other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The Housing element includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs within the County. Chapter 3 of the Comprehensive Plan identifies goals and policies for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. Chapter 4, Land Use provides analysis to identify sufficient land for multiple housing choices to meet the projected needs of all economic segments of the County.

As growth occurs within Grant County and its incorporated cities, there will be an increasing need for more housing that is affordable and desirable. Growth within the County will most likely occur primarily within the UGAs along with more limited development in rural communities and rural areas. Grant County’s housing goals and policies encourage the development of new housing within the UGAs, Rural Villages, and Rural Communities. Such development should be compatible with the unique character of the County, and should provide for the revitalization of existing service areas as well as for adequate open space. This housing element is intended to guide the location and type of housing that will be built over the next 20 years.
6.2 Existing Conditions

The 2015 American Community Survey data indicates 35,391 housing units currently exist in the County. About 86% of the total housing units are occupied, with 14% vacant units. About 61% of the housing units are owner-occupied and 39% renter-occupied (Table 6-1).

Table 6-1
Grant County Housing Types and Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Types</th>
<th>Estimate in 2015</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing units</td>
<td>35,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>30,358</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>5,033</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>18,369</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>11,989</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Types</th>
<th>Estimate in 2015</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>19,302</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>9,787</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, and other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey (U.S. Census Bureau 2015)

Single-family stick-built housing is the predominant type throughout the County followed by mobile homes. In 2015, 58% of all units were single-family stick-built, 28% were single-family mobile homes or factory assembled structures, and 14% were multi-family dwellings (U.S. Census Bureau 2015). Unincorporated Grant County contains the majority of the housing stock, which equals to approximately 56% of the total housing inventory. In the County, large lot single-family homes in rural settings with accessory structures continue to be the preferred housing type. These are mostly developed on 5 acre or larger lots. The 1 acre lots also include larger single-family homes compared to homes in the County’s urban areas. There are smaller lot homes in the LAMIRDS within the County. The, and the unincorporated County also has a large number of mobile homes (Table 6-2.).

The average countywide household size in Grant County has increased from 2.6 persons in 2006 to 3 in 2015. Despite the variety of housing types in Grant County, there continues to be a need for farmworker housing in the rural areas of the unincorporated County where the farmworker
population seasonally increases each year. Table 6-2 indicates the distribution of housing in the cities and unincorporated areas.

### Table 6-2
**Housing Mix, Cities in Grant County, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Single-family</th>
<th>Multi-family</th>
<th>Mobile Homes&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total Dwellings&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>20,580</td>
<td>4,985</td>
<td>9,787</td>
<td>35,352</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>8,254</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>16,077</td>
<td>45.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulee City</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric City</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrata</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Coulee</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartline</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krupp</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>5,857</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>8,555</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap Lake</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Creek</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Includes mobile homes and manufactured housing as defined in sub-section 6.3.5.
2. Does not include RVs, boats, or vans

Source: American Community Survey (U.S. Census Bureau 2015)

### 6.2.1 Income and Affordability

The term affordable, when used with regard to housing, is usually relative to a specific economic segment of the population. According to the HUD, families who pay more than 30% of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation, and medical care. In Grant County, the housing affordability is particularly severe among the low-income population, the farmworker population, the special needs population, and the Hispanic population, which also includes many farmworkers and their families. Based on 2015 Census data, the median home value in Grant County is $157,500. Market data indicated median home price in 2017 at $199,000 (Zillow 2017). The data also indicate median household
income for Grant County is $48,714, which is approximately 80% of the State’s median household income of $61,062. (Table 6-3).

Table 6-3
Percentage of Households Per Income Range Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below $25,000</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $25,000 and $49,999</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $50,000 and $74,999</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $50,000 and $99,999</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and above</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2015

6.2.2  Condition of Housing Stock

Most of the existing housing stock was built 20 to 50 years ago (See Table 6-4). The majority of the older houses—built between 1940 and 1955—are modest in size and were built to varying standards. Therefore, if they are not well maintained, they could be in need of substantial repair work. These homes are assets that need to be maintained, and there is only a minimal amount of funds available from the Farm Home Administration to repair homes of lower income families. About 62% of the existing homes were built more than 25 years ago and some more than 50 years ago. In addition, there is a large stock of standard mobile homes in the County that are fairly old. These mobile homes are now obsolete, yet they continue to provide a source of housing for many people in Grant County.

More than half of the housing units in Grant County in 2017 were served by a public or private sanitary sewer system, and over 70% received water from a public or private water system.

Table 6-4
Age of Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Percent of Total Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 or later</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 2009</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1989</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1969</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 and earlier</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2015
6.3 Needs Assessment

6.3.1 Population Projections and Future Housing Needs

Based on the OFM 20-year projection, Grant County's countywide population is estimated to be 130,272 in the year 2038. The unincorporated areas of the County currently maintain about 40% share of the total countywide population. The OFM “medium” series estimates indicate that Grant County can expect a population increase of 37,299 by the year 2038. Considering an annual growth rate of 1.0%, and a 40% share of the County's total population projection for 2038, the unincorporated County is estimated to add 10,178 additional people. At an estimated ratio of 3 residents per household, this increase in population would require up to 3,393 new homes in the next 20 years.

The population and land use projections contained in Chapter 4, Land Use form the basis for the projections of housing need. As discussed in Table 4-9, Land Availability for Future Housing Units, Grant County has adequate land supply to accommodate future land use and housing demand. The County also has plentiful water supply in most of the UGAs and in the unincorporated areas, except for a few areas as discussed in Section 4.6.

Rural Lands

In order for the County to meet its housing needs for the next 20 years, an adequate amount of land must be available to absorb new housing construction. As discussed above, approximately 3,796 new dwelling units are required to accommodate the expected population increase through 2038 in the unincorporated area of the County. To determine if adequate vacant, buildable land will be available, each rural land use designation was evaluated to determine the potential dwelling units that could be provided.

As shown in Chapter 4, the unincorporated County areas provide sufficient land to accommodate approximately 7,815 new dwelling units. This greatly exceeds the 3,796 dwelling units that will be needed through the year 2038.

The rural land use goals and policies of this Plan will protect the existing rural character of the land in Grant County. Urban sprawl will be minimized. Retention of resource lands and natural resource based economic activities will be encouraged. Outdoor recreation and other activities requiring open space will be promoted. Fish and wildlife and other sensitive habitats will not be adversely impacted by the rural development contemplated by these designations.

Urban Growth Areas

To determine if adequate vacant, buildable land will be available, each unincorporated UGA was evaluated to determine the potential dwelling units that could be provided.
Table 4-9, Land Availability for Future Housing Units in Unincorporated UGAs in Chapter 4, Land Use provides: 1) an estimate of the vacant buildable residential land within each UGA; and 2) the number of potential housing units within each UGA. This considers a density of 2 dwelling units per acres.

A total of 3393 new dwelling units are required to accommodate the population growth projected for the County. As shown in Table 4-9, the unincorporated UGAs provide sufficient land to accommodate approximately 6,115 new dwelling units.

6.3.2 Future Considerations

GMA requires that housing goals and policies emphasize housing affordability. Grant County must encourage affordable housing through its zoning and development regulations; establish an orderly process for distributing fair share housing funds; work in tandem with nonprofit housing organizations; and support programs that rehabilitate and preserve existing housing.

Grant County is able to provide adequate land to meet housing needs through the year 2038. Land, however, is not the only consideration. The challenge lies in adequately providing for the low- and moderate-income households.

By working to encourage the availability of affordable housing for all economic segments of the population, the community can address a fundamental human and community need. Addressing housing needs countywide requires a regional approach that involves all levels of government, including federal, state, and local, and private sector partnerships. Each community has a responsibility for meeting its fair share obligations to provide affordable housing throughout Grant County.

One way to help maintain affordable housing is to allow home occupations and businesses within existing residential structures. The State has recognized the value of such allowances by providing family daycare providers [12 or fewer children RCW 74.15.020(f)] to be established in all residential and commercial zones. Home occupations may be regulated to ensure the goals and policies of the governing jurisdiction and land use requirements are met. The County also allows manufactured housing within neighborhoods with regulations as required by the law.

6.3.3 Farmworker and H-2A Housing

Grant County is dependent on seasonal laborers for its agricultural industry in order to meet harvest and agricultural labor requirements. Farmworker families are traveling from Texas, California, or Mexico to harvest crops and then returning home. This has created demand of seasonal housing for the farmworker population including H-2A housing. The term H-2A applies to migrant "guest worker" program mostly related to farmworkers. The program is administered by the Employment Security Department, and oversight by U.S. Department of Labor. Employers must provide housing at
no cost to H-2A workers and to workers in corresponding employment who are not reasonably able to return to their residence within the same day. Housing must meet all safety requirements. Employers must also provide food and transportation.

The temporary worker housing is also regulated under RCW 70.114A.050. According to RCW, such housing is located on a rural worksite, and used for workers employed on the worksite, shall be considered a permitted use at the rural worksite for the purposes of zoning or other land use review processes, subject only to height, setback, and road access requirements of the underlying zone.

Services to support H-2A housing are provided through law enforcement, fire, and other public services, but employers and the program requirements help to meet these needs. H-2A housing development is expected to continue to support the County’s agricultural economy. The County will continue to monitor development and evaluate any service adjustments necessary to support this type of housing along with other farmworker housing.

Outside of the H-2A program, farm owners are not required by law to provide housing for workers. Some growers, however, recognize the importance of providing temporary farmworker housing, and that providing such housing can offer a strong incentive to workers.

Careful consideration to address this need is important as this may lead to overcrowding of temporary houses for farmworkers. In rural areas with inadequate water and sewer systems, overcrowding results in health problems and environmental pollution. In addition, adequate transportation and access should be available for the safety of farmworkers.

6.3.4 Housing Type and Mix

The average population growth rate for the entire County in the last decade has been about 1.1%. Much of the new growth is expected in the cities and among the Hispanic segment of the population. According to 2015 U.S. Census Bureau data, Hispanic or Latino population constitutes about 40% of the total population. The growth of low-income households has placed demand on the housing industry to provide low to moderate income housing throughout the County. Likewise, Grant County is faced with meeting the housing needs of its special populations such as the developmentally and physically challenged.

The demands call for County housing policies that support choice and flexibility in housing types, density, and location. This in turn will allow the real estate and development communities to be responsive to the changing needs of the housing continuum. The County’s special needs policies and regulations encourage flexibility that allow creative housing options (e.g., accessory unit construction, single room occupancy, clustering, manufactured housing). Accessory dwelling units are allowed in the County and provide a viable option to meet the housing demand. Furthermore, County policies must support codes, ordinances, and site plans that encourage development of
special needs housing, and public/private investment in these projects. According to the GMA, certain classes of housing cannot be treated differently. This includes housing for the disabled (RCW 36.70A.410), family daycare providers RCW (36.70A.450) and manufactured housing (RCW 35.21.684).

6.3.5 **Manufactured/Mobile Housing**

Mobile homes are defined as single-family residences transportable in one or more sections that are 8 feet or more in width and 32 feet or more in length, built on a permanent chassis, designed to be used as a permanent dwelling, and constructed before June 15, 1976. Manufactured housing, in contrast, is more durable and less mobile in nature and was constructed after June 15, 1976, in accordance with the HUD requirements for manufactured housing.

Deteriorating conditions often plague aging mobile homes, which are often occupied by low-income owners and renters. Health and safety hazards include neglected gas and electricity hook-ups, faulty plumbing, and inadequate weatherization. State housing funds cannot be used to rehabilitate mobile homes built before June 15, 1976. As discussed above in Section 7.4.3, manufactured housing cannot be treated differently than traditional housing structures (RCW 35.21.684).

6.3.6 **Housing Density**

Most of the cities within Grant County are planning for phased growth. Phased growth means that development will occur in stages, with the first phase occurring within designated UGAs that are already served by public water and/or sewer. The second phase of growth will occur in the outlying areas of the designated UGAs where services do not presently exist but are planned. Housing density in the UGAs support infill development, higher density zoning, and smaller lot sizes.

Rural area housing densities are lower than UGA densities. There are four rural land designations: Rural Residential, Rural Remote, Urban Reserve, and Rural Resource. Although densities vary by category, the Urban Reserve areas will have the most opportunity for higher density in the future. Density in the Urban Reserve areas will increase over time by cluster development and infill policies when these areas can be served by local public services and facilities.

6.3.7 **Housing Finance**

Nonprofit and private finance sectors, as well as the County, play an important role in housing finance. A healthy and complete housing finance system joins all three sectors in a manner that most appropriately reflects public purpose, capital requirements, costs, interest rates, and other influences on the financial markets.

The Housing Authority of Grant County serves as the County’s resource for administering funds for a number of housing programs aimed at low-income households, special need populations, and first-
time home buyers. In recent years the Housing Authority has taken on grants to provide emergency assistance to those experiencing homelessness (Housing Authority of Grant County 2017).

6.3.8 Housing Rehabilitation

In many cases, rehabilitation of existing houses is the most cost-effective way to increase and preserve the number of affordable housing units. However, repairing roofs, walls, and foundations are some of the more costly home repairs. Although expensive, correcting these deficiencies provides a multitude of benefits. For example, insurance companies may be more inclined to issue homeowners' policies for homes in good repair than to those in need of substantial repair. Fire insurance premiums may be higher in substandard housing. Deteriorated housing can also result in high heating bills, which presents an added economic hardship to the occupant.

Rehabilitation and weatherization programs are important means to maintain the County’s older housing stock. Low- and moderate-income residents are eligible for a number of rehabilitation programs. The following is a sample of the state, federal, and local rehabilitation programs available to County residents:

Housing Preservation Grant Program. Funded by USDA, Rural Development. Nonprofit organizations are eligible to apply for grants to rehabilitate housing of very low and low-income households.

Home Investment in Affordable Housing Program. Funded by the HUD. Funds are disbursed by DCTED. Cities and counties are eligible to apply for rehabilitation programs on behalf of low- and moderate-income homeowners and renters.

Community Development Block Grant. Funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Eligible applicants are Native American homeowners.

Habitat for Humanity. Encourages participation of homeowner and volunteers in rehabilitating and constructing housing.

Home Improvement Loans and Repair Loans and Grants. Funded by USDA, Rural Development. Individuals are eligible homeowners with very low incomes.

Housing Improvement Program. Funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Eligible applicants are Native American homeowners.
Weatherization Grants. Weatherization grants may be used for rehabilitation projects that increase protection of the house from weather. The following programs are available:

- **Energy Matchmakers Program**: Funded by Washington State Capital Budget and disbursed by DCTED. Eligible applicants are cities; eligible beneficiaries are lower income renters and homeowners.
- **Indian Housing Program**: Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program, funded by HUD. Housing Authorities are eligible applicants; Native American occupants of assisted housing are beneficiaries.
- **Weatherization Program**: Funded by the U.S. Department of Energy and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; administered by Commerce. Individuals are eligible applicants; eligible beneficiaries are low-income renters and homeowners.
- **Weatherization Program**: Funded by Bonneville Power Administration; disbursed by DCTED. Eligible applicants are low-income homeowners who have electrically-heated homes.

6.3.9 Public Housing Assistance

The federal government subsidizes construction of housing units under public housing assistance programs. The tenants living in these units have their rents subsidized so that they only pay 30% of their income for housing. Those living in assisted units takes families out of the category of a household in need of assistance.

The Grant County Housing Authority administers several assisted housing programs as indicated in Table 6-5.

**Table 6-5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8 Larson</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Worker Mattawa</td>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmentally Disabled</td>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza</td>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Housing Authority of Grant County 2014
6.3.10 Special Housing Needs

While this housing sector is not a large one, it is one that has been historically difficult to provide for. Meeting this housing need often relies on federal grant funding and benevolence of charitable or social organizations. Following is a discussion of several of the special housing needs of Grant County.

Elderly and Frail Elderly

Grant County continues to be a retirement destination location. A rise in the proportion of senior households will have an impact on the future housing needs in Grant County.

The elderly are considered a special needs group because of the high correlation between age and disability. Also, many seniors live on a fixed income that makes high housing costs prohibitive. If they own their home, they may not be able to afford the cost of increasing property tax, insurance, or maintenance. Also, a fixed income may not permit them to rent a new apartment in a new facility that would provide them with a full range of care services.

“Frail elderly” are elderly that have one or more Limitations to Activities to Daily Living (LADLs) or Instrumental Activities to Daily Living (IADLs). That is, they may need assistance to perform routine activities of daily living.

An LADL (difficulty eating, bathing, toileting, etc. by oneself) is more limiting than an IADL (difficulty using the telephone, getting outside, shopping, doing light housework, etc. by oneself). We assume that elderly persons need supportive housing assistance if they are both frail and low income since supportive housing assistance offers both services to compensate for frailty and financial assistance to offset low income. Local estimates of the number of frail elderly and their supportive housing needs are not available.

Physically Disabled

Future housing policy decisions must meet the needs of physically challenged persons. The greatest need is among the elderly. These people may need special housing with ramps instead of stairs, elevators for units with two or more stories, and modified facilities.

The federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) outlines accessible housing options. The 1990 law requires changes to building and zoning codes to improve access for disabled persons. The codes apply to both new construction and to major rehabilitation. Older units, particularly older multi-family structures, are very expensive to retrofit for disabled occupants because space is rarely available to modify elevator shafts, add ramps, and widen doorways. Much of the existing multi-family housing (traditionally the more affordable housing) cannot be economically modified to meet the needs of disabled residents.
Homeless shelters are finding themselves out of compliance with the ADA and are faced with the need to accommodate this population. In order to meet ADA standards, they are attempting to retrofit old buildings, which is expensive and difficult.

6.3.11 Affordable Housing Programs
A number of state and federal initiatives are aimed at fulfilling basic housing needs and expanding home ownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income citizens. A few of the programs are discussed below.

Department of Housing and Urban Development
In Washington State, HUD helps to provide reduced rent apartments for low-income tenants by working with apartment owners to offer reduced rents apartments. Section 8 Housing is currently administered by the Grant County Housing Authority.

Washington State Housing Finance Commission
The Washington State Housing Finance Commission (WSHFC) is a secondary lending institution that works to open the doors of opportunity for low- to moderate-income residents of the state by creating successful housing finance programs. The WSHFC’s single-family programs assist first-time homebuyers by offering low interest mortgage loans through participating lenders. Eligible borrowers cannot make more than 80% of the County’s median income, adjusted for family size. The program also includes a down payment assistance subsidy.

The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program is a federally sponsored incentive program administered by the WSHFC. It provides a dollar-for-dollar reduction in federal tax-liability to developers of multi-family apartments who agree to reserve a percentage of units for low-income renters and to restrict rents within a prescribed level. Developers can sell tax credits to investors who purchase a partnership interest in the property. This process allows the developer to raise funds required to finance the project.

Department of Commerce Housing Division
One key component of the Housing division of Commerce is the Housing Trust Fund, which provides loans and grants to local governments, nonprofit organizations, and public housing authorities to increase the availability and affordability of low-income and special needs housing. Eligible activities include:

- New construction
- Rehabilitation or acquisition of housing or homeless shelters
- Rent or mortgage guarantees and subsidies
- Matching funds for social services directly related to providing housing for special needs groups in assisted projects
- Pre-construction technical assistance
- Technical assistance, design, consultation, administrative costs, and finance services for eligible nonprofit, community, or neighborhood-based organizations.
- Down payment or closing cost assistance for eligible first-time home buyers
- Acquisition of housing units for preservation purposes as low-income or very low-income housing
- Accessible housing for low-income families
7 Transportation Element

7.1 Introduction

A safe and efficient transportation system for the movement of people and goods is needed to support existing and future development. The GMA has very specific requirements for transportation elements. To meet these requirements, Grant County has prepared this element which includes a transportation inventory, land use assumptions, travel forecasts, LOS standards, current and future transportation needs, and a transportation financial plan.

The purpose of this plan element is to identify the types, location and extent of existing and proposed transportation facilities and services (air, water and land including transit systems, pedestrian and bicycle uses).

7.2 Relationship to Other Plans

7.2.1 Growth Management Act Requirements

This transportation element has been developed in accordance with Section 36.70A.070 of the GMA to address transportation needs in Grant County. It represents the County’s policy plan for the next 20 years and specifically considers the location and condition of the existing traffic circulation
system, the projected transportation needs, and plans for addressing future transportation needs while maintaining established LOS standards. According to the GMA this element must include:

- Land use assumptions used in estimating travel;
- An overview of facilities and service needs;
- An analysis of funding capability and a multi-year financing plan to fund the needed improvements;
- Intergovernmental coordination efforts; and
- Demand-manage strategies.

The following goal of the GMA (RCW 36.70A.020 (3) relates to transportation:

**Goal (3) Transportation** – Encourage efficient multi-modal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with County and city comprehensive plans.

**7.2.2 County-Wide Planning Policies**

The adopted Grant CWPP calls for all county jurisdictions to coordinate planning efforts, including provision of current and future utilities, to address future growth in a coherent manner that leads to more efficient delivery of transportation facilities and services.

Generally, the CWPP state:

- A County-wide transportation plan should be developed pursuant to the GMA that is consistent with the land use element of the comprehensive plan.
- Transportation development and improvements should be concurrent with future commercial, residential and other land use development.
- The County-wide transportation planning effort should produce a methodology to evaluate the impact of development proposals and to identify necessary transportation improvements.
- County-wide transportation facility standards should be established by the County.
- A County and regional review process should be established to coordinate transportation programming decisions and to ensure consistency with the regional transportation plan. Transportation priority programming methods should be used to establish the six-year transportation plan.
- The finance element of the transportation plan should show the ability of the County to fund existing and proposed transportation improvements in the unincorporated areas of the County.
- The County should strive through transportation system management strategies to optimize the use and maintenance of existing roads in order to minimize the construction costs and impacts associated with roadway facility expansion.
• The County should establish consistent roadway standards, LOS standards and methodologies, and functional classification schemes to ensure consistency throughout the County.

• State, regional, or county facilities that generate substantial travel demand should be sited along or near major transportation and/or public transit corridors.

• The County should seek to foster a transportation system that is planned, balanced and compatible with land use densities so that adequate mobility and movement of goods and people can be maintained.

7.2.3 Quad County Regional Transportation Plan

In addition to the GMA, comprehensive plans should be consistent with adopted regional policies. In December 2016, the Quad County (QUADCO) Regional Transportation Planning Organization Regional Transportation Plan for 2017 to 2037 was adopted (QUADCO 2016a). Each City or Town and the County shall have their transportation plans certified by QUADCO, to ensure coordination of transportation facilities. The four counties comprising the QUADCO include Adams, Grant, Kittitas and Lincoln.

Goals and objectives for the Quad-County Regional Transportation Plan address various transportation topics, including:

• **Safety:** Improving transportation and pedestrian safety

• **Preservation:** Preserving and extending the useful life of prior transportation system investments (including roads, bridges, and other transportation modes)

• **Economic vitality:** Enhancing the region’s economic vitality by promoting and developing transportation systems that stimulate, support, and enhance the movement of people and goods, recreation and tourism, and access to jobs

• **Mobility:** Enhancing the mobility of people and goods throughout the region by providing an interconnected transportation system and opportunities for choosing different transportation modes

• **Environment:** Protecting the region’s environment and high quality of life through transportation investments that promote energy conservation, enhance healthy communities, and protect the environment.

• **Stewardship:** Improving the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of the region’s transportation system and growing communities with cost effective investments that have public support
7.2.4 Grant County Comprehensive Transit Plan and Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan

In 1995, Grant County voters approved a four-tenths of one percent sales tax to support the implementation of the Grant Transit Authority (GTA). Today the transit authority provides transit services throughout the County, including buses to established routes, vanpools, curb to curb services for individuals with special transportation needs, and other rider programs.

The Grant County Comprehensive Transit Plan, the GTA Transit Development Plan, and the QUADCO Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan, as amended in 2016 (QUADCO 2016b), are hereby incorporated by reference into this Comprehensive Plan.

7.3 Needs and Opportunities

7.3.1 Safety

All citizens place considerable importance on the safety of the transportation system. Accidents are not only traumatic on a personal level, but are also costly for society. These costs are felt in the form of increased medical costs, lost work time and economic productivity, and loss of property and possessions. Maintaining and improving the Grant County transportation system should aid in reducing or preventing accidents.

7.3.2 Mobility

Efficient movement of people, freight and goods is very important because it enhances the economic vitality of the region. Population is projected to increase over the planning period and the vehicle miles traveled are projected to increase as well. Economic development can be improved or enhanced by careful selection of transportation improvements. The existing transportation infrastructure represents a significant investment of capital and labor. To protect this investment, the capacity and condition of the system need to be maintained. Maintaining or improving the transportation system will ensure that the quality of life and economic vitality are not degraded.

7.3.3 Commodities Movement

Commodities movement, especially farm-to-market transport, is critical to the economy of Grant County. Given the rural and agricultural nature of the county and region, it is important to consider truck volumes and loads. County agreements with the USBR as part of the CBP require the County to maintain all farm-to-market roads as all-weather roads, open to legal loads at all times.

7.3.4 Alternative Modes

For most of the County's history, transportation improvements have emphasized the movement of motorized vehicles, especially automobiles and trucks. Alternative modes, such as bicycling and
walking, have been receiving additional emphasis in recent years. It is expected that the automobile will continue to account for the majority of transportation trips in the foreseeable future, both in the number of trips and in the distance traveled. However, there is a growing recognition that alternative non-motorized modes can play an important role in the transportation system, especially for relatively short trips. Encouraging these modes can lessen congestion, reduce maintenance of the built infrastructure, and reduce air pollution while providing health benefits to the users.

Continued development of paths and trails for pedestrian and bicycle use in Grant County remains an import part of the Transportation Improvement Plan.

7.4 System Inventory
This section of the Transportation element describes the existing transportation system in Grant County.

7.4.1 General System Description
The County provides a system of roadways within unincorporated Grant County. State highways, airports, city streets, park-and-ride lots, and a transit system are owned and operated by other governmental agencies. Rail services, taxi services, and other bus services are privately owned and operated. This Transportation Element focuses on facilities owned and operated by Grant County. Other transportation facilities owned and operated by other service providers are only briefly discussed.

7.4.2 County Roads

Functional Classifications
Grant County’s roadway system is divided into classes according to the function of each roadway segment. A classification defines the major role of a road within the complete existing and future roadway network. Grant County’s functional classification system is consistent with federal and state standards for roadway systems.

According to WSDOT, a roadway’s functional classification is based on an evaluation of a number of criteria, including the type and magnitude of travel generators, route feasibility and directness of travel, traffic characteristics and trip length, and spacing between and continuity of functional classes. Grant County uses nine different federal functional classifications – six urban and three rural classifications, as follows:

• **Urban Principal Arterials**: provide a network of streets and highways that can be identified as unusually significant. They are important both because they provide routes for traffic passing through the area and because they provide routes for movements within the urbanized area. Access to these routes is usually limited to intersections.
• **Urban Minor Arterials**: connect with and augment principal arterials, serving trips of moderate length. They place more emphasis on access than principal arterials, but still emphasize mobility over access. These streets provide continuity within communities.

• **Urban Collector Arterials**: provide both access service and traffic circulation within neighborhoods. These streets also collect traffic from local streets in neighborhoods and channel it to arterials.

• **Urban Local Access**: provide direct access to abutting properties and to the higher classification facilities. Service to through traffic is usually discouraged.

• **Rural Major Arterials**: connect rural communities to each other and to urban areas.

• **Rural Minor Arterials**: in conjunction with Rural Major Arterials, the rural minor arterials form a rural network that links cities together with other major traffic generators. Minor arterials should be expected to provide for relatively high overall travel speeds with minimum interference to through movement.

• **Rural Major Collectors**: provide service to larger towns and traffic generators of importance. They link population centers and serve important travel corridors within the County.

• **Rural Minor Collectors**: collect traffic from local access roads and provide access to major collectors. They link smaller communities and locally important traffic generators.

• **Rural Local Access**: provide access to adjacent land. They are used to travel relatively short distances.

Roadways within Grant County are designated according to the guidelines of the Federal Highway Administration and WSDOT as mandated by RCW 47.05.021.

In this Element, the term “arterials” refers collectively to urban principal arterials, urban minor arterials, urban collector arterials, rural major arterials, rural minor arterials, rural major collectors, and rural minor collectors. These roads make up what is referred to as the “primary” roadway system. Urban and rural local access roads are collectively referred to as “access” roads in this Element.

**Non-Motorized**

Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are provided primarily at limited points within city limits and in the immediate vicinity of larger urban areas. Moses Lake has designated bicycle routes as do other communities, such as Wilson Creek, with a bike and pedestrian path next to the Wilson Creek waterway. SR 2 crosses the northern portion of the county, and provides arterial service to cross-country cyclists.
7.4.3  Non-County Public Transportation Systems

Description
Other service providers within the County, including WSDOT, the 15 cities and towns, and the GTA, also maintain and operate public transportation systems. WSDOT is responsible for a system of freeways and highways; the cities and towns are responsible for their own roadway systems within their respective city limits.

Federal and State Highways
There are 12 state highways in Grant County. Interstate 90 is the major route for travel to destinations within and through the County. State highways include:

- **Interstate 90** – crosses through the County from the Columbia River through Moses Lake and heads east to Spokane;
- **SR 24** – is classified as a minor arterial and connects the Mattawa area to Othello and Yakima;
- **SR 243** – provides access from Mattawa to Vantage and provides arterial access to the Tri-Cities;
- **SR 26** – provides arterial access from the Royal Slope area to I-90 westerly, and easterly to Washtucna in Adams County;
- **SR 262** – serves the Potholes recreation area;
- **SR 17** – is a major north-south route from the Coulee City area to Warden. The segment between I-90 and US-395 is listed on the National Highway System;
- **SR 170** – provides access to the City of Warden;
- **SR 281** – connects SR 28 from Wenatchee, through Quincy and south to I-90;
- **SR 283** – provides the Ephrata to I-90 link;
- **SR 2** – traverses east-west through the northern portion of the county, from Coulee City to Hartline. It is included on the National Highway System;
- **SR 28** – runs from the Columbia River through Wilson Creek and east into Lincoln County;
- **SR 282** – provides access from Ephrata to Moses Lake;
- **SR 174** – runs through the City of Grand Coulee and provides access to Douglas County to the north and west and Lincoln County to the east;
- **SR 155** – is a minor arterial connecting the Grand Coulee area to the rest of the County; and
- **SR 171** – is the Moses Lake urban access route.

Public Transportation Providers
GTA provides fixed route service within Grant County and provides service connections to the following facilities:

- Amtrak Depot, Ephrata
- Grant County International Airport
Greyhound Bus Lines depots
Trailways Bus Lines, Moses Lake

GTA also provides services to several private schools, Big Bend Community College and several parks in the County. Other public transportation providers in Grant County include private inter-city bus services such as Greyhound Bus Lines and others, which provide connections with the urban public transportation systems available outside the county.

Airport Facilities
Aviation in Grant County has been of significant importance since the 1940s when the U.S. Army established airfields in Moses Lake and Ephrata. The Grant County International Airport, with one of the longest runways in the United States, is a world-class heavy jet commercial and defense aircraft manufacturing, testing, and training facility for the Boeing Company, Mitsubishi Aircraft, and the United States military. The Ephrata Municipal Airport serves recreational aircraft, in particular, glider and aerobatics clubs that host events there. Other airports exist in the County. All airports in the County are classified consistent with the FAA system by the WSDOT Aeronautics Division, in accordance with FAA Order 5090.313, Field Formulation of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPAIS) as:

- Primary Service (PR)
- Commercial Service (CM)
- Reliever (RL)
- General Aviation (GA)

Non-NPAIS airports are classified by WSDOT, Aeronautics Division, as:

- State Owned/Operated Airports (S)
- Municipally Owned Airports (M)
- Private Ownership Public Use Airports (PP)

Grant County airports and their classifications are presented in Table 7-1. Airports are also classified based on their physical facilities, including landing and navigational aids, and airspace classification.

Table 7-1
Grant County Airports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airport</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPAIS Airports:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County International</td>
<td>General Aviation (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrata Municipal</td>
<td>General Aviation (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Coulee Dam</td>
<td>General Aviation (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-NPAIS Airports:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Municipal</td>
<td>Municipally Owned Airports (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Creek</td>
<td>Municipally Owned Airports (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden Municipal</td>
<td>Municipally Owned Airports (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake Municipal</td>
<td>Municipally Owned Airports (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Aire</td>
<td>Private Ownership Public Use Airports (PP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: QUADCO 2016a and WSDOT 2017

**Railway Facilities**

Rail service within Grant County is provided by Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF), Palouse River and Coulee City (PCC) Rail System, and Columbia Basin Railroad. The BNSF main line parallels SR 28 west of Quincy and runs east to Lincoln County. This is the principal service route between the Puget Sound area, Spokane and points east. the PCC Rail system is the northernmost route which extends from Coulee City to Lincoln County, paralleling SR 2 and is owned by WSDOT and operated by the PCC Railroad Authority. The Columbia Basin Railroad operates one line through Grant County from Moses Lake to Pasco.

**TDM Facilities**

Transportation Demand Management facilities manage demand for transportation services by providing opportunities to reduce the number of vehicles using the roadway system. Transportation Demand Management facilities can include park-and-ride or park-and-pool lots, carpool or vanpool programs, subsidized transit, or high-occupancy vehicle lanes. In Grant County, WSDOT currently operates several park-and-ride or park-and-pool lots.

**7.5 Concurrency**

One of the goals of the GMA is to have transportation systems in place concurrent with development. This concept is known as “concurrency.” In Grant County concurrency means:

- Transportation systems to serve the development shall be in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is made to provide the facilities within a six-year period of development; and
- Such transportation systems have sufficient capacity to serve development without decreasing LOS below minimum standards adopted in this Transportation Element.

The GMA requires concurrency for transportation facilities. Concurrency management procedures will be developed to ensure that sufficient transportation system capacity is available for all proposed development.
7.6 Level of Service

This element contains Grant County’s plan to provide specified levels of transportation service in a timely manner. Through the use of LOS ratings, the County characterizes the quality of service provided by roadways. The LOS standards in this Plan and in the County’s UDC will be maintained through upkeep of the existing circulation system and expansion of transportation services where needed.

The GMA requires that LOS standards be adopted for all major routes to serve as a gauge for judging performance of the transportation system.

7.6.1 Capacity-based Level of Service

For this Plan, the County is using a capacity-based system of establishing LOS.

For a capacity-based LOS, the County has applied an A through F LOS standard as the minimum criteria for the quality of service provided at peak hours and average daily conditions for roadway segments on all arterials and collectors. The standard is based on the ratio of volume (V) to capacity (C) as shown in Table 7-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS Category</th>
<th>Volume to Capacity (V/C)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>V/C&lt;0.60</td>
<td>Primarily free-flow traffic operations at average travel speeds. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Stopped delays at intersections are minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.60&lt;V/C&lt;0.70</td>
<td>Reasonably unimpeded stable traffic flow operations at average travel speeds. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and stopped delays are not bothersome. Drivers are not generally subjected to appreciable tensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.70&lt;V/C&lt;0.80</td>
<td>Stable traffic flow operations. However, ability to maneuver and change lanes may be more restricted than in LOS B, and longer queues and/or adverse signal coordination may contribute to lower average travel speeds. Motorists will experience appreciable tension while driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.80&lt;V/C&lt;0.90</td>
<td>Small increases in traffic flow may cause substantial increases in approach delays and, hence, decreases in speed. This may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or some combination of these. High density traffic restricts maneuverability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.90&lt;V/C&lt;1.0</td>
<td>Unstable traffic flow. Significant delays in traffic flow operations and lower operating speeds. Conditions are caused by some combination of adverse progression, high signal density, extensive queuing at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing. Considerable delay, volume at or near capacity. Freedom to maneuver is extremely difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>V/C&gt;1.0</td>
<td>Traffic flow operations at extremely low speeds. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized locations, with high approach delays resulting. Adverse signal progression is frequently a contributor to this condition. Very low speeds, volumes exceed capacity, long delays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant County has adopted the following LOS standards for local roads (Grant County UDC Chapter 25.20):

- LOS B  County Roads outside of UGAs and Rural Activity Centers
- LOS D  County Roads within Rural Activity Centers

### 7.6.2 Existing and Projected Levels of Service

Transportation elements of GMA comprehensive plans must include an identification of current and forecast needs and a financial analysis of how identified needs might be addressed concerning the regional transportation system, including state highways. Table 7-3 identifies the existing LOS for 2017 and the forecasted LOS for the most highly traveled segments of county roadways within Grant County. Table 7-4 describes the existing and forecasted average daily traffic volume for state facilities.

As described in previous sections, the population of Grant County is predicted to increase significantly over current levels. Most of this growth is expected to occur within the incorporated and UGAs of the county. There will also be an increase in travel on the state facilities by vehicles passing through Grant County.

The present roadway system operates reasonably well. Congestion and delay measured at primary roadway and intersections indicate LOS are acceptable throughout the regional system. Each of the roads listed currently exceed the County LOS B standard, and this is projected to continue at least through 2037.

#### Table 7-3
2017 and 2037 Existing and Projected Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Daily Vehicle Capacity</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic Volume</th>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017 Levels of Service Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-SW</td>
<td>West of Mattawa</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-SE</td>
<td>South of I-90</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>South of I-90</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>North of SR 283</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodson</td>
<td>South of I-90</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>North of Moses Lake</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2037 Levels of Service Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-SW</td>
<td>W. of Mattawa</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>8,470</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-SE</td>
<td>South of I-90</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>South of I-90</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>North of SR 283</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodson</td>
<td>South of I-90</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>North of Moses Lake</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route</td>
<td>Begin Mile Post</td>
<td>End Mile Post</td>
<td>Functional Class</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Lanes Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>139.9</td>
<td>207.78</td>
<td>3 Rural Other Principal Arterial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>50.66</td>
<td>2 Rural Freeway/ Expressway</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.66</td>
<td>144.29</td>
<td>2 Rural Freeway/ Expressway</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>79.64</td>
<td>4 Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>2 Rural Freeway/ Expressway</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.89</td>
<td>4 Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>52.89</td>
<td>93.72</td>
<td>4 Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>110.14</td>
<td>179.47</td>
<td>1 Rural Interstate</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>179.47</td>
<td>221.25</td>
<td>1 Rural Interstate</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>4 Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>5 Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3 Urban Other Principal Arterial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.66</td>
<td>4 Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>4 Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>5 Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>3 Rural Other Principal Arterial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2 Rural Freeway/ Expressway</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>4 Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2815PBurke</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1 Rural Interstate</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The County is not responsible for traffic effects on highway segments in cities, and WSDOT sets LOSs on Highways of Statewide Significance. In November 2017, WSDOT released the 2017 Project Delivery Plan, a detailed county-level 8-year list of capital improvement and preservation (maintenance and operations) projects and costs for the years 2017 through 2025. Funding decisions at WSDOT are the responsibility of the Department, as are decisions on releasing information on funding sources. A background document companion to the project list discusses funding assumptions, stating the Delivery Plan aligns with legislative direction provided in the 2017 Transportation Appropriations Bill and is consistent with overall legislative investment expectations.

### 7.7 County Six Year Transportation Improvement Program

Grant County is required under the GMA to prepare a plan for financing the transportation improvements included in this Transportation Element. The County Six Year Transportation Improvement Program is the County's principal directive for "near term" capital expenditures to carry out the adopted Transportation element as it relates to the construction of new facilities and preservation of existing corridors. The Transportation Improvement Program is updated annually by the County with each update approved by the Board of Commissioners, and incorporated by reference into the Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of the program is to correlate funding sources to needed improvements and identify projects for dedicated revenues. It enables long range decision-making, helps assure the continuity of Commissioner goals and objectives, and helps to identify the impacts in future years of decisions made currently. It also identifies existing and future revenues, revenue sources, maintenance and operating costs, expenditure categories, and improvements for the transportation system.

The Transportation Improvement Program and this Transportation element is coordinated with the transportation planning of other jurisdictions through QUADCO. The four counties cooperatively conduct traffic counts on the road network to record traffic volumes over time. The data from these recordings are factored into the annual update of the Six-year program, which identifies capital projects to be carried out in the near term.

The "condition" of roadways is also monitored to assess their surface and bed condition and to indicate where the condition of a road is not sufficient to carry existing and projected volumes, as well as the volumes that would occur at the designated LOS. These data are also factored into the Transportation Improvement Program.

Funding Sources – Projects included within the program must have identified sources of funding. Under GMA, projects necessary to maintain designated LOS are a priority. A variety of local, state, and federal funding supports the program, with a primary revenue source being the County Road Fund.
Preservation and improvement projects are based on the following strategies:

- **Improve Transportation System Safety** - Safety improvements include increasing sight distance, improving rail crossings, and improving curve radii.

- **Implement Projects with High Investment Value** – Projects must be economically viable and funding must be readily available during the life of the plan. The project must offer a viable solution to a recognized problem.

- **System Continuity** – Any project that facilitates linkage between adjacent jurisdictions provides value to the region.

- **System Efficiency** – Projects that increase capacity or the ability to move goods and people.

- **Multimodal Solutions** – Projects that utilize more than one mode.

7.8 **Funding Shortfall Provisions**

If the County is faced with transportation funding shortfalls, any combination of the following strategies should be used to balance revenues and public facility needs:

- Increase revenues through use of bonds, new or increased user fees or rates, new or increased taxes, regional cost sharing, or voluntary developer funds.

- Decrease LOS standards if consistent with GMA Goals.

- Reprioritize projects to focus on those related to concurrency.

- Decrease the cost of the facility by changing project scope, or finding less expensive alternatives.

- Decrease the demand for the public service. This could involve instituting measures to slow or direct population growth or development, for example, developing only in areas served by facilities with available capacity until funding is available for other areas, or by changing project timing and phasing.

- Revise the comprehensive plan's land use and rural areas element to change types or intensities of land use as needed to match the amount of transportation facilities that can be provided.
8 Capital Facilities Element

8.1 Introduction
Capital facilities help define the quality of life for residents of Grant County. Capital facilities include roads, bridges, sewers, parks and open spaces, drinking water, stormwater, and all the government buildings (e.g., schools, fire stations, and others) which house public services. To approach these projects in a coordinated and cost-effective way, the County has developed this Element.

In order to comply with state laws, to maintain and improve public services to citizens, and to accommodate orderly growth, Grant County anticipates a continued investment in its capital facilities over the planning period.

8.2 Relationship to Other Plans

8.2.1 Growth Management Act Requirements
The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element is required under the GMA and is an important part of Grant County’s Comprehensive Plan. According to Growth Management Procedural Criteria (WAC 365-195-210), the CFP Element should contain at least the following features:

- An inventory of existing capital facilities
- A forecast of the future needs for capital facilities
• Proposed locations and sizes of expanded or new capital facilities
• A 6-year plan that will finance capital facilities
• A requirement to reassess the Land Use Element if funding falls short of meeting capital facilities needs as well as ensure consistency between the Land Use and Capital Facilities elements with its associated financing plan

The CFP must be financially feasible; probable funding must be in place to pay for capital facility needs, or else “reassess the Land Use Element.” If the costs of the CFP exceed the available revenue to pay for them, the County must reduce its LOS, reduce costs, or modify the Land Use Element to bring development into balance with available or affordable facilities. The GMA does not preclude the County from taking other steps before reassessing land use, including reduction of LOS standards, reducing the quality of facilities that meet the quantitative standards, or reducing demand by reducing consumption.

Other requirements of the GMA mandate forecasts of future needs for capital facilities and LOS standards of facility capacity as the basis for public facilities contained in the CFP. As a result, public facilities in the CFP must be based on quantifiable, objective measures of capacity, such as traffic volume capacity per mile of road.

One of the goals of the GMA is to have capital facilities in place concurrent with development. This concept is known as “concurrency.” In Grant County concurrency means the following:
• Facilities to serve the development shall be in place at the time of development (or for some types of facilities that a financial commitment is made to provide the facilities within a specified period of time)
• Such facilities have sufficient capacity to serve development without decreasing LOS below minimum standards adopted in the CFP

The GMA requires concurrency for transportation facilities. GMA also requires all other public facilities to be “adequate.”

Along with the CFP included as part of this Comprehensive Plan, the County has adopted the UDC as the development regulations to implement the Plan. The development regulations provide detailed regulations and procedures for implementing the requirements of the Plan, including concurrency requirements (Grant County UDC Section 25.20).

Each year the CFP is updated as part of the County’s budgeting process to incorporate the updated capital improvements in the plan.
8.2.2 **County-Wide Planning Policies**

This element is also developed to be consistent with the CWPP. The Policies that address capital facilities are summarized as follows:

**Policy Number 8 – Analysis of Fiscal Impacts**

*Fiscal Impact:* In order to ensure that our County-wide policies and future individual growth plans and capital facilities funding programs adequately address cumulative potential impacts on the revenues of local government, a joint fiscal impact study should be conducted, focusing on:

- Capital facility debt financing capabilities and burdens of the individual local governments, and the options and potential for sharing debt capacity and responsibility for capital facility financing among and between local governments, special purpose districts, and the private sector;
- The structure of revenues that operate local government and the potential for new revenues or an alternate system of distributing existing funds.

*Impact Fees:* Each jurisdiction is encouraged to adopt fair and reasonable impact fee ordinances to ensure that new growth pays its fair share of the cost of capital facilities, such as transportation improvements, parks, and schools.

8.2.3 **Plans of Other Jurisdictions**

Several non-County public facility and service providers, including the Grant County PUD, school districts, fire districts, sewer districts, and water districts have prepared capital facilities plans for their services and facilities. A summary of the 6-year plan for these facilities is provided in Table 8-2.

Any identified public facility improvements that are not owned or operated by the County should be included in the annual budgets and capital improvement plans of the entities which provide those public facilities. State, local government, and district plans that are affected by proposed public facility improvements will be considered prior to inclusion of the improvements in the Capital Improvement Plan. This includes considering a city’s comprehensive plan when evaluating proposed improvements that affect that city’s UGA.

8.3 **Why Plan for Capital Facilities?**

There are at least three good reasons to plan for capital facilities: 1) the GMA requires the County to do so; 2) the citizens and sound fiscal management of public funds demands it; and 3) eligibility for grants and loans for infrastructure development depends on it.
8.3.1  **Growth Management**

Capital facilities plans are one of six elements required by the GMA and are required to incorporate the following provisions:

1. Provide for and accommodate capital facilities for land development envisioned in Chapter 4, Land Use Element
2. Maintain the quality of life for existing and future development by establishing and maintaining LOS standards for capital facilities
3. Coordinate and provide consistency among the many plans for capital improvements, including the following elements and plans:
   a. Other Elements of this Plan
   b. Master plans and other studies of local government
   c. Plans for capital facilities of state and/or regional significance
   d. Plans of adjacent local governments
   e. Plans of special districts
4. Ensure timely provision of adequate facilities as required in the GMA
5. Document all capital projects and their financing, including projects to be financed with impact fees and/or real estate excise taxes that are authorized by the GMA

The CFP is the element that makes the rest of the Comprehensive Plan take shape. By establishing LOS as the basis for providing capital facilities and for achieving concurrency, the CFP determines the quality of life in the community. The requirement to fully finance the CFP (or revise the future land use plan) provides a reality check on the vision set forth in the Comprehensive Plan.

8.3.2  **Sound Management**

Planning for capital facilities and their costs enables Grant County to perform the following activities:

1. Demonstrate the need for facilities and the need for revenues to pay for them
2. Estimate future operation and maintenance costs of new facilities that will impact the annual budget of the County
3. Take advantage of sources of revenue that require a CFP in order to qualify for the revenue
4. Receive better ratings on bond issues when the County borrows money for capital facilities, and thus reduce the cost of borrowing money

8.3.3  **Eligibility of Funding**

Many grant and loan programs require local governments have a CFP to be eligible for funding.
8.4 Levels of Service

8.4.1 General

LOS are usually quantifiable measures of the amount of service public facilities provide. LOS may also measure the quality of some public facilities.

8.4.2 Method for Establishing Levels of Service

Established LOS support a financially feasible CFP. This is done by establishing LOS standards that are measurable and financially feasible for the 6 fiscal years following plan adoption.

The standards for LOS are found in Table 8-1. These standards, as adopted, will determine the need for capital improvement projects, and they are the benchmark for testing the adequacy of public facilities for each proposed development where the “concurrency” requirement has been established. The adopted LOS standards can be amended, if necessary, once each year as part of the Comprehensive Plan’s amendment.

Table 8-1
Level of Service Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Capital Facility</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Roads outside of UGAs and Rural Activity Centers</td>
<td>Ratio of Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Roads within Rural Activity Centers</td>
<td>Ratio of Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>Availability of system components</td>
<td>B^1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See Chapter 9, Utilities Element.

8.5 Major Issues

8.5.1 Impact Fees

Impact fees are authorized by statute for road, school, park, and fire safety improvements according to very specific criteria (RCW 82.02). If the County ever elects to add this optional revenue source, additional documentation and calculation will be needed to comply with the impact fee law, and an ordinance will need to be enacted, following appropriate level of public hearings.

8.5.2 Infrastructure Cost Recovery

Fiscal imbalances occur among local governments as a result of infrastructure investments and the government finance structure in Washington State. Sometimes counties are at a disadvantage, other times it is cities. For example, counties sometimes install new roads or parks only to have them annexed by cities. Conversely, cities sometimes annex areas not having adequate urban-level infrastructure, and the city must make the improvements to bring the facilities up to municipal
standards (i.e., curb, gutter and sidewalk, public water and sewerage systems). Many local
governments throughout Washington have established mechanisms to address infrastructure and
annexation.

8.6 Planning Assumptions

8.6.1 General

8.6.1.1 Definition
This Capital Facilities Element is concerned with needed improvements which are of relatively large
scale, are generally non-recurring, and which may require multi-year financing. For the purposes of
this Plan, a “capital improvement project” is defined as land, improvements to land, structures
(including design, permitting, and construction), initial furnishings, and selected equipment, resulting
in a capital expenditure and having a service life of at least 5 years.

Other “capital” costs, such as motor vehicles and motorized equipment, computers and office
equipment, office furnishings, and small tools are considered to be minor capital expenses in the
County’s annual budget, but such items are not “capital improvements” for the purposes of this
Comprehensive Plan, or the issuance of development permits.

8.6.2 What Facilities are Included in this Plan?
Grant County maintains a comprehensive capital facilities inventory to meet insurance requirements
that is incorporated by reference into the Comprehensive Plan and available upon request. The
County’s existing public facility inventory is updated annually. General capital facilities owned and
maintained by the County include:

- Roads and related transportation facilities (located outside city limits)
- County administrative buildings
- Fairgrounds
- Parks
- Solid waste management and recycling services
- Stormwater management
- Corrections
- Juvenile detention
- Law enforcement

Other capital facilities owned and maintained by others but incorporated into this plan are school
districts, water and sewer utilities, Grant PUD power facilities, and fire district facilities, as
characterized in Table 8-2.
8.7 Locally Generated Revenue

Locally generated revenues can be used to cover costs of capital facility improvements as well as the expenses of replacing and updating existing facilities, administration, operations and maintenance, and debt service on previous system improvements. The following are typical local revenue sources:

- General government taxes such as property taxes and sales tax
- Revenue or general obligation bonds
- Local Improvement District, Utility Local Improvement District (ULID), or Road Improvement District formation as an equitable assessment of benefited properties
- Developer financing, or improvements made in lieu of financial contributions, using a variety of extensions and agreements tailored to specific projects
- County funding with a general facilities charge assessment made to each property in the benefited area
- Creation of special districts, such as a County Road Improvement District, with a rate structure to generate required revenue

Several of these revenue options are discussed below.

8.7.1 Revenue Bonds

The most common source of funds for construction of major utility improvements is the sale of revenue bonds. The tax-free bonds are issued by the County. The major source of funds for debt service on these revenue bonds is from user service rates. In order to qualify to sell revenue bonds, the County must show that its net operating income (gross income less expenses) is equal to or greater than a factor, typically 1.2 to 1.4, times the annual debt service on all par debt. If a coverage factor has not been specified, it will be determined at the time of any future bond issue. This factor is commonly referred to as the coverage factor and is applicable to revenue bonds sold on the commercial market.

8.7.2 General Obligation Bonds

The County, by special election, may issue general obligation bonds to finance almost any project of general benefit to the County. The bonds are paid off by assessments levied against all privately-owned properties within the County. This includes vacant property that otherwise would not contribute to the cost of such general improvements. This type of bond issue is usually reserved for municipal improvements that are of general benefit to the public, such as arterial streets, bridges, lighting, municipal buildings, firefighting equipment, parks, and water and wastewater facilities. Inasmuch as the money is raised by assessment levied on property values, the business community also provides a fair share of funds to pay off such bonds.
General obligation bonds have the best market value and carry the lowest rate of interest of all types of bonds available to the County.

Disadvantages of general obligation bonds include the following:

- Voter approval is required which may be time-consuming, with no guarantee of successful approval of the bond; and
- The County would have a practical or legal limit for the total amount of general obligation debt. Financing large capital improvements through general obligation debt reduces the ability of the utility to issue future debt.

### 8.7.3 Utility Local Improvement Districts

Another potential source of funds for improvements comes through the formation of ULIDs involving an assessment made against properties benefited by the improvements. ULID bonds are further guaranteed by revenues and are financed by issuance of revenue bonds.

ULID financing is frequently applied to utility system extensions into previously unserved areas. Typically, ULIDs are formed by the County at the written request (by petition) of the property owners within a specific area of the County. Upon receipt of a sufficient number of signatures on petitions, the local improvement area is defined, and a utility system is designed for that particular area in accordance with the County’s Comprehensive Plan. Each separate property in the ULID is assessed in accordance with the special benefits the property receives from the system improvements. A County-wide ULID could form part of a financing package for large-scale capital projects such as water supply or storage improvements that benefit all residents in the service area.

There are several benefits to the County in selecting ULID financing. The assessment places a lien on the property and must be paid in full upon sale of the property. Further, property owners may pay the assessment immediately upon receipt, reducing the costs financed by the ULID.

The advantages of ULID financing, as opposed to rate financing, to the property-owner include:

- The ability to avoid interest costs by early payment of assessments;
- If the ULID assessment is paid off in installments, it may be an eligible federal income tax deduction;
- Low-income senior citizens may be able to defer assessment payments until the property is sold; and
- Some Community Development Block Grant funds are available to property owners with incomes near or below the poverty level. Funds are available only to reduce assessments.
The major disadvantage to the County-wide ULID process is that it may be politically difficult to approve formation. The ULID process may be stopped if owners of 40% of the property area within the ULID boundary protest its formation.

8.7.4 Developer Financing

Developers may fund the construction of extensions to utility systems to property within new plats. The developer extensions are turned over to the County for operation and maintenance when completed.

It may be necessary, in some cases, to require the developer to construct more facilities than those required by the development in order to provide either extensions beyond the plat and/or larger pipelines for the ultimate development of the system. The County may, by policy, reimburse the developer through either direct outlay, latecomer charges, or reimbursement agreements for the additional cost of facilities, such as increased size of pumping stations and pipelines over those required to serve the property under development. Developer reimbursement (latecomer) agreements provide up to 10 years or more for developers to receive payment from other connections made to the developer-financed improvements.

System Development Charges

The County may adopt a system development charge or connection charge to finance improvements of general benefit to infrastructure which are required to meet future growth. System development charges are generally established as one-time charges assessed against new customers as a way to recover a part or all of the cost of additional infrastructure capacity constructed for their use.

The system development charge or fee is deposited in a construction fund to construct such infrastructure. The intent is that all new customers will pay an equitable share of the cost of the infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate growth.

Non-Local Revenue

It is important for the County to identify sources of revenue available from agencies outside the County for implementing projects identified in this Capital Facilities Element. Federal, state, and other public program funds have assisted in financing capital improvement projects in the past. However, such monies have become increasingly scarce in recent years.

The following describes several funding sources available to the County without reference to any specific project. The selected funding sources will depend on the status of the County’s existing
financial commitments, capital and cash flow requirements, funding source availability, and the impact on the service rates and connection charges. Potential funding sources include the following:

- Grants
  - Department of Community Development
  - Community Economic Revitalization Board
  - USDA, Rural Development
  - Rural Economic Development

- Loans
  - Public Works Trust Fund
  - USDA, Rural Development

8.7.5 Community Development Block Grant
Community Development Block Grant financing is available to non-entitlement cities and counties for projects primarily benefiting low- to moderate-income persons. To be eligible for Community Development Block Grants, the municipality must be included on the list of eligible jurisdictions, and this must be a jurisdiction with at least 51% low/moderate incomes.

8.7.6 Community Economic Revitalization Board Grant
The Community Economic Revitalization Board finances growth-related infrastructure in economically disadvantaged communities. The program encourages private capital investment and development and creating and retaining industrial jobs. Eligible projects include sanitary and storm sewer, domestic and industrial water, access roads, bridges, railroad spurs, electrical power, natural gas, general purpose industrial buildings, and port facilities. Funding is primarily low interest loans up to $750,000 with a maximum interest rate of 6%. Under special circumstances, grants of up to $300,000 may be obtained. Both loans and grants require a minimum 10% local match.

8.7.7 U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development
Rural Development has a loan program that, under certain conditions, includes a limited grant program. Grants may be awarded when the annual debt service portion of the utility rate exceeds 1.0% to 1.5% of the municipality's median household income. In addition, Rural Development has a loan program for needy communities that cannot obtain funding by commercial means through the sale of revenue bonds. The loan program provides long-term 30 to 40-year loans at an interest rate that is based on federal rates and varies with the commercial market.

8.7.8 Rural Economic Development
The County receives funding through a Washington State sales tax rebate per RCW 82.14.370, providing Grant and other counties the opportunity of financing “public facilities serving economic
development purposes in rural counties, and finance personnel in economic development offices. “The funds are used either by the County or disbursed to local government partners in the community for qualified economic development projects that meet statutory requirements as outlined by the Washington State Legislature.

8.7.9 **Public Works Trust Fund**

The Public Works Trust Fund is a revolving loan fund designed to help local governments finance needed public works projects through low-interest loans and technical assistance. The Public Works Trust Fund, established in 1985 by legislative action, offers loans substantially below market rates, payable over periods ranging up to 20 years.

Interest rates are 1, 2, or 3%, with the lower interest rates providing an incentive for a higher local financial share. A minimum of 10% of projects costs must be provided by the local community to qualify for a 3% loan. A 20% local share qualifies the applicant for a 2% interest rate and a 30% local share qualifies for a 1% loan. The useful life of the project determines the loan term, with a maximum term of 20 years.

To be eligible, an applicant must be a local government such as a city or county, or special purpose utility district, and have a long-term plan for financing its public work needs. If the applicant is a county or city, it must adopt the .25% real estate excise tax dedicated to capital purposes. Eligible public works systems include streets and roads, bridges, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, and domestic water. Loans are presently offered only for purposes of repair, replacement, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or improvement of existing eligible public works systems, in order to meet current standards and to adequately serve the needs of existing service users. Ineligible expenses include public works financing costs that arise from forecasted, speculative, or service area growth. Such costs do not make a project ineligible, but must be excluded from the scope of their proposal.

Since substantially more trust fund dollars are requested than are available, local jurisdictions must compete for the available funds. The applications are carefully evaluated, and the Public Works Board submits to the Legislature a prioritized list of those projects recommended to receive low-interest financing. The Legislature reviews the list and indicates its approval through the passage of an appropriation from the Public Works Assistance Account to cover the cost of the proposed loans. Once the Governor has signed the appropriation bill into law (an action that usually occurs by the following April), those local governments recommended to receive loans are offered a formal loan agreement with appropriate interest rate and term as determined by the Public Works Board.
8.8 Capital Improvement Plan

The Capital Improvement Plan is prepared to prioritize projects and predict fiscal trends based on revenues and expenditures of the County. This enables the County to maintain and improve public facilities and infrastructure to meet established standards.

The Capital Improvement Plan is a 6-year list of projects updated at least biannually and used by the County to identify, maintain, and pay for current and future infrastructure needs for services provided by the County.

The County prepares a comprehensive capital projects list that correlates funding sources to needed improvements and identifies project funding. The Capital Improvement Plan is reviewed and updated in conjunction with the County budget process. Each update to the County’s Capital Improvement Plan is adopted by reference into the Comprehensive Plan.

Because the Capital Improvement Plan is a working document regularly amended, it is not included in its entirety as a part of the Comprehensive Plan, but is incorporated by reference. A summary of capital facilities for the next 6-years for non-County operated facilities is provided in Table 8-2.

If the County is faced with funding shortfalls various strategies to meet funding needs may be used. These include, but are not limited to, prioritizing projects focusing on concurrency, increasing revenues through use of bonds or user fees, decreasing facility costs by changing the project scope, or revising the Comprehensive Plan’s Land Use Element or adopted LOS. In addition, the year in which a project is carried out, or the exact amounts of expenditures by year for individual facilities may vary from that stated in the Capital Improvement Plan due to:

- Unanticipated revenues or revenues that become available to the County with conditions about when they may be used; or
- New development that occurs in an earlier or later year than had been anticipated.

Specific debt financing proposals may vary from that shown in the Comprehensive Plan due to changes in interest rates, other terms of financing, or other conditions which make the proposals in the plan not advantageous financially.
## Table 8-2
**Six-Year Capital Improvements Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Facility Type</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Planned Improvements (Capacity)</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Districts</td>
<td>Ephrata</td>
<td>Aging facilities need updates. Capacity to meet school enrollment is adequate for several years.</td>
<td>Current plans include facilities maintenance and preservation. Three gym remodels and parkway replacement.</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$15 million per gym $43 million parkway (2029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>Aging facilities need updates. Additional capacity to meet school enrollment is needed within next 10 years.</td>
<td>Planned new elementary school, new or remodeled junior high school, and high school expansion or replacement.</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$64 million total (2028) elementary school (2020-2025 junior high) (2034 high school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>Aging facilities need updates. Additional capacity to meet school enrollment is needed in next 5 to 10 years.</td>
<td>New elementary (#11) school, remodel of current high school, secondary space with 3 options, and pioneer learning services facility.</td>
<td>Bond and district revenue</td>
<td>$20 million/elementary school 14.8 million/high school $110 million/secondary spaces $3–4 million/learning services over (next 5–10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>Aging facilities need updates. Additional capacity to meet school enrollment is adequate.</td>
<td>Planned operational and facility upgrades to address non-capacity issues/upgrade aging facilities.</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$5–15 million (next 5–10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>Additional capacity to meet school enrollment is limited. High school constructed 12 years ago needs expansion.</td>
<td>Plan to build a new junior high, convert existing junior high to an elementary school, and high school expansions planned for future.</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>$20–30 million (next 5–10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Facility Type</td>
<td>Providers</td>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>Planned Improvements (Capacity)</td>
<td>Funding Source(s)</td>
<td>Estimated Cost/Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer</td>
<td>Grant County, and Cities and Towns</td>
<td>Existing system plans with facilities inventories and capacities adopted by reference.</td>
<td>6-year water system and sewer plans, and Ephrata Reclaimed Water plan adopted by reference.</td>
<td>Rates and development charges, grants, and loans. Existing revenues and planned rates increases will support system improvements, with growth paying for growth.</td>
<td>See system plans for these details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Grant PUD</td>
<td>Existing system plans with facility inventories adopted by reference.</td>
<td>6-year production, transmission, and distribution system improvements.</td>
<td>Rates and development charges. Existing financial plans support system improvements, with growth paying for growth.</td>
<td>See system plans for these details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Stormwater</td>
<td>Grant County, and Cities and Towns</td>
<td>Existing inventories adopted by reference.</td>
<td>6-year transportation (including stormwater) improvement plans adopted by reference.</td>
<td>County road fund, city revenue sources, grant, and loans.</td>
<td>See 6-year plans for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Districts</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Grant County PUD demolished fire station building on Crescent Bar Island.</td>
<td>New Crescent Bar/Trinidad 4,500 sq. ft. 3-bay fire station with rooms for 4 resident firefighters.</td>
<td>Grant County Fire District #3 has purchased land and is in planning and design process.</td>
<td>$800,000 (within the next 5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current fire station at Sunland Estates is too small and doesn’t meet safety standards. New station would improve response time goals for area.</td>
<td>New 4,500 sq. ft. 3-bay fire station in area of Silica Road and Sunland Estates Road with rooms for 4 resident firefighters.</td>
<td>District revenue and bonding capacity.</td>
<td>$800,000 (within next 10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current fire station is too small and doesn’t meet safety standards plus located too far to the east.</td>
<td>New 4,500 sq. ft. 3-bay fire station in area of SR 283 and Rd 7 NW with rooms for 4 resident firefighters.</td>
<td>District revenue and bonding capacity.</td>
<td>$800,000 (within next 10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>One additional station planned to improve response time.</td>
<td>Neppel Road Station (unmanned).</td>
<td>District revenue and bonding capacity.</td>
<td>$500,000 (by 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Facility Type</td>
<td>Providers</td>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>Planned Improvements (Capacity)</td>
<td>Funding Source(s)</td>
<td>Estimated Cost/Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Sheriff Facilities</td>
<td>Grant County Sheriff</td>
<td>Current facilities providing targeted level of service.</td>
<td>Equipment upgrades only planned.</td>
<td>County general revenues.</td>
<td>Purchases made annually consistent with adopted budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>Washington State Parks, Grant PUD and USBR.</td>
<td>Current facilities in most cases are adequate, except during peak periods.</td>
<td>Grant PUD planned improvements for Crescent Bar being implemented. Recent improvements also made near Vantage.</td>
<td>Grant PUD revenues.</td>
<td>Improvements to be completed by 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Utilities Element

9.1 Introduction

County residents rely on a number of basic services that help define their quality of life and maintain their health and wellbeing. Utilities that deliver water supply, gas, electricity, telecommunications, and other services are considered utilities.

The purpose of this section is to facilitate coordination between Grant County and the utility providers that serve the County. Such coordination will ensure that new facilities provided are compatible with planned growth and that utility and land use planning are coordinated. While planning for utilities is the primary responsibility of the utility providers, this section identifies issues and policies related to the provision of utilities that are of importance to Grant County.

Utilities included in this element are water, sewer, natural gas, power, and telecommunications. In addition, this element discusses the services provided by special districts such as Port and Irrigation Districts.

Virtually all land uses require one or more of the utilities discussed in this element. Local land use decisions drive the need for new or expanded utility facilities. In other words, private utilities follow growth. Expansion of the utility systems is a function of the demand for reliable service that people, their land uses, and activities place on the systems.
9.2 Relationship to Other Plans

9.2.1 Growth Management

The Washington State GMA requires that local comprehensive plans include a utilities element. According to the Act the utilities element shall, at a minimum, consist of “the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines and natural gas lines.”

In addition, the State guidelines for implementing the GMA (Chapter 365-195 WAC) state that policies should be adopted which call for:

1. Joint use of transportation rights-of-way and utility corridors, where possible;
2. Timely and effective notification of interested utilities of road construction, and of maintenance and upgrades of existing roads to facilitate coordination of public and private utility trenching activities; and
3. Consideration of utility permits simultaneously with the proposals requesting service and, when possible, approval of utility permits when the project to be served is approved.

9.2.2 County-Wide Planning and Policies

The adopted Grant County CWPP calls for all county jurisdictions to coordinate planning efforts, including provision of current and future utilities, to address future growth in a coherent manner that leads to more efficient delivery of services.

9.2.3 Grant County Coordinated Water System Plan – Quincy Groundwater Subarea

In 1999, the 1982 Grant County Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP) was comprehensively updated. The updated CWSP consists of a compilation of individual water system plans and a Regional Supplement. The Regional Supplement contains supplementary provisions and policies that address management, service areas utility review procedures, regional issues, and water rights reservation throughout the service area.

The CWSP incorporates the major policies, procedures, and recommendations jointly developed by and for the area’s water utilities through a Water Utility Coordinating Committee. Included in the document are recommended review procedures, minimum design standards, designated service areas, and other provisions required by WAC 246-293 for a CWSP. The water system plans for each individual utility within the Subarea were also appended.

The updated CWSP also addressed the regional resource issues related to the existing and future needs of public water systems within the Quincy Groundwater Subarea. Both qualitative and
quantitative water resource issues were identified and evaluated. The CWSP recognized the complexity of legal, political, and regulatory relationships resulting from the “commingling” of state public and federal artificially stored groundwater supplies.

Anticipated growth and water use projections were made for public water systems throughout the Subarea based on a review of historical water consumption, anticipated growth rates within specific areas, and a review of existing water rights authorized by Ecology for specific public water systems. The CWSP addresses regional issues such as wellhead protection, water rights, water conservation, and share facilities, and also identifies a Leak Detection Program. Within the CWSP planning area, the opportunity for water utilities to benefit from shared facilities (interties) and from a coordinated leak detection program were identified. The updated CWSP focused on coordination, consistency, and the process for development proposals requiring public water service.

9.2.4 Columbia Basin Ground Water Management Area

Funded by local, state and federal sources, the Columbia Basin GWMA program includes water monitoring and characterization, public information and education, and implementation and research. A Columbia Basin Groundwater Management Plan (Columbia Basin GWMA 2005) was approved for groundwater management in 2001 by Adams, Franklin and Grant counties, and Ecology. Lincoln County adopted the plan in 2005. The plan describes groundwater nitrate problems, potential nitrate sources, and includes management goals and recommended management strategies. Plan implementation continues through implementation efforts by conservation districts and other agencies.

9.2.5 Grant County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan Update
Grant County is in the process of updating of their 2008 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) to comply with applicable state and federal requirements. The 2008 SWMP and the updated SWMP, once completed, are adopted by reference into this plan. The SWMP is updated in
coordination with the Grant County Solid Waste Advisory Committee, and includes the following goals:

- Encourage waste reduction and recycling in Grant County
- Provide cost-effective and environmentally sound collection and disposal of solid waste
- Educate and involve Grant County citizens in waste reduction and recycling efforts and in responsible waste management

The SWMP provides recommendations regarding the following waste management categories:

- waste reduction and recycling
- collection, transfer, and disposal of waste
- waste import and export
- biosolids and septage management
- special waste handling
- illegal dumping
- system administration

The SWMP is a guide for managing solid waste for Grant County and its 15 cities and towns. The most current version of the SWMP and its recommendations form the basis of the solid waste section of this Element.

9.3 Major Issues

9.3.1 Service Provision

As growth occurs, utilities will need to be extended or developed. As requests for services are received, several important questions must be answered.

- What type of water and wastewater facilities are desirable in which locations: Who (i.e., what institution, municipality, public or private entity or other service provider) should provide them? Who should own them and be responsible for their operation?
- What LOS is appropriate for each type of utility in urban and rural areas?
- In what ways does development of land within an irrigation district affect the supply of potable groundwater, the availability of surface water for commercial agriculture (as opposed to pasture or lawns), and efficient irrigation system management?

To answer these questions, and to ensure that growth is promoted in the desired manner, the County coordinates with existing service providers. Within the unincorporated portions of UGAs for services not provided by the County, the city, town, special purpose district/association or regional comprehensive plan are consulted first to determine service providers and the planned timing of service.
9.3.2 Coordination Among Service Providers

The siting of utility facilities requires coordination with Grant County departments consistent with this plan so that they will be sited in a manner reasonably compatible with adjacent land uses. In order to site utility facilities in a reasonably compatible manner, the County may investigate development standards that require some utilities to be located underground, in accordance with any rates and tariffs, as well as with the public service obligations applicable to the servicing utility.

Grant County also coordinates with service providers of water and sewer in order to provide efficient service, solve utility problems, and accommodate growth.

9.3.3 Concurrency and Implications for Growth

As development occurs, system and facility improvements must keep pace with the higher demand. The improvements must take place within predetermined time frames to maintain appropriate LOS. To ensure concurrency, the County must address the following questions.

- At what density or level of development is it feasible to provide each type of utility (water, sewer, telephone, natural gas, electricity, cellular phone access)?
- Is there a public cost, as well as a private cost, when these services are provided (e.g., aesthetic damage, obstruction of views, environmental damage, odor)?
- What is the County’s role in assuring that the LOS provision is appropriate to the type and density of development that is occurring? Should the County require that certain services be available before development can occur in certain areas, or at certain densities?

9.3.4 Environmental Sensitivity

Important environmental issues associated with planned utility improvements must be addressed. They include the following utilities.

- Sewer: What are the impacts associated with pipeline construction? How can the specialized wastewater requirements of different industrial and commercial operations be accommodated?
- Water: What are the water withdrawal impacts of well development?
• Aesthetics: How can views be protected from excessive numbers of unsightly towers and lines? When (or in which areas) and what types of utilities should the County require to be buried?

9.4 Regulatory Setting

9.4.1 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) is responsible for regulating privately owned utility and transportation businesses in the state. The WUTC is a three-member board appointed by the governor and confirmed by the state senate. It is the WUTC’s responsibility to see that companies provide safe and reliable service to their customers at reasonable rates. The WUTC regulates private utilities only (including but not limited to, electric, gas, irrigation, telecommunication, and water companies).

Publicly owned utilities (such as municipal utilities and PUDs) are regulated by their respective legislative bodies.

WUTC mandates that utility facilities and service must be provided on a uniform or nondiscriminatory basis to all customers and that cost of service must be equitable. State law regulates the rates and charges, services, facilities, and practices of utilities. Any change in customer charges or service provision policy requires WUTC approval.

In accordance with state law, private utilities have an obligation to provide service upon demand. In other words, the utility companies must provide service to customers within their service territory as it is requested. This is known as a utility’s duty to serve. Consistent with this duty, the utility providers follow growth and will provide service to development both within and outside of UGAs (in accordance with service territories). Private utilities are therefore not a distinguishing factor in delineating "urban" from "rural" areas.

There are other federal and state agencies that impose requirements on utilities. WDOH has jurisdiction over water purveyors, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and Department of Energy have jurisdiction over electric power service, and the Federal Communications Commission has jurisdiction over the telecommunications industry.
9.5 Public Utilities

9.5.1 Electricity

Grant County Public Utility District
Grant County PUD, located in Central Washington, is a municipal corporation of the State of Washington. Grant County PUD was organized in 1938 pursuant to a general election in accordance with the Enabling Act and commenced operations in 1942. Grant County PUD’s Electric System serves virtually all of Grant County. Grant County PUD’s administrative offices are located in Ephrata. Additionally, Grant County PUD also provides broadband internet service to much of Grant County, as discussed further in Section 9.6.2.

Pursuant to Washington statutes, Grant County PUD is administered by a Board of Commissioners made up of five elected members. The legal responsibilities and powers of Grant County PUD, including the establishment of rates and charges for services rendered, are exercised through the Commission. The Commission establishes policy, approves plans, budgets and expenditures and reviews Grant County PUD’s operations.

Separate Utility Systems of Grant County PUD
The electric utility properties and operations of Grant County PUD are accounted for and financed as three separate systems. The three systems are the Electric System, the Columbia River-Priest Rapids Hydroelectric Production System ("Priest Rapids Development"), and the Wanapum Development.

Grant County PUD helps provide clean and cost-effective power to County residents, through power generation, transmission, and distributions systems and high-speed internet access. The County coordinates with Grant County PUD on energy and fiber optic internet services to serve residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural needs consistent with the goals, policies, and actions in the Comprehensive Plan.

9.5.2 Water Supply Systems
WDOH defines public water systems as all systems serving more than one single-family residence. Further, WDOH classifies the systems as Group A or B. Group A systems serve 15 or more connections, or 25 or more people per day for 60 or more days per year. Group B water systems are all the smaller systems that serve more than one single family residence but are not large enough to fit into the Groups A category. The Spokane office of the WDOH maintains a comprehensive list of all community water systems for the counties in eastern Washington. According to WDOH there are currently 325 water supply systems located in Grant County providing domestic water. The WDOH list of water systems in Grant County is summarized in Table 9-1.
Table 9-1
Grant County Water Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Type</th>
<th>Number of Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A, Community, Residential, Municipal</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A, Community, Residential</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A, All Other</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Listings</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A, Community, Residential, Municipal
Within Grant County there are 13 Group A, Community, Residential, Municipal systems operated by municipalities. These include the following incorporated towns and cities:

- Coulee City
- Electric City
- Ephrata
- George
- Grand Coulee
- Hartline
- Mattawa
- Moses Lake
- Quincy
- Royal City
- Soap Lake
- Warden
- Warden
- Wilson Creek

These municipal systems serve residential as well as commercial and other types of connections. The WDOH classifies a water system as “Community” if there are 15 or more residential units or 25 or more people served, regardless of the number of other connection types. The majority of these users, while not required are located within the incorporated city limits. Information for each city’s water system, the population served, and the average amount of water used can be found in each entity’s water system plan.

Group A, Community, Residential
The 59 Group A, Community, Residential water systems within Grant County are similar to the municipal systems discussed above, but are not operated by an incorporated city or town. The system users may be located within a municipality’s incorporated limits or within the unincorporated County.
Group A, Transient & Non-Transient
Group A, Transient and Non-Transient Non-Community systems serve hotels and other businesses that cater to people who do not live permanently at the site.Transient systems serve operations that experience intermittent use such as campgrounds and other seasonal businesses. Non-Transient systems include businesses and other operations serving non-residents more than 6 months out of the year.

County-Owned Water Systems
Grant County owns and operates two water systems: the public systems at the Grant County Fairgrounds and in the unincorporated community of Marine View Heights.

**Grant County Fairground Water System:** The Grant County Fairground Water System is managed by a Fair Board under contract with the County. The system is supplied by two on-site wells. Grant County will continue to operate the system until the Superior Court takes the system out of receivership.

Water Districts
There are three water districts in Grant County: Water District No. 1, the Royal Water District, and the Beverly Water District.

9.5.3 Columbia Basin Project and Irrigation Districts
From the time settlers began to arrive in Grant County irrigation of the vast area has been a focus of both the people and the government. The CBP, managed by the USBR of the U.S. Department of Interior, has been an ongoing large-scale irrigation project to meet these needs. The CBP is located in central Washington and currently serves a total area of approximately 556,800 acres in platted farm units, which includes portions of Grant, Lincoln, Adams, and Franklin counties, with some northern facilities located in Douglas County. The CBP is a multipurpose development that includes power production, flood control, and recreation, as well as irrigation. Continued development of the system to provide irrigation water to additional project lands not yet served is being considered.
The CBP consists of several major facilities and features including main canals, laterals, and drains and wasteways. The Grand Coulee Dam is the project's key structure and is located on the main stem of the Columbia River. The Grand Coulee Pump-Generating Plant lifts irrigation water about 280 feet from Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake to Banks Lake, which serves as an equalizing reservoir for the irrigation system. The Main Canal transports flow southward from Banks Lake at Dry Falls Dam to the northern end of the irrigable area. This canal feeds into the East Low and West Canals, which carry water over a large portion of the project area. In the central part of the CBP, O'Sullivan Dam created the Potholes Reservoir, which receives return flows from the northern part of the CBP. The Potholes Canal begins at O'Sullivan Dam and runs south to serve the southern part of the project area.

Responsibility for operating and maintaining the CBP is divided among three irrigation districts and the USBR. Basic irrigation facilities (canals, laterals, wasteways, and pumping plants) are the responsibility of the irrigation districts. The districts are the Quincy-Columbia Basin Irrigation District (Quincy District), headquartered in town of Quincy, the East Columbia Basin Irrigation District (East District), headquartered in Othello, and the South Columbia Basin Irrigation District, headquartered in Pasco (South District). Irrigation facilities operated by USBR are called "reserved works" and include Grand Coulee Dam, the Grand Coulee Power Plant and Pumping Plant, Banks Lake, Dry Falls Dam, Main Canal, Potholes Reservoir, and Potholes Canal headworks.

The Irrigation Districts, governed by a Board of Directors, hold the responsibility of managing water delivery within their boundaries. Irrigation and drainage systems are constructed to provide water for the development of commercial agriculture. The costs associated with operation and maintenance, as well as replacement costs and the repayment of construction obligations is ongoing at significant expense to Columbia Basin farmers. Costs are in part based on the amount of irrigable land assessment base. As such, all development activities within the unincorporated County must be coordinated with the irrigation districts to prevent the loss of irrigable land.

Two additional Irrigation Districts operate within Grant County. These are the Moses Lake and Black Sands Irrigation Districts.

9.5.4 Sewer Systems

Most rural residents rely on on-site septic tanks and drainfields for their wastewater treatment needs. All systems designed to handle up to 3,500 gallons per day are permitted and regulated by the Grant County Health District. When adequately designed and installed, on-site septic systems can be appropriate for rural level development. Maintenance of such systems varies from excellent to none at all. Poorly maintained septic systems are a potential source of ground and surface water pollution and have been identified both at the state and local level as significant contributors to high nitrate levels in soil and to coliform bacteria in surface water.
All on-site septic systems designed to handle between 3,500 and 14,500 gallons per day are permitted and regulated by the WDOH Large On-Site Program. The Spokane office of the WDOH currently monitors the 21 on-site systems in Grant County as presented in Table 9-2.

Table 9-2
Grant County Large, On-Site Sewer Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champs de Brionne:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorge Summer Theater Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorge Amphitheater System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Bar Condominiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Grove Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake School District:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Hutterian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardon Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelican Point Addition No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perch Point Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Valley Rest Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Rest Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbanks RV Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanson Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahluke School District No. 73:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawa Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Schott MS/Wahluke HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Mountain Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahluke High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden Lake Resort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WDOH

All on-site septic systems designed to handle over 14,500 gallons per day are permitted and regulated by Ecology. The Spokane office of Ecology currently monitors these systems. There are 15 municipal systems in Grant County as presented in Table 9-3. Twelve of the County’s fifteen UGAs are served by a permitted wastewater treatment facility. Hartline, Wilson Creek, and Krupp have no facilities; all development is served by on-site septic systems. Electric City, Grand Coulee, and Coulee Dam are served by the Grand Coulee Sewage Treatment Plant.
Table 9-3
Grant County Wastewater Treatment Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Coulee Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulee City Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Bar Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrata Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview Terrace Mobile Home Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurent’s Sun Village Resort Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawa Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake Larson Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake Sand Dunes Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rim Rock Cove Homeowners’ Association Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal City Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap Lake Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden Sewage Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ecology Waste Discharge Permit Report

County-Owned Sewer Systems
Grant County owns no sewer systems.

Sewer Districts
There is one sewer district in Grant County: Crescent Bar Sewer District.

9.6 Private Utilities

9.6.1 Natural Gas
The Pacific Northwest, including Grant County, receives its natural gas form the southwest United States and Canada. Natural gas is supplied to the entire region via two interstate pipeline systems, Williams Gas Pipeline–West and PG&E Gas Transmission–NW. Williams Gas Pipeline–West owns and operates (through its subsidiary Pacific Northwest Pipeline Company) the network that supplies natural gas to Grant County.

Within Grant County, only Moses Lake, Wheeler, Quincy, and Warden have limited natural gas service available. Service is provided by either of two gas utility companies, Cascade Natural Gas (CNG) and Avista.
Cascade Natural Gas
The Cascade Natural Gas Corporation provides all-natural gas service within Grant County with the exception of the Warden area. CNG is an investor-owned utility serving customers in 16 counties in the State of Washington. The company builds, operates, and maintains all of its natural gas facilities.

System components include gate stations, high-pressure lines, pressure reduction stations, distribution mains, and service lines. The gate station is the delivery point of natural gas from the upstream interstate pipeline to CNG’s system. Gate stations normally include metering stations, odorizing stations and pressure reduction stations. High-pressure lines transport gas to district regulators throughout CNG’s service area. Pressure reduction stations are installed at the point of delivery of natural gas from the high-pressure lines to the lower pressure distribution systems.

CNG’s service area includes Moses Lake, Wheeler, Othello, and Quincy. Service connections to CNG are initiated by customer demand and individual requests. CNG has more than 2,148 active residential, commercial, and industrial customers as of September 1998. According to CNG, the current peak demand is approximately 450,000 therms per day.

AVISTA
AVISTA (formerly Washington Water and Power Company) was brought into being in 1889. Since that time, AVISTA has grown into a company with utility operations in five western states and a service area that covers 30,000 square miles. AVISTA serves electric customers in eastern Washington and northern Idaho, and provides natural gas service to nearly 230,000 customers in four states – Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. In Grant County, AVISTA’s natural gas service area is the city of Warden. Natural gas is delivered to Warden via a connection to the Pacific Northwest Pipeline. Also included in AVISTA’s Warden distribution are service lines and individual meter sets.

9.6.2 Telecommunications
Telecommunications is the transmission of data or information by wire, radio, optical cable, electromagnetic, or other similar means. In Grant County, telecommunication utilities include broadband fiber optic cable, cellular, and wired telephone.

Grant PUD maintains and operates a fiber optic service with several retail service providers that provide internet through PUD cable to customers. Internet is also provided by several other service providers.

Cellular telecommunication allows people to have mobile telephone communication via radios which send and receive signals form a network of receivers placed at several cellular communication (“cell”) sites. Grant County is currently served by several cellular telephone companies.
They are licensed to operate in the County and throughout the region within guidelines set by the Federal Communications Commission. Siting and design of towers is regulated by the FAA and local zoning authority. Considerable expansion of the wireless telecommunications industry has occurred in recent years.

The cellular system is expected to continue to expand in response to several factors: customer growth within a designated area, shift in distribution patterns, and/or a decrease in service quality or reliability (measured by the record of dropped calls or complaints of poor sound quality). In general, cellular system growth follows trends in population density along the higher volume transportation corridors.

## 9.7 Special Districts

### 9.7.1 Port Districts

Grant County has ten port districts:

- Port of Coulee City
- Port of Ephrata
- Port of Grand Coulee
- Port of Hartline
- Port of Mattawa
- Port of Moses Lake
- Port of Quincy
- Port of Royal Slope
- Port of Warden
- Port of Wilson Creek

Ports can develop property for industrial use and can lease and sell land, buildings, and facilities to private industry in accordance with state laws. State laws specify that ports may acquire, construct, maintain, operate, develop and regulate within the district: harbor improvements; rail or motor vehicles transfer and terminal facilities; water transfer and terminal facilities; air transfer and terminal facilities; and other commercial transportation; transfer; handling storage and terminal facilities and industrial improvements.

Port districts are funded by revenue from the operation of terminals, the sale or lease of properties, and tax levies. A port district may incur debt including issuing general obligation bonds up to 0.25% of the assessed value of taxable property in the district without vote of the people. An additional 0.05% debt may be incurred if 60% of the electorate approves. They also have the power to issue revenue bonds for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction or extension of various improvements.
9.8 Levels of Service

The purpose of LOS standards is to adequately serve both current and future residents of Grant County without compromising the service they receive. LOS standards have been established in Chapter 8, Capital Facilities Element. Since Grant County operates no utilities, no LOS standards are established for utilities.

9.9 Needs Assessment

9.9.1 Solid Waste Management Facilities

The solid waste system in Grant County is a county-wide, consolidated program. The County and each of the incorporated cities work together through a series of interlocal agreements. The solid waste management system in Grant County consists of collection, transfer, waste reduction and recycling, and disposal systems. Other special wastes, including biosolids and septage, are also managed.

The SWMP is being updated in coordination with the County’s Solid Waste Advisory Committee to address identified needs and plans to address these needs. The most recent SWMP is adopted by reference as part of this plan.

9.9.2 Public Utilities and Rural Water Supply

Grant County Public Utility District

The Grant County PUD plans to continue to improve and extend the facilities of the Electric System as necessary to serve the growing loads in its service area. Grant County PUD is continually researching means to expand supply and upgrade equipment. System planners design and build their systems to follow population and employment growth projections based on county and city plans. The electricity load is determined from these plans and projections. An electric system plan is then developed to serve those loads at prescribed reliability levels, taking into account environmental, economic, financial, and operational factors. Utility construction is coordinated with the appropriate jurisdictions and agencies and is typically phased in as actual growth occurs.

Grant County PUD takes a proactive approach to system capacity, developing its system in anticipation of eventual growth. In general, the Electric System is well planned, operated, and maintained to provide reliable service to Grant County PUD’s customers.

Water Supply Systems and Rural Domestic Water Supply Needs

Water is one of Grant County’s most valuable natural resources. Reliable access to surface and groundwater is necessary for household uses, irrigated agriculture, recreation, commercial and industrial development, and for fish and wildlife. Today, irrigated agriculture is the biggest user of
water in the County, with supplies coming from the Columbia River, Crab Creek, and other streams in the County as well as from groundwater. The County’s water resources also provide benefits for the natural environment and aesthetic amenities that contribute to the ambiance and lifestyle of the area. Water is a limited resource under numerous competing and changing demands, but improved management of the water resource system will allow for managed growth.

More people moving to newly developed areas means more demand on the groundwater supply. As new residents install individual or community wells or connect to existing systems that rely on groundwater, groundwater management remains an important consideration.

RCW 90.44.050 provides for the supply of rural domestic water through the use of “exempt wells,” which can pump up to 5,000 gallons per day for residential use. The permit well exemption also allows pumping of 5,000 gallons per day for industrial use, 5,000 gallons per day for irrigation up to half an acre, and an unlimited amount for stock water purposes. Permit exempt groundwater withdrawals do not require a water right permit. However, to the extent the groundwater is beneficially used, the water user withdrawing groundwater under the exemption establishes a water right that enjoys the same privileges as a water right permit or certificate obtained directly from Ecology. Though such withdrawals are “permit exempt,” they are still subject to Washington State law regarding the seniority of water withdrawals. Water use of any sort is subject to the “first in time, first in right” clause, originally established in historical western water law and now part of Washington State law. This means that a senior right cannot be impaired by a junior right. Seniority is established by priority date—the date an application was filed for a permitted or certificated water right or the date that water was first put to beneficial use in the case of claims and exempt groundwater withdrawals. Although exempt groundwater withdrawals don’t require a water right permit, they are subject to state water law.

In some instances, Ecology has had to regulate, stop, or reduce groundwater withdrawals when they interfere with prior or “senior” water rights, including instream flow rules. Recent state court decisions on the requirements of the GMA and County land use plans had created ambiguity with counties regarding what was required for determining water is legally and physically available to support rural development. In January 2018, the state legislature adopted under Senate Bill 9061, which clarified what counties are required to do to verify adequate water is physically and legally available. Three different types of permitting were established in the bill. Grant County falls under the “C” permitting, which directs Grant and other counties to follow the previous existing law on rural exempt well development. This in essence allows Grant County to continue the current process in place for determining water availability as part of the development process.

Grant County currently oversees one water supply system with two connections for the Grant County Fairgrounds. No system needs are defined at this time. Other systems in the County are managing water supply and wastewater discharge to improve water efficiency and management strategies.
Managing groundwater quality in the Columbia Basin GWMA, and specifically nitrates, will be an ongoing effort led primarily by conservation districts.

**Sewer Systems**
Current and future deficiencies for sewer facilities within UGAs should be provided within each respective city or town’s comprehensive plan. Even though the County is not currently responsible for any public treatment facilities, it may be beneficial to prepare a Comprehensive Sewer Plan for the urban areas. This would allow the County to better assess growth in unincorporated UGAs and to identify areas where cities or special purpose districts either cannot or will not address sewer service deficiencies. Should sewer service deficiencies arise, it may be necessary for another service provider to step in.

9.9.3 **Private Utilities**

**Natural Gas**
CNG does not plan in advance for individual connections, rather connections are initiated by customer requests for new construction or conversion from electricity to oil. CNG expects to continue developing distribution systems and services in accordance with the Integrated Resource Plan Guidelines set forth by the State. CNG will identify necessary reinforcement and continue to meet growth at lowest possible cost by maximizing capacity of the existing distribution system.

The location, capacity and timing of system improvements depend greatly on opportunities for expansion, and on how quickly the county grows. The possible routes to connect different parts of the system will depend on right-of-way permitting, environmental impact, and opportunities to install gas mains along with new development, or other utilities.

At this time, CNG does not have any planned improvement projects in Grant County. However, CNG has an active policy of expanding its supply system to serve additional natural gas customers. CNG’s engineering department continually performs load studies to determine CNG’s capacity to serve its customers. If they receive a feasible project outside the Grant County service area, the boundary can be easily increased.

Like CNG, Avista service connections are initiated by customer demand and individual requests.

**Telecommunication Utilities**
The rapidly changing telecommunications industry has transformed the way service is delivered. Cellular and fiber optics are blurring the distinctions that separate data, video and voice technologies. As a result, assessing the future configuration of telecommunications service is very difficult.
Telephone service providers are required to provide adequate telecommunications service on demand (RCW 80.36.090). Accordingly, telephone service providers will provide facilities to accommodate whatever growth patterns occur. According to U.S. West, however, the delivery of telecommunication services sometimes does not coincide with the exact location of customers. Many of the telecommunication facilities, including aerial and underground, are co-located with those of the electrical power provider.

In general, telecommunication utility providers continually look for ways to expand, upgrade and maintain competitive systems. Where not required by law, future expansions will occur as technology, market demand, and return on investment allows.

9.9.4  Special Districts

Irrigation Districts
The demand for irrigation water continues to grow. The need for irrigation water is likely to continue even when some land converts to nonagricultural uses. Gardens and lawns will also require water. Irrigation districts must be notified of proposed subdivisions and the subdivision plat must be recorded and filed with the district, showing how the water is to be delivered to the irrigable acres in the subdivision. The district must approve extensions of service to subdivided units, and can require the extension of service to subdivided lots at the landowner’s expense. The irrigation district’s responsibility for delivering water ends at the established point of delivery.
10 Essential Public Facilities Element

10.1 Introduction

Essential public facilities are capital facilities “typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, state or regional transportation facilities, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, and group homes” (RCW 36.70A.200). The County and cities may also identify additional public facilities that are essential to providing services without which development cannot occur.

This chapter outlines a process for determining where essential public facilities could be located and what development standards are appropriate. This process is intended to avoid duplication in approval processes, consider the long-term as well as short-term costs of alternative siting criteria, provide for effective public review, major facility location, and emphasize reasonable compatibility with neighboring land uses.
10.2 Relationship to Other Plans

10.2.1 Growth Management Act Requirements

The GMA requires the comprehensive plan for each county and city planning under the Act to address both lands for public purposes and siting essential public facilities. The GMA states that the county:

- Shall identify lands useful for public purposes;
- Will work with the state and cities within its borders to identify areas of shared need for public facilities;
- Shall prepare with other jurisdictions a prioritized list of lands necessary for the identified public uses;
- Shall include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities; and
- May not preclude siting essential public facilities in their jurisdiction.

Confusion often arises as to the distinction between lands for public purposes and essential public facilities. Essential public facilities can be thought of as a subset of public purpose lands. Table 8-1 illustrates the distinctions.

10.2.1.1 GMA Goals

Development of this chapter was guided in particular by the following GMA Planning Goal:

“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.”

10.2.2 County-Wide Planning Policies

In addition to meeting requirements of the GMA, siting of essential public facilities should be consistent with Grant County’s adopted CWPP. The policies address siting essential facilities as follows:


1. Identifying and Siting Essential Public Facilities:
   a. The Comprehensive Plan of each city, town and county that is planning under the GMA shall include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities. (RCW 36.70A.200(1))
   b. Essential public facilities including those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, and state or regional transportation...
facilities, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, and group homes. (RCW 36.70A.200(1)

c. No city, town or county comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public utilities. (RCW 36.70A.200(2)

2. Development of Essential Public Facilities: When essential public facilities are proposed the potentially effected city(s) and/or town(s) and the county shall:

a. Establish an Advisory Project Analysis and Site Evaluation Committee composed of citizen members and government representatives selected to represent a board range of interest groups. The Committee shall develop specific siting criteria for the proposed project and to identify, analyze, and rank potential project sites. In addition the Committee shall establish a reasonable time frame for completion of the task.

b. Insure public involvement through the use of timely press releases, newspaper notices, public information meetings, and public hearings.

c. Notify adjacent cities and towns and other governmental entities of the proposed project and solicit review and comment on the recommendations made by the Advisory Project Analysis and Site Evaluation Committee.

3. Siting Considerations: In siting of essential public facilities the Advisory Project Analysis and Site Evaluation Committee shall consider at least the following:

A. Essential public facilities shall be developed in a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement and be so located so as to not adversely affect the safety, health or welfare of the citizens residing around or near the facility.

B. Essential public facilities sited near public water and sewer services shall be required to utilize such services.

C. Essential public facilities sited where public water and sewer services are not immediately available shall be required to be constructed so as to be able to be serviced by public water and sewer services when they are available and, further, the essential public services shall be required to connect to such water and sewer services when they are available.

D. Land adjacent to existing and proposed essential public facilities which may be developed in the future shall be compatible with such uses.

E. Proposed essential public facilities shall be compatible with existing land uses.

F. Adequate fire protection water supplies shall be required in all developing areas where essential public facilities may be sited.

G. Undesignated landfills, dredging, waste discharges, and other activities with potential deleterious environmental impacts shall be controlled with appropriate rules and regulations adopted and enforced by the jurisdiction with authority.
H. Essential public facilities shall not locate in resource lands or critical areas if incompatible.

I. Essential public facilities shall not be located outside of UGA's unless they are self-contained and do not require the extension of urban governmental services.

Table 10-1
Distinguishing Public Purpose Lands from Essential Public Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Purpose Lands</th>
<th>Essential Public Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS: Lands needed to accommodate public facilities.</td>
<td>FOCUS: Facilities needed to provide public services and functions that are typically difficult to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands needed to provide the public with government services, including services substantially funded by government, contracted for by government, or provided by private entities subject to public service obligations.</td>
<td>Those public facilities that are usually unwanted by neighborhoods, have unusual site requirements, or other features that complicate the siting process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples include:
- Utility Corridors
- Transportation Corridors
- Sewage Treatment Facilities
- Stormwater Management Facilities
- Recreation
- Schools
- Other Public Uses

Examples include:
- Large Scale Transportation Facilities
- State Educational Facilities
- State and Local Correctional Facilities
- Solid Waste Handling Facilities
- Airports
- Inpatient Facilities, such as, Substance Abuse Facilities, Mental Health Facilities, and Group Homes

10.3 Designation of Essential Public Facilities

10.3.1 Definition

Essential public facilities are public facilities and privately owned or operated facilities serving a public purpose and that are typically or historically difficult facilities to site. They include, but are not limited to the following facilities:

1. Airports; state education facilities; state or regional transportation facilities, including designated highways of statewide significance; prisons, jails and other correctional facilities; solid waste handling facilities; and inpatient facilities such as group homes, mental health facilities and substance abuse facilities; sewage treatment facilities; and communication towers and antennas

2. Facilities identified by the state OFM as essential public facilities, consistent with RCW 36.70A.200

3. Facilities identified as essential public facilities in the county’s development regulations
10.3.2 Locational Considerations

The following considerations have been made in developing policy and siting requirements for essential public facilities:

- Equitable distribution of public facilities should occur so that no one jurisdiction assumes cross-jurisdictional burdens for facilities that no other jurisdiction wants.
- Siting issues among cities, the County, the State, and between County, state and federal agencies, need to be coordinated to eliminate untimely review delays.
- Siting of some essential facilities is limited by the nature of the facilities’ operational requirements and the siting requirements of state and federal agencies that need to be taken into account prior to and during the public review process. Specific siting needs for each type of facility and a need to identify design requirements and standard mitigation techniques should be stated as part of any siting decision.
- Future expansion of a facility is often determined by the initial siting and design decisions, which need to be acknowledged in the public review process.

10.3.3 Designated Facilities

The following facilities are designated as essential public facilities in consistence with the GMA, CWPPs and other goals and policies included in this Comprehensive Plan:

1. Grant County International Airport: Type I
2. Ephrata Landfill: Type II
3. Big Bend Community College: Type I
4. Grand Coulee Hydroelectric Project: Type I
5. Columbia Basin Irrigation Project: Type I
6. Priest Rapids Development: Type I
7. Wanapum Development: Type I
8. Quincy Chute Project: Type I
9. Potholes East Canal Headworks: Type I
10. Sunrise Group Home, Ephrata: Type III

10.4 Siting Essential Public Facilities

Essential public facilities may be allowed as permitted or conditional (special) uses in the zoning ordinance. Essential public facilities identified as conditional (special) uses in the applicable zoning district shall be subject, at a minimum, to the following requirements.
10.4.1 Classification of Facilities

Classify essential public facilities as follows:

1. Type One: These are major, multi-county facilities serving or potentially affecting more than one county. These facilities include, but are not limited to, regional transportation facilities, such as regional airports; state correction facilities; regional hydroelectric and irrigation facilities; and state educational facilities.

2. Type Two: These are local or inter-local facilities serving or potentially affecting residents or property in more than one jurisdiction. They could include, but are not limited to, county jails, county landfills, community colleges, sewage treatment facilities, communication towers, and inpatient facilities (e.g., substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, and group homes). Such facilities that would not have impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which they are proposed to be located would be classified as Type Three facilities.

3. Type Three: These are facilities serving or potentially affecting only the jurisdiction in which they are proposed to be located.

In order to enable the County to determine the project’s classification, the applicant shall identify the approximate area within which the proposed project could potentially have adverse impacts, such as increased traffic, public safety risks, noise, glare, emissions, or other environmental impacts.

10.4.2 Notification of Public

Provide early notification and involvement of affected citizens and jurisdictions as follows:

1. Type One and Two Facilities: At least ninety days before submitting an application for a Type One or Type Two essential public facility, the prospective applicant shall notify the public and jurisdictions of the general type and nature of the proposal, identify sites under consideration for accommodating the proposed facility, and identify opportunities to comment on the proposal. Applications for specific projects shall not be considered complete in the absence of proof of a published notice regarding the proposed project in a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area. This notice shall include the information described above and shall be published at least ninety days prior to the submission of the application.

2. The Grant County Department of Community Development may provide the project sponsor and affected jurisdiction(s) with their comments or recommendations regarding alternative project locations during this 90-day period (the purpose of this provision is to enable potentially affected jurisdictions and the public to collectively review and comment on alternative sites for major facilities before the project sponsor has made their siting decision).

3. Type Three Facilities: Type Three essential public facilities are subject to the county’s standard notification requirements.
10.4.3  Impact on Critical Areas or Resource Lands
Essential public facilities shall not have any probable significant adverse impact on critical areas or resource lands, except for "linear" facilities, such as highways, unless those impacts can be mitigated according the current ordinance requirements.

10.4.4  Alternative Site Analysis
Applicants for Type One essential public facilities shall provide an analysis of the alternative sites considered for the proposed facility. This analysis shall include the following provisions:

1. An evaluation of the sites' capability to meet basic siting criteria for the proposed facility, such as size, physical characteristics, access, and availability of necessary utilities and support services
2. An explanation of the need for the proposed facility in the proposed location
3. The sites' relationship to the service area and the distribution of other similar public facilities within the service area or jurisdiction, whichever is larger
4. A general description of the relative environmental, traffic, and social impacts associated with locating the proposed facility at the alternative sites which meet the applicant's basic siting criteria. The applicant shall also identify proposed mitigation measures to alleviate or minimize significant potential impacts
5. The applicant shall also briefly describe the process used to identify and evaluate the alternative sites

10.4.5  Compliance with Plans, Ordinances, and Regulations
The proposed project shall comply with all applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance, and other county regulations.
11 Natural Setting/Water Resources

11.1 Introduction
The Natural Setting Element describes the physical and biological setting of the County. Critical areas and cultural resources within the County are identified, including their “functions and values,” and the current trends associated with regulatory protections for those resources. This element also presents Grant County’s approach for the protection of critical resources. Critical area designations “overlay” other land use designations. That is, if two or more land use designations apply to a given parcel or portion of a parcel, both or all designations apply.

11.1.1 Purpose of Element
The Natural Setting Element emphasizes the conservation and protection of our natural environment while preserving people’s lifestyles and property. Grant County and the communities within it can and will continue to grow, but this growth must occur in a way that protects critical areas functions and values. The County has also included cultural and historic resources protections under this element. By embracing a philosophy of sustainable land use management, the County can help prevent environmental degradation and impacts to cultural and historic resources, and avoid the unforeseen costs associated with correcting them.
The Natural Setting Element serves two purposes:

- The first is to clarify the relationship between the natural environment and built environments (see Section 11.2)
- The second is to carry forward the intent of the Grant County UDC related to natural resources and the environment (Section 11.3 through 11.5)

11.2 Existing Conditions

11.2.1 Natural Setting

Grant County is located within the Columbia River Basin in central Washington and bound by the Columbia River to the west and southwest. Agriculture, land use, hydrology, and habitat in the County are heavily influenced by the CBP, which delivers water from the Grand Coulee Dam for agricultural and municipal uses. The CBP also brought about major changes to the hydrology and land use in the region through the diversion of water to the historically semi-arid region.

The County includes portions of six watersheds, which are known as WRIAs. Most of the County is in the Lower Crab (WRIA 41). The southern portion of the County is in the Esquatzel Coulee (WRIA 36). The northern portion of the County is largely in the Grand Coulee (WRIA 42), with portions in the Upper Crab-Wilson (WRIA 43), Moses Coulee (WRIA 44), and Lower Lake Roosevelt (WRIA 53).

11.2.1.1 Climate

Grant County falls within the Central Basin region of Washington, which has the lowest precipitation rates within the state. Annual precipitation ranges from 7 inches in the areas of Saddle Mountain, Frenchman Hills, and Rattlesnake Mountain to an average around 15 inches in the vicinity of the Blue Mountains. Precipitation is commonly associated with summer thunderstorms and winter rains and snowfall. Snowfall depths rarely exceed 8 to 15 inches and occur from December through February. High temperatures in January can range from 30 to 40 degrees with low temperatures between 15 to 25 degrees. Summer high temperatures are usually in the lower 90s with low temperatures in the upper 50s (WRCC 2018).

11.2.1.2 Topography

The topography in Grant County is variable, ranging from low rolling hills in the north to smooth, south-sloping plains in the south. The plains and hills are dissected by channeled scablands and coulees. Ground surface elevation ranges from 380 feet mean sea level at the south end of the County along the Columbia River to about 2,880 feet mean sea level at Monument Hill.

The Grand Coulee, which contains Banks Lake, Park Lake, Blue Lake, Lake Lenore and Soap Lake, dissects the hills along the northwestern County line. The Columbia River flows along the southwestern and south boundaries of the County.
The Beezley Hills, which are west of Ephrata and north of Quincy, trend generally east-west along the transition between the rolling hills and plains. The Frenchman Hills separate the plains south of Quincy and Royal Slope. Crab Creek lies between Royal Slope and the Saddle Mountains to the south. Wahluke Slope is bounded by the Saddle Mountains and the Columbia River. Evergreen Ridge, Babcock Bench and Babcock Ridge trend generally north-south along the east side of the Columbia River.

11.2.1.3 Soils
The U.S. Soil Conservation Service has generally characterized the surficial soils in Grant County as very shallow to very deep and well-drained to excessively drained. The northern portion of the County is characterized by soils that formed in highly erodible wind-blown sediments, known as loess, dissected by channeled scablands largely stripped of soils by glacial floodwaters. Soils in this region are primarily used for dryland farming, livestock, and wildlife habitat near the Columbia River. The glacial outwash and the alluvium along existing streams such as Crab Creek yield large quantities of water. The southern portion of the County consists of smooth plains (southward-sloping) periodically broken up by Frenchman Hills and the Saddle Mountains (USDA 1984).

11.2.2 Water Resources

11.2.2.1 Introduction
As with much of the West, water in Grant County serves competing, and often conflicting, uses. Securing certainty in the water supply will be a major issue over the 20-year planning period. Reliable access to water is necessary for direct human uses like household, agricultural, commercial, and industrial operations, and for indirect human needs such as recreation. Today, irrigated agriculture is the biggest user of water. But recently the needs of other surface water uses, particularly those dealing with the protection and restoration of anadromous fish runs, have been fiercely pursued at all levels of government.

Specifically, major elements in the water supply are:

- **Columbia Basin Project.** The CBP currently serves about 671,000 acres of desert that have been transformed into some of the most productive agricultural land in the country. The CBP has fueled extensive growth in Grant County’s agriculture industry, which has led to growth in complementary industries such as food processing, agricultural services, warehousing, and trucking. In terms of farm-gate production value, Grant County is the second largest (behind Yakima) in the state.

- **Endangered Species Act-listed species needs.** Endangered Species Act-listed fish species in Grant County include spring Chinook salmon and steelhead. These species are anadromous fish, which are born in fresh water and eventually migrate out to sea where they spend a large part of their life. Ultimately, they attempt to return to the fresh water stream in which they
were hatched in order to reproduce. These species are dependent on certain habitat requirements, including water temperatures and water depth.

- **Municipal groundwater supply.** Groundwater supply and groundwater quality for municipal and rural use are described in further detail in this section. Demand for municipal and rural use are expected to increase as development continues. Since the last Comprehensive Plan update, technological use has significantly increased in the County due to lower-than-average electricity costs and high reliability.

- **Rural groundwater supply.** As rural development continues, groundwater use is expected to increase. Recent state court decisions on the requirements of the GMA and County land use plans have resulted in a duty for Grant County to ensure that water for development is legally and physically available.

In Grant County, the impact to water quality is predominantly influenced by the CBP. Those impacts have been largely beneficial ones. Prior to implementation of the CBP, many water bodies in the County were seasonally fed, becoming stagnant pools during dry summer months. Development of the CBP enhanced such water bodies, created significant amounts of fish and wildlife habitat, and enhanced water quality.

If the County is to sustain growth, every resident and jurisdiction must meet the ongoing challenge of protecting and managing our water resources, and resisting proposals for elimination of the public investment made in reclamation and flood control projects and in economic and environmentally sustainable electrical power production.

### 11.2.2.2 Surface Water

Surface water systems in the County are significantly affected by the CBP. Approximately 4% (110 square miles) of Grant County surface area is water, which is somewhat striking when considering that much of the County receives less than 8 inches of precipitation annually (in the central and southern portion of the County), while annual precipitation in the northeast portion of the County ranges up to 14 inches of precipitation annually. The CBP is a large multi-purpose development that uses Columbia River water for irrigation, power, recreation, and flood control. Potholes Reservoir and O’Sullivan Dam are the key structures that facilitate water conservation for the CBP (Anchor Environmental 2007).

Development of the CBP has also caused an increase in water available for recreation. Before the CBP was developed, there were 35 lakes in the project area, including portions of Grant, Lincoln, Adams, and Franklin counties. There are now more than 140 lakes, ponds, and reservoirs (USBR 2018). See Appendix A: Map Folio – Figure 9: Wetlands, Rivers, and Streams.

The Columbia River is the primary source of surface water in Grant County. The Columbia River is regulated through the operation of multiple hydroelectric dams within and upstream of the County.
Columbia River flows are dependent on the coordination of dam operations of all seven dams in the mid-Columbia River, which range from Grand Coulee Dam to Priest Rapids Dam. Flows and water levels for the Columbia River within Grant County are directly regulated by operations of Wanapum and Priest Rapids dams in accordance with Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensing for the Priest Rapids Hydroelectric Project.

In addition to the lakes noted as part of the CBP, Moses Lake also receives most of its water from the Columbia River in the form of irrigation return flows, canal water, and groundwater seepage. It also receives some water from Crab Creek, a small tributary with its headwaters west of Spokane, and Rocky Ford Creek, a spring-fed creek that originates south of Soap Lake. Flows in Rocky Ford Creek increased after irrigation began in the Columbia River Basin.

The County also contains many canals, ditches, and wasteways that carry irrigation water, as well as creeks and streams that have resulted from irrigation-related groundwater recharge and surface water runoff. There are also seep lakes, small ponds, and detention basins resulting from irrigation. Major CBP canals, ditches, and wasteways are shown in Appendix A: Map Folio – Figure 15: Transmission Lines and Canals.
11.2.2.2.1 *Surface Water Quality*

Water quality within the CBP has been influenced significantly by the introduction of irrigation waters to the area. Streams that had been intermittent prior to the CBP have become and are becoming flowing streams on a year-round basis. Irrigation return waters and subsurface and surface agricultural drainage comprise the flows of waterways within the project area and have created year-round reservoirs and lakes, such as the Potholes Reservoir and Banks Lake, which provide habitat for fish and wildlife. The flows created by the CBP also enhance the shallow regional aquifers, thereby supporting sustainable resource development.

Water quality standards for Washington State are established in WAC 173-201A. The objectives of the WAC are the protection of beneficial uses of these waters, including drinking water supplies, irrigation, stock watering, fish and wildlife habitat, food processing, and recreation.

Water quality concerns for the major water resources in Grant County are summarized below:

- **Columbia River**: Primary concerns include levels of dissolved gases above biological thresholds for fish species using the river. The hydroelectric projects on the Columbia River in Grant County are “run-of-river” with reservoirs that have little storage capacity. Water velocities are fast enough to prevent the formation of a thermocline (Grant PUD 2010).

- **Crab Creek**: Crab Creek is on Ecology’s proposed list of water quality limited streams for temperature and pH. Crab Creek should not be used as a source of domestic water supply nor for primary contact recreation, such as swimming or water skiing.

- **Banks Lake**: Banks Lake is one of the principal reservoirs of the CBP and impaired by invasive exotic species (Eurasian water-milfoil).

- **Moses Lake**: Water quality in Moses Lake is of concern to residents as well as downstream users of Potholes Reservoir waters. The lake has been classified as “hyper-eutrophic,” which indicates that it is receiving excessive nutrient loading (such as nitrogen and phosphorus). The primary water quality problem is overproduction of algae, particularly blue-green algae, which form unsightly, floating mats during the summer recreation season. Dilution water from the East Low Canal and improvement in irrigation techniques have provided some relief from nuisance algae blooms in recent years.

- **Billy Clapp Lake**: Water quality concerns in Billy Clapp Lake are due to invasive exotic species such as Eurasian water-milfoil.

- **Potholes Reservoir**: Comparison of water quality at the head of Potholes Canal with that of inflows indicates considerable removal of nutrients, bacteria, and suspended solids by Potholes Reservoir.

- **Soap Lake**: Soap Lake is recognized worldwide for its unique mineral content and therapeutic value. Soap Lake represents an economic, cultural, recreational, geologic, and environmental benefit to the region. Of concern is potential dilution and pollution of the waters of the lake.
as well as recreational use that may be incompatible with its therapeutic use. This Plan recognizes the unique functions and values that Soap Lake provides, and intends that the goals and policies of this Natural Setting Element pertaining to water resources and shoreline management protect this important aquatic resource.

11.2.2.3 Groundwater

Groundwater is water located within the subsurface of the earth that supplies, or is capable of supplying, water to wells and springs. Groundwater is typically located in porous material such as fractured rock or the weathering products of rock, such as sand. Groundwater is used for drinking water (treated and untreated), irrigation, livestock watering, and manufacturing processes. Groundwater is the major source of drinking water in Grant County.

The Columbia Plateau aquifer system is subdivided into four aquifers: the suprabasalt sediment (overburden) aquifer system, Saddle Mountains aquifer, Wanapum aquifer, and Grande Ronde aquifer. The overburden aquifers are found within the main structural basins (such as Quincy Basin) and are the main recipients of surface recharge water, primarily from the CBP (Columbia Basin GWMA 2001).

The CBP has impacted Grant County groundwater levels within the project area. The extensive canal system of the CBP combined with non-uniformity in sediment characteristics largely influences groundwater movement (Columbia Basin GWMA 2001). For example, before the CBP, Upper Crab Creek only connected to Moses Lake during high water conditions. Today, several springs join the Crab Creek channel because of elevated groundwater from the CBP development (USBR 2007).

11.2.2.3.1 Groundwater Management Areas

A portion of eastern Grant County is within the Odessa Groundwater Management Subarea (Odessa Subarea), an area designated by Washington State Legislature in 1967 due to groundwater declines. Since the 1980s, groundwater levels in the Odessa Subarea have declined as much as 200 feet (USBR and Ecology 2012).

A major portion of central Grant County is within the Quincy Groundwater Management Subarea (Quincy Subarea), an area designated by Washington State Legislature in 1969 to establish...
boundaries and depth zones to develop a groundwater management program for the area (WAC 173-124).

### 11.2.2.3.2 Groundwater Quality

Grant County is one of four counties that make up the Columbia Basin GWMA. The Columbia Basin GWMA was designated by Ecology in 1998 due to concerns over high nitrate concentrations in groundwater. In 1998, median nitrate-N values were 3.7 milligrams per liter in Grant County.

Nitrate contamination is common in groundwater and can be traced to a variety of agricultural and non-agricultural uses. Agricultural sources of nitrate include inorganic fertilizer and manure. Nitrate can also be derived from vehicles, fertilized lawns, and septic systems. In groundwater, nitrate occurs primarily in upper aquifer wells drilled in the lower lying areas of the County. The correlation between elevated concentrations of nitrates in groundwater and irrigated lands indicates that the major sources include applied fertilizers on irrigated lands such as crops, lawns, golf courses, parks, and other similarly managed lands. In general, shallow wells had higher nitrate levels than deep wells, which suggests that surface application is the primary source of nitrate loading (Columbia Basin GWMA 2001).

Several federal, state, and local regulations are in place to help minimize negative impacts to groundwater quality. These include regulations on drinking water wells, septic tanks, and runoff from landscaping practices.

In general, groundwater is the major source of drinking water in Washington State, including Grant County. To protect groundwater used for drinking water supplies as required by the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, the WDOH requires all Group A public water systems (those that serve 25 or more people or 15 or more connections) that use groundwater as their supply source to implement a wellhead protection program. The wellhead protection program has several requirements that are designed to prevent contamination of groundwater used for drinking water (DOH 2010).

Septic (on-site sewage) systems that are improperly sited, operated, or maintained can affect groundwater quality by discharging contaminants to groundwater. WAC Chapter 246-272A regulates on-site sewage system location, design, installation, operation, maintenance, and monitoring to limit the discharge of contaminants and to minimize public health impacts from septic systems. The Grant County Health District is the authority in Grant County regarding on-site sewage systems.

### 11.2.3 Air

The attractiveness and livability of communities are directly related to air quality. Polluted air contributes to a variety of health problems and consumes millions of dollars in medical costs each year. Polluted air also obscures visibility, creates unpleasant odors, and adversely affects animal and plant life.
In Grant County, current air quality is, on average, good, because of the County’s lack of industrial development and low population density. While motor vehicle operation is not highly concentrated in the County, vehicle emissions do provide a source of air pollution. The County can also expect to experience negative effects due other sources, such as increased dust from additional traffic on unpaved roads in residential and agricultural areas and commercial and industrial operations. The agencies that monitor air quality, Ecology and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, have designated Grant County as an area currently in attainment for all standards.

New air quality issues from emerging industries in Grant County such as from marijuana growing operations and bitcoin server farms are also of concern. Associated air quality affects may need to be addressed as new industries and operations emerge within the County.

Additionally, at times, air quality can be negatively affected due to wind erosion. Because of the general lack of industrial sources, agricultural sources are of greater importance due to the prevalence of wind erosion from range areas, gravel roads, and cultivated fields. Wind erosion is greatest during the spring and fall, when high winds and dry soil conditions create dust storms of varying severity. The severity of dust storms is exacerbated by dryland agricultural practices, which expose the soil during spring cultivation and fall harvesting periods.

### 11.2.4 Vegetation

The majority of Grant County is native rangeland characterized by steppe vegetation comprised mainly of grasses, forbs, and shrubs. The *Artemisia/Agropyron* (sagebrush/wheat grass) association forms the climax species for this zone and is the most extensive association of the steppe vegetation of the eastern Columbia River Basin. Very similar communities are also found in British Columbia, Central Oregon, Southern Idaho, and Montana. Low precipitation levels serve to maintain this association and generally prevent growth of trees except along water courses and in low, wet depressions.

The vegetation in the *Artemisia/Agropyron* association can be divided into four layers:

1. Shrub layer dominated by sage brush
2. Perennial grass layer with blue-bunch wheatgrass and needle and thread grass typically occurring in dense tufts
3. Mixed herbaceous layer of prostrate plants such as cheat grass
4. Surface crust of lichens and mosses

In addition, along the mainstem of the Columbia River and its adjacent stream corridors are vegetative belts that contain various shrubs, trees, and grasses. Water-loving trees like black cottonwood, aspen, and alder are found along many stream banks. These well vegetated stream-side riparian zones provide substantial food and shelter for wildlife. Many aquatic organisms feed on leaf
litter and woody debris that collect in these streams. Insects and other invertebrates falling from these plants provide an important source of food for many fish species. Birds and land animals depend on stream-side vegetated areas for food, thermal protection, visual cover, and as a migratory corridor to other parts of their habitat. It is the sum of these parts, from microorganism to migrating fish that make habitat vibrant and healthy.

11.3 Critical Areas and Cultural Resources

Critical areas are protected ecosystems, landforms, or processes that are protected under the Washington State GMA for the biological or physical functions and values that they provide. Critical areas are categorized by Grant County CAO (UDC 24.08.020) as follows:

- Wetlands
- Frequently Flooded Areas
- Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas
- Geologically Hazardous Areas
- Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas
- Cultural Resource Areas

Critical areas such as wetlands, open spaces, and fish and wildlife habitat contain much of the fish and wildlife, their habitats and other natural resources valued by County residents. Other sensitive areas, such as land located outside fire districts or those prone to flooding are important because of the risk to lives and property posed by developing in them. Critical areas in Grant County also include cultural and historic resources which include those areas or structures that have historic or archaeological significance. Cultural and historic resources protections help the County comply with state and federal laws and regulations as they protect these sensitive resources. Critical Areas and Cultural Resources (UDC Chapter 24.08) is being updated in 2018 to include the latest information and standards for designating and protecting natural resources and critical area lands.

The key functions and values provided by the five critical areas in Grant County can be summarized into four major functions, which include: 1) water quality, 2) hydrology, 3) soil, and 4) habitat. These functions and values are summarized in Table 11-1.

The following sections include descriptions, current trends, and future considerations for each of the critical areas. Section 11.3.8 includes additional information on the VSP and the intersection of critical areas with agricultural lands.
Table 11-1
Critical Areas Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Areas</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>Hydrology</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently Flooded Areas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologically Hazardous Areas (Erosion)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Cultural resource areas are included as critical areas in the CAO but are addressed separately in Section 11.3.4.

11.3.1 Maps and References
Grant County Development Services maintains a series of data maps containing the best available graphic depiction of critical areas in Grant County for the purpose of administering UDC Chapter 24.08 – Critical Areas and Cultural Resources. These maps are for information and illustrative purposes only and are not regulatory in nature.

The maps are intended to alert the development community, appraisers, and current or prospective owners of a potential encounter with a use or development limiting factor based on the natural systems present. The indication of the presence of a critical area on the maps is sufficient cause for the County to request a site-specific analysis for the critical areas identified prior to acceptance of a development application as being complete and ready for processing.

The maps are to be used as a general guide to the location and extent of critical areas. Critical areas indicated on the maps are presumed to exist in the locations shown. The exact location and extent of critical areas shall be determined by the applicant as a result of field investigations performed by qualified professionals using the definitions found UDC Chapter 24.08 – Critical Areas and Cultural Resources. Also see Figures 8 through 13 of Appendix A: Map Folio for the general location of critical areas in Grant County.

11.3.2 Wetlands
Wetlands are important ecosystems that serve many beneficial functions. Wetlands can help reduce erosion and siltation; provide filtration and produce cleaner water; retain water to reduce flooding and support base flows; and provide wildlife, plant, and fisheries habitats. Vegetative growth along waterways and canals in Grant County improves food, cover, and nesting habitats for many wildlife species, which also provide recreational opportunities.
In Grant County, the wetland environment is predominantly a function of irrigation, which has created mostly freshwater emergent seasonal wetlands in portions of the County. The CBP has provided beneficial wetlands to more than 110,000 acres of naturally drainage-impaired lands. In Grant County, wetlands have formed along reservoirs, streams, and creeks receiving return flows from the CBP including Crab Creek, Lower Crab Creek, Rocky Ford Creek, and Lind Coulee. Wetlands have also formed in proximity to CBP main canals, laterals, and wasteways including the Winchester and Frenchman Hills wasteways. Reservoirs and lakes, including Potholes and Banks Lake, also include wetland complexes that have formed over time as a result of the CBP.

Many wetlands within Grant County are considered unintentional wetlands, resulting from localized conditions such as unlined irrigation ditches and tailwater from surface irrigated fields. These types of wetlands are considered jurisdictional wetlands regulated by state wetland law. However, if the irrigation practices and infrastructure upgrades are changed (such as implementation of water conservation practices and lining and piping ditches), and the wetland dries up and no longer performs wetland functions, then no mitigation is required (Ecology 2010).

In Grant County, wetlands are protected under the CAO as a resource vital to sustaining biological productivity and water quality. Wetland habitat is commonly affected by development, resulting in habitat fragmentation and/or losses. Other activities affecting wetlands include agricultural practices and changes in irrigation efficiencies. Wetland destruction or impairment may result in increased public and private costs or property loss.

Recent updates to the CAO have been made to improve protection of wetlands from these activities using best available science, and consistent with the Grant County SMP (Anchor QEA and Oneza & Associates 2014). The Comprehensive Plan is also intended to protect natural wetlands from non-agricultural developments and protect previously unfarmed wetlands from new agriculture. The VSP Work Plan, described in Section 11.3.8, is being implemented by Grant County and participating agricultural producers to protect and voluntarily enhance wetlands and other critical areas.
Currently available resources for determining the approximate location of wetlands in Grant County include:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory (https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/)
- WDFW Priority Habitats and Species Maps (http://wdfw.wa.gov/mapping/phs/)
- Grant County Geographic Information System Maps (http://www.grantcountywa.gov/GIS/)

To confirm if wetlands are present, a wetland delineation is conducted by a professional using methods approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and verified using local rating systems. The Ecology Wetland Rating System is used to rate wetland soils in Washington State. Wetland delineation and verification resources are available here:


### 11.3.3 Frequently Flooded Areas

Frequently flooded areas are defined as floodplains or other areas designated as being within a 100-year or greater floodplain by FEMA’s Federal Insurance Rate Maps. FEMA has defined the extent of the 100-year floodplain to establish actuarial flood insurance rates and to assist communities in efforts to promote sound floodplain management. Frequently flooded areas primarily occur on waterways and drainages. In Grant County, these mainly include Banks Lake, Crab Creek, Lower Crab Creek, Dry Creek, and Potholes Reservoir.

Frequently flooded areas protect public health and safety by providing temporary flood water storage and conveyance. They also provide riparian habitat and other wildlife benefits, and can improve water quality and recharge groundwater. Frequently flooded areas also affect surface and groundwater quality and hydrology (timing and magnitude of flows, and alluvial aquifer recharge), improve or degrade soil health based on vegetative conditions, contribute to riparian habitat diversity, and provide natural areas and rich agricultural lands.

Flooding in the County is typically caused by either heavy snowfall followed by warm temperatures or by high-intensity, short-duration rainfall during winter months (December to February). Flash floods are sometimes seen in the County and can be particularly damaging due to the short warning time. Human activities such as development within the floodplain may increase the frequency, magnitude, and displacement of the flood, hence causing flooding in other areas of a stream. Flood hazards in these areas include periodic inundation ranging in severity, with the potential to result in the loss of life, loss of property, health and safety hazards, disruption of commerce and governmental services, and extraordinary public expenditures for flood protection and relief.

To limit damage to individuals, property, and natural systems, Grant County requires compliance with the provisions of the County’s Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (UDC 24.16), CAO (UDC 24.08),
Zoning Ordinance (UDC Title 23), SMP (UDC 24.12), and Land Division Ordinances (UDC 22.04), including plats, subdivisions, and short plats. The intent of these policies is to promote the efficient use of land and water resources by allocating frequently flooded areas to the uses for which they are best suited. These regulations are intended to discourage obstructions to floodways and prohibit uses that pollute or deteriorate natural waters and watercourses. New development should be reviewed by Grant County for compliance with local, state, and federal regulations for development within frequently flooded areas.

FEMA works with the County to update floodplain mapping. No updates to the mapping are currently underway in Grant County; any changes to the FEMA maps in the future would be available at the following resources:

- FEMA Flood Map Service Center (https://msc.fema.gov/portal)
- Grant County Geographic Information System Maps (http://www.grantcountywa.gov/GIS/)

### 11.3.4 Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas

Critical aquifer recharge areas are groundwater aquifers that provide protections to public drinking water supplies and are typically located near cities and towns. Grant County’s potable water comes from groundwater and surface water supplies, including the critical aquifer recharge areas. Once a potable water source is contaminated, it is difficult, costly, and sometimes impossible to clean up. Therefore, preventing contamination of these water sources is necessary to avoid public costs, hardships, and potential physical harm to people.

As precipitation reaches the earth it typically forms into snow pack, enters lakes, streams, rivers, oceans, or wetlands, seeps into the soil and plant roots, or filters into the ground into groundwater basins. The land surface where this filtering process takes place is called an aquifer recharge zone. Aquifer recharge zones warrant special protection from surface pollution to protect the quality of the groundwater in the area. Groundwater often moves through the ground, eventually discharging to surface water features, such as lakes, streams, or rivers, which in turn recharges the groundwater. The water remaining in the ground makes up the aquifer.

Grant County is located within the Columbia Basin GWMA, an area designated for protecting groundwater and addressing groundwater issues. Of the 176 public water supply system wells recorded within Grant County, more than half of them are shallow wells that could be considered domestic supply wells with the highest potential susceptibility to contamination. The remaining public water supply wells are deeper wells, which likely receive their recharge outside of the wellhead protection areas. Consequently, the deeper wells would be considered to have lower susceptibility to contamination from surface activities occurring within Grant County, as recharge occurs outside of the County (EA 2017).
Continued protection and management of critical aquifer recharge areas in and around Grant County is imperative to reducing pollution and maintaining water storage levels for future use. The Grant County Conservation District provides resources to landowners to educate them on the impact of land management practices on groundwater and groundwater quality. Programs include irrigation water management, lawn care, livestock management, and water quality and quantity programs.

Other groundwater-related information is available at the following resources:

- Columbia Basin GWMA Subsurface Mapping and Aquifer Assessment Project (Columbia Basin GWMA 2009)
- Grant County Conservation District webpage (http://www.columbiabasincds.org/)

11.3.5 **Geologically Hazardous Areas**

Geologically hazardous areas are defined per RCW 36.70A.030 (10) as "areas that, because of their susceptibility to erosion, sliding, earthquake or other geologic events, are not suited to the siting of commercial, residential or industrial development consistent with public health or safety concerns."

According to the Grant County CAO, geologically hazardous areas include:

- Erosion Hazards: Areas identified by the USDA NRCS as having high or very high water erosion hazard
- Landslide Hazards: Areas potentially subject to landslides based on a combination of related geologic, topographic, and hydrologic conditions (e.g., steep slopes, alluvial fans, high-velocity stream banks)
- Mine Hazards: Areas within or within 100 horizontal feet of a mine opening at the surface or those areas designated by DNR as a mine hazard area
- Seismic Hazards: Areas subject to severe risk of damage as a result of earthquake-induced ground shaking, slope failure, settlement, soil liquefaction, or surface faulting

Development within geologically hazardous areas can result in a potential risk to health and safety. In some cases, the risk can be reduced or mitigated to acceptable levels by engineering design or modified construction practices. However, when the risks cannot be sufficiently mitigated, development should be prohibited. Future development within or near geologically hazardous areas should be carried out consistent with Grant County CAO. The Grant County CAO includes a list of references for identifying geologically hazardous areas. Additionally, site assessment protocols, protection requirements, and mitigation measures are provided for development within each geologically hazardous area type.
The following references are available for determining the general location and extent of geologically hazardous areas:

- U.S. Geologic Survey Geologic Hazards Science Center (https://www.usgs.gov/centers/geohazards)
- DNR Geologic Information Portal (https://www.dnr.wa.gov/geologyportal)
- Grant County Geographic Information System Maps (http://www.grantcountywa.gov/GIS/)

**Erosion Hazards.** Erosion is a common occurrence in Grant County due to hydrologic and geologic characteristics, vegetative conditions, wind and human land use. Grant County soils are generally characterized by loess, which are very deep, fertile, and highly erodible soils deposited through lake settling or by wind from the post-glacial outwash. As shown in Figure 12 in Appendix A: Map Folio, erosive soils are located throughout Grant County. These areas are predominantly located along the Columbia River, Lower Crab Creek, and near Grand Coulee. Minimizing or mitigating for development in these areas can help to reduce the damage to natural and built environments.

**Landslide Hazards.** Landslide hazard areas are those areas within Grant County that are subject to potential slope failure. Steep slopes in Grant County are generally located near rivers and streams where erosive forces have steepened slopes over time. Steep slopes are predominantly located along the Columbia River Basin and Lower Crab Creek (Grant County 2017). Regulations should continue to be followed to protect public health and safety from development located on, or adjacent to, steep slope or landslide areas, preserve the scenic quality and natural character of Grant County's hillsides, and to protect water quality.

**Seismic Hazards.** Seismic hazard areas are generally associated with active fault areas and earthquakes. While earthquakes cannot be eliminated, there are no areas in Grant County that have been identified that pose significant, predictable hazards to life and property resulting from the associated ground shaking, differential settlement, and/or soil liquefaction. The USDA NRCS provides soil information indicating areas of risk for liquefaction.

**Mine Hazards.** Mine hazard areas are defined as "areas directly underlain by, adjacent to, or affected by mine workings such as adits, tunnels, drifts, or air shafts." Mine hazards may also include steep and unstable slopes created by open mines. There has been minimal, if any, historical subsurface mining in Grant County due to the geology in the area.

**11.3.6 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas**

Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas include streams, riparian vegetation, and upland habitats that provide habitat to support fish and wildlife species throughout their life stages. These include ranges and habitat elements where endangered, threatened, and sensitive species may be found, and areas that serve a critical role in sustaining needed habitats and species for the functional
integrity of the ecosystem, and which, if altered, may reduce the likelihood that the species will persist over the long term. These areas provide key ecological functions for water quality, hydrology, soil health, and habitat.

Grant County provides habitat for a variety of birds and large mammals, particularly near Lynch Coulee, the Winchester and Frenchman Hills wasteways, and around the Banks Lake area. Bird species and habitat identified by the WDFW in these areas include sage grouse, Ferruginous hawk, American white pelican, bald eagle, sandhill crane, western grebe, and a variety of shorebird and waterfowl concentrations. Mule deer is the most common large mammal, with wide-ranging habitat across Grant County.

Priority habitats in Grant County include cliffs and bluffs, riparian areas, shrub-steppe habitat, and wetlands. These habitats serve a variety of functions in Grant County for locally protected species. These habitats are largely affected by various anthropogenic activities including agricultural practices and development. A decline in these locally important habitats can also affect the species that rely on them.

Species such as sage grouse have historically been on the decline in Grant County. WDFW completed a recovery plan in 2004 and has since worked with landowners to enroll thousands of acres in federal conservation programs, tailored to address the needs of the specific property in order to keep working lands working while also providing conservation actions compatible with the federal Sage Grouse Initiative and related conservation programs (WDFW 2015).

Shrub-steppe upland habitat is the largest native land cover type in Grant County. The shrub-steppe habitat provides many ecosystem services including soil stabilization, wildfire moderation, and overall biodiversity. Shrub-steppe also provides habitat to many species that are endemic to the region, such as sage grouse. Recommendations provided in the Grant County SMP Final Draft Shoreline, Inventory, Analysis, and Characterization Report for preserving shrub-steppe habitat include limiting development footprints including agricultural land cover changes, limiting road and utility corridors to avoid fragmenting habitat, restricting vegetation clearing, keeping domestic pets and livestock out of sensitive species habitat, limiting fencing to avoid barriers to native wildlife, and limiting irrigation canals through shrub-steppe habitat (Anchor QEA 2013).
Many of the habitat conservation areas in Grant County are managed to protect species and natural geographic distribution to avoid fragmenting habitat. In these cases, cooperative and coordinated land use planning is critical for not only the natural environment, but to the quality of life in Grant County. Several managed and protected fish and wildlife habitat areas are located in Grant County as described below:

- **Columbia River:** The Columbia River provides habitat to a variety of aquatic and terrestrial species in Grant County. The Columbia River supports more than 40 fish species, including individuals from 14 families of freshwater fishes, and 6 anadromous species (including Chinook salmon, sockeye salmon, coho salmon, steelhead, and Pacific and river lamprey). Anadromous salmonids are present only downstream of Chief Joseph Dam on the mid-Columbia River. The USBR, Northwest Power and Conservation Council, Grant County PUD, and Columbia River Basin Hydropower manage hydroelectric activities in the Columbia River Basin to enhance and facilitate the downstream migration of juvenile salmonids throughout the year. This streamflow allocation for fisheries protection and enhancement is intended to provide favorable flow conditions during peak passage times. These agencies, the WDFW, and other agencies also implement fish habitat enhancement programs on the Columbia River.

- **Banks Lake:** Banks Lake is a 27-mile manmade irrigation impoundment that receives water directly from Lake Roosevelt via pumping and serves as the irrigation equalizing reservoir for the CBP. Banks Lake supports nongame, warmwater, and coldwater game fish and a valuable, year-round sport fishery for kokanee, smallmouth bass, walleye, and other species. The WDFW supplements the kokanee population with hatchery fry plants, and also plants rainbow trout through a cooperative agreement with the local community. The area surrounding Banks Lake also provides habitat for birds and large mammals.

- **Potholes Reservoir:** The Potholes Reservoir was formed in the early 1950s with the completion of O’Sullivan Dam and is considered to have the most diverse, well-used fishery in the Columbia River Basin. The Potholes Reservoir is managed by the USBR, in coordination with the Washington State Parks and WDFW. At least ten game fish are known to exist in the reservoir, with yellow perch, black crappie, largemouth bass, bluegill sunfish, walleye, and rainbow trout being the most popular. Rainbow trout are stocked annually in the reservoir, and the other species are self-sustaining. The area surrounding the Potholes Reservoir provides habitat for a variety of large mammals such as elk, deer, and bighorn sheep.

- **Other Water Bodies:** The USBR and the WDFW have investigated the fisheries resources of nearly 200 lakes and 40 streams or stream segments comprising 425 miles of flowing water in the Columbia River Basin. Lakes directly connected to the irrigation system are dominated by yellow perch, whereas rainbow trout dominate the seep lakes indirectly affected by irrigation. Other abundant game fish species in both lake groups include black crappie, largemouth bass, and pumpkinseed sunfish. The most abundant nongame fish are Tui chub, common carp, and sucker, all of which occur only in lakes directly connected to the irrigation system.
As the conversion of untouched land to agriculture and development continues, habitat fragmentation will further reduce biological productivity and diversity. Conservation areas, such as public holdings, hold promise for successfully protecting eastern Washington’s natural wildlife heritage. The acreage and benefits of these conservation areas may be improved by lands protected and enhanced through the VSP and other programs carried out by Grant County and the Grant County Conservation District. Future considerations for Grant County include:

- Conserving existing public or private lands for habitat purposes, augmented where needed by additional purchases, exchanges, conservation easements to “connect” large tracts of habitat (e.g., wetlands, shrub-steppe) into functional systems
- Applying and monitoring for effectiveness of regulatory provisions to protect and enhance near-shore riverine and wetland environments
- Applying water conservation standards to non-farm developments
- Increasing watershed storage capacity to provide additional low season flows and reduce the competition between in- and out-of-stream uses for available water supplies
- Encouraging land use practices that eliminate or significantly reduce non-point source pollution
- In concert with state resources agencies, undertaking local educational outreach programs including grant monies for demonstration projects on private lands associated with sensitive resource issues

The following references are available for determining the general location and extent of fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory (https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/)
- WDFW Priority Habitats and Species Interactive Mapping (http://wdfw.wa.gov/mapping/phs/)
- WDFW SalmonScape (http://apps.wdfw.wa.gov/salmonscape/)
- DNR Natural Heritage Program (https://www.dnr.wa.gov/natural-heritage-program)
- Grant County Conservation District webpage (http://www.columbiabasincds.org/)
- Grant County Geographic Information System Maps (http://www.grantcountywa.gov/GIS/)

11.3.7 Cultural Resource Areas

Cultural resources are identified in the Grant County CAO as those areas that have been identified as having lands, sites, and structures that have historical or archaeological significance. Native Americans, like the Columbia and Wanapum people, have traveled over the landscape that is now Grant County harvesting the roots and plants for food and medicine, taking shelter where the land
suited them. Cultural resources include archaeological sites and objects, traditional cultural lands, food gathering areas, and burial grounds. Preservation of Grant County’s cultural resources through records and other means of preservation is important to Grant County’s past, current, and future residents.

Future development should be consistent with the local, state, and federal regulations for protection of cultural resources and archaeological sites. The Grant County CAO provides maps and references for identifying archaeological sites and potential cultural resources areas. Additionally, site assessment requirements and protection standards are provided for future development. Where archaeological sites or cultural resources are identified, development should be coordinated with the tribes to avoid, minimize, or mitigate for potential impacts.

In addition to the Grant County CAO, the following resources are available for determining the potential for encountering archaeological sites or cultural resources:

- Grant County PUD Artifact Protection webpage (http://www.gcpud.org/environment/artifact-protection)

### 11.3.8 Voluntary Stewardship Program

Grant County opted into the VSP in 2012 and developed an approved Grant County VSP Work Plan in 2017 (Anchor QEA 2017) to protect and voluntarily enhance critical areas in places where agricultural activities are conducted, while maintaining and enhancing the long-term viability of agriculture.

Agricultural lands have little intersect with critical areas in Grant County. Geologically hazardous areas have the greatest at 38% intersect with private agricultural lands. Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas have a 10% intersect with private agricultural lands. Frequently flooded areas, geologically hazardous areas, and wetlands all have a 2% or less intersect with private agricultural lands.

To protect and/or voluntarily enhance critical areas with an intersect with private agricultural lands, Grant County

---

**The Voluntary Stewardship Program (RCW 36.70A.700)**

The GMA was amended in 2011 to establish the VSP, a new, non-regulatory, and incentive-based approach that balances the protection of critical areas on agricultural lands while promoting agricultural viability, as an alternative to managing agricultural activities in Grant County under the CAO.

VSP is not a replacement for compliance with other local, state, or federal laws and regulations, but participation in VSP will help to show how much effort the County’s agricultural producers are investing in meeting these requirements and to document the benefits of these efforts in protecting and enhancing critical area functions and values.
Conservation District collaborated with a local Work Group to develop and implement the Grant County VSP Work Plan (Anchor QEA 2017). For the purposes of the Work Plan, the Work Group identified eight community planning areas within the County to help develop a more localized planning approach during implementation of the Work Plan. The community planning areas include: Black Sands, Ephrata, Hartline, Mattawa, Moses Lake, Quincy, Royal Slope, and Warden. More information on the VSP can be found in the VSP Work Plan (Anchor QEA 2017). The Grant County Conservation District webpage also contains additional information at http://www.columbiabasincds.org/vsp.

11.4 Shoreline Master Program

The Washington State Shoreline Management Act was enacted in 1971 to provide for the management and protection of shorelines of the state by regulating development in the shoreline area. The Shoreline Management Act requires cities and counties to adopt a SMP to regulate shoreline development and accommodate all reasonable and appropriate uses. Grant County completed an updated SMP as required by Chapter 90.58 RCW in 2014 (Anchor QEA and Oneza & Associates 2014).

The GMA requires counties with an adopted SMP to include the goals and policies of such program in the county’s comprehensive plan. The SMP goals and policies are to be considered an element of the comprehensive plan and the regulations are to be considered a part of the county’s development regulations (RCW 36.70A.480). The goals and policies set forth in this Comprehensive Plan reflect the guiding principles of Grant County’s SMP, with the remainder of the SMP adopted by reference. Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan provides the framework for future decision-making and is a guide for future development of lands within the County’s shoreline jurisdiction boundaries. Additional information is included in the SMP (Anchor QEA and Oneza & Associates 2014).

11.5 Fire Hazards

Fire hazards are a serious and growing threat in the United States, particularly in drier regions that are more susceptible to fires. Whether wildfire occurs in urban areas, shrub-steppe, wheat fields, or grasslands, the potential loss to life and property is a concern to both property owners and firefighters. Grant County receives little natural precipitation and is highly susceptible to fire hazard during much of the year. In August 2017, a 500-acre wildfire was sparked in Quincy, Washington, forcing the evacuation of many residents and damaging at least two homes. Similar wildfires have occurred in the region that are attributed to dry summers with little to no precipitation for months at a time.

As development expands into rural areas, the need to provide adequate and efficient fire services increases. Future development should consider potential fire hazards and proximity to more susceptible areas. Grant County UDC Chapter 6.10 includes provisions related to fire hazards,
including regulations pertaining to vegetation pile burning and recreational fires. Other resources available for fire hazard education and prevention include:

- Grant County Conservation District Agricultural Burn Permits Program (http://www.columbiabasincds.org/publications-)
- Washington Burn Bans for Grant County (https://waburnbans.net/recent-burn-bans/grant/)
- Grant County Fire Marshall (http://www.grantcountywa.gov/Fire-Marshall/)
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12.1 Fact Sheet

Project Title:
Grant County Comprehensive Plan Update Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Addendum
(Comprehensive Plan Update Chapter 12 Environmental Analysis)

Project Proponent:
Grant County

Location:
The area represented by this EIS Addendum is Grant County, which is located in central Washington
and encompasses approximately 2,791 square miles.

Proposed Action:
Grant County is updating their Comprehensive Plan consistent with the GMA (RCW 36.70A). The plan
is being developed to reflect the County’s values and plan for future growth consistent with the GMA
as well as guide County decisions on land use, transportation, infrastructure, housing, economic
development, and the environment. The following two alternatives are being considered:
Alternative 1: No Action Alternative
The "No Action" alternative, Alternative 1, would maintain Grant County’s existing land use designations without modifications. This means future growth and any changes to land use would need to occur within the existing land use designations and policies. UGA policies would remain the same.

Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative
The Proposed Action alternative, Alternative 2, allows for changes in the Comprehensive Plan reclassifying and updating existing land use designations to be more consistent with GMA requirements, better reflect existing and planned uses and accommodate population growth within Grant County. To address future growth, this alternative includes adding the Rural Resource land use designation for many of the lands that may no longer be designated as Agricultural Resource. This alternative includes removing approximately 295,400 acres of land currently designated Agricultural Resource that require management to be suitable, are not currently farmed, or are not prime farmland, and should not have been included originally in the Agricultural Resource land use designation. Approximately 1,300 acres would be added to the Agricultural Resource designation to preserve these lands for rangeland uses and agricultural production opportunity areas.

This alternative also re-designates Ag Dryland, Ag Irrigated, and Ag Rangeland resource lands to GMA Ag Dryland, DMA Ag Irrigated, and DMA Ag Rangeland designations. These lands are identified by Grant County as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance and will be managed accordingly under the GMA.

This alternative also:
- Incorporates proposed updates to Grant County’s critical areas code, including updated standards for wetlands and protection of fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas
- Includes planning efforts under the VSP (RCW 36.70A.700), which is promulgated under the GMA; Grant County has published a VSP Work Plan to voluntarily protect critical areas on agricultural lands
- Accommodates anticipated growth in UGAs consistent with CWPP

Lead Agency:
Grant County Development Services
264 West Division Avenue
Ephrata, Washington 98823

State Environmental Policy Act Contact Person and Responsible Official:
Damien Hooper, Development Services Director
Grant County Development Services
P.O. Box 37
Ephrata, Washington 98823
**Required Permits and/or Approvals:**
The following actions are required for adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Update:

- Issuance of SEPA EIS Addendum
- Open record public hearing with the Grant County Planning Commission for a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners
- Final approval of the Comprehensive Plan Update by the Board of County Commissioners in an open record public hearing

**Authors and Principal Contributors:**
This EIS Addendum was prepared under the direction of Grant County. Research and analysis was provided by:

- White Bluffs Consulting, Lead Author
- Anchor QEA, LLC, Analysis and Technical Support
- Oneza & Associates, Alternatives Development

**Date of Final Environmental Impact Statement Issuance:**
October 11, 1999

**Date of Draft Environmental Impact Statement Issuance:**
March 29, 1998

**Date of Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments Due:**
May 2, 1999

**Public Meetings:**
- September 13 and 14, 2017: Public Planning Commission-hosted Visioning Workshop
- November 11 and December 6, 2017 and January 17, 2018: Public Planning Commission Workshops

**Final Action:**
Board of County Commissioners adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Update is planned for late May or early June 2018 (subject to change).

**Related Plans and Documents:**

- Grant County Draft Comprehensive Plan Update

*A limited number of CD and hard copy Comprehensive Plan documents are available at Grant County Development Services. This Comprehensive Plan is also available online at: http://www.grantcountywa.gov/GCDS/*
12.2 Introduction

Grant County is updating its Comprehensive Plan consistent with the GMA (RCW 36.70A). The Comprehensive Plan consists of goals, policies, and analyses to reflect Grant County’s values and plans for future growth consistent with the GMA and to guide decisions on land use, transportation, infrastructure, housing, economic development, and the environment. The Comprehensive Plan was originally developed in 1999 and comprehensively amended in 2006 as required by RCW36.70A.130. More minor amendments as well as site-specific land use designation changes have also occurred throughout this period, as recently as 2017. Refinements to the Comprehensive Plan have been made consistent with the plan’s vision and to further refine the balance of plan elements consistent with GMA goals.

Washington’s SEPA classifies the adoption of a comprehensive plan as a “non-project action”; that is, it involves policies, plans, or programs rather than a site-specific project. For non-project actions, SEPA requires an EIS that evaluates possible impacts of the proposed action as well as impacts of alternatives to the action. Grant County has prepared this environmental analysis to amend the EIS that was issued in 1999, and amended in 2006 for the 2006 Comprehensive Plan. This EIS Addendum provides an environmental analysis of two alternatives to support the Comprehensive Plan: a No Action alternative and a Proposed Action alternative. Alternative 1, the No Action alternative, calls for keeping Grant County’s existing Comprehensive Plan and minor amendments without modifications. Alternative 2, the Proposed Action alternative, allows for changes in the Comprehensive Plan to accommodate future land uses and population growth expected to occur within Grant County.

The proposed alternative evaluated in this Addendum does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives as evaluated in the 1999 EIS and subsequent amendments. Therefore, this Addendum satisfies the requirements of SEPA pursuant to RCW Chapter 43.21C and WAC 197-11-625.

12.2.1 State Environmental Policy Act Requirements

SEPA (RCW 43.21C) requires government officials to consider the environmental consequences of actions they are about to take and seek better or less damaging ways to accomplish those proposed actions. Officials must consider whether the proposed action would have a significant, adverse environmental impact on elements of the natural and built environment.

SEPA empowers local government to protect environmental quality, and it requires state and local officials to make decisions consistent with the policy set forth in the act. When necessary, SEPA can be used to supplement agencies’ authority to address gaps in laws affecting environmental quality. Under SEPA, policies, plans, and regulations adopted per GMA are considered "non-project" actions subject to SEPA review.
This chapter describes the findings of a review conducted to meet SEPA requirements. It is an addendum to the original 1999 EIS with the 2006 updated analysis and review, and meets SEPA requirements for such documents.

12.2.2 State Environmental Policy Act and Growth Management Act Integration

The GMA requires compliance with both SEPA and GMA in the comprehensive planning process. Due to similarities, integration of SEPA with GMA eliminates duplication of effort and assures consistency between them. The procedural and substantive requirements of SEPA and GMA have been integrated at several points in the County's planning process:

- **Public Participation.** Both SEPA and GMA recognize public participation and agency coordination as fundamental to the planning process. Public participation has been an ongoing process since the first Comprehensive Plan’s SEPA EIS was published in 1999. Additional public participation activities occurred with the 2006 update and again for more minor amendments occurring through 2017. For this Comprehensive Plan Update, Grant County held a public Planning Commission-hosted Visioning Workshop on September 13 and 14, 2017. After that, the Planning Commission held public workshops occurring on November 11 and December 6, 2017, and January 17, 2018. These workshops were held to obtain feedback on the Comprehensive Plan and Proposed Alternative being evaluated as part of this analysis.

- **Visioning and Scoping** Visioning (for the Comprehensive Plan) and scoping (for the EIS) are the fundamental beginning points of each process. Visioning and scoping have been combined over an extended period of time in the Grant County process.

- **Existing Conditions** Both SEPA and GMA require collection and analysis of information regarding existing conditions. The Comprehensive Plan contains a description of existing conditions for the various planning issues/resources.

- **Goals and Policies** Goals and policies play an important role in the development of the GMA comprehensive plan and the SEPA evaluation of plan alternatives. Element-specific goals and policies are included in Chapter 3 of the Comprehensive Plan.

- **Impact Analysis** GMA requires collection and analysis of data for natural resource lands, critical areas, the mandatory plan elements (i.e., land use, rural, housing, transportation, utilities, capital facilities), UGAs, and the siting of essential public facilities. SEPA requires the analysis of the Comprehensive Plan’s significant adverse impacts on elements of the natural and built environments. Grant County’s draft plan contains the data inventories and descriptions of resources to which the required SEPA analysis is applied in this chapter.

- **Mitigation** GMA requires plan and ordinance provisions to reduce the impacts of growth on the natural and built environment (e.g., designate and protect critical areas by regulation, the
land use plan must protect water quality). Accordingly, the Comprehensive Plan, including text, mapping, goals and policies, along with its implementation mechanisms naturally incorporate SEPA required mitigation.

- **Documents** Both SEPA and GMA require preparation of documents for public participation and decision-making processes, but each has specific guidelines on the information and analysis that must or should be included. This chapter contains the requirements of SEPA as an integrated portion of the draft Comprehensive Plan document, which has been prepared to satisfy GMA requirements. After certification of the EIS and adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, this chapter (Chapter 12) could be separated from the plan to become a standalone document.

### 12.2.3 Location
Grant County is located in the central part of Washington. The fourth largest county in the State, Grant County is approximately 2,675 square miles in area and is bordered on the west by Douglas and Kittitas counties, on the south by Yakima and Benton counties, on the north by Okanogan County, and on the east by Adams County. The Grant County physical profile is described in Chapter 2 of this Plan.

### 12.3 Description of Proposed Alternatives
Grant County is proposing two alternatives based on projected future growth patterns. The alternatives and how they were developed are described further below.

#### 12.3.1 How the Alternatives Were Developed
Alternative 1 is the No Action alternative required under SEPA and calls for keeping Grant County’s existing Comprehensive Plan without modifications. The Proposed Action alternative, Alternative 2, was developed based on public input during the visioning process. This alternative was also developed through a county-wide review of agricultural resource lands, as the designated lands had not been reviewed and updated for several years, and to confirm a more complete set of designation factors. As a result, modifications to the land use designations were made to better reflect the existing and potential land use of GMA agricultural lands designated as Agricultural Resource. A summary of public and Planning Commission comments received during the visioning workshops are included in Appendix C.

#### 12.3.2 Alternatives

##### 12.3.2.1 Alternative 1
Alternative 1 is the SEPA-required No Action alternative in which there would be no change from Grant County’s current planning strategies. Under this alternative, future population growth and any
changes to land use would occur within the existing land use designations and policies. Lands currently designated as Agricultural Resource would retain that land use designation although they are not currently farmed or irrigated, do not have a suitable soil type without management, are areas in conservation/Conservation Reserve Program, or are not prime farmland, and should not have been included originally in the Agricultural Resource land use designation. These areas include areas north of Quincy in the Beezley Hills area, north of Soap Lake and south of Coulee City in the Dry Falls area, areas around Wilson Creek in the Black Rock/Wilson Creek area, and areas east-northeast of Mattawa in the Saddle Mountain/Mattawa area.

Under this alternative, UGA policies would also remain the same. Table 4-2 summarizes the existing land use inventory for the County. Figure 4 in Appendix A shows existing land use in the County.

The No Action alternative would continue incompatible land uses in the County and would not accommodate projected population growth as described in Chapter 4.5.

12.3.2.2 Alternative 2
Alternatives 2 is the Proposed Action alternative, which would allow for changes in the Comprehensive Plan, reclassifying and updating existing land use designations to be more consistent with GMA requirements, better reflect existing and planned uses, and accommodate population growth within the County. Based on OFM medium series population forecast, Grant County population would increase by 37,299 by the year 2038. Considering an annual growth rate of 1.0% in the unincorporated County, this part of the County is estimated to add 10,178 additional people over the next 20 years. Table 4-8 indicates projected population and distribution of future growth in each jurisdiction.

To address future growth, this alternative includes adding the Rural Resource land use designation for many of the lands that may no longer be designated as Agricultural Resource. This alternative includes removing approximately 295,400 acres of land currently designated Agricultural Resource that require management to be suitable, are not currently farmed, or are not prime farmland, and should not have been included originally in the Agricultural Resource land use designation. Lands to be removed from this designation and moved to Rural Resource include areas north of Quincy in the Beezley Hills area, north of Soap Lake and south of Coulee City in the Dry Falls area, areas around Wilson Creek in the Black Rock/Wilson Creek area, and areas east-northeast of Mattawa in the Saddle Mountain/Mattawa area. These areas will be designated as Rural Resource lands. Approximately 1,300 acres would be added to the Agricultural Resource designation to preserve these lands for rangeland uses and agricultural production opportunity areas. Areas added to Agricultural Resource land designation are areas east of Mattawa and north of Coulee City. These areas are currently farmed and irrigated, exhibit suitable capability, have a large parcel size, or are within one of Grant County’s three American Viticultural Areas.
This alternative also re-designates Ag Dryland, Ag Irrigated, and Ag Rangeland resource lands to GMA Ag Dryland, GMA Ag Irrigated, and GMA Ag Rangeland designations. These lands are identified by the County as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance and will be managed accordingly under the GMA.

This alternative incorporates Grant County’s CAO Update, which is adopted by reference in the plan. The CAO protects wetlands, waterways, wildlife habitats, and frequently flooded, aquifer recharge (groundwater), and geologically hazardous areas. Recent updates to the CAO have been made to improve protection of wetlands from these activities using best available science, and consistent with the Grant County SMP (Anchor QEA and Oneza & Associates 2014). This Environmental Analysis chapter also provides the framework for future decision making and a guide for future development of lands within and nearby Grant County’s critical areas.

Alternative 2 also incorporates planning efforts under the VSP (RCW 36.70A.700), which is promulgated under the GMA. The Washington State Conservation Commission recently approved Grant County’s VSP Work Plan prepared in coordination with the Grant County Conservation District to voluntarily protect critical areas on agricultural lands (Anchor QEA 2017). Implementation of the VSP Work Plan is largely designed to fit within the framework of established programs. The VSP Work Plan is incorporated by reference in the Comprehensive Plan.

Alternative 2 also accommodates anticipated growth in UGAs consistent with CWPP. Changes to geographic boundaries or UGA expansions are not proposed under this alternative. Table 4-3 summarizes the future land use designations for the County. Figure 5 in Appendix A shows future land use designations in the County.

12.4 Affected Environment, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

12.4.1 Affected Environment
The physical and human elements of the affected environment are described in the Comprehensive Plan and the 1999 EIS as amended in 2006. This Addendum is focused on incremental additional impacts and mitigation measures described in the following sections.

12.4.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures
The impact analyses for a non-project action such as the Comprehensive Plan are based on the amount of planned growth, areas where growth will occur, land use type and character, and associated adjacent higher density areas. The Comprehensive Plan itself would not result in direct changes to the physical and human environment. However, the plan provides a policy framework that is intended to guide future development and any impacts to the environment would be indirect.
Table 12-1 describes potential impacts to physical and human elements of the environment from the two alternatives described herein.

Mitigation measures are primarily based on regional plans and policies developed to address the impacts of forecasted growth. Similarly, improvements to important infrastructure systems needed to accommodate planned growth are identified. Under the Proposed Action alternative, the Comprehensive Plan references goals and policies intended to address ways to anticipate and mitigate the potential impacts of planned growth on the environment and Grant County’s quality of life. Table 12-1 also includes mitigation measures to address potential impacts from future development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1: No Action</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Proposed Action</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Earth       | Earth-related impacts would be related to development, scaling with the intensity of    | The conversion of lands from Agricultural Resource to Rural Resource would potentially maintain development densities, but better allocate future development to suitable land types and uses. For example, lands converted from Agricultural Resource to Rural Resource designation would include areas that have not historically been farmed and are not expected to be farmed in the future. In many cases, this designation change is based on soil type and other factors that require more intensive management to be suitable for agricultural uses. CAO and VSP adoption would further protect earth resources. | • Manage resource lands to reduce erosion potential  
• Compact soils at densities appropriate for planned land uses  
• Provide vegetative cover or soil cement on exposed surfaces  
• For agricultural practices, implement voluntary conservation measures described in the VSP Work Plan (Anchor QEA 2017) |
|             | development, scaling with the intensity of future land uses. Development and land uses would continue to be inconsistent with existing land use designations, including in some areas potentially better suited for agricultural uses and some areas potentially suited for uses other than agriculture. Future development would be subject to environmental review. |                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                     |
| Air         | The No Action alternative would not directly impact air quality. Future development potentially impacting air quality would be subject to environmental review by Ecology's Eastern Regional Office. | The Proposed Action alternative would not directly impact air quality. Future development potentially impacting air quality would be subject to environmental review by Ecology’s Eastern Regional Office. | • Continue to heed local notices for burn bans and other air quality advisories  
• Maintain compliance with Ecology Eastern Regional Office requirements during construction and operation  
• Implement projects under the 2017 to 2022 Transportation Improvement Plan and future amendments, to improve transportation infrastructure and potentially reduce emissions |
| Water       | Water quality impacts could occur from development activities with the potential to cause erosion or increase impervious surfaces that could discharge contaminated or sediment-laden water to nearby surface waters. Potential sources of contaminants to surface water bodies include animal sources, | Water-related impacts under the Proposed Action alternative would also be scaled with development. Managing future growth under this alternative will reduce the impact of development and may help to control water quality impacts. CAO and VSP adoption | • Comply with on-site sewer system and other development standards in the UDC and County Health District regulations  
• Comply with CAO per UDC 24.08  
• Comply with SMP regulations |
<p>| | | | |
|             |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1: No Action</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Proposed Action</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agricultural sources, and malfunctioning on-site sewage systems. Water-related impacts under the No Action alternative would be related to development, scaling with the intensity of future land uses. Water supply impacts would also be scaled with future growth.</td>
<td>would further protect water resources impacts from development.</td>
<td>• Implement VSP to protect and enhance critical areas that intersect with agricultural lands&lt;br&gt;• Reduce impervious surface area by adopting implementing applicable low-impact development requirements per the Stormwater Management Manual for Eastern Washington (Ecology 2004) and grading and drainage requirements in UDC 25.12.080&lt;br&gt;• Implement groundwater management strategies identified in the Columbia Basin GWMA Plan in coordination with the Grant County Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna and Flora</td>
<td>The impact of development on habitat includes the replacement of agricultural lands and other undeveloped areas with buildings, roads, parking lots, landscaping, and structures. Depending on the location, density, and intensity of land use, this can result in the removal and displacement of habitat, can result in habitat fragmentation, and can cause some wildlife species to relocate. Under this alternative, future growth would be more dispersed and at a higher density than Alternative 2. Thus, this alternative has greater potential to impact habitat conservation areas and disrupt migration corridors. Impacts to flora would scale with the intensity of land uses within the planning areas.</td>
<td>The conversion of lands from Agricultural Resource to Rural Resource will maintain development densities, but better allocate existing and future uses to suitable land types and designations. Much of the land going into Rural Resource includes priority habitat for birds and large mammals, including shrub-steppe habitat. Future development and land uses should consider priority habitats in these areas as part of the planning process. Land densities are the same under both Agricultural and Rural Resource designations. However, the low intensity use of rural land also provides fish and wildlife habitat, open space, and other environmental benefits. CAO and VSP adoption would further protect natural resources including shorelines and other critical areas.</td>
<td>• Comply with CAO per UDC 24.08&lt;br&gt;• Provide erosion and stormwater control measures during construction, particularly in areas adjacent to surface waters that provide fish and wildlife habitat&lt;br&gt;• Consider landscaping with native plants to provide vegetation of habitat significance in streetscapes, buffers for stormwater swales, rain gardens, and other habitat features&lt;br&gt;• Sponsor or encourage public education about the benefits of native vegetation&lt;br&gt;• Implement VSP to protect and enhance critical areas that intersect with agricultural lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Alternative 1: No Action</td>
<td>Alternative 2: Proposed Action</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noisy activities associated with future development under the No Action alternative would be subject to the Grant County Noise regulation in UDC 6.24.</td>
<td>Noise-generating activities associated with future development and land use activities under the Proposed Action alternative would be subject to the Grant County Noise regulation in UDC 6.24.</td>
<td>• For construction activities, comply with Grant County Noise Regulation in UDC 6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light and Glare</td>
<td>The generation of light and glare would scale with future development. Under the No Action alternative, light and glare impacts from development would be more diffuse, particularly in rural areas where higher-density development would continue to occur.</td>
<td>The Proposed Action alternative would potentially reduce light and glare impacts in rural areas by concentrating higher-density development through growth policies under the Plan. Concentrated development in UGAs may result in increased light and glare impacts in these areas.</td>
<td>• Incorporate directional lighting into streetscapes and other development design, as applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comply with County lighting standards in UDC 23.12.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>The No Action alternative would allow development to occur according to existing land use designations. Existing and potential future land uses would not be consistent with the land use designation in some Agricultural Resource areas. Similarly, existing and potential land uses consistent with Agricultural Resource areas would not be properly designated.</td>
<td>The conversion of lands from Agricultural Resource to Rural Resource will maintain development densities, but better allocate future development to suitable land types and uses. For example, areas proposed for addition to the Agricultural Resource designation include areas that are currently farmed, are irrigated, have a suitable soil type, and are large enough to be commercially viable in the long-term. This designation will preserve agricultural resource lands. Areas proposed for conversion to Rural Resource include lands that were inappropriately designated and are not currently farmed or irrigated and do not contain suitable soil types without management. This re-designation of land uses would reduce the intensity of land management within resource lands that are less suitable for agriculture.</td>
<td>• Use existing high-density areas for future population and employment growth within the County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement rural area protection or preservation measures to maintain the character of rural areas within the County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meet population growth targets and housing demand through developing existing planned areas and infill developments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1: No Action</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Proposed Action</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As described in the Comprehensive Plan, population within Grant County has continued to grow at a rate of 1% per year from 2010 to 2017 (nearly 14% aggregate). The No Action alternative would allow development to occur according to existing land use designations.</td>
<td>The Proposed Action alternative would better allocate land uses in rural areas, outside of UGAs to accommodate population growth. The adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and policies would better manage growth in Grant County and within UGAs expected to include the major share of future growth, such as the cities of Moses Lake, Mattawa, Quincy, and Ephrata.</td>
<td>• Concentrate development in UGAs with existing infrastructure and near employment centers&lt;br&gt;• Meet housing demand through developing existing planned areas and infill developments&lt;br&gt;• Consider infill incentives and upzones in cities and UGAs&lt;br&gt;• Manage planned development to accommodate population growth near the Potholes Reservoir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1: No Action</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Proposed Action</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The No Action alternative would allow development to occur according to existing land use designations. The location and type of housing allowed within these land use designations would not change. No additional policies supporting H-2A housing for seasonal workers would be provided.</td>
<td>Based on the population estimates, Grant County will need to add 3,393 new homes in the next 20 years. The Proposed Action alternative would encourage density to be concentrated in cities and UGAs with higher density designations. The Comprehensive Plan also includes policies that support H-2A housing for seasonal workers.</td>
<td>• Consider similar mitigation measures as described in &quot;population&quot; above&lt;br&gt;• Encourage affordable housing through zoning and development regulations&lt;br&gt;• Ensure sufficient H-2A housing for seasonal workers that meets the standards in RCW 70.114A.050&lt;br&gt;• Continue to monitor development and evaluate any service adjustments necessary to support this type of housing along with other farmworker housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Alternative 1: No Action</td>
<td>Alternative 2: Proposed Action</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transportation/Circulation | The No Action alternative would allow development to occur according to existing land use designations. This could result in increased and more diffuse impacts to transportation facilities from future development in rural areas from higher density development. Maintenance of transportation facilities would also be greater and more widespread rather than focused near cities and UGAs. | Increased density in cities and UGAs under the Proposed Action alternative would increase demand on transportation facilities and circulation, including trails and paths located throughout the County. Major transportation facilities would be impacted by higher density growth including SR-243 west of Mattawa, SR-17 between Ephrata and Moses Lake, and SR 28 between Quincy and Ephrata. As described in the Plan, adequate capacity exists to accommodate growth on these roadways. The Six Year Transportation Improvement Program, which is incorporated by reference in the Plan (Appendix E), identifies capital projects to be carried out in the near term based on tracking and reporting. These projects include critical infrastructure such as bridge replacements and safety improvements on major roads throughout the County. Other projects include repairs and traffic control upgrades to Dodson, Martin, Stratford, and Lower Crab Creek roads, for example. | - Work with development applicants to oversee that appropriate coordination with affected agencies and property owners occurs upon future development  
- Implement transportation improvements in accordance with the QUADCO Regional Transportation Plan for Adams, Grant, Kittitas, and Lincoln counties  
- Cooperate with the Washington State regional transportation planning organization for LOS  
- Consider multimodal transportation and alternative transportation opportunities to and from growth areas such as Moses Lake, Mattawa, Quincy, and Ephrata  
- Prioritize infrastructure replacement and safety improvements in the Six Year Transportation Improvement Program |
| Public Services          | Future population and employment growth would result in increased demand on public services. The No Action alternative would potentially increase the service area for public services by allowing higher density development to occur in rural areas.                                                                 | The Proposed Action alternative would potentially maintain the service area for public services by concentrating density in cities and UGAs with higher density designations; with significant growth in rural areas still projected and associated public services increases also occurring.                                                                                     | - Locate public services near high-density areas  
- Comply with UDC 25.20, which requires capital facilities and services necessary to accommodate the impacts of development to be available and adequate to maintain LOS standards specified in the Plan  
- Comply with the SWMP, which is adopted by reference under the Plan |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th><strong>Alternative 1: No Action</strong></th>
<th><strong>Alternative 2: Proposed Action</strong></th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Energy** | Energy demand would continue to increase with future population growth. | Similar to the No Action alternative, energy demand would continue to increase with future population growth. | • Provide incentives for businesses and households to supply alternative energy to the grid  
• Encourage and educate electric utility customers of energy conservation measures |
| **Utilities** | Future population and employment growth would result in increased demand on private utilities and special utility districts. The No Action alternative would potentially increase the service area for utilities by allowing higher density development to occur in rural areas. | Similar to the No Action alternative, future population and employment growth would result in increased demand on private utilities and special utility districts. The Plan includes a policy recognizing that municipal governments and other water utilities are the best long-term providers within UGAs. However, significant growth in rural areas would occur and increase demand for utility services outside of urban areas as well. | • Implement similar mitigation measures as described in “Energy” above  
• Employ consistency between city and county land use planning measures for consistency between land use patterns and utility usage  
• Encourage new development to occur in currently developed areas where utility corridors are located  
• Encourage sustainable use of water supplies coming from the Columbia River, Crab Creek, other streams in the County, and groundwater sources in coordination with local utilities and irrigation districts |
| **Aesthetics** | Continued population and employment growth would increase the potential for changes to the character and visual quality of the County. | The Proposed Action alternative would concentrate growth in higher density areas and maintain the rural character of rural areas. The conversion of lands from Agricultural Resource to Rural Resource would potentially maintain development densities, but better allocate future development to suitable land types and uses. This action would help to retain existing neighborhood and rural character which would also reduce visual change. | • Encourage rural land uses in rural areas and move higher density development to cities and UGAs  
• Ensure future development is consistent with the aesthetic character of the neighborhood or land use designation in which it is located  
• Future development should comply with the CAO, SMP, and VSP to protect and/or enhance shorelines and other critical areas within the County. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Alternative 1: No Action</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Proposed Action</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recreation               | Demand for recreational areas would continue to increase with population growth under the No Action alternative. | No direct impacts to recreation are expected to occur under the Proposed Action alternative. The Plan includes goals and policies to encourage recreational uses where practicable throughout the County. | • Provide for park or recreation opportunities near urban centers, and planned growth areas such as the planned development area near the Potholes Reservoir, through land use designations  
• Provide shoreline access where feasible consistent with the SMP (Anchor QEA and Oneza & Associates 2014)                                                                                       |
| Archaeological/ Historical | Future development under the No Action alternative may result in indirect impacts to archaeological or historical sites. | Adoption of the Plan would not have any direct impacts on archaeological or historical sites. However, indirect impacts may occur from future development. The Plan includes goals and policies for avoiding or mitigating for impacts to archaeological and historical sites from development. | • Future development should comply with applicable laws and regulations regarding impacts to cultural resources per UDC 24.08, RCW 27.53, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and Executive Order 05-05 |

12.5  Comments and Responses
See Appendix B of the Plan for a PPP describing how Grant County obtained public feedback throughout the Comprehensive Plan development process. Appendix I includes public comments received during the review process and associated responses.
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Appendix A  Public Participation Plan Addendum: 2018 Comprehensive Plan Update
1 Introduction and Overview

The Grant County Public Participation Plan (PPP) includes guidelines and procedures for early and continuous public participation related to the Growth Management Act (GMA; Revised Code of Washington [RCW] 36.70A) and Grant County’s planning processes in the development and subsequent updates and amendments of the County’s Comprehensive Plan. These guidelines and procedures are intended to engage the policy makers from the local jurisdictions and key stakeholders. Common communication strategies are characterized, along with specific strategies for each jurisdiction, as applicable.

This PPP is intended to guide and form the basis for public participation. Grant County will comply with the PPP as appropriate to a situation. As the planning process develops, it should be expected that deviations from the PPP may be warranted. The GMA recognizes such deviation may occur per RCW 36.70A.140.
2 Public Participation Goals and Objectives

The County recognizes the importance of early and continuous public participation in order to adequately reflect the County’s citizens’ input. The goal of the PPP is to make all citizens of Grant County aware of the progress of the planning process and to offer them opportunities to comment or make suggestions. To achieve this goal, Grant County has adopted the following plan to encourage public participation throughout the remainder of the planning process. Taken individually, the activities are not expected to reach and inform each and every citizen of Grant County. Collectively, however, the plan activities are designed to effectively and efficiently provide broad-based dissemination of information and maximize opportunity for citizen involvement and comment.

The following activities will ensure public input is incorporated into the decision-making process:

- Providing procedures for broad dissemination of proposals and alternatives
- Establishing a strategy to educate the public and stakeholders about the Comprehensive Plan update and amendment processes and requirements
- Ensuring available comprehensive planning information is current and accessible to the public
- Clearly identifying procedures and strategies for public comment and participation, and providing adequate time for review of comprehensive planning materials and amendments prior to decision-making
- Encouraging and maintaining open lines of communication between the County, the public, and stakeholders through meetings, open houses, and workshops
3 Public Meetings, Workshops, and Open Houses

The following are key meetings, workshops, and open houses that will be hosted by the County and the County Planning Commission in order to encourage outreach and public involvement throughout the GMA planning processes:

- **Visioning Workshops/Open Houses.** The Planning Commission will host one or more public workshops/open houses to inform the citizens of the growth management planning process, update them on progress to date, and validate or revise previously developed goals and values. Following the workshop(s), the County will draft an updated County vision statement, which will be used to guide the development of the plan, especially its goals and policies.

- **Planning Commission Workshops.** Upon completion of preliminary drafts of updated or amended Comprehensive Plan elements and land use alternatives, the Planning Commission will conduct a series of public workshops to present both Comprehensive Plan Elements and the Land Use Alternatives that will be evaluated.

- **Public Officials Workshops/Public Meetings.** The County will conduct one or more workshops with public officials, including the Grant County Planning Commission, the Board of County Commissioners, City officials, special district officials, and others, to present technical information regarding the Comprehensive Plan. These meetings could be conducted in conjunction with the Planning Commission workshops identified above, or at a separate time and place. The meetings will be designed to give officials an opportunity to ask questions and gain a better understanding of the implications of growth management for their jurisdiction or special district, and to discuss the issues with other public officials in the same position. Time and place of these meetings will be determined as the plan development proceeds. The County will make final arrangements for accommodations for the workshops.

- **Meetings with City Representatives.** The County will meet with representatives of each of the cities to discuss their urban growth area boundary and general GMA concerns.

- **Coordination with State Agencies.** Coordination will be conducted with affected agencies, including the Washington Department of Commerce, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Ecology, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Transportation, and other interested state and local agencies to keep them informed of plan development progress and to solicit their comments early on in the process. Copies of the final draft plan and integrated Environmental Impact Statement, or Environmental Impact Statement addendum, as applicable, will be provided to affected agencies for review and comment.

- **Public Hearing and Formal Comment Periods.** Once the Final Draft Comprehensive Plan is completed, a formal public review will be conducted under the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C) including a public hearing and public comment period. All comments received
during the public hearing and public comment period will be compiled and an updated Comprehensive Plan will be developed.

3.1 Legal Notifications

Grant County planning staff will place legal notices of hearings and comment periods in the County’s official paper, currently the Columbia Basin Herald. Hearing notices should be published as required by state law and County policy.

Legal notifications notifying dates and times of open houses and public hearings and comment periods will be distributed to the public via email, United States Postal Service including notices with Grant Public Utility District utility bills, newspaper, flyers, and other public postings. Notices will also be provided on the County website.
4 Public Involvement and Outreach Strategies

Described below are key strategies developed to encourage outreach and public involvement throughout the GMA planning processes. Implementation of these strategies is expected to generate meaningful public participation.

4.1 Website

Grant County’s website (www.grantcounty-wa.com) will include a page regarding growth management and comprehensive planning. This page will provide a public forum for obtaining comprehensive planning information, including but not limited to the following:

- Status updates
- Meeting notices and agendas
- Comprehensive Plan draft documents and maps
- Contact lists
- An email address for submitting public comments
- Email distribution list registration

4.2 Mailing List

As public participation proceeds, interested citizens will have opportunities to place their name on a mailing list to receive additional information regarding the planning process via direct mail. The County will compile and maintain this mailing list. Names will originate from meeting and hearing sign-in sheets, written correspondence, recognized community groups, as well as individual requests to be included. This list will be used for newsletter circulation, special mailings, and notices as appropriate.

4.3 Email Communications

An email distribution list will be maintained for individuals and groups who wish to receive periodic project announcements, public notices of upcoming public meetings, and other comprehensive planning related information. Those interested in being included on the email distribution list should contact the Administrative Assistant at the Grant County Planning Department or visit the website.

4.4 Utility Insert Flyers

The County, in coordination with the Grant County Public Utility District, may periodically distribute informative flyers inserted in utility bills. These flyers will contain background information, meeting notices, and other announcements regarding the comprehensive planning updates.
4.5 Libraries and City Halls
A hardcopy of draft comprehensive planning work products will be available at the County Planning Department and local jurisdiction city halls or other suitable locations. The comprehensive planning website will be updated with documents as they become available, along with hardcopy locations.

4.6 Other Public Outreach Approaches
Other outreach approaches may be employed to maximize public participation and input in the decision-making process. These could include public outreach at the Grant County Fair or other public venues such as displays at the County Courthouse. The County will also periodically evaluate the effectiveness of outreach approaches and adjust these as necessary, and within budget constraints, to continue providing appropriate opportunities for public input to the comprehensive planning process.

4.7 Planning Document Dissemination
Documents such as reports, plans, or environmental reviews that contain or describe proposed plans, policies, maps, or regulations will be made available for public review. Such documents will be made available well in advance of opportunities for public discussion or testimony. Such documents will be made available typically at least 5 days prior to any public meeting or hearing scheduled for their discussion or a decision.

Documents will be disseminated as follows:

- Digital versions will be posted on the Grant County website.
- Digital copies will be delivered to local the regional library for circulation.
- Digital copies will be delivered to City officials and planning staff.
- Hard copies will be made available for review at the Grant County Planning Department.
- Hard copies will be made available for the cost of reproduction through the Grant County Planning Department.

Meeting and hearing notices will state the availability and location of documents.
5 Public Involvement Implementation and Documentation

5.1 Implementation
Public involvement plans for each individual planning effort under GMA will be attached as addendums to this PPP and will minimally include the following information:

- A chronology of public meetings
- Type of meeting (e.g., workshop, open house, public hearing)
- Date, time, and location

5.2 Documentation
All public outreach efforts and the results of those efforts will be documented in the administrative record maintained by the County. Documentation will include invitation letters and responses, meeting and hearing notices, meeting materials, meeting notes with attendance and comments received, draft and final work products, and other information as applicable.
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The following are proposed public participation activities for the County’s 2018 Comprehensive Plan Update, consistent with the County’s Public Participation Plan.

Proposed Public Meetings and Workshops Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Time and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 13 and 14, 2017</td>
<td>Visioning Workshops with the Planning Commission</td>
<td>Time: 7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location: Commissioner’s hearing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 C Street NW, Ephrata, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2017</td>
<td>Cities Coordination Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017 to February 2018</td>
<td>Planning Commission Workshops</td>
<td>Time: 7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location: Commissioner’s Hearing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 C Street NW, Ephrata, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tentative Dates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wednesday, 11/1/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wednesday, 12/6/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wednesday, 1/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May 2018</td>
<td>Planning Commission Public Hearing and Recommendation</td>
<td>Time: 7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location: Commissioner’s Hearing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 C Street NW, Ephrata, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late May/June 2018</td>
<td>Board of County Commissioners Review and Final Adoption</td>
<td>Time: TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location: Commissioner’s Hearing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 C Street NW, Ephrata, WA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notices
Legal notices for newspaper publications will be provided by the County staff to meet the minimum requirements of RCW 36.70.
Appendix C
Visioning Workshops Summary
Introduction

Grant County is preparing an updated Comprehensive Plan. To help identify the vision for the County for the next ten to twenty years, the County planned and conducted two visioning workshops in Ephrata on September 13 and 14, 2017.

The purpose of these visioning workshops is to provide an overview of the plan update process and receive input from the County Planning Commission and members of the public on key topics, vision elements and other ideas to incorporate into the updated plan.

Visioning Workshops Structure

Meetings began with introductions followed by a presentation by White Bluffs Consulting staff on the comprehensive plan update process, including:

- Overview of the state Growth Management Act
- Comprehensive plan elements
- Projected population growth over the next 20 years (approximately 40,000)
- Recent and current trends
- A summary of vision information in the 2006 plan
- How the public can be involved during the update process

During the meetings, Planning Commission and public comments were captured. To help solicit feedback, a set of visioning questions were discussed at each meeting.
Attendees were encouraged to provide additional feedback through the online comment form available from the Grant County Comprehensive Plan update website (http://www.grantcountywa.gov/planning/HTM/Comp_Plan_Update.htm).

The website is intended to facilitate continued communication and public involvement by providing an opportunity for interested parties to access additional information, including meeting announcements, status updates, and Comprehensive Plan materials. The visioning workshop presentation is also posted to the website.

**Attendance**

The two workshops were held on September 13 and 14, 2017, and were attended by a combined total of approximately 20 individuals, including county, Port, consultant, and Planning Commission members.

**Summary of Comments**

Public and Planning Commission comments received during the visioning workshops are summarized below.

- Incorporate County historical locations into tourism efforts to leverage appeal of the community. Include an “About Grant County” outreach effort in the Comprehensive Plan in appropriate areas along with a map layer that identifies important historic sites (excluding cultural areas).
- An important trend has been the millions of dollars in recreation improvements made by Grant PUD in recent years.
- The Larson Subdivision needs attention and may an area to develop a sub-area plan; consider including this as an action in the plan. The neighborhood is depressed and deteriorating. A Wheeler Corridor new rail line to the Port of Moses Lake will provide new supply chain options, which may renew interest in the area for development.
- The recently approved Grant County Voluntary Stewardship program should still be applied to areas in the County subject to changes in agricultural designations and areas designated as a new rural resource category.
- Agri-tourism is a developing opportunity for Grant County.
- The federal H-2A housing program that provides temporary workers for agriculture has impacts on local public services and private commercial services. Perhaps the plan could address providing for adequate public services and areas for commercial services (beyond those provided by the agri-business) are present in the rural areas of the County where this housing is often constructed. The southwest part of the County is an area with needs. The population projections in the plan should also include a component for this seasonal population influx, or at least acknowledge it. H-2A data may be available from the state? Fire, police, other services can be ‘taxed’ with this seasonal influx that comes without additional support services. H-2A housing can also create domestic water and sewer issues although these systems are typically located on farm.
- 250 new housing units to be located within City of Mattawa for farm worker and single family homes. Teachers commuting 100+ miles roundtrip to work in Mattawa.
- Marijuana uses should be addressed in the plan where applicable.
• Acknowledge the potential for new agricultural packing, processing and other facilities throughout the County, as farmers vertically integrate operations where they have opportunities to do so.

Next Steps

The public feedback provided during the visioning workshops provides valuable information for the Comprehensive Plan update process. This information will be used in updating goals and policies, and other plan elements. Additional opportunities for public input will be provided throughout the update process including public meetings, information posted on the website, and other communications.
Appendix D

County-Wide Planning Policies
POLICY 1

POLICY REGARDING URBAN GROWTH AREAS AND THE DESIGNATION OF URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES

I. DESIGNATION OF URBAN GROWTH AREAS/BOUNDARIES

A. An Urban Growth Area (UGA) shall be designated for each city and town in Grant County (RCW 36.70A.110).
   1. Urban growth, as defined in RCW 36.70A.030, shall be encouraged within designated UGA's.
   2. Growth can occur outside a UGA only if it is not urban in nature. A pattern of more intensive rural development, as provided in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) is not urban growth [RCW 36.70A.030(17)].
   3. At a minimum, each city and town in Grant County shall have included in its UGA the area within the corporate limits of the city or town.
   4. A UGA may include territory that is outside of the city or town if such territory is characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth.

B. UGA's, based upon the population forecast made for Grant County by the Washington State Office of Financial Management, shall include areas and density sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in Grant County within the next 20 years. Each UGA shall permit urban densities and shall include green belt and open space areas (RCW 36.70A.110)(2).

C. Each city and town in Grant County shall provide to Grant County a UGA with urban growth boundaries for its jurisdiction (RCW 36.70A.110)(2).
   1. The county shall attempt to reach an agreement with each city and town on the establishment and location of a UGA and urban growth boundaries for each city and town.
   2. UGA's, which includes territory outside the corporate limits of a city or town, shall be established by examining criteria including, but not limited to, the following:
      a. Existing commercial and residential developments bordering the corporate limits of the city or town.
      b. Estimated population growth of the city or town.
      c. The capacity of the city or town for expanding urban governmental services as defined in RCW 36.70A.030(16).
      d. Availability of land suitable for development in the city or town or the area adjacent to the city or town.
   3. If an agreement is not reached with each city or town as to a UGA, the county shall justify in writing, supported by findings consistent with RCW 36.70A, as to the reasons why it does not agree with the city or town's proposed UGA.
   4. A city or town may object formally, with the Washington State Department of Community Development, over the designation of the urban growth area within which it is located.
5. The Washington State Department of Community Development, when appropriate, shall attempt to resolve any conflict between the county and a city or town where a difference of opinion exists as to the location of an urban growth area. The Department of Community Development may use mediation services if necessary.

6. UGA’s shall be reviewed every five (5) years and amended as necessary.

D. Urban governmental services should be provided by cities and urban governmental services should not be provided in rural areas. Urban governmental services include those governmental services historically and typically delivered by cities and towns, and includes storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, street cleaning services, fire and police protection services, public transit services, and other public utilities associated with urban areas and normally not associated with non-urban areas (RCW 36.70A.110)(3).

1. Urban growth should first be located in areas already characterized by urban growth that have existing public facilities and service capabilities.

2. Urban growth should secondarily occur in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served by a combination of both existing public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources.

E. Commercial and industrial development, except for that commercial and industrial development allowed as a pattern of more intensive rural development as provided in RCW 36.70A.050(d)(d), or within a major industrial development as provided in RCW 36.70A.367, must be confined within a UGA if urban governmental services are required or cannot be supplied by said development.

POLICY 1A

II. PROCEDURE FOR SETTLING URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY DISPUTES

A. If the affected jurisdictions are unable to reach consensus and arrive at an impasse, all affected jurisdictions shall enter into mediation. All participating jurisdictions shall jointly select a neutral mediator within thirty (30) days of reaching an impasse in negotiations. If they cannot agree upon a neutral mediator within thirty (30) days of impasse, then any jurisdiction may apply to the Washington State Department of Community Development or the Eastern Washington Planned Growth Hearings Board for appointment of a neutral mediator. No mediator may be an employee or elected official of any of the participating jurisdictions. Each mediator must possess professional mediation skills and/or dispute resolution skills.

B. The affected jurisdictions shall enter into mediation within thirty (30) days following the failure to reach consensus through negotiations and the mediation shall be concluded within forty-five (45) days of its inception.

C. Any affected jurisdiction may appeal the results of mediation to the Growth Management Hearings Board as provided for by RCW 36.70A.

POLICY 1B

III. PROCEDURES FOR AMENDING URBAN GROWTH AREAS/BOUNDARIES

A. The amendment procedure allows for the opportunity for a jurisdiction to request an amendment of that jurisdiction's established UGA. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that a consistent administrative procedure and a consistent method will be used in evaluating any proposed amendments.

B. Within thirty (30) days of receiving a request for an amendment, all affected jurisdictions shall enter into negotiations for the purpose of considering the request. Such negotiations shall be
conducted in good faith by all participating jurisdictions. Such negotiations shall be concluded, by either reaching consensus or an impasse, within forty-five (45) days of the date of the request.

C. An electronically recorded record and minutes shall be kept of all negotiations conducted pursuant to a request for amendment.

D. If the affected jurisdictions reach a consensus as to the amendment, each jurisdiction shall amend its Comprehensive Plan as necessary to reflect the agreed upon amendment. Any amendment agreed to in this process shall be presumed to be with the authority of that jurisdiction's entire governing body.

POLICY 2 & 2A

POLICIES TO PROMOTE CONTIGUOUS ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT AND THE PROVISION OF URBAN GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES TO SUCH DEVELOPMENT

I. Definitions:

A. Public facilities - means streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, park and recreational facilities, and schools [RCW 36.70A.030(1 2)].

B. Public Services - means fire protection and suppression, law enforcement, public health, education, recreation, environmental protection, and other governmental services [36.70A.030(13)].

C. Urban Growth - means growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of such land for the production of food, other agriculture products or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources. When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services. “Characterized by urban growth” means land having urban growth located on it, or to land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth [RCW 36.70A.030(14)]. A pattern of more intensive rural development, as provided in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) is not urban growth [RCW 36.70A.030(17)].

D. Provision of Urban Governmental Services - means those governmental services historically and typically delivered by cities and includes storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, street cleaning services, fire and police protection services, public transit services, and other public utilities associated with urban areas and normally not associated with non urban areas [RCW 36.70A.030(16)].

E. Rural Character - refers to patterns of land use and development established by a county in the rural element of its comprehensive plan:

1. in which open space, the natural landscape, and vegetation predominate over the built environment;
2. that foster traditional total lifestyles, rural-based economics, and opportunities to both live and work in rural areas;
3. that provide visual landscapes that are traditionally found in rural areas and communities;
4. that are comparable with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat;
5. that reduce inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development; that generally do not require the extension of urban governmental services; and
6. that are consistent with the protection of natural surface water flows and ground water and surface water recharge and discharge areas [RCW 36.70A.030(14)].
F. Rural Development - means development outside the urban growth area and outside resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. Total development can consist of a variety of uses and residential densities, including clustered residential development, at levels that are consistent with the preservation of rural character and the requirements of the rural element. Rural development does not refer to agricultural activities that may be conducted in total areas (RCW 36.70A.030(15)).

G. Rural Governmental services - means those public services and public facilities historically and typically delivered at an intensity usually found in rural areas, and may include domestic water systems, fire and police protection services, transportation and public transit services, and other public utilities associated with rural development and normally not associated with urban areas. Rural services do not include storm or sanitary sewer, except when necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development. [RCW 36.70A.030(16)].

II. Phasing of Urban Development

In order to achieve the intent of the State of Washington's growth management legislation, Grant County shall consult with each city and town within Grant County and each city or town shall propose the location of an Urban Growth Area (UGA). Grant County shall designate UGA's, after holding the aforesaid consultations, which will be associated with each city and town in Grant County and further, shall designate a rural area surrounding the established UGA according to the following [RCW 36.70A.110(2)]:

A. A short term urban growth boundary shall be established within the UGA within which urban growth will occur over the next ten years. Policies and actions will emphasize urban land uses and the provision of urban governmental services by cities and towns and the intended gradual phasing outward from the corporate limits of the city or town as opposed to converting undeveloped land into unplanned sprawling low-density development [RCW 36.70A.020(1) and RCW 36.70A.020(2)].

B. A long term urban growth boundary shall be established within the UGA within which urban growth will occur over the next eleven (11) to twenty (20) years as urban growth expands beyond the short term urban growth boundary. Policies and actions will emphasize planning for the longer term and will continue to emphasize urban land uses and the provision of urban governmental services by cities and towns and the intended gradual phasing outward from the short term urban growth boundary as opposed to converting undeveloped land into unplanned sprawling low-density development [RCW 36.70A.020(1) and RCW 36.70A.020(2)].

III. Rural Area:

A rural area shall exist outside of the UGA within which very low intensive land uses will prevail over the next twenty (20) years. County policies and actions will emphasize rural residential densities and the protection of agricultural lands and natural resources. Urban growth will be prohibited. Development will be encouraged in UGA's where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner. The inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling low-density development will be also prohibited [RCW 36.70A.020(2)].

IV. Provision of Urban Governmental Services, Public Facilities, and Public Services:

Cities should be the primary providers of urban governmental services, public facilities, and public services in the UGA [RCW 36.70A.110(2)].

V. Policies on Development Standards:

All development within a UGA but outside the current corporate limits of a city or town shall conform with all city construction standards, performance standards, land use, and circulation patterns. Any development...
proposed within a UGA but outside the corporate limits of a city or town shall be jointly reviewed by the city and county to ensure compliance with the aforesaid and the intended development goals and requirements as stated in both the city and county comprehensive plans.

POLICY 2B

URBAN DENSITIES - DEFINITION OF LOT SIZES

I. Urban densities typically make intensive use of land to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of such lands for the production of agricultural products or mineral resources. When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires a high level of urban governmental services. (based on RCW 36.70A.030 (14)

Recognizing that a variety of urban densities will occur within each municipality and urban growth area, that each municipality's vision of its future is different, and that any one minimum density designation for urban growth within such areas would be overly restrictive and inappropriate for inclusion within a regional policy:

A. It is appropriate that urban densities within the corporate boundaries of each city be defined by such jurisdiction in its comprehensive land use plan.

B. Urban densities within designated urban growth areas, but outside the corporate boundaries of adjacent cities, shall be designated jointly by the adjacent city and county in each jurisdiction's comprehensive land use plan.

C. Urban densities within designated urban growth areas that do not include a city shall be designated by the county in its comprehensive land use plan.

D. Urban densities are prohibited outside of established urban growth areas except for the establishment of master planned resorts and new fully contained communities consistent with the requirements for reserving a portion of the twenty (20) year county population projection. (RCW 36.70A.350 & RCW 36.70A.360) The county will determine appropriate densities outside of designated urban growth areas in its comprehensive land use plan consistent with the goals of the Growth Management Act

E. The comprehensive plan of the county and of each city shall be coordinated with, and consistent with, the comprehensive plan of other counties or cities with which the county or city has in part common borders or related regional issues. (based on RCW 36.70A.100)

POLICY 3

POLICIES FOR SITING PUBLIC FACILITIES
OF A COUNTY-WIDE OR STATE-WIDE NATURE

I. Identify and Siting Essential Public Facilities:

A. The Comprehensive Plan of each city, town and county that is planning under the Growth Management Act shall include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities.(RCW 36.70A.200(1)

B. Essential public facilities including those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, and state or regional transportation facilities, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, and group homes. (RCW 36.70A.200(1)
C. No city, town or county comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public utilities. (RCW 36.70A.200(2)

II. Development of Essential Public Facilities: When essential public facilities are proposed the potentially effected city(s) and/or town(s) and the county shall:

A. Establish an Advisory Project Analysis and Site Evaluation Committee composed of citizen members and government representatives selected to represent a board range of interest groups. The Committee shall develop specific siting criteria for the proposed project and to identify, analyze, and rank potential project sites. In addition the Committee shall establish a reasonable time frame for completion of the task.

B. Insure public involvement through the use of timely press releases, newspaper notices, public information meetings, and public hearings.

C. Notify adjacent cities and towns and other governmental entities of the proposed project and solicit review and comment on the recommendations made by the Advisory Project Analysis and Site Evaluation Committee.

III. Siting Considerations: In siting of essential public facilities the Advisory Project Analysis and Site Evaluation Committee shall consider at least the following:

A. Essential public facilities shall be developed in a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement and be so located so as to not adversely affect the safety, health or welfare of the citizens residing around or near the facility.

B. Essential public facilities sited near public water and sewer services shall be required to utilize such services.

C. Essential public facilities sited where public water and sewer services are not immediately available shall be required to be constructed so as to be able to be serviced by public water and sewer services when they are available and, further, the essential public services shall be required to connect to such water and sewer services when they are available.

D. Land adjacent to existing and proposed essential public facilities which may be developed in the future shall be compatible with such uses.

E. Proposed essential public facilities shall be compatible with existing land uses.

F. Adequate fire protection water supplies shall be required in all developing areas where essential public facilities may be sited.

G. Undesignated landfills, dredging, waste discharges, and other activities with potential deleterious environmental impacts shall be controlled with appropriate rules and regulations adopted and enforced by the jurisdiction with authority.

H. Essential public facilities shall not locate in resource lands or critical areas if incompatible.

I. Essential public facilities shall not be located outside of UGA's unless they are self-contained and do not require the extension of urban governmental services.
POLICY 4

POLICIES FOR COUNTY-WIDE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND STRATEGIES

I. A county-wide transportation plan developed pursuant to the Growth Management Act shall be consistent with the land use elements of the comprehensive plans developed for the jurisdictions within the transportation planning area.

II. A county and regional review process shall be established to coordinate transportation programming decisions and to ensure consistency with the regional transportation plan.
   A. Local six-year programs should identify all regionally significant projects meeting adopted regional criteria. These projects will be submitted to the Quad-County Regional Transportation Planning Organization for certification of consistency with the regional transportation plan.
   B. Transportation priority programming methods should be required for all jurisdictions. This requirement should apply to the functionally classified roadway system, as well as to transit capital expenditures. Priority programming should be integrated as a standard of good practice.
   C. Local governments may want to obtain ongoing technical assistance from the state (WSDOT).

III. As a component of a county-wide transportation plan, each comprehensive plan adopted pursuant to the Growth Management Act, will contain a transportation element which includes a financial sub-element including:
   A. A multi-year financing plan;
   B. An analysis of the jurisdiction's ability to fund existing or potential transportation improvement which identifies existing sources and new revenue sources which may include impact fees;
   C. If identified funding falls short, land use assumptions will be reassessed to assure that the level of service standards are being met or are adjusted to be consistent with the land use element.

IV. Transportation improvements which are identified in the transportation plan shall be implemented concurrent with new development. Concurrent with development means that improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years.

V. The county-wide transportation planning effort should produce a methodology and/or tools for jurisdictions to use in evaluating the impact of development proposals and identifying related transportation improvements.

VI. The county-wide transportation plan should address:
   A. Economic growth.
   B. Cost-effective accessibility for goods, services and people.
   C. The quality of life issues.
   D. Alternatives which will provide convenient and safe access to employment, educational, and recreational opportunities for citizens in both urban and rural environments.
   E. Transportation improvements necessary to provide for a balanced transportation system that will work effectively and safely over the next twenty years.
F. Energy-efficiency in transportation systems.

VII. An integrated transportation system is conceived as a cooperatively developed; integrated system of public transportation services, road facilities, transportation system management (TSM)/demand management programs, and land use policy. The integrated system should enhance mobility by providing a range of transportation choices for the public. The transportation plan element shall address air, water and land transportation facilities including but not limited to:

A. Airports and airstrips.
B. Facilities related to commercial water transportation.
C. Major and secondary arterial and collector roadways.
D. Transit routes.
E. Non-motorized modes of transportation including bikeways, equestrian ways, and pedestrian routes.
F. Railroad systems.
G. Bridges.
H. Truck Routes.

VIII. The Transportation Plan element will provide a summary and analysis of planning information including:

A. Land use assumptions which provide a summary of the current population, employment by type, recreation, and comprehensive land use designations, and the ratio of single and multi-family units to total housing units.

B. Inventory and analysis of existing services and facilities should include:
   1. Function and scope of the facility (local/regional).
   2. Traffic and volume patterns including peak hour traffic congestion and current capacity.
   3. Jurisdiction.
   4. Accident problem areas.
   5. Geometry and structural adequacy of arterial and collectors.
   6. Traffic control devices.
   7. Facility specific plans and routes.
   8. Origin and destination data and commute distance for the urban area.
   9. Methods of evaluating changes.
   10. Transit facilities.
   11. Environment and geographic limitations in the study area.
   12. Demand management (carpools, public transit, etc.)

C. Level-of-service (LOS) standards for arterial and collectors.

D. An analysis and forecast of future transportation needs including:
   1. An issues assessment and prioritization for the study area and for each facility.
   2. A forecast of future travel demand for each facility.
   3. An analysis of deficient transportation facilities based on adopted LOS standards.
   4. An identification of facility expansion needs.

IX. Level-of-service standards for arterial, collectors and transit routes should be coordinated at a county-wide level.
X. Transportation plans should be designed to have services that are specific to conditions to include growth, employment diversification, environmental quality, mobility needs, and quality of life and the future environment of Grant County. An integrated plan should help support the operations of buses, ride-sharing programs, para-transit, and special services within the region; and coordinate services that link Grant County to other counties.

A. Air quality. Jurisdictions should be encouraged to look at a balanced approach to reduce vehicle exhaust emissions as a means of maintaining federal air quality standards. The transportation plan should address means of providing and promoting:
   1. Alternatives to the single occupant vehicle.
   2. The use of cleaner fuels.
   3. Optimum maintenance of individual vehicles.
   4. Improved operating efficiency of the transportation system.

B. Water quality. Levels of harmful pollutants generated by transportation activities should be minimized and controlled to prevent their entry into surface and ground water resources.

C. Fish and Wildlife habitat. Where feasible, fish and wildlife habitat populations should be protected, restored and enhanced within transportation corridors.

D. Wetlands. Natural wetlands which are adversely impacted by transportation-related construction, maintenance, and operations activities should be protected, restored, and enhanced in support of federal and state "no net loss" policies.

E. Noise control. Strategies should be adopted to minimize noise impacts from transportation systems and facilities.

POLICY 5

POLICIES THAT CONSIDER THE NEED FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING, SUCH AS HOUSING FOR ALL ECONOMIC SEGMENTS OF THE POPULATION

I. The housing element of each comprehensive plan shall:

A. Provide a range of housing alternatives which takes into account price, tenure type, and density which meet the urban area and regional housing needs.

B. Provide for the development of a balanced variety of dwelling unit types and densities within the county with maximum choices of living environment, considering the needs of the public at all economic levels.
   1. The development of a balanced variety of dwelling unit types and densities shall be encouraged.
   2. Site constructed and factory manufactured housing shall be recognized as needed and functional housing types.
   3. Provisions shall be made for the location of manufactured (mobile) homes in planned manufactured (mobile) home subdivisions and parks, or on single lots when in conformance with standards governing location (on lot) of site constructed housing.

C. Provide areas for the location of a variety of residential uses while minimizing the impact on surrounding areas.
   1. Plan provisions for the location of high, medium, and low density residential development shall be made within the urban growth area where possible and within or adjacent to existing communities.
2. Plan provisions for the location of rural housing shall be made in a manner consistent with preserving agricultural lands and maintaining the rural lifestyles of the county while minimizing conflicts with commercial agricultural activities.

D. Preserve the viability of existing single-family residential areas.
   1. Existing viable single-family residential areas shall be given sufficient protection to prevent the encroachment of incompatible land uses which may lead to the deterioration of such residential.
   2. Rural residential areas located outside of urban growth areas shall be discouraged from becoming urbanized as UGA's.

E. E. Promote housing that meets the needs of all socio-economic groups in the county.
   1. Develop performance standards governing the placement of manufactured homes.
   2. Encourage the rehabilitation of substandard housing.
   3. Encourage efforts to renew and rehabilitate as well as maintain existing housing.

F. Develop land uses that will preserve and enhance the quality of life and desired lifestyles.
   1. Encourage builders and developers to deliver housing with a variety of price ranges, amenities, natural settings, and conveniences.
   2. Protect residential neighborhoods from incompatible land uses.
      a. Maintain natural boundaries (roads, creeks, outcroppings, etc.).
      b. Cluster developments off main arterial roads with vegetated buffer strips between houses and main roads.
   3. Buffer future developments from existing farm activity to minimize nuisances generated by either use.

G. Incorporate Washington State Community Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) requirements and actively solicit grant monies through FSS, HOPE 1, 2, & 3, CIAP and 5H programs.

POLICY 6

POLICIES FOR JOINT COUNTY AND CITY PLANNING WITHIN URBAN GROWTH AREAS

I. Zoning, Subdivision Controls, Development and Land Use Compatibility:

The zoning and subdivision ordinances and performance standards adopted in the UGA's and the related policy planning measures should be used to implement the provisions of the Growth Management Act and the comprehensive plans of each city, town and county to ensure development and land use which are compatible with surrounding uses and which do not create traffic, safety or health hazards, or undue adverse economic impacts.

II. Development of Lands in UGA's:

City, town, and county governments shall:

A. Encourage the development of lands in the UGA's rather than allow the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped rural lands into urban sprawling, low density development. [RCW 36.70A.020(1) and RCW 36.70A.020(2)].

B. Encourage the development of lands adjacent to the incorporated limits of a city or town prior to developing outlying areas in a UGA.

C. Discourage urban encroachment on agricultural areas.
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D. Encourage the determination of land use by the inherent capability of the land to sustain that use without creating problems that require a publicly funded solution.

III. Establishment of Zones in UGA's:

City, town and county governments shall:

A. Encourage the establishment of zones in UGA's which allow a variety of land uses.
B. Establish zones in UGA's which discourage lineal or strip development.
C. Encourage land uses which require medium size lots or lower intensity usage which will serve as a buffer between rural areas and urban areas.
D. Encourage the development of vacant and unused lands within the corporate limits of each city or town.
E. Encourage the location of business and industry in clusters where appropriate in or near the towns and cities except where they would cause or allow a public nuisance.
F. Encourage city services be extended to areas adjacent to cities prior to serving outlying areas.

IV. Community Councils and Special Purpose Districts: Established community councils of unincorporated urbanized areas and all special purpose districts should be made aware of and encouraged to comment on developments proposed within or adjacent to the urbanized area in which they reside.

V. Agreement Between Cities, Towns, Established Community Councils in Urbanized Areas and the County:

A. Since each individual municipality within Grant County is unique in its needs, situations, services and interests, and each is unique in population and geographic characteristics, each community will negotiate joint city and county planning procedures and policies on an individual basis. Each municipality should meet with the county individually, at a time coinciding with the establishment of the UGA's.
B. Agreements, which include joint development standards between cities, towns, established community councils in urbanized areas, and the county should be established. These agreements shall coordinate land use planning and decision making within UGA's.

VI. Expansion of UGA's:

Cities, towns and the county shall:

A. Require that any expansion of a UGA be negotiated between the city or cities within the UGA and the county, with direct notice to affected landowners (pursuant to RCW 36.70A.140).
B. Allow the inclusion of agricultural lands in a UGA after it has been determined that all other lands have been developed and that the agricultural lands to be added are marginal and do not possess prime and unique farmland soils as defined by the United States Soil Conservation Service, unless prime and unique farmlands are all that is available to that city or town.

POLICY 7

POLICY FOR COUNTY-WIDE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT

I. To encourage, strengthen, sustain, and diversify the County's economic base.

A. Emphasis on the County's stable agricultural base shall be maintained, and protected.
B. That development be encouraged by seeking and providing incentives to environmentally acceptable industries.

II. Encourage Grant County's economic base instituting plans to promote employment opportunities.

A. Emphasis should be given to promote the processing of locally produced goods, and the value added industries related to our existing ag-related base.

B. Stabilize the work force by seeking industries that provide employment on a year-round basis and operate on multiple shifts.

C. Emphasize strong County-wide economic development promotion to attract new business and industry investments to Grant County through a pro-active marketing strategy.

D. To encourage community leadership involvement in the strategic planning process that facilitates the development of sound capital, social and human infrastructures that are conducive to and fosters an environment that attracts and enables new and existing business to grow and thrive.

III. Encourage a diversity of industrial development.

A. Examine alternative industry that in the past have chose not to locate in our economic circle.

B. Utilize economic development, and commerce organizations expertise to enhance goals.

C. Concentrate maximum efforts on the strengths of existing industrial park developments.

D. Support and maintain capital improvement projects for utilities and services to existing and proposed industrial park site development.

E. Target proposed industrial parks in, or as near to, existing or planned utility services as identified by the joint urban growth boundary designations of the comprehensive plan.

F. To encourage the development of local programs (County and City) that provide incentives to environmentally acceptable industries.

G. That new development be encouraged which provides the most positive overall impact on the environment, quality of life and services within Grant County.

H. Encourage each community to develop their own Community Development Task Force/Response Team. This team would be a cross-section of local business, agencies and community leaders organized for the purpose of bringing together stronger planning and communication links concerning current and future community needs, schools, housing, sewer, water, and other infrastructure needs.

I. Each Task force should develop an economic development marketing profile based on a comprehensive assessment of it's strengths and weaknesses and the type of industry it can realistically expect to attract.

IV. Direct commercial activity towards existing and proposed regional and local transportation access.

A. Encourage commercial, and industrial distribution centers at highway interchanges serving the urban areas.

B. Maximize the extent of existing industrial, and commercially zoned property.

C. Encourage the development of commercial centers, where the need has been established, and/or where future planning consistent with the comprehensive plan has them established.
V. Emphasize recreational and tourism as an alternate source of revenue, and economic impact for Grant County and its municipalities.

POLICY 8
AN ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL IMPACT
I. Fiscal Impact
   A. In order to ensure that our county-wide policies and future individual growth plans and capital facilities funding programs adequately address cumulative potential impacts on the revenues of local government, a joint fiscal impact study should be conducted, focusing on:
      1. Capital facility debt financing capabilities and burdens of the individual local governments, and the options and potential for sharing debt capacity and responsibility for capital facility financing among and between local governments, special purpose districts, and the private sector;
      2. The structure of revenues that operate local government and the potential for new revenues or an alternate system of distributing existing funds.

II. Impact Fees
   A. Each jurisdiction is encouraged to adopt fair and reasonable impact fee ordinances to ensure that new growth pays its fair share of the cost of capital facilities, such as transportation improvements, parks, and schools.

POLICY 9
PROVISIONS FOR THE REVIEW OF NEW FULLY CONTAINED COMMUNITIES, MASTER PLANNED RESORTS AND RECREATIONAL TYPE DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS
I. Fully contained Communities
   A. A county required or choosing to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 may establish a process as part of its urban growth areas, that is designated under RCW 36.70A.110, for reviewing proposals to authorize new fully contained communities located outside of the initially designated urban growth area.
      1. A new fully contained community may be approved in a county planning under this chapter if criteria including but not limited to the following are met
         a. New infrastructure is provided for and impact fees are established consistent with the requirements of RCW 82.02.050;
         b. Transit-oriented site planning and traffic demand management programs are implemented;
         c. Buffers are provided between the new fully contained communities and adjacent urban development;
         d. A mix of uses is provided to offer jobs, housing, and services to residents of the new community;
         e. Affordable housing is provided within the new community for a broad range of income levels;
         f. Environmental protection has been addressed and provided for;
         g. Development regulations are established to ensure urban growth will not occur in adjacent non-urban area;
         h. Provision is made to mitigate impacts on designated agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands;
i. The plan for the new fully contained community is consistent with the
development regulations established for the protection of critical areas by the
county pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170.

2. New fully contained communities may be approved outside established urban growth
areas only if a county reserves a portion of the twenty-year population projection and
offsets the urban growth area accordingly for allocation to new fully contained
communities that meet the requirements of this chapter. Any county electing to establish a
new community reserve shall do so no more often that once every five years as a part of
the designation or review of urban growth areas required by this chapter. The new
community reserve shall be allocated on a project-by-project basis, only after specific
project approval procedures have been adopted pursuant to this chapter as a development
regulation. When a new community reserve is established, urban growth areas designated
pursuant to this chapter shall accommodate the unreserved portion of the twenty-year
population projection.

Final approval of an application for a new fully contained community shall be considered
an adopted amendment to the comprehensive plan prepared pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070
designating the new fully contained community as an urban growth area.

II. Master Planned Resort

A. Counties that are required or choose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 may permit master planned
resorts which may constitute urban growth outside of urban growth areas as limited by this
section. A master planned resort means a self-contained and fully integrated planned unit
development, in a setting of significant natural amenities, with primary focus on destination resort
facilities consisting of short-term visitor outdoor recreational facilities. A master planned resort
may include other residential uses within its boundaries, but only if the residential uses are
integrated into and support the on-site recreational nature of the resort.

A master planned resort may be authorized by county only if:

1. The comprehensive plan specifically identifies policies to guide the development of
master planned resorts;
2. The comprehensive plan and development regulations include restrictions that preclude
new urban or suburban land uses in the vicinity of the master planned resort, except in
areas otherwise designated for urban growth under RCW 36.70A.110;
3. The county includes a finding as a part of the approval process that the land is better
suited, and has more long-term importance, for the master planned resort than for the
commercial harvesting of timber or agricultural production, if located on land that
otherwise would be designated as forest land or agricultural land under RCW
36.70A.170;
4. The county ensures that the resort plan is consistent with the development regulations
established for critical areas; and
5. On-site and off-site infrastructure impacts are fully considered and mitigated.

POLICY 10
MONITORING, REVIEW AND AMENDMENT OF COUNTY-WIDE PLANNING POLICIES

I. Throughout the ongoing planning process Grant County or any city or town within Grant County may
request that the Grant County Planned Growth Committee reconvene to discuss problems or concerns
regarding specific policies as they may relate to the development, implementation; management, or
amendment of the county's or any city's or town's comprehensive plan. The committee shall meet twice per
year to consider the requests.
POLICY 11

POLICIES REGARDING DIVISION, ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNDS/COUNTY - CITIES MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT ADOPTING METHOD FOR DISTRIBUTION OF STATE GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNDS ALLOCATED TO GRANT COUNTY BY THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

I. RECITALS.

A. Pursuant to the Growth Management Act of 1990 (hereinafter the "Act") and its 1991 amendments contained in ReESHB 1025, Grant County and the cities within Grant County have established an inter-governmental committee entitled the "Grant County Planned Growth Committee" (hereinafter the "Committee") for the purpose of implementing the requirement of the County-Wide Planning Policies required by ReESHB 1025, Section 2 and subsequent adoption of individual comprehensive plans.

B. The Committee is comprised of representatives from the County and each of the participating cities and towns.

C. The Act provides that State funds be made available to counties and cities/towns through the Department of Community Development (hereinafter "DCD") to assist them in meeting the requirements of the Act. The Committee's information received by the State DCD indicates that an initial allocation of One Hundred Thousand ($100,000) Dollars will be distributed to each County with an additional per capita allocation. The purpose of this memorandum of agreement is to memorialize the Committee's agreement as to the method by which these State funds will be divided amongst the parties hereto.

II. PARTIES.

The parties to this agreement include the three Commissioner Districts of Grant County and the following cities and towns: Moses Lake, Ephrata, Soap Lake, Quincy, Royal City, Grand Coulee, Coulee City, Mattawa, Electric City, Krupp, Wilson Creek, Coulee Dam, Hartline Warden, and George.

III. DEFINITIONS.

A. "BASE" allocation means the lump sum amount of One Hundred Thousand ($100,000) Dollars expected to be distributed to the County by the State DCD.

B. "PER CAPITA" allocation means the additional amount per capita amount that will be distributed to the County by the State DCD.

C. "PER CAPITA POPULATION FIGURES" shall mean those most recent population figures established through the Washington State Office of Financial Management (hereinafter "OFM").

IV. AGREEMENT

The Parties adopt the following procedure and methodology for dividing amongst them all future State Growth Management funds allocated through DCD: All "base" allocations will be divided equally amongst all parties, and all "per capita" allocations will be divided amongst the parties on a per capita population basis. The population figures used shall be derived from the OFM's population figures and shall be amended as necessary to reflect the most current OFM population figures available.

V. TERM
This agreement shall continue to have full force and effect and shall be binding upon all parties for as long as State funds and/or grants are available to assist Counties and Cities/Towns in their efforts to comply with the Act, as now enacted or hereafter amended.

[SEE ATTACHMENT FOR SIGNATURES]

POLICY 12

DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL-PURPOSE DISTRICTS AND POLICIES AND RELATIONSHIP WITH SPECIAL-PURPOSE DISTRICTS, i.e., SCHOOL DISTRICTS, HOSPITAL DISTRICTS, FIRE DISTRICTS, ETC.

[Incorporated within Policy 6]

POLICY 13

POLICIES TO PERMIT FLEXIBILITY WITHIN LOCAL POLICY PROCEDURE

It is understood that these policies are meant as general framework guidelines for the county and each municipality, however flexibility must be maintained in order to adapt to different needs and conditions.

[ADOPTED AS THE PREAMBLE TO THE COUNTY-WIDE PLANNING POLICIES IN LIEU OF POLICY #13.]

POLICY 14

POPULATION FORECAST DISTRIBUTION

I. County-wide projected population shall be allocated among jurisdictions through the combined application use of the following factors applied to each jurisdiction:

   A. Documented historical growth rates over the last decade, the last two (2) decades, and the last two (2) years.

   B. Developing or current planning programs which a jurisdiction has, and which identify quantitative increases in business and industry development, and housing construction activity.

   C. Intangibles.

Formally ratified this day ___ of ________, 2002, Grant County Commissioners
Appendix E
Transportation Improvement Program, 2017 – 2022
IN THE MATTER OF ADOPTING A
COMPREHENSIVE SIX YEAR
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM FOR THE YEARS 2017-2022

WHEREAS, pursuant to the requirements of Section 6, Chapter 83, Laws of Extraordinary
Session of the State of Washington, Grant County did prepare a Comprehensive Transportation
Improvement Program for the ensuing six years; and

WHEREAS, priority array of projects prepared in accordance with County Road
Administration Board Standards of Good Practice (WAC 136-14) was made available and was consulted
by the Board during the preparation of this Six Year Program; and

WHEREAS, the Engineer's report with respect to deficient bridges was available to the
Board during the preparation of the Six Year Program; and

WHEREAS, an environmental pre-assessment of the Six Year Program indicated that the
social, economic and aesthetic values would not be disturbed; and

WHEREAS, pursuant further to said Law, the Board of County Commissioners, being the
legislative body of the County, did prepare, revise and extend said Six Year Program and did hold a public
hearing on said Comprehensive Plan at 1:30 pm at the Courthouse, Ephrata, Washington on the 29th day
of November, 2016;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Grant
County, Washington, that the Comprehensive Six Year Road Program presented at the public hearing be
hereby adopted.

DATED this 29th day of November, 2016.

Yea Nay Abstain
✓  □  □
✓  □  □

ATTEST:

Deputy

Cindy Carter, Chair
Carolann Swartz, Vice Chair
Richard Stevens, Member

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
GRANT COUNTY, WASHINGTON
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022  
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)  

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00001</td>
<td>9003</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Stratford Road NE  
Structure ID:  
Road: 9402520 - STRATFORD RD  
Begin Term.: 20.28  
End Term.: 20.67

Realignment and Install Bridge - Work will include earthwork, drainage, crushed surfacing, BST, traffic control and other items.  
Location: (BNSF RR xing to SR 28)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>USBR</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -  
$750,000  
$0  
$445,000  
$1,195,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -  
$1,195,000  
$0  
$0  
$0  
$0
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

*from 2017 to 2022*

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q

**County:** Grant

**Agency:** Grant County

**Project Info -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00002</td>
<td>9004</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Title: Adams Road & Bridge #331 & #332  Structure ID:*

*Road: 9101710 - ADAMS RD  Begin Termini: 23.68  End Termini: 25.53*

Reconstruction & Install Bridges - Work will include earthwork, drainage, bridge, HMA surfacing, traffic control and other items

Location: (SR 28 to Martin Road)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals -**

|                  | $0          | $950,000    | $500,000    | $1,450,000    |

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**

$1,450,000
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

*(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)*

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RM Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00003</td>
<td>9006</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Title: Bridge #330 & 334  Structure ID:*

**Bridge Replacement:** Work will include demolition, structure replacement, approaches, traffic control and other items  
**Location:** (M-NW & 11-NW)

---

### Funding - Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  
**Federal Funds:** $0  
**State Funds:** $0  
**Local Funds:** $370,000  
**Total:** $370,000

---

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:** $370,000  
**5th & 6th Years:** $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q  RTPO
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>00004</td>
<td>9005</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T,W</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Cochran & Ottmar Road
Structure ID:
Road: 4155000 - COCHRAN RD  Begin Termini: 0.00  End Termini: 0.25
Road: 4155010 - OTTMAR RD  Begin Termini: 0.25  End Termini: 0.69

Reconstruction - Work will include grade, drain, HMA surfacing, Curb & Gutter, sidewalks, traffic control and other items
Location: (Airway Drive to Valley Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$43,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$934,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$145,800</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $977,450 $0 $157,550 $1,135,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $1,135,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00005</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>7.200</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Beverly-Burke Road  Structure ID: Road: 9101300 - BEVERLY BURKE RD  Begin Term: 0.00  End Term: 7.20

2R Overlay - Work consist of HMA Overlay, shoulder finishing, guardrail, traffic control and other items
Location: (SR 243 to SR26)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$1,946,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$278,750</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$303,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $1,946,250 $0 $303,750 $2,250,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $2,250,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00006</td>
<td>9007</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$161,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: County Road Safety - Rumble Strips & Flashing Signs
Structure ID:

This project will include installation of rumble strips, flashing LED stop signs and other associated work on various roads throughout the County.
Location: Various

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$161,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$161,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $161,400

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$161,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $161,400

November 29, 2016
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00007</td>
<td>9008</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: County Road Safety - Horizontal Curve Signs
Structure ID:

This project will include installation of warning signs and other associated work on various roads throughout the County.
Location: Various

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$719,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$719,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $719,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$719,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $719,000
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00008</td>
<td>9009</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: J-NE Road  Structure ID:
Road: 5305000 - J-NE  Begin Termini: 0.00  End Termini: 0.72

Reconstruction - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surfacing, traffic control and other items
Location: (Pinto Ridge Road to 36-NE Road)

Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -

|                  | $200,000    | $0        | $0        | $0        | $0              |

November 29, 2016
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022  
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00009</td>
<td>9012</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/28/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>3.510</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,060,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 9-NW Road  
**Structure ID:**

Road: 3020020 - 9 NW  
Begin Termini: 4.47  
End Termini: 7.98

2R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (Quincy City Limits to Adams Road)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$678,000</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0  
$750,000  
$310,000  
$1,060,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $1,060,000

$0  
$0  
$0
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

### Project Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00010</td>
<td>9013</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$462,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 10-SW & F-SW Road  
**Structure ID:**
Road: 1278000 - 10 SW  Begin Terminii: 0.00  End Terminii: 1.12  
Road: 1278010 - F SW  Begin Terminii: 1.12  End Terminii: 2.10

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (G-SW Road to 11-SW Road)

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  
$0  $0  $462,000  $462,000

### Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**  
$462,000  $0  $0  $0  $0
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**  
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Grant County  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00011</td>
<td>9014</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 8-NW Road  
**Structure ID:**
Road: 3934000 - 8 NW  
Begin Termini: 0.00  
End Termini: 1.60

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (Dodson Road to 1.60 miles East)

## Funding - Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$360,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November 29, 2016
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>00012</td>
<td>9037</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$136,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Endeavor Middle School Sidewalk  Structure ID:
Road: 4517000 - PATTON BLVD  Begin Termini: 1.60  End Termini: 1.87

Safety Project - Install rapid-flash beacons, recessed crosswalk warning light system, school zone flashing beacon, ADA sidewalk Ramp upgrades and other items.
Location: (Patton Blvd Intersections)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$123,400</td>
<td>$13,100</td>
<td>$136,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$136,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -

$136,500
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00013</td>
<td>9034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Bridge #353 R-NW  Structure ID:

Bridge Replacement - Work will include demolition, structure replacement, approaches, traffic control and other items
Location: (R-NW & Martin Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0 $0 $100,000 $100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $100,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00014</td>
<td>9002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Miscellaneous Projects
Structure ID:

*Including Cost Share Projects
Location: Various

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November 29, 2016
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q

**County:** Grant

**Agency:** Grant County

### Project Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00015</td>
<td>9010</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 3-NE Road - Phase 1

**Structure ID:**

**Road:** 9400020 - 3 NE  Begin Termeni: 5.03  End Termeni: 6.91

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items

Location: (O-NE Road to Q-NE Road)

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**

| $0 | $0 | $1,150,000 | $1,150,000 |

### Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**

| $0 | $1,150,000 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

#### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00016</td>
<td></td>
<td>9011</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.900</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,795,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** Dodson Road Overlay  
**Structure ID:**  
Road: 9103000 - DODSON RD  
Begin Termini: 0.00  
End Termini: 5.90

2R Overlay - Work will include HMA, shoulder finishing, traffic control and other items  
Location: (SR 26 to Frenchman Hills Road)

#### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$1,531,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$238,950</td>
<td>$263,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  
- **Federal Funds:** $1,531,050  
- **State Funds:** $0  
- **Local Funds:** $263,950  
- **Total:** $1,795,000

#### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,770,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**  
- **1st Year:** $0  
- **2nd Year:** $1,795,000  
- **3rd Year:** $0  
- **4th Year:** $0  
- **5th & 6th Years:** $0
**Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program**

from 2017 to 2022  
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**November 29, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>00017</td>
<td>9018</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-186-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,S,T,W</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Randolph Road  
Structure ID:  
Road: 4501000 - RANDOLPH RD  Begin Term: 0.00  End Term: 0.99  
Road: 4501010 - RANDOLPH RD  Begin Term: 0.99  End Term: 1.13  
(additional Roads ...)

2R Grind & Inlay - Work will include grinding, HMA surfacing, ADA ramps, sidewalk, traffic control and other items  
Location: (SR 17 to Moses Lake City Limits)

---

**Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$908,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$141,750</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -  
$908,250

---

**Expenditure Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -  
$1,100,000

---
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

*(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)*

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County  
**November 29, 2016**

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00018</td>
<td>9015</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 4-NE Road  
**Structure ID:**  
**Road:** 4290000 - 4 NE  
**Begin Termin: 0.00**  
**End Termin: 2.01**

Reconstruction - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items  
**Location:** (N-NE Road to L-NE Road)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$905,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  
Federal: $0  
State: $995,000  
Local: $105,000  
**Total:** $1,100,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**  
1st Year: $0  
2nd Year: $1,100,000  
3rd Year: $0  
4th Year: $0  
5th & 6th Years: $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00019</td>
<td>9016</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>3.010</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$670,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: 28-SW Road  
Structure ID: 
Road: 1029000 - 28 SW  Begin Termini: 3.01  End Termini: 6.02

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (O-SW Road to R-SW Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0  $0  $670,000  $670,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0  $670,000  $0  $0  $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Heading Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00020</td>
<td>9017</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: 3-NE Road - Phase 2  Structure ID:
Road: 9400020 - 3 NE  Begin Termini: 6.91  End Termini: 8.91

3R: Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (Q-NE Road to S-NE Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,105,000</td>
<td>$1,105,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project Totals |             |        |                   | $0            |                 | $0          | $1,200,000  | $1,200,000     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,105,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Expenditure Totals | $0       | $0       | $1,200,000| $0       | $0              |
**Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program**

from 2017 to 2022  
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
RTPO  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

---

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00021</td>
<td>9019</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-183-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>4.420</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,326,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 4-NE Road  
**Structure ID:**  
Road: 9300410 - 4 NE  
Begin Termini: 5.03  
End Termini: 9.45

Reconstruction - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (Hiawatha Road to Westshore Drive)

---

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$1,103,000</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals -**  
$0  
$1,193,000  
$133,000  
$1,326,000

---

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**  
$0  
$0  
$1,326,000  
$0  
$0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00022</td>
<td>9027</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$855,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: 5-NW  Structure ID:
Road: 9301000 - 5 NW  Begin Termini: 14.07  End Termini: 17.23

2R Overlay - Work will include Hot Mix Asphalt, shoulder finishing, traffic control and other items
Location: (SR 281 to T-NW Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$713,625</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$111,375</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$713,625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$825,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $713,625 $0 $141,375 $855,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0 $0 $855,000 $0 $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

Title: Grape & Maple Drive  Structure ID: 
Road: 4235000 - GRAPE DR  Begin Terminus: 0.03  End Terminus: 0.27 
Road: 4260000 - MAPLE DR  Begin Terminus: 0.00  End Terminus: 0.75

Reconstruction - Work will include grade, drainage, curb and gutter, HIMA, sidewalk, traffic control and other items
Location: (SR 17 to Stratford Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>00023</td>
<td>9029</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T,W</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,525,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$108,125</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$16,875</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$1,211,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$189,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $1,319,125 $0 $205,875 $1,525,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0 $0 $125,000 $1,400,000 $0
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

---

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00024</td>
<td>9030</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Baseline.5 SE Road  
Structure ID: Road: 2210000 - BASELINE.5 SE  
Begin Term: 1.01  
End Term: 2.02

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (N-SE Road to O-SE Road)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -  
$0  
$0  
$250,000  
$250,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -  
$0  
$0  
$250,000  
$0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q RTPO
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RV Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00025</td>
<td>9031</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Lower Crab Creek Road    Structure ID:
Road: 11130000 - LOWER CRAB CREEK RD  Begin Termini: 0.00  End Termeni: 2.50

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (E-SE Road to 2.5 Miles East)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding -</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$555,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -
$0       $0       $550,000      $550,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -
$0       $0       $550,000      $0       $0
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

### from 2017 to 2022

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County  
**Date:** November 29, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00026</td>
<td>9020</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.990</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Title:** 3-NE Road - Phase 3  
- **Structure ID:**  
- **Road:** 94000020 - 3 NE  
- **Begin Termini:** 8.91  
- **End Termini:** 10.90  

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (S-NE Road to U-NE Road)

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:** $0 $0 $1,300,000 $1,300,000

### Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:** $0 $0 $0 $1,300,000 $0
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>0027</td>
<td>9022</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-185-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>4.010</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Stratford Road - Phase 1  Structure ID: Road: 9402520 - STRATFORD RD Begin Termini: 9.23 End Termini: 13.24

2R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (12-NE Road to 16-NE Road)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -

|                      | $0       | $1,200,000 | $0       | $0       | $0              |

November 29, 2016
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

- **From:** 2017 to 2022
- **(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)**

## MPO / RTPO:
- Q
- RTPO

## County:
- Grant

## Agency:
- Grant County

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Heading Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00028</td>
<td>9028</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>5.680</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$1,297,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$202,500</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**
- Federal Funds: $1,297,500
- State Funds: $0
- Local Funds: $232,500
- Total: $1,530,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**
- 1st Year: $0
- 2nd Year: $0
- 3rd Year: $0
- 4th Year: $1,530,000
- 5th & 6th Years: $0

---

2R Overlay - Work will include Hot Mix Asphalt, shoulder finishing, traffic control and other items

Location: (T-NW Road to SR 29)
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q

**County:** Grant

**Agency:** Grant County

## Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00029</td>
<td>9032</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** H-NW Road

**Structure ID:**

**Road:** 3883020 - H NW  
**Begin Termini:** 2.17  
**End Termini:** 3.17

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items

Location: (7-NW Road to 8-NW Road)

## Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals -**

|                   | $0 | $0 | $225,000 | $225,000 |

## Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**

|                   | $0 | $0 | $225,000 | $0       |
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q

**County:** Grant

**Agency:** Grant County

#### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00030</td>
<td>9033</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Title:** H-SW Road  
- **Structure ID:**  
- **Road:** 1253000 - H SW  
- **Begin Termini:** 0.00  
- **End Termini:** 1.02

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items.  
Location: (12-SW Road to SR 26)

#### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals -**

$0

$0

$250,000

$250,000

#### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**

$0

$0

$0

$250,000

$0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07 00031 0036</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>2.850</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Hiawatha Road  Structure ID: Road: 4055500 - HiAWATHA RD  Begin Termin: 0.23  End Termin: 3.08

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA & BST surface, traffic control and other items.
Location: (N. Frontage to 4-NE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding -</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE CN</td>
<td>2020 P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$123,300</td>
<td>$13,700</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>$1,238,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0 $1,237,500 $137,500 $1,375,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>$1,238,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0 $0 $0 $1,375,000 $0
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

*(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)*

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00032</td>
<td>9021</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,995,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 3-NE Road - Phase 4  
**Structure ID:**

Road: 9400020 - 3 NE  
Begin Termini: 10.90  
End Termini: 13.90

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items

Location: (U-NE Road to Adams County Line)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,995,000</td>
<td>$1,995,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**

|                      | $0       | $0       | $0       | $0       | $1,995,000    |

November 29, 2016
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q RTPO
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00033</td>
<td>9023</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Stratford Road - Phase 2  Structure ID: Road: 9402520 - STRATFORD RD  Begin Term.: 13.24  End Term.: 17.24

2R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (18-NE Road to 20-NE Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule - Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -

|       | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $1,200,000     |
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

*from 2017 to 2022*  
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County  
**RTPO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00034</td>
<td>9024</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>3.040</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$930,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Stratford Road - Phase 3  
Structure ID:  
Road: 9402520 - STRATFORD RD  
Begin Termini: 17.24  
End Termini: 20.28

2R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (22-NE Road to BNSF Crossing)

## Funding Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -  
$0  
$0  
$930,000  
$930,000

## Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -  
$0  
$0  
$0  
$0  
$930,000
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00035</td>
<td>9025</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: 12-NE  Structure ID:  
Road: 9403030 - 12 NE  Begin Termini: 6.24  End Termini: 9.01

Reconstruction - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (M-NE Road to East end of Bridge #158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding -</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -  
$0  $0  $200,000  $200,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -  
$0  $0  $0  $0  $200,000
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**  
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)  

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00036</td>
<td>9026</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>2.753</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: North Frontage Road  
Structure ID:  
Road: 4352010 - NORTH FRONTAGE RD  
Begin Termini: 11.17  
End Termini: 13.92  

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (O-N-E Road to Moses Lake City Limits)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$725,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**  
$0  
$0  
$0  
$0  
$725,000
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00037</td>
<td>9035</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Bridge #382 H-NW Road  Structure ID:

Bridge Replacement - Work will include demolition, structure replacement, approaches, traffic control and other items
Location: (0.4 Miles North of SR 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BROS</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BROS</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -
$700,000  $0  $175,000  $875,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -
$0  $0  $0  $0  $875,000
No. 6 - COUNTY ROAD SAFETY PROJECTS
Rumble Strips, Flashing Signs

No. 7 - COUNTY ROAD SAFETY PROJECTS
Horizontal Curve Signs

No. 14 MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS
Various areas, includes Cost Shares.
## Revenue and Expenditure Analysis

**Grant County**

**SIX-YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

### REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>5,631,400</td>
<td>5,749,000</td>
<td>17,247,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL &amp; PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS CO ROAD DIVERSION</td>
<td>8,400,000</td>
<td>8,886,000</td>
<td>8,976,880</td>
<td>26,930,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX</td>
<td>6,690,000</td>
<td>6,690,000</td>
<td>6,690,000</td>
<td>20,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO ARTERIAL PRES PROGRAM</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>4,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>995,000</td>
<td>995,000</td>
<td>2,985,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT BOARD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UATA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAC-SALMON RECOVERY FUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 21-STPR</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>1,939,300</td>
<td>821,790</td>
<td>2,465,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 21-STPU</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 21-STPE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 21-STPN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARD ELIMINATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>860,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER INTERGOVERNMENT &amp; STATE SHARED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERFUND/INTERGOVMNT REIMB FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES</td>
<td>1,426,300</td>
<td>678,300</td>
<td>676,300</td>
<td>2,028,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROCEEDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEEDS FOR SALE OF FIXED ASSETS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PURPOSE PATH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC WORKS TRUST FUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING TRANSFER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT FEES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES &amp; FUND BALANCES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,331,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,775,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,863,930</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,591,790</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES:

| ENDING FUND BALANCE       | 5,331,400  | 5,749,000  | 6,346,930  | 18,753,790  |
| ADMINISTRATION & SUPPORT SERVICES | 350,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 1,950,000 |
| SSWM PROGRAM ASSESSMENT   | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0           |
| COUNTY RISK MANAGEMENT ALLOCATION | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| COUNTY INDIRECT COST ALLOCATION | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ENGINEERING SERVICES      | 225,000    | 225,000    | 225,000    | 675,000     |
| SURVEYING & RIGHT OF WAY MANAGEMENT | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 300,000 |
| DEVELOPMENT REVIEW & INSPECTION | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 | 255,000 |
| ROAD SYSTEM MAINTENANCE   | 11,500,000 | 11,500,000 | 11,500,000 | 34,500,000 |
| TRAFFIC OPERATIONS        | 1,800,000  | 1,800,000  | 1,800,000  | 5,400,000   |
| TRANSPORTATION PLANNING   | 75,000     | 75,000     | 75,000     | 225,000     |
| MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES | 990,000    | 500,000    | 500,000    | 1,500,000   |
| SPECIAL PURPOSE PATHS      | 1,000      | 1,000      | 1,000      | 3,000       |
| REIMBURSABLE SERVICES     | 25,000     | 25,000     | 25,000     | 75,000      |
| LONG TERM DEBT (PW TRUST FUND) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CONTRIBUT. TO OTHER FUNDS (DEBT SERVICE) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CONSTRUCTION IN HOUSE SERVICES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBTOTAL OPERATIONS:** | **$21,082,400** | **$20,710,000** | **$21,307,930** | **$63,636,790** |

### CONSTRUCTION:

| SIX-YEAR TIP | 9,848,900 | 6,065,000 | 4,596,000 | 13,555,000 |

### SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION:

**$9,848,900** | **$6,065,000** | **$4,596,000** | **$13,555,000**

### TOTAL EXPENDITURES:

**$30,931,300** | **$26,775,000** | **$25,863,930** | **$77,591,790**

### FUND BALANCE:

**$0** | **$0** | **$0** | **$0**

---

Print Date: 11/29/2016
Appendix F
Capital Facilities Plan Addendum, 2017 – 2022
RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF
ADOPTING THE 2017-2022 GRANT
COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

WHEREAS, The Board of Grant County Commissioners desires to annually update the
Grant County Capital Facilities Plan in conjunction with the annual Grant County Budget; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Facilities Plan is a planning document to be used in setting policy
and establishing priorities for capital facilities projects.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT the Board of Grant
County Commissioners hereby adopts the attached 2017-2022 Grant County Capital
Facilities Plan.

DATED this 6th day of Dec., 2016.

Yea  Nay  Abstain
☐    ☐    ☐

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
GRANT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Cindy Carter, Chair

ATTEST:

Carolann Swartz, Vice-Chair

Barbara J. Vasquez, Clerk of the Board

Richard Stevens, Member
Grant County
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Capital Facilities Plan Addendum Overview

This Capital Facilities Plan Addendum (CFPA) summarizes the County’s adopted budget for the upcoming year while incorporating the County’s larger ongoing, multi-year plan that provides a planned and programmed approach to utilizing the County’s financial resources in the most efficient manner to meet its service and facility needs (Grant County Capital Facilities Plan).

The County has prepared a comprehensive capital projects list as a part of the annual budget process. This list provides a six-year view of intended and/or potential projects and has served as an excellent resource to the Board of Commissioners, County staff and Grant County citizens in understanding the scope, timing, and funding of key projects. While funding was identified as a part of each project description, some unfunded projects have historically been included to keep them in the forefront as targets for grants, ballot measures, and other continued funding efforts. The Grant County Capital Facilities Plan (Plan) details these projects.

Advantages of a Capital Facilities Plan

A Plan allows the community, through its County Commissioners, to take a critical look at itself, identify what is good, what could be improved, and what might be needed in the future. Without this comprehensive approach, consideration and approval of capital improvements results in a short-range approach to capital planning.

Capital planning provides a process that considers all possible projects at the same time and produces a planning record that balances projects funding sources, and timing schedules. In addition, a Plan:

✔ Promotes efficiency by reducing scheduling problems;

✔ Helps to distribute costs more equitably over a period of time; and

✔ Enhances opportunities for outside financial assistance.
Project Priority Status

A. Essential and time-critical
   - Funding sources are generally identified for the upcoming year's project(s).

B. Necessary but not immediately required
   - A design component may be required prior to construction;
   - A funding source may or may not be identified; and/or
   - Often, grants or outside sources determine timing or feasibility.

C. Foreseen for future demand or long term needs and, while included in the Plan, whether the project has been postponed. A funding source may or may not be identified for these projects.

Cost Estimate Confidence Level

1. No estimate or placeholder

2. Rough estimate

3. Preliminary – Some work has been done to determine rough estimate, either based on previous projects of similar nature or industry standards.

4. Design – Receive a cost estimate from a vendor or an architect; provided a cost estimate.

5. Construction – Quotes or bids are in; cost is set with the exception of change orders.
Explanation of Fund Uses

**CUMULATIVE RESERVE FUND** is for routine capital outlay purchases and projects by the County including, but not limited to, office furniture and fixtures, major building maintenance, real property acquisition, building remodeling projects, road projects, and water projects, and said funds shall be invested by the Grant County Treasurer with interest accruing to the Current Expense fund. This fund is authorized by RCW 36.33.020.

\( \frac{1}{4} \text{ PERCENT REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX} \) is a fund to account for the revenues generated by a special \( \frac{1}{4} \) of 1 percent excise tax levied on the sale of real property within the County. This fund is authorized by RCW 82.46.010(2).

**SECOND \( \frac{1}{4} \) PERCENT REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX** is a fund to track and fund specific capital projects allowed by RCW 82.46.035.

**C.J. -- CRIMINAL JUSTICE FUND** is a fund established to track state funding for criminal justice and to address specific law and justice needs. This fund is authorized by RCW 82.14.310.

**C.E. -- CURRENT EXPENSE -- GENERAL FUND** is the more flexible, main fund account which is made up of many various general property taxes, user fees, penalties and State & Federal grant monies.

**H.M. -- HOTEL/MOTEL LODGING TAX FUND** is a proprietary fund which can only be used for promotion of tourism to our County. These funds can be used for specific development of print materials, advertising, mailing costs, purchase of promotional goods and services, but is limited from use in staffing areas and functions.

**ECONOMIC RURAL COUNTY (133)** is a fund authorized by RCW 43.168 to promote economic development and job creation in areas of economic stagnation, unemployment, and poverty. Grant County is a recipient of these funds and they are used to pay for County commitments on interlocal agreements involving long term economic development projects and can also be used for making bond payments, as appropriate, on qualifying projects.

**OTHER SOURCES** includes potential loans, grants, and other dedicated revenue possibilities.
# Summary of Capital Plan Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>In 2017 Budget?</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fairgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restroom #1 replacement</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Warm-up pen expansion</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4-H Building floor refinish/repair</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ventilation/fans for Ardell Pavilion</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centerfield sprinklers</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building ventilation (older buildings)</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gold Parking Lot upgrade</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paving for ADA around Ardell Pavilion</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Barns</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rodeo Arena upgrades</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gravel (multiple locations/improvements)</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fuller Building upgrade</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perimeter fence repair</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rodeo grandstand foundation</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rodeo bleacher replacement</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Old barns re-roofed</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lighting upgrade (through attrition)</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commercial Building insulation</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commercial Building ceiling</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brian Miller stage upgrade</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water tank replacement</td>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well – Maintenance &amp; Repair</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>REET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PA System replacement</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>REET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fairgrounds improvements (bond)</td>
<td>2007-2027</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>REET/Econ Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 4-H Bldg upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bathroom replacement(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o New horse barns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Covered riding arena (Harwood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Underground utilities – sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o ADA pathways, sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Realignment of Airway Drive, parking improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sod and landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lighting improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Tech Services

- Cameras, Annex Bldg. 2017 Pending Yes Current Expense L&J Funds
- Cameras, Courthouse Bldg. 2017 Pending Yes

[Cont’d next page]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>In 2017 Budget?</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lavatory remodel, Boys; Public/Det</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security lighting package</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Detention controls upgrade</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L&amp;J Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water line extension</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Detention door replacement</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shower repair (2 in Detention)</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electrical panel generator connect</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscaping (bark &amp; plants)</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HVAC system cleaned</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Courtroom security upgrade (Ephrata)</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Video/Audio conferencing for courtroom</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Trial Court Impv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Video/audio conferencing for Detention</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security in ML bldg. (cameras, doors)</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drinking fountain in lobby</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L&amp;J Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking lot ADA painting, signage</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electronic water conditioner</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UV lights</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security upgrades for PREA compliance</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security in Moses Lake building</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L&amp;J Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building furniture</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L&amp;J Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerk’s Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• QUAD security cameras &amp; software</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Trial Court Impv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities &amp; Maintenance (Courthouse facility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paving of Parking Lot “D”</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>REET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paving of Parking Lot “B”</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>REET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Irrigation system upgrades</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sidewalk replacement, Annex/L&amp;J Bldg.</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>REET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Terminal units replacement (ongoing)</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security improvements – security screening area</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security improvements – Enterprise</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Central Services Building</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asbestos/Hazardous Material Abatement</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interior Improvements (Gen'l)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>REET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTR updates, all Courts/Hearing Room</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Trial Court Impv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New water softener for L&amp;J Building</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L&amp;J Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road Fund 101 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis
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# Revenue and Expenditure Analysis

**Grant County**  
**SIX-YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**  
**REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>5,631,400</td>
<td>6,749,000</td>
<td>17,247,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL &amp; PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS CO ROAD DIVERSION</td>
<td>8,800,000</td>
<td>8,888,000</td>
<td>8,976,880</td>
<td>26,930,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX</td>
<td>6,690,000</td>
<td>6,690,000</td>
<td>6,690,000</td>
<td>20,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO ARTERIAL PRES PROGRAM</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>4,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>995,000</td>
<td>995,000</td>
<td>2,985,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT BOARD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UATA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAC-SALMON RECOVERY FUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 21-STPR</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>1,839,300</td>
<td>621,750</td>
<td>2,465,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 21-STPU</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 21-STPE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 21-STPN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARD ELIMINATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>880,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER INTERGOVERNMENT &amp; STATE SHARED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERFUND/INTERGOVMNT REIMB FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES</td>
<td>1,426,300</td>
<td>676,300</td>
<td>676,300</td>
<td>2,028,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROCEEDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEEDS FOR SALE OF FIXED ASSETS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PURPOSE PATH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC WORKS TRUST FUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING TRANSFER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT FEES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES &amp; FUND BALANCES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,931,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,775,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,863,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,591,790</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDING FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>5,931,400</td>
<td>6,749,000</td>
<td>6,346,930</td>
<td>18,753,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION &amp; SUPPORT SERVICES</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSWM PROGRAM ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY RISK MANAGEMENT ALLOCATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY INDIRECT COST ALLOCATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEYING &amp; RIGHT OF WAY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT REVIEW &amp; INSPECTION</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD SYSTEM MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>11,500,000</td>
<td>11,500,000</td>
<td>11,500,000</td>
<td>34,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC OPERATIONS</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>5,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PURPOSE PATHS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIMBURSABLE SERVICES</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG TERM DEBT (PW TRUST FUND)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIB. TO OTHER FUNDS (DEBT SERVICE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION IN HOUSE SERVICES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL OPERATIONS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,082,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,710,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,307,930</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63,836,790</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIX-YEAR TIP</td>
<td>9,848,900</td>
<td>6,065,000</td>
<td>4,856,000</td>
<td>13,965,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,848,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,065,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,856,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,965,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020 - 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$30,931,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,775,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,863,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,591,790</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
Grant County, Washington

IN THE MATTER OF ADOPTING A
COMPREHENSIVE SIX YEAR
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM FOR THE YEARS 2017-2022

RESOLUTION No. 16-188-CC

WHEREAS, pursuant to the requirements of Section 6, Chapter 83, Laws of Extraordinary
Session of the State of Washington, Grant County did prepare a Comprehensive Transportation
Improvement Program for the ensuing six years; and

WHEREAS, priority array of projects prepared in accordance with County Road
Administration Board Standards of Good Practice (WAC 136-14) was made available and was consulted
by the Board during the preparation of this Six Year Program; and

WHEREAS, the Engineer's report with respect to deficient bridges was available to the
Board during the preparation of the Six Year Program; and

WHEREAS, an environmental pre-assessment of the Six Year Program indicated that the
social, economic and aesthetic values would not be disturbed; and

WHEREAS, pursuant further to said Law, the Board of County Commissioners, being the
legislative body of the County, did prepare, revise and extend said Six Year Program and did hold a public
hearing on said Comprehensive Plan at 1:30 pm at the Courthouse, Ephrata, Washington on the 29th day
of November, 2016;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Grant
County, Washington, that the Comprehensive Six Year Road Program presented at the public hearing be
hereby adopted.

DATED this 29th day of November, 2016.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
GRANT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Yea Nay Abstain

☐ ☐ ☐

Cindy Cartar, Chair

Carolann Swartz, Vice Chair

Excused

Richard Stevens, Member

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Board

Capital Facilities Plan Addendum, 2017-2022
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>000010</td>
<td>9003</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Stratford Road NE     Structure ID:
Road: 9402520 - STRATFORD RD Begin Termini: 20.28   End Termini: 20.67

Realignment and Install Bridge - Work will include earthwork, drainage, crushed surfacing, BST, traffic control and other items.
Location: (BNSP RR xing to SR 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>USBR</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -

$1,195,000
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022  
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County  
**November 29, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00002</td>
<td>9004</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-166-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** Adams Road & Bridge #331 & #332  
**Structure ID:**

**Road:** 9101710 - ADAMS RD  
**Begin Termini:** 23.08  
**End Termini:** 25.53

Reconstruction & Install Bridges - Work will include earthwork, drainage, bridge, HMA surfacing, traffic control and other items.  
Location: (SR 28 to Martin Road)

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  
- Federal Funds: $0  
- State Funds: $950,000  
- Local Funds: $500,000  
- Total: $1,450,000

### Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:** $1,450,000
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Classes</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00003</td>
<td></td>
<td>9006</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-186 cc</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>P;T</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>CE No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$970,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Bridge #330 & 334
Structure ID:

Bridge Replacement - Work will include demolition, structure replacement, approaches, traffic control and other items
Location: (M-NW & 11-NW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0 $0 $370,000 $370,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $370,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: 0
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>00004</td>
<td>9005</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P.T.W</td>
<td>0,890</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Cochisn & Ottmar Road
Structure ID:
Road: 4155000 - COCHRAN RD  Begin Terminl: 0.00  End Terminl: 0.25
Road: 4155010 - OTTMAR RD  Begin Terminl: 0.25  End Terminl: 0.59
Reconstruction - Work will include grade, drain, HMA surfacing, Curb & Gutter, sidewalks, traffic control and other items
Location: (Airway Drive to Valley Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$43,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$934,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$145,800</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
<td>$1,135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $977,450 $0 $157,550 $1,135,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $1,135,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00005</td>
<td>5001</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Beverly-Burke Road  Structure ID: Road: 9101300 - BEVERLY BURKE RD  Begin Termini: 0.00  End Termini: 7.20

2R Overlay - Work consist of HMA Overlay, shoulder finishing, guardrail, traffic control and other items
Location: (SR 243 to SR26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$1,946,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$278,750</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $1,946,250 $0 $303,750 $2,250,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $2,250,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

*from 2017 to 2022*

*(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)*

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County  
**November 29, 2016**

---

**Project Info -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00006</td>
<td>9007</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-186-cc</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$161,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** County Road Safety - Rumble Strips & Flashing Signs  
**Structure ID:**

This project will include installation of rumble strips, flashing LED stop signs and other associated work on various roads throughout the County.  
**Location:** Various

---

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$161,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$161,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:** $161,400

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$161,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:** $161,400
**Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program**

from 2017 to 2022

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00007</td>
<td>9008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-188-c1</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$719,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: County Road Safety - Horizontal Curve Signs

Structure ID:

This project will include installation of warning signs and other associated work on various roads throughout the County.

Location: Various

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$719,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$719,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $719,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $719,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th &amp; 6th Years</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Facilities Plan Addendum, 2017-2022
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00008</td>
<td>9009</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-186-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P;T</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: J-NE Road  Structure ID:
Road: 5305000 - J NE  Begin Termini: 0.00  End Termini: 0.72

Reconstruction - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surfacing, traffic control and other items
Location: (Pinto Ridge Road to 36-NE Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding -</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0 $0 $200,000 $200,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $200,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00009</td>
<td>5012</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-CC</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P;T</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,060,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: 0-NW Road  Structure ID:
Road: 30200020 - 9 NW  Begin Termini: 4.47  End Termini: 7.58

2R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (Quincy City Limits to Adams Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$678,000</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0 $750,000 $310,000 $1,060,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $1,060,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO / RTPO: Q</th>
<th>County: Grant</th>
<th>Agency: Grant County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00010</td>
<td>9013</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-168-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$462,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 10-SW & F-SW Road
**Structure ID:**
**Road:** 1278000 - 10 SW Begin Ternini: 0.00 End Ternini: 1.12
**Road:** 1278010 - F-SW Begin Ternini: 1.12 End Ternini: 2.10

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items.
Location: (G-SW Road to 11-SW Road)

#### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**
$0 + $0 = $462,000 + $462,000

#### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
<th>Expenditure Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$462,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**
$462,000
**Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program**

from 2017 to 2022

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

November 29, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00011</td>
<td>3014</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-ccl</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 8-NW Road  
**Structure ID:** Road: 3934000 - 8 NW  
**Begin Termn: 0.00  
**End Terminal: 1.60  

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
**Location:** (Dodson Road to 1.60 miles East)

### Funding Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  
Federal: $0  
State: $360,000  
Local: $360,000  
Total: $360,000

### Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**  
1st Year: $350,000  
2nd Year: $0  
3rd Year: $0  
4th Year: $0  
5th & 6th Years: $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>00012</td>
<td>9037</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-168-cc</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>P,7</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$136,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Endeavor Middle School Sidewalk  Structure ID:
Road: 4517000 - PATTON BLVD  Begin Termini: 1.60  End Termini: 1.87

Safety Project - Install rapid-flash beacons, recessed crosswalk warning light system, school zone flashing beacon, ADA sidewalk Ramp upgrades and other items.
Location: (Paton Blvd Intersections)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding -</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>$123,400</td>
<td>$13,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>$136,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $136,500
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Info -</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Category</td>
<td>Priority Number</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>Hearing Date</td>
<td>Adoption Date</td>
<td>Amendment Date</td>
<td>Resolution Number</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00013</td>
<td>8034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-186-cc</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>P:T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Bridge #353 R-NW  Structure ID:

Bridge Replacement - Work will include demolition, structure replacement, approaches, traffic control and other items

Location: R-NW & Martin Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0 $0 $100,000 $100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>5th &amp; 6th Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $100,000 $0 $0 $0 $0
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00014 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-c0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Miscellaneous Projects Structure ID:  

*Including Cost Share Projects  
Location: Various

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding -</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -  

Federal Funds: $0  
State Funds: $0  
Local Funds: $1,500,000  
Total: $1,500,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -  

$250,000  
$250,000  
$250,000  
$250,000  
$500,000
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00015</td>
<td>9010</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P;T</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: 3-NE Road - Phase 1
Structure ID:
Road: 9400020 - 3-NE  Begin Termin 5.03 End Termin 6.91

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (O-NE Road to Q-NE Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -
$0
$0
$1,150,000
$1,150,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -
$0
$1,150,000
$0
$0
$0
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q
**County:** Grant
**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00016</td>
<td>9011</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-168-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,795,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** Dodson Road Overlay
**Structure ID:**
**Road:** 9103000 - DODSON RD
**Begin Termini:** 0.00  **End Termini:** 5.90

*3R Overlay - Work will include HMA, shoulder finishing, traffic control and other items
Location: (SR 26 to Frenchman Hills Road)*

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$1,531,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,795,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$238,950</td>
<td>$1,770,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,531,050</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$238,950</td>
<td>$1,795,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,770,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Facilities Plan Addendum, 2017-2022
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

### Project Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00017 9018</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,S,T,W</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Title:** Randolph Road
- **Structure ID:**
- **Road:** 4501000 - RANDOLPH RD
- **Begin Termin:** 0.00
- **End Termin:** 0.99
- **Road:** 4501010 - RANDOLPH RD
- **Begin Termin:** 0.99
- **End Termin:** 1.13

(Additional Roads ...)

- **2R Grind & Inlay -** Work will include grinding, HMA surfacing, ADA ramps, sidewalk, traffic control and other items
- **Location:** (SR 17 to Moses Lake City Limits)

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$908,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$141,750</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**
- Federal Funds: $908,250
- State Funds: $0
- Local Funds: $191,750
- Total: $1,100,000

### Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**
- 1st Year: $0
- 2nd Year: $1,100,000
- 3rd Year: $0
- 4th Year: $0
- 5th & 6th Years: $0
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**November 29, 2016**

**MPO / RTPO:** Q

**County:** Grant

**Agency:** Grant County

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Heating Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00018</td>
<td>9015</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 4-NE Road  
**Structure ID:**  
**Road:** 4290000 - 4 NE  
**Begin Terminal:** 0.00  
**End Terminal:** 2.01

Reconstruction - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items  
Location: (N-NE Road to L-NE Road)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:** $0, $995,000, $105,000, $1,100,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:** $0, $1,100,000, $0, $0, $0
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**From 2017 to 2022**

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

#### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00019</td>
<td>9016</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-183-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>3.010</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 28-SW Road  
**Structure ID:**

**Road:** 1029000 - 28 SW  
**Begin Terminus:** 3.01  
**End Terminus:** 6.02

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items.

Location: (O-SW Road to R-SW Road)

#### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  
Federal $0  
State $0  
Local $670,000  
Total $670,000

#### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**  
1st Year $0  
2nd Year $670,000  
3rd Year $0  
4th Year $0  
5th & 6th Years $0
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**From 2017 to 2022**

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q

**County:** Grant

**Agency:** Grant County

### Project Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00020</td>
<td>9017</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 3-NE Road - Phase 2

**Structure ID:**

**Road:** 9400020 - 3 NE  Begin Termini: 6.91  End Termini: 8.91

**3R:** Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items.

**Location:** (Q-NE Road to 5-NE Road)

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,105,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**

- Federal Funds: $0
- State Funds: $0
- Local Funds: $1,200,000
- Total: $1,200,000

### Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,105,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**

- 1st Year: $0
- 2nd Year: $0
- 3rd Year: $1,200,000
- 4th Year: $0
- 5th & 6th Years: $0
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hosting Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07 00021 9019</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P, T</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.420</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 4-NE Road  
**Structure ID:**
**Road:** 9300410 - 4 NE  
**Begin Terminal:** 5.03  
**End Terminal:** 9.45

**Reconstruction - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items**

**Location:** (Hiawatha Road to Westshore Drive)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$1,103,000</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  

|                      | Project Costs | $1,193,000 | $133,000 | $1,326,000 |

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**

|                      | Expenditure Totals | $1,326,000 | $0 | $0 |
**Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program**

*from 2017 to 2022*

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

November 29, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO / RTPO: Q</th>
<th>County: Grant</th>
<th>Agency: Grant County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00022</td>
<td>9027</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc 04</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$855,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: S-NW  Structure ID:  
Road: 9901000 - 5 NW  Begin Termin: 14.07  End Termin: 17.23

2R Overlay - Work will include Hot Mix Asphalt, shoulder finishing, traffic control and other items  
Location: (SR 281 to T-NW Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$713,625</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$713,625</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$111,375</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $713,625 $0 $141,375 $855,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0 $0 $855,000 $0 $0
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

November 29, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>00023</td>
<td></td>
<td>9029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,525,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Grape & Maple Drive  
Structure ID:  
Road: 4235000 - GRAPE DR  Begin Termini: 0.03  End Termini: 0.27  
Road: 4260000 - MAPLE DR  Begin Termini: 0.00  End Termini: 0.75

Reconstruction - Work will include grade, drainage, curb and gutter, HMA, sidewalk, traffic control and other items.  
Location: (SR 17 to Stratford Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$108,125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(U)</td>
<td>$1,211,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $1,319,125  
Local Funds $265,875  
Total $1,525,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0  
Local Funds $1,400,000  
Total $0
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

November 28, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO / RTPO: Q</th>
<th>Agency: Grant County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Veh</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00024</td>
<td>9030</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Baseline.5 SE Road  Structure ID:
Road: 2210000 - BASELINE.5 SE  Begin Termini: 1.01  End Termini: 2.02

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items
Location: [N-SE Road to O-SE Road]

## Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -

| $0 | 30 | $250,000 | $250,000 |

## Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -

| $0 | $0 | $250,000 | $0 | $0 |
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: 0
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00025</td>
<td>9031</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Lower Crab Creek Road
Structure ID: Road: 1113000 - LOWER CRAB CREEK RD

Begin Terminli: 0.00
End Terminli: 2.50

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (E-SE Road to 2.5 Miles East)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0 $0 $550,000 $550,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0 $0 $550,000 $0 $0
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00026</td>
<td>9020</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.990</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** 3-NE Road - Phase 3
**Structure ID:**
**Road:** 9400020 - 3 NE
**Begin Termin: 8.91**
**End Termin: 10.90**

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (S-NE Road to U-NE Road)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals -**

|               | $0   | $0   | $1,300,000 | $1,300,000 |

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,170,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**

|               | $0   | $0   | $1,300,000 | $0                      |
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

Title: Stratford Road - Phase 1
Structure ID:
Road: 9402520 - STRATFORD RD

2R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items.
Location: (12-NE Road to 16-NE Road)

| MPO / RTPO: | Q | RTPO |
| County: | Grant |
| Agency: | Grant County |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Info -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Totals -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Totals -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00028</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>5,680</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: 5-NW & U-NW  Structure ID:
Road: 9301000 - 5 NW  Begin Termin: 17.23  End Termin: 18.19
Road: 9301010 - U NW  Begin Termin: 18.19  End Termin: 22.91

2R Overlay - Work will include Hot Mix Asphalt, shoulder finishing, traffic control and other items
Location: (T-NW Road to SR 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>STP(R)</td>
<td>$1,297,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$202,500</td>
<td>$1,530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $1,297,500  $0  $232,500  $1,530,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0  $0  $0  $1,530,000  $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q  RTPO
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>00029</td>
<td>9032</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: H-NW Road  Structure ID:  Road: 3883020 - H NW  Begin Termini: 2.17  End Termini: 3.17

Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items.
Location: (T-NW Road to B-NW Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Totals -</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0 $0 $0 $225,000 $0
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

*Projects Funds to Nearest Dollar*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Info -</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>RW/Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>9033</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** H-SW Road  
**Structure ID:**  
**Road:** 1253000 - H-SW  
**Begin Terminal:** 0.00  
**End Terminal:** 1.02

*Gravel to BST Program - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items*

*Location: (12-SW Road to SR 26)*

---

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals -**

- Federal Funds: $0
- State Funds: $0
- Local Funds: $250,000
- Total: $250,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**

- 1st Year: $0
- 2nd Year: $0
- 3rd Year: $0
- 4th Year: $250,000
- 5th & 6th Years: $0
# Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q

**County:** Grant

**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00031</td>
<td>9036</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.850</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** Hiawatha Road  
**Structure ID:**
**Road:** 4025500 - HIAWATHA RD  
**Begin Termini:** 0.23  
**End Termini:** 3.08

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HIA & BST surface, traffic control and other items

**Location:** (N. Frontage to 4-NE)

## Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$123,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$137,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>$1,114,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,238,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**

- Federal Funds: $0
- State Funds: $1,237,500
- Local Funds: $137,500
- Total: $1,375,000

## Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,238,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**

- 1st Year: $0
- 2nd Year: $0
- 3rd Year: $0
- 4th Year: $1,375,000
- 5th & 6th Years: $0
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: 0
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00032</td>
<td>9021</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-198-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P.T</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,995,000</td>
<td>$1,995,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: 3-NE Road - Phase 4  Structure ID:
Road: 9400020 - 3 NE  Begin Termini: 10.90  End Termini: 13.90

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, HMA surface, traffic control and other items
Location: (U-NE Road to Adams County Line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding - Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals -
$0  $0  $1,995,000  $1,995,000

Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals -
$0  $0  $0  $0  $1,995,000
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Info -</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Class</td>
<td>Priority Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>0023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** Stratford Road - Phase 2  
**Structure ID:**  
**Road:** 9402520 - STRATFORD RD  
**Begin Termini:** 13.24  
**End Termini:** 17.24

2R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items  
**Location:** (16-NE Road to 20-NE Road)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals -**  
$0  
$0  
$1,200,000  
$1,200,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals -**  
$0  
$0  
$0  
$0  
$1,200,000
Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program
from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

MPO / RTPO: Q
County: Grant
Agency: Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Info -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
<td>0034</td>
<td>9024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** Stratford Road - Phase 3  **Structure ID:**
**Road:** 9402520 - STRATFORD RD  **Begin Termini:** 17.24  **End Termini:** 20.28

2R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items.
Location: (29-NE Road to BNSF Crossing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals - $0 $0 $930,000 $930,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Totals - $0 $0 $0 $0 $930,000
## Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

from 2017 to 2022
(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

November 29, 2016

### MPO / RTPO:
Q

### County:
Grant

### Agency:
Grant County

### Project Info -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00035</td>
<td>0925</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
- Title: 12-NE  Structure ID:
- Road: 9403030 - 12 NE  Begin Termini: 8.24  End Termini: 9.01

Reconstruction - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items.

Location: (M-NE Road to East end of Bridge #158)

### Funding -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**
- $0
- $0
- $200,000
- $200,000

### Expenditure Schedule -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $200,000
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

November 29, 2016

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>00335 9026</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-168-cc</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>2.753</td>
<td>2.753</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** North Frontage Road  
**Structure ID:**

Road: 4352010 - NORTH FRONTAGE RD  
Begin Terminal: 11.17  
End Terminal: 13.92

3R - Work will include earthwork, drainage, BST surface, traffic control and other items

Location: (O-NE Road to Moses Lake City Limits)

### Funding Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:** 0  
0  
725,000  
725,000

### Expenditure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th &amp; 6th Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:** 0  
0  
0  
725,000
### Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

**from 2017 to 2022**

(Project Funds to Nearest Dollar)

**MPO / RTPO:** Q  
**County:** Grant  
**Agency:** Grant County  
**November 29, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Category</th>
<th>Priority Number</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Utility Codes</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
<th>RW Required</th>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Total Est. Cost of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00037</td>
<td>9035</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>2016-188-cc</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>P,T</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$875,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** Bridge #382 H-NW Road  
**Structure ID:**

Bridge Replacement - Work will include demolition, structure replacement, approaches, traffic control and other items  
**Location:** 0.4 Miles North of SR 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal Fund Code</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Fund Code</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BROS</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>BROS</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Totals:**  
- Federal Funds: $700,000  
- State Funds: $0  
- Local Funds: $175,000  
- Total: $875,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Totals:**  
- $0  
- $0  
- $0  
- $0  
- Total: $875,000
Grant County
Six Year Transportation Improvement Program
From 2017 to 2022

- No. 6 COUNTY ROAD SAFETY PROJECTS
  Rumble Strips, Flashing Signs
- No. 7 COUNTY ROAD SAFETY PROJECTS
  Horizontal Curve Signs
- No. 14 MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS
  Various areas, Includes Cost Shares.

Legend
- Six Year 2017-2022
- County Roads
- Lakes and Streams
- County Outline
- City Limits
- State Highways and Interstates
- Rail Road
Appendix G
Agricultural Lands Memorandum
Memorandum

To: Damien Hooper, Grant County Planning Director
From: Adam Hill, Anchor QEA
Cc: Ben Floyd, White Bluffs Consulting

Re: Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification

Introduction
Grant County is amending their Comprehensive Plan through a comprehensive 2018 plan update. As part of these amendments, it was determined that a county-wide review of agricultural resource lands be completed, as the designated lands had not been reviewed and updated for several years, and to confirm a more complete set of designation factors are addressed in the updated analysis. This memorandum describes work completed as part of this review and analysis process, including the elements necessary to consider for agricultural resource land classification, findings from the review, and recommended changes to agricultural resource lands in Grant County.

Agricultural Resource Land Considerations
Grant County is required to implement a comprehensive plan under RCW 36.70A.040. As part of this requirement, “the county...shall designate critical areas, agricultural lands, forestlands, and mineral resource lands, and adopt development regulations conserving these designated agricultural lands, forestlands, and mineral resource lands and protecting these designated critical areas” (emphasis added) (RCW 36.70A.040(3)(b)).

Agricultural land is defined as "land primarily devoted to the commercial production of horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, dairy, apiary, vegetable, or animal products or of berries, grain, hay, straw, turf, seed, Christmas trees..., finfish in upland hatcheries, or livestock, and that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production" (emphasis added) (RCW 36.70A.030(2)). Long-term commercial significance “includes the growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of the land for long-term commercial production, in consideration with the land’s proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more intense uses of the land” (emphasis added) (RCW 36.70A.030(10)). Additionally, in Lewis County v Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (2006), it is noted that “[i]f the farm industry cannot use land for agricultural production due to economic, irrigation, or other constraints, the possibility of more intense uses of the land is heightened. RCW 36.70A.030(10) permits such considerations in designating agricultural lands.”
Further, each county “shall designate where appropriate [a]gricultural lands that are not already characterized by urban growth and that have long-term significance for the commercial production of food or other agricultural products” (RCW 36.70A.170(1)(a)). A county “may use a variety of innovative zoning techniques in areas designated as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance…. The innovative zoning techniques should be designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy” (RCW 36.70A.177(1)).

WAC 365-190-050 establishes minimum guidelines to assist counties in classifying and designating agricultural lands. The following sections go through the minimum guidelines in WAC 365-190-050 and the approach being used to follow the guidelines.

**Classification/Designation Approach**

WAC 365-190-050(1) states that “counties must approach the effort as a county-wide or area-wide process. Counties…should not review resource lands designations solely on a parcel-by-parcel process. Counties…must have a program for the transfer or purchase of development rights prior to designating agricultural resource lands in urban growth areas. Cities are encouraged to coordinate their agricultural resource lands designations with their county and any adjacent jurisdictions” (WAC 365-190-050(1)).

The first part of this guideline (county-wide/area-wide process) is met because analyses and approaches developed in the following sections of this memorandum are applied county-wide as part of the review process to determine if agricultural land designations need revisions. Individual parcels are not evaluated in this process. Figure 1 shows the existing agricultural resource land designations of Grant County.

No lands are being designated as agricultural resource lands in urban growth areas, so a program to transfer or purchase development rights is not required by Grant County.

Several cities are adjacent to Grant County planning jurisdictions. Figure 2 shows a map of city limits and Urban Growth Areas within Grant County.

**Development Regulations**

WAC 365-190-050(2) states that counties “must adopt development regulations that assure the conservation of agricultural resource lands” (WAC 365-190-050(2)). Grant County has adopted regulations to meet this guideline; these regulations are coded in Grant County Code (GCC) Chapter 23.04. These regulations discuss allowable uses, uses requiring permits, and building requirements.

Additionally, coordination with Grant County Conservation District will occur to ensure the goals of agricultural resource land conservation are met. Considerations from meetings with Grant County Conservation District will be added to this memorandum as necessary.
Designation Factors

WAC 365-190-050(3) states that “lands should be considered for designation as agricultural resource lands based on three factors:” 1) specifically is not characterized by urban growth, 2) is used or is capable of being used for agricultural production, and 3) has long-term commercial significance for agriculture. Each of these factors are described in more detail and analyzed below.

Urban Growth

WAC 365-190-050(3)(a) states that lands should be considered for agricultural resource designation if “the land is not already characterized by urban growth” (WAC 365-190-050(3)(a)). Urban growth areas are characterized in WAC 365-196-310. Figure 2 shows the areas in Grant County already characterized by urban growth.

These urban growth areas mapped in Figure 2 were not under consideration as agricultural resource lands for this analysis.

Production Capability

WAC 365-190-050(3)(b) states that lands should be considered for agricultural resource designation if “the land is used or capable of being used for agricultural production. This factor evaluates whether lands are well suited to agricultural use based primarily on their physical and geographic characteristics” (WAC 365-190-050(3)(b)). Production capability is further detailed that lands currently used or capable to be used for agricultural production “must be evaluated for designation” (WAC 365-190-050(3)(b)(i)), and that counties “shall use the land-capability classification system of the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service as defined in relevant Field Office Technical Guides” (WAC 365-190-050(3)(b)(ii)).

The NRCS land-capability classification divides soil types into 8 classes. Classes 1 through 4 are generally suitable for cultivation, while Classes 5 to 8 are generally not suitable for cultivation. However, with certain types of land management, Classes 5 to 7 could be used for agriculture (Duncan, 2017). Classes are different for the same soil type for irrigated and non-irrigated lands. An analysis was done using Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) agricultural land use data to determine land that is irrigated; data includes crop type, acreage, and irrigation type. Land not noted as irrigated in the WSDA data is assumed to be non-irrigated. Figure 3 maps the NRCS land-capability classification for Grant County, splitting the classes into suitable, suitable with management, and non-suitable land for cultivation.

Some areas currently designated as agricultural resource lands are not well suited to agricultural use, some areas can be suitable for agricultural use with certain types of land management, and some areas not designated as agricultural resource lands may be well suited to agricultural use. Figure 4 highlights these areas. There are small areas located throughout Grant County that are suitable for
agricultural use but not currently designated as agricultural resource lands. There are also large areas that are currently designated as agricultural resource lands but would require additional land management measures to be suitable, as classified by NRCS, for other agriculture uses besides seasonal grazing. These areas are generally located in southern Grant County east-northeast of Mattawa, in the northwest corner of Grant County west of Ephrata, in eastern-central Grant County south of Wilson Creek, and in northern Grant County south of Coulee City.

This mapping procedure is done as an initial step to check the potential for areas to be well-suited for addition or removal from agricultural resource land designation, as one consideration in the evaluation process.

**Long-term Commercial Significance**

WAC 365-190-050(3)(c) states that lands should be considered for agricultural resource designation if “the land has long-term commercial significance for agriculture” (WAC 365-190-050(3)(c)). As part of determining this, counties should consider classification of prime and unique farmland soils, availability of public facilities including roads used in transporting agricultural products, tax status, public service availability, proximity to urban growth areas, predominant parcel size, land use settlement patterns, intensity of nearby land uses, history of nearby land development permits, land values under alternative uses, and proximity to markets (WAC 365-190-050(3)(c)). The following sections describe considerations employed in this analysis.

**Water Availability/Precipitation**

One of the main considerations in Grant County for long-term commercial significance is water availability. Water availability can either come from irrigation or precipitation. If there is insufficient water available, lands cannot be commercially significant in the long-term.

To assist in determining water availability for dryland production areas, an analysis of precipitation was completed. Figure 5 shows a map of mean annual precipitation and non-irrigated crops for Grant County.

Upon review of average annual precipitation for Grant County, it was found that changes in annual average precipitation in Grant County does not relate to long-term commercial viability for dryland farming – that is, an area with much higher precipitation in a non-irrigated area in Grant County does not necessarily make land more commercially viable than an area with lower precipitation in a non-irrigated area in Grant County.

Areas that are classified to be suitable with management but are not irrigated and are not currently farmed are likely to not be long-term commercially viable, as the management required to make the land suitable would be cost prohibitive for land not currently farmed.
Parcel Size
Agricultural lands must be large enough in area to have long-term commercial significance. Parcels were categorized into various sizes – less than 10 acres, between 10 and 20 acres, between 20 and 40 acres, and over 40 acres. Larger acreages are assumed to be needed to be long-term commercially significant, acknowledging that smaller acreages may be adequate for certain high value crops such as tree fruits or wine grape vineyards. County land use designations for smaller parcels allow for development of these higher value crops, as desired. Figure 6 highlights the large parcels outside of agricultural resource land designation and small parcels inside of agricultural resources designation that may have potential for change based solely on parcel size. Resource land designation is also included in Figure 6 for reference.

Lands with relatively smaller parcel sizes that are currently designated as agricultural resource lands include areas northwest of Ephrata, north of Quincy, north of Soap Lake, east of Coulee City, and northeast of Moses Lake. Lands with relatively larger parcel sizes that are not currently designated as agricultural resources lands include areas along large water bodies such as Banks Lake, Potholes Reservoir, and the Columbia River. Most of these areas require management to be suitable for agriculture per NRCS, or they are already reserved as public or open spaces.

Land in CRP or Conservation Land
Land in CRP or conservation land may or may not mean that land has long-term commercial significance. In some cases, land may return from CRP or conservation and have long-term commercial significance; in other cases, the land is in CRP or conservation because it is not viable to farm the land. Figure 7 maps the land noted as CRP or conservation land in Grant County.

Areas noted as CRP or conservation land include areas in the northwest portion of Grant County northwest of Quincy, areas in the northern portion of Grant County, and areas in the eastern portion of Grant County south of Wilson Creek.

Prime Farmlands
Some farmlands are designated as farmland of statewide importance or farmland of unique importance. These areas are mapped in Figure 8. Statewide important and unique important farmland are reviewed with previous elements listed to determine if any areas should be designated as agricultural resource land or removed from designation.

Areas north of Hartline, east of Moses Lake, east of Mattawa, and south of Warden are noted as farmlands of statewide importance. Many areas are not prime farmland, including areas north of Quincy, north of Soap Lake, southwest of Wilson Creek, south of Coulee City, and east of Ephrata.
Food Security
WAC 365-190-050(4) states that “counties may consider food security issues, which may include providing local food supplies for food banks, schools and institutions, vocational training opportunities in agricultural operations, and preserving heritage or artisanal foods (WAC 365-190-050(4)).

Grant County does not explicitly consider food security issues as Grant County is a net exporter of agriculture, however this element was reviewed to ensure food security is not a concern for the area.

Sufficiency
WAC 365-190-050(5) states that “the process should result in designating an amount of agricultural resource lands sufficient to maintain and enhance the economic viability of the agricultural industry in the county over the long term; and to retain supporting agricultural businesses, such as processors, farm suppliers, and equipment maintenance and repair facilities” (WAC 365-190-050(5)).

In addition to agricultural resource land, Grant County has proposed adding a new land designation called Rural Resource land for many of the lands that may no longer be designated as GMA Agriculture. This designation more appropriately includes range, scablands, and other limited soil areas that have not historically been farmed and are not expected to be farmed in the future, and many of the lands NRCS has designated as suitable with management. The development density of Rural Resource land is expected to be similar to GMA Agriculture land and will be discussed further with the Planning Commission. These are lands that were inappropriately designated GMA Agriculture previously as they do not meet the designation criteria, and currently and historically have not been used for agriculture except some seasonal grazing.

Local Importance
WAC 365-190-050(5) states that “counties...may further classify additional agricultural lands of local importance. Classifying additional agricultural lands of local importance should include, in addition to general public involvement, consultation with the board of the local conservation district and the local committee of the farm service agency” (WAC 365-190-050(5)).

Grant County has three American Viticultural Areas (AVAs) within the county boundaries. Figure 9 maps the AVAs located fully within Grant County.

Much of the AVAs are already designated as agricultural resource lands; it is recommended that these areas not be removed from designation unless multiple factors deem a removal to be appropriate, as discussed further below.
Findings and Conclusions

Using the information presented in the previous sections, multiple areas in the County may be considered for reclassification. In general, it is important to maintain continuity in agricultural resource land designation; unless there are sufficient reasons that the agricultural resource land should be de-designated, land should remain as agricultural resource land to protect the resource. Therefore, many areas that may not be as suitable as agricultural land may remain within agricultural resource land designation due to its proximity to lands of other types.

Additionally, there are many areas that have potential to be added or removed from designation in some analyses but not others. For example, there are areas east-northeast of Mattawa that are located in an AVA and have large parcel sizes. However, these areas require management to be suitable, are not currently farmed, and are not prime farmland. It does not appear appropriate to include these areas as agricultural resource lands.

The areas that should be removed from agricultural resource land designation are areas north of Quincy in the Beezley Hills area, north of Soap Lake and south of Coulee City in the Dry Falls area, areas around Wilson Creek in the Black Rock/Wilson Creek area, and areas east-northeast of Mattawa in the Saddle Mountain/Mattawa area. These areas are not currently farmed, require management to be suitable, and are not prime farmland, all of which threaten the long-term commercial significance of the land as agricultural land, which fits the considerations noted in *Lewis County v Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board* (2006).

Areas that should be added to agricultural resource land designation are areas east of Mattawa and north of Coulee City. These areas are currently farmed, are irrigated and in some cases have permanent crops in place, have suitable capability classes, are outside of urban growth areas, and are near existing land that is already designated as agricultural resource land.

Approximately 295,400 acres are proposed to be changed to Rural Resource from agricultural resource land. Although being removed from agricultural resource land designation, this new designation will preserve these lands for rangeland uses and agricultural production opportunity areas. Development densities are expected to be similar to agricultural resource land, pending further discussion with the Planning Commission. The new designation can be considered an innovative zoning technique that fits RCW 36.70A.177(1) as being designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy.

Based on the information and analyses in the previous sections, some areas are proposed to be added to the agricultural land designation, some areas are proposed to be removed from the agricultural land designation. The changes are shown in Figure 10. Details of areas proposed to be added are summarized in Table 1. Details of areas proposed to be removed are summarized in Table 2.
### Table 1
**Agricultural Resource Lands Proposed Additions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Previous Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Reason(s) for Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry Falls Area</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Currently farmed and irrigated, suitable capability, in AVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Falls Area</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rural Residential 2</td>
<td>Currently farmed and irrigated, suitable capability, in AVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Mountain/Mattawa Area</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rural Residential 1</td>
<td>Currently farmed and irrigated, suitable capability, in AVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Mountain/Mattawa Area</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>Rural Remote</td>
<td>Currently farmed and irrigated, suitable capability, large parcel size, in AVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total area (acres)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,329</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
**Agricultural Resource Lands Proposed Removals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>New Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Reason(s) for Removal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beezley Hills Area</td>
<td>77,063</td>
<td>Rural Resource</td>
<td>Not currently farmed or irrigated, not suitable soil type without management, areas in conservation/CRP, not prime farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rock/Wilson Creek Area</td>
<td>91,461</td>
<td>Rural Resource</td>
<td>Not currently farmed or irrigated, not suitable soil type without management, areas in conservation/CRP, not prime farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Falls Area</td>
<td>58,537</td>
<td>Rural Resource</td>
<td>Not currently farmed or irrigated, not suitable soil type without management, areas in conservation/CRP, not prime farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Mountain/Mattawa Area</td>
<td>68,313</td>
<td>Rural Resource</td>
<td>Not currently farmed or irrigated, not suitable soil type without management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total area (acres)</strong></td>
<td><strong>295,374</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas proposed for addition include areas that are currently farmed, are irrigated, have a suitable soil type, and are large enough to be commercially viable in the long-term. They are generally located on the border of the existing designated agricultural resource land. Areas proposed for removal are primarily lands that were inappropriately designated previously and are now being removed as part of this update. They are not currently farmed or irrigated and do not contain suitable soil types without management. Some areas proposed for removal are also not prime farmland.

As shown in Table 1, the areas proposed to be added to agricultural resource land designation total about 1,300 acres, while Table 2 shows the areas proposed to be removed from agricultural resource land designation total about 295,400 acres.

Areas proposed for removal of designated agricultural resource land are proposed to be changed to rural resource land, which (as noted previously) is similar in development density (pending discussion) and can be used for rangeland uses and agricultural production opportunity areas to preserve agricultural lands.

These recommended changes follow the goals of the Growth Management Act in regards to agricultural lands. As noted in Clark County v. Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (2011), “[a] significant goal of the GMA is to identify, maintain, enhance, and conserve agricultural lands. See RCW 36.70a.020(8).” With the removal of land that does not have long-term commercial significance, addition of land that does have long-term commercial significance, and a new land designation of rural resource land to help maintain and conserve agricultural lands, these changes help maintain the Growth Management Act goals for agricultural lands.
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Figure 1
Existing Designated Agricultural Resource Lands and City Planning Areas
Grant County
Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification

Data sources: Grant County, WDFW, WSDOT, ESRI
Figure 3
Soil Capability Class
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Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification
Figure 4
Soil Capability / Land Use Designation Potential Mismatch Areas
Grant County
Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification

Figure 5
1981-2010 Annual Average Precipitation
Grant County
Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification
Figure 7
Lands in Conservation Status or Conservation Reserve Program
Grant County
Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification

Data sources: Grant County, NEDB, WSDOT, ESRI, Natural Resources Assessment Section, Washington State Department of Agriculture
Figure 8
Farmland Designation based on soil type
Grant County
Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification
Figure 9
American Viticultural Areas
Grant County
Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification

Data sources: Grant County, WDEH, WSDOT, ESR, Natural Resources Assessment Section, Washington State Department of Agriculture

The map shows the American Viticultural Areas in Grant County, with various land use classifications and locations marked, including highways, urban growth areas, county boundaries, incorporated city limits, and specific land use zones such as Ancient Lakes of Columbia Valley, Columbia Valley, and Wahluke Slope.
Figure 10
Changes to Agricultural Resource Land Designations
Grant County
Agricultural Resource Land Reclassification
Appendix H
Grant County Urban Growth Area Land Capacity Analysis
Memorandum

Date: February 22, 2018

To: Damien Hooper, Grant County Planning Department

From: Ferdouse Oneza, Oneza & Associates

Cc: Ben Floyd, White Bluffs Consulting

Re: Grant County UGA Land Capacity Analysis

The city limits and urban growth areas (UGA) for each City or town in Grant County were analyzed to determine if they have adequate land to accommodate future growth.

Table 1 includes the information used in this analysis, including the:

- 20 years population increase projection
- Allocation of population within the City limits and UGA
- Area required for growth based on 4 units/acre density
- Available land
- Additional land needed as applicable

The preliminary analysis indicates each city or town has adequate land to absorb most if not all of the projected future growth. Although the preliminary analysis indicates a shortage of land exists in some UGAs, review of supporting information in each City’s Comprehensive Plan indicates they have adequate land to accommodate growth for most of the projected population. This analysis will need to be reviewed and updated in the next Comprehensive Plan update cycle.
Table 1 – Grant County UGA Growth Capacity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>20 Year Population Increase</th>
<th>50% population growth to be in the City limits in infill areas</th>
<th>Population growth in the unincorporated UGA / outside the city limits</th>
<th>Land required for growth (acres) (assumes 4 unit/acre density)</th>
<th>Available buildable land (acres)</th>
<th>Additional land required for residential growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coulee City</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric City</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrata</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Coulee</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krupp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>1844.5</td>
<td>1844.5</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>15,833</td>
<td>7916.5</td>
<td>7916.5</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>1352.5</td>
<td>1352.5</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap Lake</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>220.5</td>
<td>220.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Creek</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I
Public Comment/Response Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Section No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Will Simpson, State Department of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Items supported by the Department of Commerce:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Plan lays out a clear purpose statement that reflects both local and State goals. This includes the wise use and investment of tax dollars for public services, long-range planning that informs short-range actions, that property owners are protected, securing funding for capital projects is prioritized, and public interests are represented in the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We support the County’s adoption of the OFM medium projection as this represents the most likely projection for Grant County.¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The County’s goals and policies chapter establishes a policy framework in which the County and cities will work together to accommodate low and moderate-income families, as the proximity to transportation systems, jobs, support services, and business are available in urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, the County carefully considers the need for affordable housing in rural areas. The County’s Housing Element recognizes the importance of farmworker and H-2A housing. Considering the demographics and the significance of the agricultural economy in Grant County, policies and regulations that support farmworker housing are critical to ensuring affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The County has amended the Natural Setting Element to focus more extensively on water resources in rural areas. The County’s Comprehensive Plan discusses the importance of the Columbia Basin Project in multiple chapters, and the significance of this project for regional and statewide agricultural production and growth. Growth Management Services is currently coordinating with the other State agencies and regional stakeholders involved in the Columbia Basin Project. Our staff is available as a resource to the County as you consider and address water resources in your planning efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The County has incorporated strong goals and policies to encourage economic development. These include a collaborative approach with local economic development organizations and educational institutions to diversify the local economy, along with a focus on infrastructure investments and a predictable permitting process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We appreciate that the County has recognized Washington State’s commitment to rural economic development. The County has carefully evaluated, and clearly articulated, its economic strengths and opportunities, as well as potential constraints to growth in the Economic Development Element. The County’s transition from “economically distressed” to significant economic growth over the last two decades demonstrates how rural areas can leverage good planning, natural assets, and human capital to create a solid economic foundation for the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ RCW 43.62.035

Thanks for the feedback!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Section No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Will Simpson, State Department of Commerce</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4.2.2 of the County’s Comprehensive Plan states that the County identifies city limits as UGAs in general. We recommend that you remove this language and rely on the future land use map to depict city limits and urban growth area (UGA) boundaries.</td>
<td>Update as suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4.2.3 of the Land Use Element briefly describes the role of airports as essential public facilities and the special consideration necessary for land use planning near airports. This section, along with the relevant subsection of 7.4.3 in the Transportation Element, could be strengthened with additional reference to the requirements for formal consultation with WSDOT and aviation stakeholders. The County should specify that towns, cities, and counties are required by RCW 36.70.547 and 36.70A.510 to formally consult with airport owners, managers, private airport operators, general aviation pilots, ports, and the Aviation Division of the WSDOT to address incompatible land uses prior to updating or amending a comprehensive plan or development regulation that may affect properties adjacent to a publicly or privately owned public-use airport. WAC 365-196-455 provides additional guidance on consultation requirements for airport compatibility.</td>
<td>Follow up with WSDOT and airports in the County to receive input and update plan as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our agency received a draft of the Comprehensive Plan and Chapter 24.03 of the County’s development regulations regarding critical areas and cultural resources. The County’s Notice of Intent to Adopt indicated that the materials submitted reflect the update of the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130. If the County does not plan to make any additional changes to the development regulations, the County’s record should clearly demonstrate that no additional changes are necessary. If changes are necessary to implement new zones or amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, please ensure those are completed and submitted to the State for review.</td>
<td>Additional updates to the County’s development regulations (Unified Development Code) are being made and will be shared with Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.2.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4.4.2.3 of the County’s Land Use Element states that 51% of future growth in Grant County will be located in UGAs during the next 20 years. Elsewhere, Section 4.5 discusses the population projection and allocation process, noting that 72.7% of growth will occur in cities and towns. The County should address this to ensure the use of a consistent population projection and allocation throughout the plan. The County should also consider clarifying whether the 10,178 additional people projected in unincorporated areas will be located outside of UGAs, or if a portion of that population will occur in unincorporated UGAs. This distinction is important for both cities and the County as they plan for capital facilities and transportation infrastructure.</td>
<td>The plan will be updated to clarify future growth discussions and ensure consistency among the various plan sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Section No.</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Line No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Will Simpson, State Department of Commerce</td>
<td>4.4.2.4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>The County’s Land Use Element contains a Residential, Suburban (R1) zone that allows for low-density, single-family estate residential housing that provides for larger lot uses and activities more suburban in character than those found in more concentrated, urban residential neighborhoods. The County’s Residential, Low Density (R2) designation allows densities in the range of one to four dwelling units per acre. We have concerns that these land use designations, and the R1 zone in particular, do not permit urban densities as required by RCW 36.70A.110(2). We encourage the County to remove the R1 zone, and amend the R2 zone to ensure that development patterns inside of UGAs can be served with adequate public services in a financially realistic and sustainable manner. Although cities and counties have discretion in how they plan for growth, densities less than four units per acre are difficult to serve with urban levels of services without subsidies or additional tax burdens on the existing community. This becomes particularly problematic when assessing the full life cycle of infrastructure investments and the replacement costs for infrastructure beyond the twenty-year planning period. Low-density development patterns put additional pressure on local governments to amend UGAs in subsequent review cycles, which have the potential to directly or indirectly affect designated resource lands. The County’s Resource Lands sub-element recognizes subdivisions and conversion of resources lands as the greatest threat to Grant County’s status as a national agricultural producer. We understand that any changes to these zones will require coordination with your municipal planning partners and that the County is actively working to meet the upcoming deadline for the periodic update. We believe investing the necessary time to address this issue will yield long-term benefits.</td>
<td>These are legacy designations that were established in earlier comprehensive planning. The areas are limited in the County and mostly built out. No additional changes are proposed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.2</td>
<td>169 &amp; 170</td>
<td></td>
<td>The County should ensure that the Transportation Element or technical appendix contains a forecast of traffic for at least 10 years, including the land use assumptions used in estimating travel.</td>
<td>A 20 year traffic forecast (average daily travel volume) has been provided in Tables 7-3 and 7-4 for major roads in the County. Land use assumptions and other detail used in the estimated travel will be provided in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6.2 Appendix F</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td>The County’s plan includes a list facilities included in the plan (Section 8.6.2) as well as a more detailed list of needed facilities in the 6-year Capital Facilities Plan Addendum (Appendix F). We recommend the County develop a more detailed plan that considers projected population and adopted levels of service over the planning period. The Element or supporting technical materials should also demonstrate the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities to ensure compliance with RCW 36.70A.070(3). WAC 365-196-415 and our Capital Facilities Guidebook provide more detailed recommendations for meeting statutory requirements for the capital facilities element.</td>
<td>Supplemental evaluation of specific geographic areas and how services will be met will be included in the plan. NOTE: SEE ATTACHMENT 2 FOR TABLE OF 6 YEAR IMPROVEMENTS PLANNED FOR CAPITAL FACILITIES, WHICH WILL BE ADDED TO THE PLAN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Grant County Comprehensive Plan 4.4.2.4 – Urban Land Use Designations
2 Grant County Comprehensive Plan 4.4.4.8.2
3 RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i), RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(ii)(E)
4 RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(ii), RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(ii)(E)
### Comment Response Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Section No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Marc Pudists</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Telephonic outreach from Marc Pudists regarding land use map (figure 5), he was concerned with removal of Rural Remote as a land use designation and potential impacts to Desert Unit Fish and Wildlife area.</td>
<td>It was not the County’s intention to eliminate the Rural Remote designation. It was likely a technical map error. A revised Land Use Figure 5 that reinstated the Rural Remote designation was prepared and will be included in the updated plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>John Ness, Grant County Health District</td>
<td>4.4.3.5, 9.5.4, 11.2.2.3.2</td>
<td>96, 194, 217</td>
<td>96 &amp; 97</td>
<td>Bottom of Page 96, it states “County Health Department”. Last paragraph of page 194 states “County Health Department”. On page 217 second to last paragraph it states “County Health Department”. Please change these references to “Grant County Health District”.</td>
<td>Update as suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4.3.5</td>
<td>96 &amp; 97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The paragraph that starts at the bottom of page 96, and continues at the top of 97 discusses needing a more thorough review. Given the ESSB 6091 requiring the well log up front, all projects are given the same scrutiny now. So while it may be worth noting those areas may not have reliable water, they do not require a more detailed water availability review.</td>
<td>Noted and discussion will be made more general per the comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.5.4</td>
<td>195, 196</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On page 195 and 196 it lists Large on-site septic systems and Wastewater Treatment Facilities. There are 3 sewer lagoon systems that I do not see listed in either table.</td>
<td>The table will be updated to include the 3 additional sewer lagoons Marlin Hutterian Sewer Lagoon Mardon Sewer Lagoon Winchester Rest Areas (East and West have a combined system) sewer Lagoon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments on the County’s Draft UDC - Critical Areas and Cultural Resources Protection – ALL COMMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED IN UPDATED CODE SECTION PROVIDED AS ATTACHMENT 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Section No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jacob McCann, Department of Ecology</td>
<td>24.08.060(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.08.060(a) Consider including the following language: All exempted activities shall use reasonable methods to avoid impacts to critical areas or their buffers. An exemption does not give permission to degrade a critical area or ignore risk from natural hazards. Any temporary damage to, or alteration of a critical area or buffer, shall be restored, rehabilitated, or replaced to prior condition or better at the responsible party’s expense. Revegetation shall occur during the wet season, but no later than 180 days after the damage or alteration of the critical area or buffer occurred. All other restoration or rehabilitation shall be completed within 60 days of the damage or alteration, unless otherwise approved by the Administrative Official.</td>
<td>Update as suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.08.110(a)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.08.110(a) Recommend adding the following criterion: The inability of the applicant to derive reasonable use of the property is not the result of actions by the applicant after the effective date of this chapter.</td>
<td>Update as suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.08.160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.08.160 Should include, per SEPA (Chapter 197-11-768 WAC): (6) Monitoring the impact and taking appropriate corrective measures.</td>
<td>Include suggested language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.08.210</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.08.210 Maps and References Should include some sort of language like the following (although I guess this is stated in 24.08.080): These maps and other available resources (such as topographic maps, soils maps, and aerial photos) are intended only as guides. They depict the approximate location and extent of known critical areas. Some wetlands depicted in these resources may no longer exist and wetlands not shown in these resources may occur. The provisions of this Chapter and the findings of a site assessment take precedence over maps and references.</td>
<td>No change – this information is already provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Section No.</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Line No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jacob McCann, Department of Ecology</td>
<td>24.08.230</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.230 Site Assessment Requirements Should use “within 300 feet” since this is what was used in 24.08.070(e)(4)(A) and (B).</td>
<td>Update as suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.250</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.250 Protection Standards</td>
<td>Include suggested language in Moderate. Update timber management in Low to be “Woody riparian tree management” instead of timber management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Table 2 Need to replace all habitat scores consistent with tables in <a href="https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/parts/0506008part2.pdf:%E7%8C%AB">https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/parts/0506008part2.pdf:猫</a> II, high level of function, High- 200 ft doesn’t need ft2</td>
<td>Update as suggested, except leave buffer reduction as 35%. Use language related to stormwater to include: “Consistent with the Eastern Washington Stormwater Manual...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.260(a)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.260(a) Needs to have more specifics on monitoring. We recommend that monitoring should occur for at least five years from the date of plant installation and ten years where woody vegetation (forested or shrub wetlands) is the intended result.</td>
<td>Update as suggested and note that monitoring does not have to occur annually for these longer periods. Could occur every few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.260(b)(3)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.260(b)(3)—This isn’t really necessary, is it? The table has “enhancement only” ratios, which are a lot more than just doubling. Delete provision as suggested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.260(e)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.260(e) says “by selecting mitigation sites pursuant to GCC 24.08.260(e).” I think that should be GCC 24.08.260(f). the following section Update reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.260(i)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08.260(i) We recommend that “the proposal use a watershed approach consistent with Selecting Wetland Mitigation Sites Using a Watershed Approach (Eastern Washington) (Ecology Publication #10-06-07, November 2010).”</td>
<td>Include watershed approach as an option for mitigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I
### Comment Response Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Section No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Eric Pentico, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>(24.08.250) (24.08.0300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Items Supported by WDFW:</td>
<td>Thank you for the feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wetlands Protections (24.08.250). Your proposed CAO update says, &quot;The Standard buffer widths are based on wetland category, intensity of impacts, and wetland functions or special characteristics. The buffer is to be vegetated with native plant communities that are appropriate for site conditions. If vegetation in the buffer are disturbed (grazed or mowed), applicants planning changes to land that will increase impacts to wetlands need to rehabilitate the buffer with native plant communities that are appropriate for the site conditions. The width of the buffer is measured in horizontal distance.&quot; Table 2 Buffer Widths shows that the buffer requirements for wetlands increase in width as the level of disturbance next to wetlands increase. At the same time, wetlands that are rated as being higher in category are given larger buffers, which again increase in size as the disturbance next to them increase in intensity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas (24.08.0300). Your proposed identification and designation of HCAs includes (1) Areas in which State and Federal endangered and threatened species exist or State sensitive, candidate, and monitor species have primary association; (2) Priority Habitat and Species areas identified by WDFW; (3) Waters of the State as defined by WAC 22-116; (4) Lakes, ponds, streams and rivers planted with game fish by a governmental or tribal agency; and (7) Areas in which anadromous fish have primary association. These are consistent with science and has WDFW’s full support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>(24.08.160(a)(1))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Mitigation Requirements and Mitigation Sequencing (24.08.160(a)(1)). Your proposed CAO update states, &quot;Avoid the impacts altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action. Where impacts on critical areas or their buffers will not be avoided, the applicant will demonstrate that the impacts meet the criteria for granting an administratively approved alteration.&quot; I could not find, nor does the proposed CAO guide readers to where they may find the “criteria for granting an administratively approved alteration.&quot;</td>
<td>The criteria are the additional provisions in 24.08.160 applicable when avoidance is not possible and mitigation is required. Additional wetlands mitigation criteria/provisions are provided in 24.08.260 and additional fish and wildlife habitat conservation area mitigation and habitat management requirements 24.08.350 and 360. To clarify, the word “criteria” in 24.08.160(a)(1) will be replaced with “mitigation requirements”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Section No.</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Line No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eric Pentico, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>(24.08.340(f)(6) Protection Standards Riparian Habitat Areas (24.08.340(f)(6) and Table XX). Your proposed CAO update shows a table, which has not been numbered, that states “All other streams not meeting the shoreline jurisdiction criteria” shall be given Riparian Buffer Width (Feet) of 50.” In no case are project proponents asked to consider the stream, presence of fish, or the level of disturbance which is proposed to be placed next to the stream. We encourage you to have wider buffers for fish-bearing streams and, as you have done with wetlands, to increase the required riparian buffer width on a stream when the expected intensity of use will be greater. Critical areas in Grant County enrich the county’s citizens and citizens of Washington State in numerous ways, such as providing fishing and hunting opportunities, controlling flooding, and filtering pollutants. Providing adequate space for fish and wildlife also provides a visually pleasing landscape, which is good for tourism and the local economy. Grant County’s critical areas also provides irreplaceable habitat for fish and wildlife, a public resource, which is why WDFW takes a keen interest in your CAO update. We acknowledge the large step forward the updated CAO represents towards providing for the needs of fish and wildlife and thank you for your hard work. We look forward to continuing to work with you to create a final CAO that meets the needs of fish and wildlife, along with the citizens of Grant County.</td>
<td>Update language with the following: “For streams with known fish presence or high intensity land use next to the stream as defined in Table 1 of 24.08.250 then the buffer will be 75 feet.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>John Ness, Grant County Health District</td>
<td>Critical Areas and Cultural Resources Critical Areas and Cultural Resources On page 32, (m) it states “Septic drainfields and any required replacement drainfield area shall be at least 100 feet from the edge of any HCA”. This seems to be quite excessive. Being the HCA is already a buffer to ordinary high water, adding another buffer to it seems overly restrictive. Currently, WAC 246-272A requires a 100 foot setback to ordinary high water. Given that drainfields are buried, once the construction phase is completed, there should be very minimal activity around this area, and often the impacted area is reseeded with grass or allowed to be reestablished with the surrounding flora. There is likely a shoreline standard that is the basis for this, does it allow for any flexibility for this setback?</td>
<td>Update by revising the distance to be at least 50 feet from the edge of any HCA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>