

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Fact Sheet</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Description of Preferred Alternative</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Changes to the DEIS</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Questions and Answers Generated Through the Public Process</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A	
11 x 17 Maps with Preferred Alternative	
Appendix B	
DEIS Comments and City of Liberty Lake Responses	

## **FACT SHEET**

### **PROJECT TITLE**

Urban Growth Area Boundary Alternative FEIS

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL**

The proposed action is adoption of an updated City of Liberty Lake Urban Growth Area (UGA) Boundary. Adoption of this boundary constitutes a non-project action under SEPA (WAC 197-11-704(b)).

The PROPOSED ACTION may include consideration of the following:

-Revising the City of Liberty Lake's UGA map within City Comprehensive Plan

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES**

This Final Environmental Impact Statement examines the Preferred Alternative (see attached map):

### **LOCATION**

The planning area includes areas north and south of existing City of Liberty Lake boundaries (see attached maps).

### **SEPA LEAD AGENCY**

City of Liberty Lake Planning & Community Development Department

### **SEPA RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL & PROJECT INFORMATION CONTACT PERSON**

Doug Smith, Director

Liberty Lake Planning & Community Development Dept.

22710 E. Country Vista Dr.

Liberty Lake, WA 99019

(509)755-6707

[dsmith@libertylakewa.gov](mailto:dsmith@libertylakewa.gov)

### **APPROVALS REQUIRED**

Adoption of an updated City of Liberty Lake Urban Growth Area boundary will require acceptance by the Liberty Lake City Council with final approval from the Spokane County Board of County Commissioners.

### **DATE OF ISSUANCE**

Final EIS and Addendum is being released December 13, 2006

Draft EIS was released November 8, 2006

### **ANTICIPATED DATE OF FINAL ACTION**

The City of Liberty Lake expects to present the Final EIS to the City of Liberty Lake Planning Commission December 13, 2006. The City of Liberty Lake Planning Commission will forward a recommendation to the City of Liberty Lake

City Council in December 2006. The City Council will forward a request to Spokane County with anticipated review and possible adoption in 2007.

- City Planning Commission Recommendation
- City Council Review
- CTED Review
- Spokane County Steering Committee
- Spokane County Planning Commission
- Spokane County Commissioners
- City Council Adoption
- Joint Planning Area Agreement
- Land Use/ Zoning Designations

**NATURE OF FINAL ACTION**

Adoption of new UGA boundary

**TYPE & TIMING OF ANY SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The Preferred Alternative and other draft alternatives reviewed in this process are considered “non-project proposals” under WAC 197-11-442. The Preferred Alternative describes a potential Urban Growth Area Boundary and Urban Reserve areas that aim to balance the need to accommodate anticipated growth with the need to protect the environment. The City of Liberty Lake recognizes that subsequent environmental review of proposed site-specific actions will be necessary in the future. The City of Liberty Lake has not identified future activities or times but will comply with SEPA’s phased review procedures.

Copies of the FEIS are available for review at:

[www.libertylakewa.gov/development/public\\_notices.asp](http://www.libertylakewa.gov/development/public_notices.asp)

A hard copy of the FEIS is also available for review at:

Liberty Lake City Hall  
22710 E. Country Vista Dr.  
Liberty Lake, WA 99019

Liberty Lake Municipal Library  
1421 N. Meadowwood Ln., Ste. 130  
Liberty Lake, WA 99019

**COST PER COPY**

Electronic copies are available at no cost on disk at City Hall or on [www.libertylakewa.gov/development/public\\_notices.asp](http://www.libertylakewa.gov/development/public_notices.asp)

Hard Copies are available for the cost of reproduction. Call (509)755-6707 to order a copy.

**PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTORS**

**CITY OF LIBERTY LAKE:**

Planning and Community Development Department

Doug Smith, Director

Amanda Tainio, Associate Planner

Mary Wren-Wilson, Environmental Specialist

**CITY OF LIBERTY LAKE ELECTED & APPOINTED OFFICIALS**

**MAYOR**

Steve Peterson

**CITY OF LIBERTY LAKE CITY COUNCIL**

Wendy Van Orman

Dennis Paul

David Crump

Joanna Klegin

Judi Ownes

Brian Sayrs

Patrick Jenkins

**CITY OF LIBERTY LAKE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Steve McElvain

Bill Jeckle

Jeff Hoover

Sheila Bell

Neal Olander

Craig Singer

Stan Jochim

Randy Grinalds – Adjunct Member

## **Introduction**

The City of Liberty Lake proposes to update the existing Urban Growth Area (UGA) in accordance with the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act. This update is intended to accommodate a 20-year projected population of 22,511 in the City of Liberty Lake and adjacent UGA.

The proposed action includes the possible approval of a new Urban Growth Area for the City of Liberty Lake's UGA.

## **Location**

The planning area encompasses the incorporated City limits of Liberty Lake, the current designated UGA, and portions of Spokane County (See maps in Appendix A).

Spokane County has responsibility to establish urban growth area boundaries for each City in Spokane County pursuant to the Growth Management Act. The Liberty Lake City Council held a final hearing on the establishment of an Interim Urban Growth Area boundary (IUGA). Three IUGA scenarios had been presented to the public at Planning Commission workshops and hearing in the summer of 2002. After extensive public input, the City Council approved the Planning Commission's recommendation of the existing, status quo scenario. The City planned for the area within current City limits and a Future City Annexation Area (FCAA), located to the northwest of the City limits, which was already contained within the Spokane County UGA. The FCAA was considered a joint planning area with Spokane County. The areas in the FCAA were annexed into the City in 2003 and 2006.

## **Land Area**

The City of Liberty Lake encompasses 3,937 acres (6.15 square miles) of incorporated land east of the City of Spokane Valley, west of the Idaho State line, south of the Spokane River, and north of Liberty Lake. The current UGA adjacent to the City of Liberty Lake encompasses a total of 328 acres (0.5 square miles).

## Description of Preferred Alternative

This alternative looks at accommodating the forecasted growth by adding developable lands to Liberty Lake's UGA and rezoning this land to allow urban levels of development. This alternative assumes that development density increases would occur within the existing City boundaries.

Through the Draft EIS and public comment process, it became apparent that none of the seven proposed alternatives would accomplish the goal of accommodating anticipated growth while protecting as much of the environment as possible. The Preferred Alternative was developed through the following:

- Rural Conservation Zoning was removed from consideration
- Saltese Flats wetland was removed from consideration
- Majority of FEMA wetlands were removed from consideration
- Priority Habitats were removed from consideration in SW planning area; protected in NW planning area
- Limited infill areas along Garry Rd. and Henry Rd. removed from consideration
- Development densities increased within existing City boundaries

The maps in Appendix A illustrate the Preferred Alternative and its proposed boundaries.

The impacts of the Preferred Alternative are fully covered in the DEIS. Those impacts include the same impacts as for Alternative 3, and greatly reduce the environmental impacts discussed for Alternatives 4-7 in the SW planning area by removing those areas Zoned Rural Conservation, Saltese Flats wetlands, the majority of the FEMA wetlands, the Priority Habitats in the SW planning area, and assuming increased development density within the existing City Limits.

## Changes to DEIS

Based upon comments submitted by the public and agencies, the following changes have been made to the DEIS:

- 1) Add the following to the DEIS page 3-36, section 3.4.1.2.1. after the third sentence in the first paragraph: “A population projection of 15,586 has been adopted for planning purposes. Population forecasts will be updated when the Comprehensive Plan is updated at required intervals.”
- 2) For the purpose of this document, the terms “population projection” and “population forecast” shall be used interchangeably. The term “expected” is used in this document as “to consider reasonable or due” as defined in Webster’s II New College Dictionary, 1995
- 3) For the purpose of this document, the term “mitigation measure” is defined as “an action taken to reduce or eliminate environmental impacts”. Add the definition to the Glossary in Appendix A.
- 4) Section 2.4 Water Resources. Make the following correction on page 2-24 of the DEIS, Land Use: Replace “There are no priority habitats or species in the planning area” with “The stretch of the Spokane River in the NW planning area has been designated Urban Natural Open Space. Urban Natural Open Space is defined as “A priority species resides within or is adjacent to the open space and uses it for breeding and/or regular feeding; and/or the open space functions as a corridor connecting other *priority habitats*, especially those that would otherwise be isolated; and/or the open space is an isolated remnant of natural habitat larger than 4 ha (10 acres) and is surrounded by urban development. Local considerations may be given to open space areas smaller than 4 ha (10 acres).” (Definition provided on <http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phshabs.htm>)”.
- 5) Section 2.5.1.1.6. Riparian Areas. Add to text: “The stretch of the Spokane River in the NW planning area has been designated Urban Natural Open Space. Urban Natural Open Space is defined as “A priority species resides within or is adjacent to the open space and uses it for breeding and/or regular feeding; and/or the open space functions as a corridor connecting other *priority habitats*, especially those that would otherwise be isolated; and/or the open space is an isolated remnant of natural habitat larger than 4 ha (10 acres) and is surrounded by urban development. Local considerations may be given to open space areas smaller than 4 ha (10 acres).” (Definition provided on <http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phshabs.htm>)”.

- 6) Section 2.5.1.3.1. Priority Habitats. Make the following correction on page 2-36 of the DEIS: Replace “There are no priority habitats or species in the NW planning area” with “The stretch of the Spokane River in the NW planning area has been designated Urban Natural Open Space. Urban Natural Open Space is defined as “A priority species resides within or is adjacent to the open space and uses it for breeding and/or regular feeding; and/or the open space functions as a corridor connecting other *priority habitats*, especially those that would otherwise be isolated; and/or the open space is an isolated remnant of natural habitat larger than 4 ha (10 acres) and is surrounded by urban development. Local considerations may be given to open space areas smaller than 4 ha (10 acres).”(Definition provided on <http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phshabs.htm> )”.
- 7) Add the following to the DEIS page 3-14 after Table 3.3 Central Valley School District: “Existing capacity figures for permanent facilities were provided by CVSD as part of the district’s Capital Facility Plan. These figures reflect school capacities of record when the plan was being drafted. Due to subsequent changes in contractual maximum class sizes and in location of specialized instructional programs, these capacity figures may no longer be current. The district has recently relocated various other programs or classes to best utilize space.”
- 8) Add the following to the DEIS page 3-14 Table 3.3 Central Valley School District: Barker Center, Summit School, and Keystone Center.
- 9) Change the following in the DEIS page 3-14 Table 3.3 Central Valley School District to reflect CVSD grade organization of K-5, 6-8, and 9-12.
- 10)Change the following typographical error in the DEIS page 3-14 Table 3.3 Central Valley School District to reflect actual Elementary Existing Capacity of 6360.
- 11)Change the following in the DEIS page 3-15 Table 3.3 Central Valley School District to reflect a remodel of Evergreen Middle School as opposed to a replacement of the Evergreen MS.
- 12)Change the following in the DEIS page 3-15 Table 3.3 Central Valley School District to reflect “Total as of 2011” as opposed to “Total as of 2001”.
- 13)Change the text in Chapter 3, page 3-10, section 3.3.1.1., paragraph 3, from “The existing rating for SCFD # 1 is 4.” to “The existing rating for SCFD #1 is 3.”

- 14) Change the text in Chapter 3, page 3-10, section 3.3.1.1., paragraph 4, to reflect that “Fire District 1 provides advanced life support (paramedic) service and also provides a higher level of fire suppression service as indicated by the difference in the WSRB insurance ratings.”
- 15) Add “Spokane County” in front of “Draft Revised Shoreline Master Program” on page 3-8, Section 3.2.1.1.
- 16) Change the wording in the first two sentences of Chapter 3, Section 3.3.1.17.2 to read “Spokane County owns ten (10) million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater treatment capacity in the Riverside Park Water Reclamation Facility (RPWRF). The RPWRF currently has a rated capacity of 44 MGD.”
- 17) Replace the first sentence of the fourth paragraph in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.1.17.2 with “Spokane County is proceeding with the planning, permitting, design, and construction of a new wastewater treatment facility. The first phase of the plant will be constructed to provide a treatment capacity of 8 MGD, and is anticipated to be operational by late 2012.”
- 18) Replace the fifth paragraph in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.1.17.2 with “It is anticipated that future phases of the plant will accommodate the wastewater flows from the plant’s service area for the next 50 years. An update to the County’s Wastewater Facilities Plan is currently underway to address additional requirements necessary to meet the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). The update will be completed in the first quarter 2007, and will provide updated cost estimates for the required facilities and programs.”
- 19) Reword the last paragraph of Chapter 3, Section 3.3.1.17.2 to read “Additionally, municipal wastewater agencies that discharge into the Spokane River and produce Class A effluent that is suitable for reclamation may evaluate the feasibility of implementing effluent reuse opportunities such as urban irrigation, industrial reuse, aquifer recharge, and wetlands restoration.”

These changes do not significantly change the described impacts in the DEIS, therefore this FEIS consists of an addendum to the DEIS and related appendices.

## **Questions and Answers generated through the public process.**

### **1. How was the UGA Study Area established?**

The State Office of Financial Management, Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Spokane County, and the City of Liberty Lake conducted independent population-forecasting studies. As a result of these studies, Liberty Lake requested a population allocation in the midrange of the projected growth for Liberty Lake (from a total of 197,939 projected population growth for all of Spokane County). The future population estimates represent an increase of 15,586 additional people living in Liberty Lake in the next 20 years, for total population of about 22,511.

The study area was delineated based upon a land quantity analysis (lands available within the existing city and areas outside the city). The City currently has the capacity for 15,861 total people within the existing City limits based on a land use assumption of 4.5 units per acre, which is consistent with existing development patterns. In order to accommodate the additional population within the existing City boundaries, previous assumptions would have to be modified to accommodate higher density development (multi-family or higher density single family residential). Through the land quantity analysis, additional acreage has been identified outside the City that could be used to accommodate the additional growth without changing land use patterns within the City.

The UGA Study Area represents an area large enough to accommodate the projected growth for 20 years and provides a boundary in which to study the off site impacts. The final UGA will take into consideration land quantity analysis, environment constraints, ability to provide services, and the citizen's vision for the city.

### **2. Why is the City planning for a population much larger than similar sized cities within Spokane County?**

Because of geographic location, natural beauty, and abundant amenities, the City of Liberty Lake continues to be a desirable place to locate. Growth in Liberty Lake has historically exceeded 11% of Spokane County's total growth. By acknowledging this we are addressing our responsibility to plan in advance for the growth that is certain to occur in the future. By being realistic about the anticipated growth we meet our statutory requirement of the Growth Management Act, but more importantly, by planning now we have better certainty of sustaining the quality of life we now appreciate.

**3. Is the UGA Study Area included in the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA)?**

Yes, 100% of the existing City and the majority of the land around the City are included in the CARA.

**4. Why does the UGA Study Area not include land to the East of existing boundaries?**

The ability to provide infrastructure is limited East of City limits and the existing development pattern of 10-acre home sites make infill difficult and comprehensive planning problematic. Currently, the majority of the proposed UGA Study Area contains vacant, undeveloped land.

**5. Why is the City considering land West of Henry Rd. in the UGA Study Area?**

Central Valley School District owns a future high school site west of Henry Rd., which requires inclusion in a UGA to build upon. Additionally, the large wetland area is being considered as a prime location to release Class A treated effluent, which would enhance wetland function and minimize discharge to the river.

**6. Why not use existing industrial and commercial land within City limits for residential development?**

By reducing the industrial and commercial land supply to provide for residential development, the City would become a bedroom community that would not be self-sustainable.

**7. Are the UGA alternatives consistent with the vision established in the City of Liberty Lake Comprehensive Plan?**

Yes, the expansion of the UGA would ensure the City's vision would be continued in the next 20 years by maintaining a healthy built urban environment with an array of natural amenities outside our front doors.

**8. If land inside the UGA Study Area remains outside an UGA, how could the land be developed?**

Several development scenarios would be possible based upon existing zoning and development approvals. The likely development pattern would be clustered development with individual wells and septic systems scattered throughout the site. Another option would be 10 and 20-acre parcels with individual wells and septic systems with no requirement for environment review or traffic impact analysis; as individual large tract developments have no concurrency requirements and are exempt from the State Environmental Policy Act.

**9. What could the impacts of the above mentioned rural development be?**

Additional private wells and septic systems pose an increased threat to aquifer quality and watersheds. Because no development standards are in place for site design, development could occur anywhere outside the designated shoreline and critical areas, including the hillside west of Liberty Lake. Growth would not be focused in any specific area.

**10. How would including land within an UGA be different than leaving it to develop in a rural pattern (10-20 acre parcels)?**

Development would be urban and be required to have public services, joint planning with Spokane County would occur, and if included in the City, would be subject to more stringent development standards.

**11. How often can UGA be evaluated for expansion?**

State law requires 7 year review; Spokane County currently requires 5 year review but is considering 10 year reviews for regional UGA evaluation. Individual extension requests can be made annually to the County during yearly Comprehensive Plan amendments. The City of Liberty Lake is not anticipating reviewing UGA expansion requests on a yearly basis, but will remain part of the regional process.

**12. What steps has the City taken to mitigate, and what is the City's role in alleviating, school overcrowding within CVSD schools?**

Overcrowding throughout the CVSD system is the probable future. As the smallest jurisdiction creating the least amount of impact to the CVSD system, the City is the only jurisdiction that has engaged CVSD in a proposal for implementing impact fees. In addition the City has consistently provided CVSD with detailed population projections since incorporation to ensure CVSD had sound information to plan adequately. The City will continue to coordinate with CVSD and provide support within our legal authority. At this time, schools are an indirect concurrency requirement; meaning overcrowded schools cannot be a factor used for controlling growth.

**13. Does the UGA have to include commercial and industrial land?**

No, commercial and industrial lands do not have to be included in the UGA. At this time there is adequate commercial and industrial land within the existing City limits.

**14. How will sewer and water be provided in the future to accommodate growth?**

Developers would supply the extension of sewer and water services at the time of project development. LLSWD has spent in excess of \$12 million for treatment plant expansion in anticipation of future growth. Without adequate water and sewer services development cannot be approved.

**15. Will the City experience a shortage of water in the future?**

Studies are currently underway to determine the capacity of the aquifer; right now the limiting factor is water rights.

**16. Has a master plan for traffic been prepared?**

Yes, the Harvard Road Mitigation Plan has been in place since 1995 and has been updated to address the anticipated growth.

**17. Is it anticipated that the Harvard Rd./ Interstate 90 overpass will be expanded, and who will pay?**

The City is working with the State Department of Transportation to determine what improvements will be necessary in conjunction with the new interchange at exit 294. It is expected that the Harvard overpass will require replacement. City taxes would not be used to cover the cost of these improvements.

**18. Are there opportunities for preservation of open space?**

Yes, there are several programs in place, including the Conservation Futures program administered by Spokane County. Locally the City has adopted goals and policies for the preservation of open space that can be implemented at time of zoning designation.

**19. How would stormwater mitigation be addressed in the Liberty Lake watershed?**

Additional studies addressing stormwater management would be required prior to specific project development. Best management practices would be used to mitigate potential stormwater impacts.

**20. Are there any designated wildlife corridors within the UGA Boundary Alternatives?**

All critical areas and designated wildlife corridors were identified in the DEIS. This information was verified through Spokane County maps, as well as through conversations with WA Department of Fish and Wildlife.

## **21. Why would the City consider expanding the UGA?**

- To ensure consistent and realistic planning be implemented - Because about 15,500 new people are coming to Liberty Lake
- To ensure densities within the City limits will not have to significantly increase to accommodate growth - Because an additional 6,200 housing units will need to be built
- To provide CVSD additional land for school construction - Because an additional 4,650 school aged children will be living in Liberty Lake
- To ensure an adequate tax base for future sustainability – Because Liberty Lake citizens have come to expect a high level of service
- To meet WA State Growth Management Act planning requirements – Because it is the City’s statutory responsibility to accommodate anticipate growth
- To ensure local influence on development outcomes - Because 1600 acres of residential land are needed for development, and currently only 226 acres of vacant residentially zoned land is available within existing City boundaries
- To ensure preservation of environmentally sensitive areas through locally adopted standards - Because an additional 150 acres of open space is needed to maintain adopted Levels of Service