Resolution No. 31432

Of the City Council of the City of Seattle approving and ratifying the decision of the Metropolitan King County Council to adopt a revised set of Countywide Planning Policies.

Related Legislation File:

Date Introduced and Referred: 2.25.13	To: (committee): ~~Planning, Land Use + Sustainability~~
Date Re-referred:	To: (committee): Full Council
Date Re-referred:	To: (committee):
Date of Final Action: 3/4/13	Date Presented to Mayor: 3/4/13
Date Signed by Mayor: 3.4.13	Date Returned to City Clerk: 3.4.13
Published by Title Only X Published in Full Text	Date Returned Without Concurrence:

The City of Seattle – Legislative Department

Resolution sponsored by: Richard Conlin

Committee Action:

Date	Recommendation	Vote

This file is complete and ready for presentation to Full Council.

Full Council Action:

Date	Decision	Vote
March 4, 2013	Adopted	9-0

Law Department

CITY OF SEATTLE
RESOLUTION 31432

A RESOLUTION of the City Council of the City of Seattle approving and ratifying the decision of the Metropolitan King County Council to adopt a revised set of Countywide Planning Policies.

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan King County Council adopted the original Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) in July 1992; and

WHEREAS, the CPPs are a series of policies that provide a countywide vision and serve as a framework for each jurisdiction in King County to develop its own comprehensive plan under the State Growth Management Act; and

WHEREAS, the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) was established by interlocal agreement in 1992 to provide for the collaborative development of CPPs; and

WHEREAS, the City of Seattle representation on the GMPC includes the Mayor and two City Councilmembers; and

WHEREAS, through a series of actions in September 2011, April 2012 and June 2012, the GMPC recommended adoption of amendments to the CPPs; and

WHEREAS, on December 3, 2012, the Metropolitan King County Council adopted amended CPPs by King County Ordinance 17486; and

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs support efforts for providing affordable housing by describing the countywide need and by emphasizing the implementation of specific strategies that will increase the supply of affordable housing; and

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs clarify that sewer service shall not be extended into rural areas, including for public schools; and

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs make minor adjustments to the urban growth boundary consistent with the overall policy direction; and

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs describe more specific connections between growth management actions and positive outcomes for human health; and

DWS CITY CLERK

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs include substantial revisions that update references and improve the document's usability; and

WHEREAS, the amended countywide planning policies do not change the targets for housing and employment growth that were adopted by the Metropolitan King County Council, through adoption of King County Ordinance No. 16747 on January 25, 2010 and ratified by the City of Seattle on May 10, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the 1992 interlocal agreement remains in effect, requiring ratification of Countywide Planning Policies and amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies by 30 percent of the jurisdictions representing at least 70 percent of the population of King County, within 90 days of adoption by the Metropolitan King County Council.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THE MAYOR CONCURRING, THAT:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Seattle hereby approves and ratifies the amendments to the King County Countywide Planning Policies adopted by King County Ordinance 17486 (a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A).

Section 2. The Mayor is hereby authorized to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Clerk of the Metropolitan King County Council.

CITY CLERK

Section 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage and signatures hereon.

Adopted by the City Council the 4th day of March, 2013, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this 4th day of March, 2013.

President _____ of the City Council

THE MAYOR CONCURRING:

Michael McGinn, Mayor

Filed by me this 4th day of March, 2013.

Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

(Seal)

Attachment A: Amended King County Countywide Planning Policies

CITY CLERK

17486

ATTACHMENT A

2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies

November, 2012
Amended December 3, 2012

2013 CITY CLERK

CONTENTS 2
VISION 2040 STATEMENT 4
VISION & FRAMEWORK 5
Vision for King County 2030 5
Framework 7
Framework Policies 9
ENVIRONMENT 11
Environmental Sustainability 11
Earth and Habitat 12
Flood Hazards 13
Water Resources 13
Air Quality and Climate Change 14
DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS 16
Urban Growth Area 16
Urban Lands 17
Growth Targets 18
Amendments to the Urban Growth Area 21
Review and Evaluation Program 22
Joint Planning and Annexation 23
Centers 24
Urban Centers 24
Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers 25
Local Centers 26
Urban Design and Historic Preservation 27
Rural Area and Resource Lands 27
Rural Area 28
Resource Lands 29
HOUSING 31
Housing Inventory and Needs Analysis 32
Strategies to Meet Housing Needs 32
Regional Cooperation 34
Measuring Results 34
ECONOMY 36
Business Development 37
People 38
Places 38

DIS CITY CLERK

TRANSPORTATION 40
Supporting Growth 40
Mobility 42
System Operations 43
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES 45
Urban and Rural Levels of Service 45
Collaboration Among Jurisdictions 45
Utilities 46
Water Supply 46
Sewage Treatment and Disposal 47
Solid Waste 47
Energy 48
Telecommunications 48
Human and Community Services 48
Siting Public Capital Facilities 49
APPENDIX 1: LAND USE MAP 50
APPENDIX 2: POTENTIAL ANNEXATION AREAS MAP 51
APPENDIX 3: URBAN SEPARATORS MAPS 52
APPENDIX 4: HOUSING TECHNICAL APPENDIX 55
APPENDIX 5: KING COUNTY SCHOOL SITING TASK FORCE REPORT 59
GLOSSARY 61

2013 CITY CLERK

VISION 2040 STATEMENT

The 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies were prepared to address changes to the Growth Management Act, take into account the passage of 20 years since their initial adoption, and to specifically reflect the regional direction established in VISION 2040.

Vision 2040 is the product of the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), an association of cities, towns, counties, ports, tribes, and state agencies that serves as a forum for developing policies and making decisions about regional growth management, environmental, economic, and transportation issues in the four-county central Puget Sound region of Washington state (King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish counties). Vision 2040's Regional Growth Strategy outlines how the four-county Puget Sound region should plan for additional population and employment growth.

As made clear in the Regional Growth Strategy, all jurisdictions in King County have a role in accommodating growth, using sustainable and environmentally responsible development practices. The 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies support this strategy and provide direction at the county and jurisdiction level with appropriate specificity and detail needed to guide consistent and useable local comprehensive plans and regulations.

While VISION 2040 is consistent with the overall growth management strategy of the 1992 King County Countywide Planning Policies, restructuring the Countywide Planning Policies—into the six chapters of Environment, Development Patterns, Housing, Economy, Transportation, and Public Facilities and Services—was done to match the structure of VISION 2040.

DMS CITY CLERK

VISION & FRAMEWORK

Vision for King County 2030

It is the year 2030 and our county has changed significantly in the roughly 40 years that have elapsed since the first Countywide Planning Policies were adopted in 1992. In many ways this is a result of the successful public-private partnership that has supported a diversified, sustainable regional economy and has managed and accommodated growth while maintaining the quality of life and the natural environment throughout King County.

King County in 2030 is characterized by:

- **Protected Critical Areas. Effective stewardship of the environment has preserved and protected the critical areas in the County, including wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, and fish and wildlife conservation areas.**
  These critical areas continue to provide beneficial functions and values for reducing flooding, protecting water quality, supporting biodiversity, and enriching our quality of life for future generations as the as the region's population continues to grow.

- **Viable Rural Area. The Rural Area, established in 1992, is permanently protected with a clear boundary between Rural and Urban Areas.**
  The successful protection of these lands is due in large part to continued innovation within the Urban Growth Area to create new ways to use land efficiently and sustainably. In this way, there is minimal pressure to convert rural lands. The Rural Area is a viable option for those seeking a lifestyle contrast to the Urban Growth Area. The pressure to urbanize the Rural Area has also been lessened by market pressures to use the land for agriculture.

- **Bountiful Agricultural Areas and Productive Forest Lands.**
  More people are farming and a greater number of residents are benefiting from King County agricultural products, which can be purchased through a network of farmers markets and farm stands throughout the county. Since 2010, the increase in productive farming in the Agricultural Production District and in the Rural Area has accelerated as more residents seek locally grown food. Thriving markets now exist throughout the county for these products. The forests of the Pacific Northwest remain as some of the most productive in the world with large scale commercial forestry prevalent in the eastern half of the county.

- **Vibrant, diverse and compact urban communities.**
  Within the Urban Growth Area little undeveloped land now exists and urban infrastructure has been extended to fully serve the entire Urban Growth Area.

DMS CITY CLERK

Development activity is focused on redevelopment to create vibrant neighborhoods where residents can walk, bicycle or use public transit for most of their needs. Improvements to the infrastructure now focus on maintaining existing capacity as opposed to extending the infrastructure into previously unserved areas. Because of the innovations developed in public and private partnerships, there is still ample capacity to accommodate the planned population and employment growth targets within the Urban Growth Area.

Much of the growth in employment and new housing occurs in the Urban Centers. These centers successfully provide a mixture of living, working, cultural, and recreational activities for all members of the community. All the centers are linked together by a high-capacity transit system, including light rail and high capacity bus transit. Transit stations and hubs are within walking distance to all parts of the center and the high capacity transit system facilitates people moving easily from one center to another. Within the collection of Urban Centers there is balance between jobs and housing. Each center has developed its own successful urban character and all are noted for their livability, vibrancy, healthy environment, design, and pedestrian focus.

Smaller concentrations of businesses are distributed throughout the Urban Growth Area to provide goods and services to surrounding residential areas. Most residents are within walking distance of commercial areas, fostering a healthy community through physical exercise and a sense of neighborhood. Local transit systems provide convenient connections to the Urban Centers and elsewhere within the Urban Growth Area.

Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers continue to thrive and function as important hubs of the regional economy. These areas too are well served by transportation systems that emphasize the efficient movement of people, goods and information to and within Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers as well as connecting to other regions.

The entire Urban Growth Area is characterized by superior urban design with an open space network that defines and separates, yet links, the various jurisdictions and central places. Countywide and regional facilities have been equitably dispersed—located where needed, sited unobtrusively—and have provided appropriate incentives and amenities to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Rural Cities have created unique urban environments within the Rural Area and provide commercial services and employment opportunities for their residents. These include retail, business, educational and social services for residents both of cities and the surrounding Rural Area while protecting and supporting the surrounding Rural Area and Resource Lands.

Federal, state and regional funds have been used to further this land use plan and to fund needed regional facilities while local resources focus on funding local and neighborhood facilities. The sharing of resources to accomplish common goals is done so that the regional plan can succeed and all can benefit.

DNS CITY CLERK

The economy is vibrant, vital, and sustainable, and emphasizes diversity in the range of goods and information produced and the services provided. Regional cooperation has focused on economic development activities that have retained and expanded key industries such as aerospace, software, and biotechnology while using the resources of the region to attract new business clusters such as in renewable energy. Businesses continue to locate in our county because of the high quality of life; the preservation of the natural environment; the emphasis on providing a superior education; the predictability brought about by the management of growth and the effectiveness of public-private partnerships supporting these attributes.

Housing opportunities for all incomes and lifestyles exist throughout the county and with the balanced transportation system access to employment is convenient and reliable. Innovation in the development of a diverse range of housing types has been fundamental in accommodating population growth. The diversity of housing types has allowed residents to stay within their community as their housing needs change.

King County communities are extraordinarily diverse culturally and this has been embraced and celebrated by the residents of King County. The needs of residents are attended to by a social service system that emphasizes prevention but stands ready to respond to direct needs as well. There is a sense of social equity within our communities and all share equitably in the distribution of and access to parks, open space, and vibrant neighborhood centers.

The Urban Growth Area is completely located within cities, which are the primary providers of urban services. Where appropriate, sub-regional consortia have been created for certain services, and King County government is recognized as a significant provider of regional services as well as the coordinator of local services to the Rural Area and Resource Lands.

Residents and businesses have recognized that, over time, through clear and reasonable timelines and financing commitments, issues will be addressed. Residents and businesses trust in their local governments because the plans and promises made to manage growth starting in 1992 have been followed. Change is accepted and proceeds in an orderly fashion based on the locally adopted and embraced growth management plans.

Framework

The year 1991 was one of tremendous change for the management of growth in King County and this environment of change gave rise to the distinctive character of the 1992 Countywide Planning Policies. While the Countywide Planning Policies have been amended periodically to address specific issues or revisions required by the Growth Management Act, the first thorough update of the Countywide Planning Policies was completed in 2012 to ensure that the Countywide Planning Policies are consistent with VISION 2040, the Growth Management Act and changes that had occurred in the previous twenty years within King County. In addition for the 2012 update, the Growth Management Planning Council directed that the revised policies

2015 CITY CLERK

include countywide direction on three new policy areas: climate change, healthy communities and social equity. Understanding the history of the 1992 policies is important in order to establish the context for the revised policies.

In 1991 five major conditions gave rise to the first Countywide Planning Policies and the process used in their development and adoption:

1. **In 1985, the King County Council adopted a Comprehensive Plan that for the first time established a clear boundary between Urban and Rural Areas and set forth standards to delineate a clear development character for each.**

2. **In 1991, the adoption of the Growth Management Act transformed the way that local jurisdictions looked at land use planning as well as how they interacted with neighboring jurisdictions.**

   A fundamental requirement of the Growth Management Act was coordination between a shared countywide vision on how growth would be planned for and accommodated and how this would be implemented by local jurisdictions. In 1991, the Growth Management Act was amended to include the requirement that Countywide Planning Policies be adopted to describe this vision and how these relationships would be created. These provisions gave rise to the creation of the Growth Management Planning Council – an advisory group of elected officials from jurisdictions throughout the county charged with overseeing the preparation of the Countywide Planning Policies. Since the Growth Management Act was new and many jurisdictions had not created a comprehensive plan before, the Countywide Planning Policies became a guide for jurisdictions to follow in complying with the Growth Management Act in areas as diverse as critical area regulation to local growth targets.

3. **In 1991, the Puget Sound Council of Governments was dissolved and replaced with the Puget Sound Regional Council that initially had significantly reduced responsibilities for regional land use planning and coordination.**

   Without an effective regional body for land use planning, it was necessary for the Puget Sound counties to identify their own process and organization for developing the Countywide Planning Policies. In the case of King County, this was the Growth Management Planning Council. Subsequently, as its responsibilities were expanded over time, the Puget Sound Regional Council developed VISION 2040, the multi-county vision and planning policies that set the structure for these revised Countywide Planning Policies.

4. **By 1991, the Suburban Cities Association had changed from a loose coalition of cities outside of Seattle to a formal organization with the ability to represent constituent jurisdictions in regional forums.**

CITY CLERK

5. **Prior to the development of the Countywide Planning Policies, King County and METRO attempted and failed to win electoral support for merger.**
   This defeat left jurisdictions with concerns about the relationship between city and county governments, and further confusion about the roles of governments in the Urban Growth Area.

Because of these conditions and the environment they fostered, jurisdictions in King County decided to go further than just meeting the specific statutory requirements for such policies. The 1992 King County Countywide Planning Policies provided direction for many issues related to growth management and established a policy structure for subsequent issue resolution.

Since their adoption, many of the initial Countywide Planning Policies have been codified into local regulations or carried out in regional or statewide arenas and no longer need to be included in them. Through amendments to the King County Charter and interlocal agreements, the relationship between county and city governments has been clearly defined and annexations and incorporations have brought most of the unincorporated urban area into the cities.

Other key actions that were required by the 1992 Countywide Planning Policies along with their current status are described below:

- Complete a fiscal and environmental review of the 1992 Countywide Planning Policies – completed and adopted in 1994;
- Establish housing and employment targets for each jurisdiction – completed in 1994 and periodically updated pursuant to the Countywide Planning Policies;
- Adopt local comprehensive plans pursuant to the Growth Management Act and Countywide Planning Policies – each jurisdiction within King County has an adopted plan that is periodically updated;
- Develop land use capacity and urban density evaluation program – developed and then superseded by the King County Buildable Lands Program as required by the Growth Management Act;
- Develop a growth management monitoring program – King County Benchmarks program established in 1994 and annually updated as described in policy G-2; and
- Evaluate the need to change the Urban Growth Boundary and work to maintain a permanent Rural Area – established in 1994 and periodically reviewed as described in the Development Patterns chapter.

General Policies

Unless otherwise noted, the Countywide Planning Policies apply to the Growth Management Planning Council, King County, and all of the cities within King County.

DIS CITY CLERK

Amendments. While much has been accomplished, the Countywide Planning Policies were never intended to be static and will require amendment over time to reflect changed conditions. While the formal policy development is done by the Growth Management Planning Council, ideas for new policies begin in a variety of areas including individual jurisdictions. Policy G-1 below describes the process for amending the Countywide Planning Policies:

G--1 Maintain the currency of the Countywide Planning Policies through periodic review and amendment. Initiate and review all amendments at the Growth Management Planning Council through the process described below:

a) Only the Growth Management Planning Council may propose amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies except for amendments to the Urban Growth Area that may also be proposed by King County in accordance with policies DP-15 and DP-16;
b) Growth Management Planning Council recommends amendments to the King County Council for consideration, possible revision, and approval; proposed revisions by the King County Council that are of a substantive nature may be sent to the Growth Management Planning Council for their consideration and revised recommendation based on the proposed revision;
c) A majority vote of the King County Council both constitutes approval of the amendments and ratification on behalf of the residents of Unincorporated King County.;
d) After approval and ratification by the King County Council, amendments are forwarded to each city and town for ratification. Amendments cannot be modified during the city ratification process; and
e) Amendments must be ratified within 90 days of King County approval and require affirmation by the county and cities and towns representing at least 70 percent of the county population and 30 percent of those jurisdictions. Ratification is either by an affirmative vote of the city's or town's council or by no action being taken within the ratification period.

Monitoring. Periodically evaluating the effectiveness of the Countywide Planning Policies is key to continuing their value to the region and local jurisdictions. In 1994 King County and cities established the current Benchmarks program to monitor and evaluate key regional indicators.

G-2 Monitor and benchmark the progress of the Countywide Planning Policies towards achieving the Regional Growth Strategy inclusive of the environment, development patterns, housing, the economy, transportation and the provision of public services. Identify corrective actions to be taken if progress toward benchmarks is not being achieved.

Investment. Key to ensuring the success of the Countywide Planning Policies is investment in regional infrastructure and programs. Balancing the use of limited available funds between regional and local needs is extremely complex.

CITY CLERK

G-3 Work collaboratively to identify and seek regional, state, and federal funding sources to invest in infrastructure, strategies, and programs to enable the full implementation of the Countywide Planning Policies. Balance needed regional investments with local needs when making funding determinations.

Consistency. The Countywide Planning Policies provide a common framework for local planning and each jurisdiction is required to update its comprehensive plans to be consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies. The full body of the Countywide Planning Policies is to be considered for decision-making.

G-4 Adopt comprehensive plans that are consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies as required by the Growth Management Act.

ENVIRONMENT

Overarching Goal: *The quality of the natural environment in King County is restored and protected for future generations.*

Environmental Sustainability

Local governments have a key role in shaping sustainable communities by integrating sustainable development and business practices with ecological, social, and economic concerns. Local governments also play a pivotal role in ensuring environmental justice by addressing environmental impacts on minority and low-income populations and by pursuing fairness in the application of policies and regulations.

EN-1 Incorporate environmental protection and restoration efforts into local comprehensive plans to ensure that the quality of the natural environment and its contributions to human health and vitality are sustained now and for future generations.

EN-2 Encourage low impact development approaches for managing stormwater, protecting water quality, minimizing flooding and erosion, protecting habitat, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

EN-3 Encourage the transition to a sustainable energy future by reducing demand through planning for efficiency and conservation and by meeting reduced needs from sustainable sources.

EN-4 Identify and preserve regionally significant open space networks in both Urban and Rural Areas. Develop strategies and funding to protect lands that provide the following valuable functions:

2013 CITY CLERK

- Physical or visual separation delineating growth boundaries or providing buffers between incompatible uses;
- Active and passive outdoor recreation opportunities;
- Wildlife habitat and migration corridors that preserve and enhance ecosystem resiliency in the face of urbanization and climate change;
- Preservation of ecologically sensitive, scenic or cultural resources;
- Urban green space, habitats, and ecosystems;
- Forest resources; and
- Food production potential.

EN-5 Identify and mitigate unavoidable negative impacts of public actions that disproportionately affect people of color and low-income populations.

Earth and Habitat

Healthy ecosystems and environments are vital to the sustainability of all plant and animal life, including humans. Protection of biodiversity in all its forms and across all landscapes is critical to continued prosperity and high quality of life in King County. The value of biodiversity to sustaining long-term productivity and both economic and ecological benefits is evident in fisheries, forestry, and agriculture. For ecosystems to be healthy and provide healthful benefits to people, local governments must prevent negative human impacts and work to ensure that this ecosystem remain diverse and productive over time. With the impending effects of climate change, maintaining biodiversity becomes even more critical to the preservation and resilience of resource-based activities and to many social and ecological systems. Protection of individual species, including Chinook salmon, also plays an important role in sustaining biodiversity and quality of life within the county. Since 2000, local governments, citizens, tribes, conservation districts, non-profit groups, and federal and state fisheries managers have cooperated to develop and implement watershed-based salmon conservation plans, known as Water Resource Inventory Area plans, to conserve and restore habitat for Chinook salmon today and for future generations.

EN-6 Coordinate approaches and standards for defining and protecting critical areas especially where such areas and impacts to them cross jurisdictional boundaries.

EN-7 Encourage basin-wide approaches to wetland protection, emphasizing preservation and enhancement of the highest quality wetlands and wetland systems.

EN-8 Develop an integrated and comprehensive approach to managing fish and wildlife habitat conservation, especially protecting endangered, threatened, and sensitive species.

EN-9 Implement salmon habitat protection and restoration priorities in approved Water Resource Inventory Area plans.

DTS CITY CLERK

Flood Hazards

Flooding is a natural process that affects human communities and natural environments in King County. Managing floodplain development and conserving aquatic habitats are the main challenges for areas affected by flooding. The King County Flood Control District exists to protect public health and safety, regional economic centers, public and private property and transportation corridors. Local governments also have responsibility for flood control within their boundaries.

EN-10 Coordinate and fund flood hazard management efforts through the King County Flood Control District.

EN-11 Work cooperatively to meet regulatory standards for floodplain development as these standards are updated for consistency with relevant federal requirements including those related to the Endangered Species Act.

EN-12 Work cooperatively with the federal, state, and regional agencies and forums to develop regional levee maintenance standards that ensure public safety and protect habitat.

Water Resources

The flow and quality of water is impacted by water withdrawals, land development, stormwater management, and climate change. Since surface and ground waters do not respect political boundaries, cross-jurisdictional coordination of water is required to ensure its functions and uses are protected and sustained. The Puget Sound Partnership was created by the Washington State Legislature as the state agency with the responsibility for assuring the preservation and recovery of Puget Sound and the freshwater systems flowing into the Sound. King County plays a key role in these efforts because of its large population and its location in Central Puget Sound.

EN-13 Collaborate with the Puget Sound Partnership to implement the Puget Sound Action Agenda and to coordinate land use and transportation plans and actions for the benefit of Puget Sound and its watersheds.

EN-14 Manage natural drainage systems to improve water quality and habitat functions, minimize erosion and sedimentation, protect public health, reduce flood risks, and moderate peak storm water runoff rates. Work cooperatively among local, regional, state, national and tribal jurisdictions to establish, monitor and enforce consistent standards for managing streams and wetlands throughout drainage basins.

DMS CITY CLERK

EN-15 Establish a multi-jurisdictional approach for funding and monitoring water quality, quantity, biological conditions, and outcome measures and for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring efforts.

Air Quality and Climate Change

Greenhouse gas emissions are resulting in a changing and increasingly variable climate. King County's snow-fed water supply is especially vulnerable to a changing climate. Additionally, the patterns of storm events and river and stream flow patterns are changing and our shorelines are susceptible to rising sea levels. Carbon dioxide reacts with seawater and reduces the water's pH, threatening the food web in Puget Sound. While local governments can individually work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, more significant emission reductions can only be accomplished through countywide coordination of land use patterns and promotion of transportation systems that provide practical alternatives to single occupancy vehicles. Efficient energy consumption is both a mitigation and an adaptation strategy. Local governments can improve energy efficiency through the development of new infrastructure as well as the maintenance and updating of existing infrastructure.

EN-16 Plan for land use patterns and transportation systems that minimize air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, including:

- Maintaining or exceeding existing standards for carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulates;
- Directing growth to Urban Centers and other mixed use/ high density locations that support mass transit, encourage non-motorized modes of travel and reduce trip lengths;
- Facilitating modes of travel other than single occupancy vehicles including transit, walking, bicycling, and carpooling;
- Incorporating energy-saving strategies in infrastructure planning and design;
- Encouraging new development to use low emission construction practices, low or zero net lifetime energy requirements and "green" building techniques; and
- Increasing the use of low emission vehicles, such as efficient electric-powered vehicles.

EN-17 Establish a countywide greenhouse gas reduction target that meets or exceeds the statewide reduction requirement that is stated as the 2050 goal of a 50 percent reduction below 1990 levels.

EN-18 Establish a greenhouse gas emissions inventory and measurement framework for use by all King County jurisdictions to efficiently and effectively measure progress toward countywide targets established pursuant to policy EN-17.

2015 CITY CLERK

EN-19 Promote energy efficiency, conservation methods and sustainable energy sources to support climate change reduction goals.

EN-20 Plan and implement land use, transportation, and building practices that will greatly reduce consumption of fossil fuels.

EN-21 Formulate and implement climate change adaptation strategies that address the impacts of climate change to public health and safety, the economy, public and private infrastructure, water resources, and habitat.

2012 CITY CLERK

DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

The policies in this chapter address the location, types, design and intensity of land uses that are desired in King County and its cities. They guide implementation of the vision for physical development within the county. The policies also provide a framework for how to focus improvements to transportation, public services, the environment, and affordable housing, as well as how to incorporate concerns about climate change and public health into planning for new growth. Development patterns policies are at the core of growth management efforts in King County; they further the goals of VISION 2040, and recognize the variety of local communities that will be taking action to achieve those goals.

Overarching Goal: *Growth in King County occurs in a compact, centers-focused pattern that uses land and infrastructure efficiently and that protects Rural and Resource Lands.*

The Countywide Planning Policies designate land as Urban, Rural, or Resource. The Land Use Map in Appendix 1 shows the Urban Growth Area boundary and Urban, Rural, and Resource Lands within King County. Further sections of this chapter provide more detailed descriptions and guidance for planning within each of the three designations.

DP-1 All lands within King County are designated as:

- Urban land within the Urban Growth Area, where new growth is focused and accommodated;
- Rural land, where farming, forestry, and other resource uses are protected, and very low-density residential uses, and small-scale non-residential uses are allowed; or
- Resource land, where permanent regionally significant agricultural, forestry, and mining lands are preserved.

Urban Growth Area

The Urban Growth Area encompasses all of the urban designated lands within King County. These lands include all cities as well as a portion of unincorporated King County. Consistent with the Growth Management Act and VISION 2040, urban lands are intended to be the focus of future growth that is compact, includes a mix of uses, and is well-served by public infrastructure. Urban lands also include a network of open space where ongoing maintenance is a local as well as a regional concern.

The pattern of growth within the Urban Growth Area implements the Regional Growth Strategy through allocation of targets to local jurisdictions. The targets create an obligation to plan and provide zoning for future potential growth, but do not obligate a jurisdiction to guarantee that a given number of housing units will be built or jobs added during the planning period.

CITY CLERK

Several additional elements in the Development Patterns chapter reinforce the vision and targeted growth pattern for the Urban Growth Area. Procedures and criteria for amending the Urban Growth Area boundary address a range of objectives and ensure that changes balance the needs for land to accommodate growth with the overarching goal of preventing sprawl within the county. A review and evaluation program provides feedback for the county and cities on the effectiveness of their efforts to accommodate and achieve the desired land use pattern. Joint planning facilitates the transition of governance of the Urban Growth Area from the county to cities, consistent with the Growth Management Act.

Urban form and development within the Urban Growth Area are important settings to provide people with choices to engage in more physical activity, eat healthy food, and minimize exposure to harmful environments and substances. In particular, the quality and safety of walking and biking routes children use to reach school is known to affect their health.

Goal Statement: *The Urban Growth Area accommodates growth consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and growth targets through land use patterns and practices that create vibrant, healthy, and sustainable communities.*

Urban Lands

DP-2 Promote a pattern of compact development within the Urban Growth Area that includes housing at a range of urban densities, commercial and industrial development, and other urban facilities, including medical, governmental, institutional, and educational uses and parks and open space. The Urban Growth Area will include a mix of uses that are convenient to and support public transportation in order to reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicle travel for most daily activities.

DP-3 Efficiently develop and use residential, commercial, and manufacturing land in the Urban Growth Area to create healthy and vibrant urban communities with a full range of urban services, and to protect the long-term viability of the Rural Area and Resource Lands. Promote the efficient use of land within the Urban Growth Area by using methods such as:

- Directing concentrations of housing and employment growth to designated centers;
- Encouraging compact development with a mix of compatible residential, commercial, and community activities;
- Maximizing the use of the existing capacity for housing and employment; and
- Coordinating plans for land use, transportation, capital facilities and services.

DP-4 Concentrate housing and employment growth within the designated Urban Growth Area. Focus housing growth within countywide designated Urban Centers and locally designated local centers. Focus employment growth within countywide designated Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers and within locally designated local centers.

CITY CLERK

DP-5 Decrease greenhouse gas emissions through land use strategies that promote a mix of housing, employment, and services at densities sufficient to promote walking, bicycling, transit, and other alternatives to auto travel.

DP-6 Plan for development patterns that promote public health by providing all residents with opportunities for safe and convenient daily physical activity, social connectivity, and protection from exposure to harmful substances and environments.

DP-7 Plan for development patterns that promote safe and healthy routes to and from public schools.

DP-8 Increase access to healthy food in communities throughout the Urban Growth Area by encouraging the location of healthy food purveyors, such as grocery stores and farmers markets, and community food gardens in proximity to residential uses and transit facilities.

DP-9 Designate Urban Separators as permanent low-density incorporated and unincorporated areas within the Urban Growth Area. Urban Separators are intended to protect Resource Lands, the Rural Area, and environmentally sensitive areas, and create open space and wildlife corridors within and between communities while also providing public health, environmental, visual, and recreational benefits. Changes to Urban Separators are made pursuant to the Countywide Planning Policies amendment process described in policy G-1. Designated Urban Separators within cities and unincorporated areas are shown in the Urban Separators Map in Appendix 3.

DP 10 Discourage incompatible land uses from locating adjacent to general aviation airports throughout the county.

Growth Targets

DP-11 GMPC shall allocate residential and employment growth to each city and unincorporated urban area in the county. This allocation is predicated on:

- Accommodating the most recent 20-year population projection from the state Office of Financial Management and the most recent 20-year regional employment forecast from the Puget Sound Regional Council;
- Planning for a pattern of growth that is consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy including focused growth within cities with countywide designated centers and within other larger cities, limited development in the Rural Area, and protection of designated Resource Lands;
- Efficiently using existing zoned and future planned development capacity as well as the capacity of existing and planned infrastructure, including sewer and water systems;

CITY CLERK

- Promoting a land use pattern that can be served by a connected network of public transportation services and facilities and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and amenities;
- Improving the jobs/housing balance within the region and the county;
- Promoting sufficient opportunities for housing and employment development throughout the Urban Growth Area;
- Allocating growth to individual Potential Annexation Areas within the urban unincorporated area proportionate to its share of unincorporated capacity for housing and employment growth.

DP-12 GMPC shall:

- Update housing and employment targets periodically to provide jurisdictions with up-to-date growth allocations to be incorporated in state-mandated comprehensive plan updates;
- Adopt housing and employment growth targets in the Countywide Planning Policies pursuant to the procedure described in policy G-1; and
- Adjust targets administratively upon annexation of unincorporated Potential Annexation Areas by cities. Growth targets for the 2006-2031 planning period are shown in table DP-1.

DP-13 All jurisdictions shall plan to accommodate housing and employment targets. This includes:

- Adopting comprehensive plans and zoning regulations that provide capacity for residential, commercial, and industrial uses that is sufficient to meet 20-year growth needs and is consistent with the desired growth pattern described in VISION 2040;
- Coordinating water, sewer, transportation and other infrastructure plans and investments among agencies, including special purpose districts; and
- Transferring and accommodating unincorporated area housing and employment targets as annexations occur.

2015 CITY CLERK

Table DP-1: King County Jurisdiction Growth Targets 2006-2031

		Net New Units 2006-2031		Net New Jobs 2006-2031	
		Housing Target	Potential Annexation Area Housing Target	Employment Target	Potential Annexation Area Emp Target
Metropolitan Cities					
	Bellevue	17,000	290	53,000	
	Seattle	86,000		146,700	
Metropolitan Cities Subtotal		**103,000**		**199,700**	
Core Cities	Auburn	9,620		19,350	
	Bothell	3,000	810	4,800	200
	Burien	4,440		4,960	
	Federal Way	8,100	2,390	12,300	290
	Kent	9,270	90	13,280	210
	Kirkland	8,570		20,850	
	Redmond	10,200	640	23,000	
	Renton	14,835	3,895	29,000	470
	SeaTac	5,800		25,300	
	Tukwila	4,800	50	15,500	2,050
Core Cities Subtotal		**78,638**		**168,340**	
Larger Cities	Des Moines	3,000		5,000	
	Issaquah	5,750	290	20,000	
	Kenmore	3,500		3,000	
	Maple Valley	1,800	1,060	2,000	
	Mercer Island	2,000		1,000	
	Sammamish	4,000	350	1,800	
	Shoreline	5,000		5,000	
	Woodinville	3,000		5,000	
Larger Cities Subtotal		**28,050**		**42,800**	
Small Cities	Algona	190		210	
	Beaux Arts	3		3	
	Black Diamond	1,900		1,050	
	Carnation	330		370	
	Clyde Hill	10		0	
	Covington	1,470		1,320	
	Duvall	1,140		840	
	Enumclaw	1,425		735	
	Hunts Point	1		0	
	Lake Forest Park	475		210	
	Medina	19		0	
	Milton	50	90	160	
	Newcastle	1,200		735	
	Normandy Park	120		65	
	North Bend	665		1,050	
	Pacific	285	135	370	
	Skykomish	10		0	
	Snoqualmie	1,615		1,050	
	Yarrow Point	14		0	
Small Cities Subtotal		**10,922**		**8,168**	
Urban Unincorp	Potential Annexation Areas	10,090		3,220	
	North Highline	820		2,170	
	Bear Creek UPD	910		3,580	
	Unclaimed Urban Uninc.	650		90	
Urban Incorporated Subtotal		**12,470**		**9,060**	
Urban Growth Area Total		**233,077**		**428,068**	

2015 CITY CLERK

Amendments to the Urban Growth Area

The following policies guide the decision-making process by both the GMPC and King County regarding proposals to expand the Urban Growth Area.

DP-14 Review the Urban Growth Area at least every ten years. In this review consider monitoring reports and other available data. As a result of this review, and based on the criteria established in policies DP-15 and DP-16, King County may propose and then the Growth Management Planning Council may recommend amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies and King County Comprehensive Plan that make changes to the Urban Growth Area boundary.

DP-15 Allow amendment of the Urban Growth Area only when the following steps have been satisfied:

a) The proposed expansion is under review by the County as part of an amendment process of the King County Comprehensive Plan;
b) King County submits the proposal to the Growth Management Planning Council for the purposes of review and recommendation to the King County Council on the proposed amendment to the Urban Growth Area;
c) The King County Council approves or denies the proposed amendment; and
d) If approved by the King County Council, the proposed amendment is ratified by the cities following the procedures set forth in policy G-1.

DP-16 Allow expansion of the Urban Growth Area only if at least one of the following criteria is met:

a) A countywide analysis determines that the current Urban Growth Area is insufficient in size and additional land is needed to accommodate the housing and employment growth targets, including institutional and other non-residential uses, and there are no other reasonable measures, such as increasing density or rezoning existing urban land, that would avoid the need to expand the Urban Growth Area; or
b) A proposed expansion of the Urban Growth Area is accompanied by dedication of permanent open space to the King County Open Space System, where the acreage of the proposed open space
    1) is at least four times the acreage of the land added to the Urban Growth Area;
    2) is contiguous with the Urban Growth Area with at least a portion of the dedicated open space surrounding the proposed Urban Growth Area expansion; and
    3) Preserves high quality habitat, critical areas, or unique features that contribute to the band of permanent open space along the edge of the Urban Growth Area; or
c) The area is currently a King County park being transferred to a city to be maintained as a park in perpetuity or is park land that has been owned by a city since 1994 and is less than thirty acres in size.

DIS CITY CLERK

DP-17 If expansion of the Urban Growth Area is warranted based on the criteria in DP-16(a) or DP-16(b), add land to the Urban Growth Area only if it meets all of the following criteria:

a) Is adjacent to the existing Urban Growth Area and is no larger than necessary to promote compact development that accommodates anticipated growth needs;
b) Can be efficiently provided with urban services and does not require supportive facilities located in the Rural Area;
c) Follows topographical features that form natural boundaries, such as rivers and ridge lines and does not extend beyond natural boundaries, such as watersheds, that impede the provision of urban services;
d) Is not currently designated as Resource Land;
e) Is sufficiently free of environmental constraints to be able to support urban development without significant adverse environmental impacts, unless the area is designated as an Urban Separator by interlocal agreement between King County and the annexing city; and
f) Is subject to an agreement between King County and the city or town adjacent to the area that the area will be added to the city's Potential Annexation Area. Upon ratification of the amendment, the Countywide Planning Policies will reflect both the Urban Growth Area change and Potential Annexation Area change.

DP-18 Allow redesignation of Urban land currently within the Urban Growth Area to Rural land outside of the Urban Growth Area if the land is not needed to accommodate projected urban growth, is not served by public sewers, is contiguous with the Rural Area, and:

a) Is not characterized by urban development;
b) Is currently developed with a low density lot pattern that cannot be realistically redeveloped at an urban density; or
c) Is characterized by environmentally sensitive areas making it inappropriate for higher density development.

Review and Evaluation Program

The following policies guide the decision-buildable lands program conducted by the GMPC and King County.

DP-19 Conduct a buildable lands program that meets or exceeds the review and evaluation requirements of the Growth Management Act. The purposes of the buildable lands program are:

- To collect and analyze data on development activity, land supply, and capacity for residential, commercial, and industrial land uses;
- To evaluate the consistency of actual development densities with current comprehensive plans; and
- To evaluate the sufficiency of land capacity to accommodate growth for the remainder of the planning period.

DNS CITY CLERK

DP-20 If necessary based on the findings of a periodic buildable lands evaluation report, adopt reasonable measures, other than expansion of the Urban Growth Area, to increase land capacity for housing and employment growth within the Urban Growth Area by making more efficient use of urban land consistent with current plans and targets.

Joint Planning and Annexation

DP-21 Coordinate the preparation of comprehensive plans among adjacent and other affected jurisdictions as a means to avoid or mitigate the potential cross-border impacts of urban development.

DP-22 Designate Potential Annexation Areas in city comprehensive plans and adopt them in the Countywide Planning Policies. Ensure that Potential Annexation Areas do not overlap or leave unincorporated urban islands between cities.

DP-23 Facilitate the annexation of unincorporated areas within the Urban Growth Area that are already urbanized and are within a city's Potential Annexation Area in order to provide urban services to those areas. Annexation is preferred over incorporation.

DP-24 Allow cities to annex territory only within their designated Potential Annexation Area as shown in the Potential Annexation Areas Map in Appendix 2. Phase annexations to coincide with the ability of cities to coordinate the provision of a full range of urban services to areas to be annexed.

DP-25 Within the North Highline unincorporated area, where Potential Annexation Areas overlapped prior to January 1, 2009, strive to establish alternative non-overlapping Potential Annexation Area boundaries through a process of negotiation. Absent a negotiated resolution, a city may file a Notice of Intent to Annex with the Boundary Review Board for King County for territory within its designated portion of a Potential Annexation Area overlap as shown in the Potential Annexation Areas Map in Appendix 2 and detailed in the city's comprehensive plan after the following steps have been taken:

a) The city proposing annexation has, at least 30 days prior to filing a Notice of Intent to annex with the Boundary Review Board, contacted in writing the cities with the PAA overlap and the county to provide notification of the city's intent to annex and to request a meeting or formal mediation to discuss boundary alternatives, and;
b) The cities with the Potential Annexation Area overlap and the county have either:
   i) Agreed to meet but failed to develop a negotiated settlement to the overlap within 60 days of receipt of the notice, or
   ii) Declined to meet or failed to respond in writing within 30 days of receipt of the notice.

DMS CITY CLERK

DP-26 Develop agreements between King County and cities with Potential Annexation Areas to apply city-compatible development standards that will guide land development prior to annexation.

DP-27 Evaluate proposals to annex or incorporate unincorporated land based on the following criteria:

a) Conformance with Countywide Planning Policies including the Urban Growth Area boundary;
b) The ability of the annexing or incorporating jurisdiction to provide urban services at standards equal to or better than the current service providers; and
c) Annexation or incorporation in a manner that will avoid creating unincorporated islands of development.

DP-28 Resolve the issue of unincorporated road islands within or between cities. Roadways and shared streets within or between cities, but still under King County jurisdiction, should be annexed by adjacent cities.

Centers

A centers strategy is the linchpin for King County to achieve the Regional Growth Strategy as well as a range of other objectives, particularly providing a land use framework for an efficient and effective regional transit system. Countywide designation of Urban Centers and local designation of local centers provide for locations of mixed-use zoning, infrastructure, and concentrations of services and amenities to accommodate both housing and employment growth. Manufacturing/Industrial Centers preserve lands for family-wage jobs in basic industries and trade and provide areas where that employment may grow in the future.

Goal Statement: *King County grows in a manner that reinforces and expands upon a system of existing and planned central places within which concentrated residential communities and economic activities can flourish.*

Urban Centers

DP-29 Concentrate housing and employment growth within designated Urban Centers.

DP-30 Designate Urban Centers in the Countywide Planning Policies where city-nominated locations meet the criteria in policies DP-31 and DP-32 and where the city's commitments will help ensure the success of the center. Urban Centers will be limited in number and located on existing or planned high capacity transit corridors to provide a framework for targeted private and public investments that support regional land use and transportation goals. The Land Use Map in Appendix 1 shows the locations of the designated Urban Centers.

DMS CITY CLERK

DP-31 Allow designation of new Urban Centers where the proposed Center:

a) Encompasses an area up to one and a half square miles; and
b) Has adopted zoning regulations and infrastructure plans that are adequate to accommodate:
    i) A minimum of 15,000 jobs within one-half mile of an existing or planned high-capacity transit station;
    ii) At a minimum, an average of 50 employees per gross acre within the Urban Center; and
    iii) At a minimum, an average of 15 housing units per gross acre within the Urban Center.

DP-32 Adopt a map and housing and employment growth targets in city comprehensive plans for each Urban Center, and adopt policies to promote and maintain quality of life in the Center through:

- A broad mix of land uses that foster both daytime and nighttime activities and opportunities for social interaction;
- A range of affordable and healthy housing choices;
- Historic preservation and adaptive reuse of historic places;
- Parks and public open spaces that are accessible and beneficial to all residents in the Urban Center;
- Strategies to increase tree canopy within the Urban Center and incorporate low-impact development measures to minimize stormwater runoff;
- Facilities to meet human service needs;
- Superior urban design which reflects the local community vision for compact urban development;
- Pedestrian and bicycle mobility, transit use, and linkages between these modes;
- Planning for complete streets to provide safe and inviting access to multiple travel modes, especially bicycle and pedestrian travel; and
- Parking management and other strategies that minimize trips made by single-occupant vehicle, especially during peak commute periods.

DP-33 Form the land use foundation for a regional high-capacity transit system through the designation of a system of Urban Centers. Urban Centers should receive high priority for the location of transit service.

Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers

DP-34 Concentrate manufacturing and industrial employment within countywide designated Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers. The Land Use Map in Appendix 1 shows the locations of the designated Manufacturing/Industrial Centers.

DIS CITY CLERK

DP-35 Adopt in city comprehensive plans a map and employment growth targets for each Manufacturing/ Industrial Center and adopt policies and regulations for the Center to:

- Provide zoning and infrastructure adequate to accommodate a minimum of 10,000 jobs;
- Preserve and enhance sites that are appropriate for manufacturing or other industrial uses;
- Strictly limit residential uses and discourage land uses that are not compatible with manufacturing and industrial uses, such as by imposing low maximum size limits on offices and retail uses that are not accessory to an industrial use;
- Facilitate the mobility of employees by transit and the movement of goods by truck, rail, air or waterway, as appropriate;
- Provide for capital facility improvement projects which support the movement of goods and manufacturing/industrial operations;
- Ensure that utilities are available to serve the center;
- Avoid conflicts with adjacent land uses to ensure the continued viability of the land in the Manufacturing/ Industrial Center for manufacturing and industrial activities; and
- Attract and retain the types of businesses that will ensure economic growth and stability.

DP-36 Minimize or mitigate potential health impacts of the activities in Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers on residential communities, schools, open space, and other public facilities.

DP-37 Designate additional Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers in the Countywide Planning Policies pursuant to the procedures described in policy G-1 based on nominations from cities and after determining that:

a) the nominated locations meet the criteria set forth in policy DP-35 and the criteria established by the Puget Sound Regional Council for Regional Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers;
b) the proposed center's location will promote a countywide system of Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers with the total number of centers representing a realistic growth strategy for the county; and
c) the city's commitments will help ensure the success of the center.

Local Centers

DP-38 Identify in comprehensive plans local centers, such as city or neighborhood centers, transit station areas, or other activity nodes, where housing, employment, and services are accommodated in a compact form and at sufficient densities to support transit service and to make efficient use of urban land.

DIS CITY CLERK

Urban Design and Historic Preservation

The countywide vision includes elements of urban design and form intended to integrate urban development into existing built and natural environments in ways that enhance both the urban and natural settings. These elements include high quality design, context sensitive infill and redevelopment, historic preservation, and the interdependence of urban and rural and agricultural lands and uses.

Goal statement: *The built environment in both urban and rural settings achieves a high degree of high quality design that recognizes and enhances, where appropriate, existing natural and urban settings.*

DP-39 Develop neighborhood planning and design processes that encourage infill development, redevelopment, and reuse of existing buildings and that, where appropriate based on local plans, enhance the existing community character and mix of uses.

DP-40 Promote a high quality of design and site planning in publicly-funded and private development throughout the Urban Growth Area.

DP-41 Preserve significant historic, archeological, cultural, architectural, artistic, and environmental features, especially where growth could place these resources at risk. Where appropriate, designate individual features or areas for protection or restoration. Encourage land use patterns and adopt regulations that protect historic resources and sustain historic community character.

DP-42 Design new development to create and protect systems of green infrastructure, such as urban forests, parks, green roofs, and natural drainage systems, in order to reduce climate-altering pollution and increase resilience of communities to climate change impacts.

DP-43 Design communities, neighborhoods, and individual developments using techniques that reduce heat absorption, particularly in Urban Centers.

DP-44 Adopt design standards or guidelines that foster infill development that is compatible with the existing or desired urban character.

Rural Area and Resource Lands

The Rural Area and Resource Lands encompass all areas outside of the Urban Growth Area and include Vashon Island in Puget Sound and the area just east of the Urban Growth Area all the way to the crest of the Cascade Mountains. The Rural Area is characterized by low density development with a focus on activities that are dependent on the land such as small scale farming and forestry. The Rural Area also provides important environmental and habitat

CITY CLERK

functions and is critical for salmon recovery. The location of the Rural Area, between the Urban Growth Area and designated Resource Lands, helps to protect commercial agriculture and timber from incompatible uses. The Rural Area, outside of the Rural Cities, is to remain in unincorporated King County and is to be provided with a rural level of service.

Rural Area

Goal Statement: *The Rural Area provides a variety of landscapes, maintains diverse low density communities, and supports rural economic activities based on sustainable stewardship of the land.*

DP-45 Limit growth in the Rural Area to prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, reduce the need for new rural infrastructure, maintain rural character, and protect the natural environment.

DP-46 Limit residential development in the Rural Area to housing at low densities that are compatible with rural character and comply with the following density guidelines:

a) One home per 20 acres where a pattern of large lots exists and to buffer Forest Protection Districts and Agricultural Districts;
b) One home per 10 acres where the predominant lot size is less than 20 acres; or
c) One home per five acres where the predominant lot size is less than 10 acres.
d) Allow limited clustering within development sites to avoid development on environmentally critical lands or on productive forest or agricultural lands, but not to exceed the density guidelines cited in (a) through (c).

DP-47 Limit the extension of urban infrastructure improvements through the Rural Area to only cases where it is necessary to serve the Urban Growth Area and where there are no other feasible alignments. Such limited extensions may be considered only if land use controls are in place to restrict uses appropriate for the Rural Area and only if access management controls are in place to prohibit tie-ins to the extended facilities.

DP-48 Establish rural development standards to protect the natural environment by using seasonal and maximum clearing limits for vegetation, limits on the amount of impervious surface, surface water management standards that preserve natural drainage systems, water quality and groundwater recharge, and best management practices for resource-based activities.

DP-49 Prevent or, if necessary, mitigate negative impacts of urban development to the adjacent Rural Area.

DP-50 Except as provided in Appendix 5 (March 31, 2012 School Siting Task Force Report), limit new nonresidential uses located in the Rural Area to those that are demonstrated to serve the

BHS CITY CLERK

Rural Area, unless the use is dependent upon a rural location. Such uses shall be of a size, scale, and nature that is consistent with rural character.

DP-51 Allow cities that own property in the Rural Area to enter into interlocal agreements with King County to allow the cities to provide services to the properties they own as long as the cities agree to not annex the property or serve it with sewers or any infrastructure at an urban level of service. The use of the property must be consistent with the rural land use policies in the Countywide Planning Policies and the King County Comprehensive Plan.

Resource Lands

The Resource Lands are designated areas with long term commercial significance for agriculture, forestry, and mining, and are depicted in the Land Use Map in Appendix 1 as Forest Product Districts, Agricultural Production Districts, and Mineral Resource Lands. The use and designation of these lands are to be permanent, in accordance with the Growth Management Act. King County has maintained this base of agriculture and forest lands despite the rapid growth of the previous decades. The Resource Lands are to remain in unincorporated King County but their benefit and significance is felt throughout the county into the cities. Within cities, farmers markets are becoming important and sought after neighborhood amenities.

The forests of the Pacific Northwest are some of the most productive in the world and King County has retained two-thirds of the county in forest cover. Large scale forestry is a traditional land use in the eastern half of King County and remains a significant contributor to the rural economy. In addition, forests provide exceptional recreational opportunities, including downhill and cross-country skiing, mountain biking, hiking, and backpacking.

Goal Statement: *Resource Lands are valuable assets of King County and are renowned for their productivity and sustainable management.*

DP-52 Promote and support forestry, agriculture, mining and other resource-based industries outside of the Urban Growth Area as part of a diverse and sustainable regional economy.

DP-53 Conserve commercial agricultural and forestry resource lands primarily for their long-term productive resource value and for the open space, scenic views, wildlife habitat, and critical area protection they provide. Limit the subdivision of land so that parcels remain large enough for commercial resource production.

DP-54 Encourage best practices in agriculture and forestry operations for long-term protection of the natural resources.

DP-55 Prohibit annexation of lands within designated Agricultural Production Districts or within Forest Production Districts by cities.

BHS CITY CLERK

DP-56 Retain the Lower Green River Agricultural Production District as a regionally designated resource that is to remain in unincorporated King County.

DP-57 Discourage incompatible land uses adjacent to designated Resource Lands to prevent interference with their continued use for the production of agricultural, mining, or forest products.

DP-58 Support local production and processing of food to reduce the need for long distance transport and to increase the reliability and security of local food. Promote activities and infrastructure, such as farmers markets, farm worker housing and agricultural processing facilities, that benefit both cities and farms by improving access to locally grown agricultural products.

DP-59 Support institutional procurement policies that encourage purchases of locally grown food products.

DP-60 Ensure that extractive industries maintain environmental quality and minimize negative impacts on adjacent lands.

DP-61 Use a range of tools, including land use designations, development regulations, level-of-service standards, and transfer or purchase of development rights to preserve Rural and Resource Lands and focus urban development within the Urban Growth Area.

DP-62 Use transfer of development rights to shift potential development from the Rural Area and Resource Lands into the Urban Growth Area, especially cities. Implement transfer of development rights within King County through a partnership between the county and cities that is designed to:

- Identify rural and resource sending sites that satisfy countywide conservation goals and are consistent with regionally coordinated transfer of development rights efforts;
- Preserve rural and resource lands of compelling interest countywide and to participating cities;
- Identify appropriate transfer of development rights receiving areas within cities;
- Identify incentives for city participation in regional transfer of development rights (i.e. county-to-city transfer of development rights);
- Develop interlocal agreements that allow rural and resource land development rights to be used in city receiving areas;
- Identify and secure opportunities to fund or finance infrastructure within city transfer of development rights receiving areas; and.
- Be compatible with existing within-city transfer of development rights programs.

DMS CITY CLERK

HOUSING

The Countywide Planning Policies provide a framework for all jurisdictions to plan for and promote a range of affordable, accessible, and healthy housing choices for current and future residents. Within King County, there is an unmet need for housing that is affordable for households earning less than 80 percent of area median income (AMI). Households within this category include low-wage workers in services and other industries; persons on fixed incomes including many disabled and elderly residents; and homeless individuals and families. A high proportion of these households spend a greater percentage of their income on housing than is typically considered appropriate. This is especially true for low and very low income households earning 50 percent or less (low) and 30 percent or less (very-low) of area median income. The county and all cities share in the responsibility to increase the supply of housing that is affordable to these households.

While neither the county nor the cities can guarantee that a given number of units at a given price level will exist, be preserved, or be produced during the planning period, establishing the countywide need clarifies the scope of the effort for each jurisdiction. The type of policies and strategies that are appropriate for a jurisdiction to consider will vary and will be based on its analysis of housing. Some jurisdictions where the overall supply of affordable housing is significantly less than their proportional share of the countywide need may need to undertake a range of strategies addressing needs at multiple income levels, including strategies to create new affordable housing. Other jurisdictions that currently have housing stock that is already generally affordable may focus their efforts on preserving existing affordable housing through efforts such as maintenance and repair, and ensuring long-term affordability. It may also be appropriate to focus efforts on the needs of specific demographic segments of the population.

The policies below recognize the significant countywide need for affordable housing to focus on the strategies that can be taken both individually and in collaboration to meet the countywide need. These policies envision cities and the county following a four step process

1. Conduct an inventory and analysis of housing needs and conditions;
2. Implement policies and strategies to address unmet needs;
3. Measure results; and
4. Respond to measurement with reassessment and adjustment of strategies.

The provision of housing affordable to very-low income households, those earning less than 30% of AMI, is the most challenging problem and one faced by all communities in the county. Housing for these very-low income households cannot be met solely through the private market. Meeting this need will require interjurisdictional cooperation and support from public agencies, including the cities and the county.

KING CITY CLERK

Overarching Goal: *The housing needs of all economic and demographic groups are met within all jurisdictions.*

H-1 Address the countywide need for housing affordable to households with moderate, low and very-low incomes, including those with special needs. The countywide need for housing by percentage of Area Median Income (AMI) is:

50-80% of AMI (moderate)	16% of total housing supply
30-50% of AMI (low)	12% of total housing supply
30% and below AMI (very-low)	12% of total housing supply

H-2 Address the need for housing affordable to households at less than 30% AMI (very low income), recognizing that this is where the greatest need exists, and addressing this need will require funding, policies and collaborative actions by all jurisdictions working individually and collectively.

Housing Inventory and Needs Analysis

The Growth Management Act requires an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs as part of each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan housing element. Assessing local housing needs provides jurisdictions with information about the local housing supply, the cost of housing, and the demographic and income levels of the community's households. This information on current and future housing conditions provides the basis for the development of effective housing policies and programs. While some cities may find that they meet the current need for housing for some populations groups, the inventory and needs analysis will help identify those income levels and demographic segments of the population where there is the greatest need. Further guidance on conducting a housing inventory and analysis is provided in Appendix 4.

H-3 Conduct an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of all economic and demographic segments of the population in each jurisdiction. The analysis and inventory shall include:

a. Characteristics of the existing housing stock, including supply, affordability and diversity of housing types;
b. Characteristics of populations, including projected growth and demographic change;
c. The housing needs of very-low, low, and moderate-income households; and
d. The housing needs of special needs populations.

Strategies to Meet Housing Needs

VISION 2040 encourages local jurisdictions to adopt best housing practices and innovative techniques to advance the provision of affordable, healthy, sustainable, and safe housing for all residents. Meeting the county's affordable housing needs will require actions by a wide range of private for profit, non-profit and government entities, including substantial resources from federal, state, and local levels. No single tool will be sufficient to meet the full range of needs in a given jurisdiction. The county and cities are encouraged to employ a range of housing tools to

2015 CITY CLERK

ensure the countywide need is addressed and to respond to local conditions. Further detail on the range of strategies for promoting housing supply and affordability is contained in Appendix 4.

Jobs-housing balance, addressed in H-9, is a concept that advocates an appropriate match between the number of existing jobs and available housing supply within a geographic area. Improving balance means adding more housing to job-rich areas and more jobs to housing-rich areas.

H-4 Provide zoning capacity within each jurisdiction in the Urban Growth Area for a range of housing types and densities, sufficient to accommodate each jurisdiction's overall housing targets and, where applicable, housing growth targets in designated Urban Centers.

H-5 Adopt policies, strategies, actions and regulations at the local and countywide levels that promote housing supply, affordability, and diversity, including those that address a significant share of the countywide need for housing affordable to very-low, low, and moderate income households. These strategies should address the following:

a. Overall supply and diversity of housing, including both rental and ownership;
b. Housing suitable for a range of household types and sizes;
c. Affordability to very-low, low, and moderate income households;
d. Housing suitable and affordable for households with special needs;
e. Universal design and sustainable development of housing; and
f. Housing supply, including affordable housing and special needs housing, within Urban Centers and in other areas planned for concentrations of mixed land uses.

H-6 Preserve existing affordable housing units, where appropriate, including acquisition and rehabilitation of housing for long-term affordability.

H-7 Identify barriers to housing affordability and implement strategies to overcome them.

H-8 Tailor housing policies and strategies to local needs, conditions and opportunities, recognizing the unique strengths and challenges of different cities and sub-regions.

H-9 Plan for housing that is accessible to major employment centers and affordable to the workforce in them so people of all incomes can live near or within reasonable commuting distance of their places of work. Encourage housing production at a level that improves the balance of housing to employment throughout the county.

H-10 Promote housing affordability in coordination with transit, bicycle, and pedestrian plans and investments and in proximity to transit hubs and corridors, such as through transit oriented development and planning for mixed uses in transit station areas.

H-11 Encourage the maintenance of existing housing stock in order to ensure that the condition and quality of the housing is safe and livable.

CITY CLERK

H-12 Plan for residential neighborhoods that protect and promote the health and well-being of residents by supporting active living and healthy eating and by reducing exposure to harmful environments.

H-13 Promote fair housing and plan for communities that include residents with a range of abilities, ages, races, incomes, and other diverse characteristics of the population of the county.

Regional Cooperation

Housing affordability is important to regional economic vitality and sustainability. Housing markets do not respect jurisdictional boundaries. For these reasons, multijurisdictional efforts for planning and adopting strategies to meet regional housing needs are an additional tool for identifying and meeting the housing needs of households with moderate, low, and very-low incomes. Collaborative efforts, supported by the work of Puget Sound Regional Council and other agencies, contribute to producing and preserving affordable housing and coordinating equitable, sustainable development in the county and region. Where individual cities lack sufficient resources, collective efforts to fund or provide technical assistance for affordable housing development and preservation, and for the creation of strategies and programs, can help to meet the housing needs identified in comprehensive plans. Cities with similar housing characteristics tend to be clustered geographically. Therefore, there are opportunities for efficiencies and greater impact through interjurisdictional cooperation. Such efforts are encouraged and can be a way to meet a jurisdiction's share of the countywide affordable housing need.

H-14 Work cooperatively among jurisdictions to provide mutual support in meeting countywide housing growth targets and affordable housing needs.

H-15 Collaborate in developing sub-regional and countywide housing resources and programs, including funding, to provide affordable housing for very-low, low-, and moderate-income households.

H-16 Work cooperatively with the Puget Sound Regional Council and other agencies to identify ways to expand technical assistance to local jurisdictions in developing, implementing and monitoring the success of strategies that promote affordable housing that meets changing demographic needs. Collaborate in developing and implementing a housing strategy for the four-county central Puget Sound region.

Measuring Results

Maintaining timely and relevant data on housing markets and residential development allows the county and cities to evaluate the effectiveness of their housing strategies and to make appropriate changes to those strategies when and where needed. In assessing efforts to meet their share of the countywide need for affordable housing, jurisdictions need to consider public actions taken to encourage development and preservation of housing affordable to households with very low-, low- and moderate-incomes, such as local funding, development code changes,

CITY CLERK

and creation of new programs, as well as market and other factors that are beyond local government control. Further detail on monitoring procedures is contained in Appendix 4.

H-17 Monitor housing supply, affordability, and diversity, including progress toward meeting a significant share of the countywide need for affordable housing for very-low, low, and moderate income households. Monitoring should encompass:

a. Number and type of new housing units;
b. Number of units lost to demolition, redevelopment, or conversion to non-residential use;
c. Number of new units that are affordable to very-low, low-, and moderate-income households;
d. Number of affordable units newly preserved and units acquired and rehabilitated with a regulatory agreement for long-term affordability for very-low, low-, and moderate-income households;
e. Housing market trends including affordability of overall housing stock;
f. Changes in zoned capacity for housing, including housing densities and types;
g. The number and nature of fair housing complaints and violations; and
h. Housing development and market trends in Urban Centers.

H-18 Review and amend, a minimum every five years, the countywide and local housing policies and strategies, especially where monitoring indicates that adopted strategies are not resulting in adequate affordable housing to meet the jurisdiction's share of the countywide need.

CITY CLERK

ECONOMY

Overarching Goal: *People throughout King County have opportunities to prosper and enjoy a high quality of life through economic growth and job creation.*

The Countywide Planning Policies in the Economy Chapter support the economic growth and sustainability of King County's economy. A strong and healthy economy results in business development, job creation, and investment in our communities. The Economy Chapter reflects and supports the Regional Economic Strategy and VISION 2040's economic policies, which emphasize the economic value of business, people, and place.

The Regional Economic Strategy is the region's comprehensive economic development strategy and serves as the VISION 2040 economic functional plan. VISION 2040 integrates the Regional Economic Strategy with growth management, transportation, and environmental objectives to:

- support critical economic foundations, such as education, infrastructure, technology, and quality of life; and
- promote the region's specific industry clusters: aerospace, clean technology, information technology, life sciences, logistics and international trade, military, and tourism.

Each local community will have an individual focus on economic development, while the region's prosperity will benefit from coordination between local plans and the regional vision that take into account the county's and the region's overall plan for growth.

EC-1 Coordinate local and countywide economic policies and strategies with VISION 2040 and the Regional Economic Strategy.

EC-2 Support economic growth that accommodates employment growth targets (see table DP-1) through local land use plans, infrastructure development, and implementation of economic development strategies.

EC-3 Identify and support industry clusters and subclusters within King County that are components of the Regional Economic Strategy or that may otherwise emerge as having significance to King County's economy.

EC-4 Evaluate the performance of economic development policies and strategies in business development and job creation. Identify and track key economic metrics to help jurisdictions and the county as a whole evaluate the effectiveness of local and regional economic strategies.

DNS CITY CLERK

Business Development

Business creation, retention, expansion, and recruitment are the foundations of a strong economy. The success of the economy in the county depends on opportunities for business growth. Our communities play a significant role through local government actions, such as by making regulations more predictable, by engaging in public-private partnerships, and by nurturing a business-supportive culture.

These policies also seek to integrate the concept of healthy communities as part of the county's economic objectives, by calling for support of the regional food economy, including production, processing, wholesaling and distribution of the region's agricultural food and food products.

EC-5 Help businesses thrive through:

- Transparency, efficiency, and predictability of local regulations and policies;
- Communication and partnerships between businesses, government, schools, and research institutions; and
- Government contracts with local businesses.

EC-6 Foster the retention and development of those businesses and industries that export their goods and services outside the region.

EC-7 Promote an economic climate that is supportive of business formation, expansion, and retention and emphasizes the importance of small businesses in creating jobs.

EC-8 Foster a broad range of public-private partnerships to implement economic development policies, programs and projects.

EC-9 Identify and support the retention of key regional and local assets to the economy, such as major educational facilities, research institutions, health care facilities, manufacturing facilities, and port facilities.

EC-10 Support the regional food economy including the production, processing, wholesaling, and distribution of the region's agricultural food and food products to all King County communities. Emphasize increasing access to those communities with limited presence of healthy food options.

BHS CITY CLERK

People

People, through their training, knowledge, skills, and cultural background, add value to the region's economy. Additionally, creating an economy that provides opportunities for all helps alleviate problems of poverty and income disparity.

EC-11 Work with schools and other institutions to increase graduation rates and sustain a highly-educated and skilled local workforce. This includes aligning job training and education offerings that are consistent with the skill needs of the region's industry clusters. Identify partnership and funding opportunities where appropriate.

EC-12 Celebrate the cultural diversity of local communities as a means to enhance the county's global relationships.

EC-13 Address the historic disparity in income and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged populations, including minorities and women, by committing resources to human services; community development; housing; economic development; and public infrastructure.

Places

Economic activity in the county predominantly occurs within the Urban Growth Area, including Urban Centers and Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers. Continuing to guide local investments to these centers will help provide the support needed to sustain the economy and provide greater predictability to businesses about where capital improvements will be located. In addition to making productive use of urban land, economic activity adds to the culture and vitality of our local communities. Businesses create active, attractive places to live and visit, and make significant contributions to the arts. The Rural Area and Resource Lands are important for their contribution to the regional food network, mining, timber and craft industries, while Rural Cities are important for providing services to and being the economic centers for the surrounding Rural Area.

EC-14 Foster economic and employment growth in designated Urban Centers and Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers through local investments, planning, and financial policies.

EC-15 Make local investments to maintain and expand infrastructure and services that support local and regional economic development strategies. Focus investment where it encourages growth in designated centers and helps achieve employment targets.

2015 CITY CLERK

EC-16 Add to the vibrancy and sustainability of our communities and the health and well-being of all people through safe and convenient access to local services, neighborhood-oriented retail, purveyors of healthy food (e.g. grocery stores and farmers markets), and transportation choices.

EC-17 Promote the natural environment as a key economic asset. Work cooperatively with local businesses to protect and restore the natural environment in a manner that is efficient and predictable and minimizes impacts on businesses.

EC-18 Maintain an adequate supply of land within the Urban Growth Area to support economic development. Inventory, plan for, and monitor the land supply and development capacity for, manufacturing/ industrial, commercial and other employment uses that can accommodate the amount and types of economic activity anticipated during the planning period.

EC-19 Support Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers by adopting industrial siting policies that limit the loss of industrial lands, maintain the region's economic diversity, and support family-wage jobs. Prohibit or strictly limit non-supporting or incompatible activities that can interfere with the retention or operation of industrial businesses, especially in Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers.

EC-20 Facilitate redevelopment of contaminated sites through local, county and state financing and other strategies that assist with funding environmental remediation.

EC-21 Encourage economic activity within Rural Cities that does not create adverse impacts to the surrounding Rural Area and Resource Lands and will not create the need to provide urban services and facilities to those areas.

CITY CLERK

TRANSPORTATION

The Regional Growth Strategy identifies a network of walkable, compact, and transit-oriented communities that are the focus of urban development, as well as industrial areas with major employment concentrations. In the Countywide Planning Policies, these communities include countywide designated Urban Centers and Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers, and locally designated local centers. An essential component of the Regional Growth Strategy is an efficient transportation system that provides multiple options for moving people and goods into and among the various centers. Transportation system, in the context of this chapter, is defined as a comprehensive, integrated network of travel modes (e.g. airplanes, automobiles, bicycles, buses, feet, ferries, freighters, trains, trucks) and infrastructure (e.g. sidewalks, trails, streets, arterials, highways, waterways, railways, airports) for the movement of people and goods on a local, regional, national and global scale.

Goals and policies in this chapter build on the 1992 King County Countywide Planning Policies and the Multicounty Planning Policies in VISION 2040. Policies are organized into three sections:

- Supporting Growth – focusing on serving the region with a transportation system that furthers the Regional Growth Strategy;
- Mobility – addressing the full range of travel modes necessary to move people and goods efficiently within the region and beyond; and
- System Operations – encompassing the design, maintenance and operation of the transportation system to provide for safety, efficiency, and sustainability.

Overarching Goal: *The region is well served by an integrated, multi-modal transportation system that supports the regional vision for growth, efficiently moves people and goods, and is environmentally and functionally sustainable over the long term.*

Supporting Growth

An effective transportation system is critical to achieving the Regional Growth Strategy and ensuring that centers are functional and appealing to the residents and businesses they are designed to attract. The policies in this section reinforce the critical relationship between development patterns and transportation and they are intended to guide transportation investments from all levels of government that effectively support local, county and regional plans to accommodate growth. Policies in this section take a multi-modal approach to serving growth, with additional emphasis on transit and non-motorized modes to support planned development in centers.

DMS CITY CLERK

Goal Statement: *Local and regional development of the transportation system is consistent with and furthers realization of the Regional Growth Strategy.*

T-1 Work cooperatively with the Puget Sound Regional Council, the state, and other relevant agencies to finance and develop a multi-modal transportation system that enhances regional mobility and reinforces the countywide vision for managing growth. Use VISION 2040 and *Transportation 2040* as the policy and funding framework for creating a system of Urban Centers and Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers linked by high-capacity transit, bus transit and an interconnected system of freeways and high-occupancy vehicle lanes.

T-2 Avoid construction of major roads and capacity expansion on existing roads in the Rural Area and Resource Lands. Where increased roadway capacity is warranted to support safe and efficient travel through the Rural Area, appropriate rural development regulations and effective access management should be in place prior to authorizing such capacity expansion in order to make more efficient use of existing roadway capacity and prevent unplanned growth in the Rural Area.

T-3 Increase the share of trips made countywide by modes other than driving alone through coordinated land use planning, public and private investment, and programs focused on centers and connecting corridors, consistent with locally adopted mode split goals.

T-4 Develop station area plans for high capacity transit stations and transit hubs. Plans should reflect the unique characteristics and local vision for each station area including transit supportive land uses, transit rights-of-way, stations and related facilities, multi-modal linkages, and place-making elements.

T-5 Support countywide growth management objectives by prioritizing transit service to areas where existing housing and employment densities support transit ridership and to Urban Centers and other areas planned for housing and employment densities that will support transit ridership. Address the mobility needs of transit-dependent populations in allocating transit service and provide at least a basic level of service throughout the Urban Growth Area.

T-6 Foster transit ridership by designing transit facilities and services as well as non-motorized infrastructure so that they are integrated with public spaces and private developments to create an inviting public realm.

T-7 Ensure state capital improvement policies and actions are consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and support VISION 2040 and the Countywide Planning Policies.

T-8 Prioritize regional and local funding to transportation investments that support adopted growth targets.

DMS CITY CLERK

Mobility

Mobility is necessary to sustain personal quality of life and the regional economy. For individuals, mobility requires an effective transportation system that provides safe, reliable, and affordable travel options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities. While the majority of people continue to travel by personal automobile, there are growing segments of the population (e.g. urban, elderly, teens, low income, minorities, and persons with disabilities) that rely on other modes of travel such as walking, bicycling, and public transportation to access employment, education and training, goods and services. According to the *2009 American Community Survey*, about 8.7 percent of all households in King County had no vehicle available. For many minority populations, more than 20 percent had no vehicle available to them.

The movement of goods is also of vital importance to the local and regional economy. International trade is a significant source of employment and economic activity in terms of transporting freight, local consumption, and exporting of goods. The policies in this section are intended to address use and integration of the multiple modes necessary to move people and goods within and beyond the region. The importance of the roadway network, implicit in the policies of this section, is addressed more specifically in the System Operations section of this chapter.

Goal Statement: *A well-integrated, multi-modal transportation system transports people and goods effectively and efficiently to destinations within the region and beyond.*

T-9 Promote the mobility of people and goods through a multi-modal transportation system based on regional priorities consistent with VISION 2040 and local comprehensive plans.

T-10 Support effective management of existing air, marine and rail transportation capacity and address future capacity needs in cooperation with responsible agencies, affected communities, and users.

T-11 Develop and implement freight mobility strategies that strengthen King County's role as a major regional freight distribution hub, an international trade gateway, and a manufacturing area.

T-12 Address the needs of non-driving populations in the development and management of local and regional transportation systems.

T-13 Site and design transit stations and transit hubs to promote connectivity and access for pedestrian and bicycle patrons.

2015 CITY CLERK

System Operations

The design, management and operation of the transportation system are major factors that influence the region's growth and mobility. Policies in this section stress the need to make efficient use of the existing infrastructure, serve the broad needs of the users, address safety and public health issues, and design facilities that are a good fit for the surroundings. Implementation of the policies will require the use of a wide range of tools including, but not limited to:

- technologies such as intelligent transportation systems and alternative fuels;
- demand management programs for parking, commute trip reduction and congestion; and
- incentives, pricing systems and other strategies to encourage choices that increase mobility while improving public health and environmental sustainability.

Goal Statement: *The regional transportation system is well-designed and managed to protect public investments, promote public health and safety, and achieve optimum efficiency.*

T-14 Prioritize essential maintenance, preservation, and safety improvements of the existing transportation system to protect mobility and avoid more costly replacement projects.

T-15 Design and operate transportation facilities in a manner that is compatible with and integrated into the natural and built environments in which they are located. Incorporate features such as natural drainage, native plantings, and local design themes that facilitate integration and compatibility.

T-16 Protect the transportation system (e.g. roadway, rail, transit, air, and marine) against major disruptions by developing prevention and recovery strategies and by coordinating disaster response plans.

T-17 Promote the use of tolling and other pricing strategies to effectively manage the transportation system, provide a stable and sustainable transportation funding source, and improve mobility.

T-18 Develop a countywide monitoring system to determine how transportation investments are performing over time consistent with *Transportation 2040* recommendations.

T-19 Design roads and streets, including retrofit projects, to accommodate a range of motorized and non-motorized travel modes in order to reduce injuries and fatalities and to encourage non-motorized travel. The design should include well-defined, safe and appealing spaces for pedestrians and bicyclists.

2015 CITY CLERK

T-20 Develop a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to human health, including exposure to environmental toxins generated by vehicle emissions.

T-21 Provide opportunities for an active, healthy lifestyle by integrating the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists in the local and regional transportation plans and systems.

T-22 Plan and develop a countywide transportation system that reduces greenhouse gas emissions by advancing strategies that shorten trip length or replace vehicle trips to decrease vehicle miles traveled.

T-23 Apply technologies, programs and other strategies that optimize the use of existing infrastructure in order to improve mobility, reduce congestion, increase energy-efficiency, and reduce the need for new infrastructure.

T-24 Promote the expanded use of alternative fuel vehicles by the general public with measures such as converting public and private fleets, applying incentive programs, and providing for electric vehicle charging stations throughout the Urban Growth Area.

2015 CITY CLERK

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Overarching Goal: *County residents in both Urban and Rural Areas have access to the public services needed in order to advance public health and safety, protect the environment, and carry out the Regional Growth Strategy.*

Urban and Rural Levels of Service

The Growth Management Act directs jurisdictions and special purpose districts to provide public facilities and services to support development. The Growth Management Act distinguishes between urban and rural services and states that land within the Urban Growth Area should be provided with a full range of services necessary to sustain urban communities while land within the Rural Area should receive services to support a rural lifestyle. Certain services, such as sanitary sewers, are allowed only in the Urban Growth Area, except as otherwise authorized. The Growth Management Act also requires jurisdictions to determine which facilities are necessary to serve the desired growth pattern and how they will be financed, in order to ensure timely provision of adequate services and facilities.

PF-1 Provide a full range of urban services in the Urban Growth Area to support the Regional Growth Strategy and adopted growth targets and limit the availability of services in the Rural Area consistent with VISION 2040.

Collaboration Among Jurisdictions

More than 100 special purpose districts, including water, sewer, flood control, stormwater, fire, school and other districts, provide essential services to the residents of King County. While cities are the primary providers of services in the Urban Growth Area, in many parts of the county special purpose districts also provide essential services. Coordination and collaboration among all of these districts, the cities, King County, the tribes, and neighboring counties is key to providing efficient, high-quality and reliable services to support the Regional Growth Strategy.

PF-2 Coordinate among jurisdictions and service providers to provide reliable and cost-effective services to the public.

PF-3 Cities are the appropriate providers of services to the Urban Growth Area, either directly or by contract. Extend urban services through the use of special districts only where there are agreements with the city in whose Potential Annexation Area the extension is proposed. Within the Urban Growth Area, as time and conditions warrant, cities will assume local urban services provided by special service districts.

DHS CITY CLERK

Utilities

Utilities include infrastructure and services that provide water supply, sewage treatment and disposal, solid waste disposal, energy, and telecommunications. Providing these utilities in a cost-effective way is essential to maintaining the health and safety of King County residents and to implementing the Regional Growth Strategy.

Water Supply

Conservation and efficient use of water resources are vital to ensuring the reliability of the region's water supply, the availability of sufficient water supplies for future generations, and the environmental sustainability of the water supply system.

PF-4 Develop plans for long-term water provision to support growth and to address the potential impacts of climate change on regional water resources.

PF-5 Support efforts to ensure that all consumers have access to a safe, reliably maintained, and sustainable drinking water source that meets present and future needs.

PF-6 Coordinate water supply among local jurisdictions, tribal governments, and water purveyors to provide reliable and cost-effective sources of water for all users, including residents, businesses, fire districts, and aquatic species.

PF-7 Plan and locate water systems in the Rural Area that are appropriate for rural uses and densities and do not increase the development potential of the Rural Area.

PF-8 Recognize and support agreements with water purveyors in adjacent cities and counties to promote effective conveyance of water supplies and to secure adequate supplies for emergencies.

PF-9 Implement water conservation and efficiency efforts to protect natural resources, reduce environmental impacts, and support a sustainable long-term water supply to serve the growing population.

PF-10 Encourage water reuse and reclamation, especially for high-volume non-potable water users such as parks, schools, and golf courses.

PHS CITY CLERK

Sewage Treatment and Disposal

Within the Urban Growth Area, connection to sanitary sewers is necessary to support the Regional Growth Strategy and to accommodate urban densities. Alternatives to the sanitary sewer system and the typical septic system are becoming more cost effective and therefore, more available. Alternative technology may be appropriate when it can perform as well or better than sewers in the Urban Growth Area. Septic systems are not considered to be alternative technology within the Urban Growth Area.

In the Rural Area and Resource Lands, which are characterized by low-density development, sewer service is not typically provided. In cases where public health is threatened, sewers can be provided in the Rural Area but only if connections are strictly limited. Alternative technology may be necessary to substitute for septic systems in the Rural Area.

PF-11 Require all development in the Urban Growth Area to be served by a public sewer system except:

a) single-family residences on existing individual lots that have no feasible access to sewers may utilize individual septic systems on an interim basis; or
b) development served by alternative technology other than septic systems that:
   - provide equivalent performance to sewers;
   - provide the capacity to achieve planned densities; and
   - will not create a barrier to the extension of sewer service within the Urban Growth Area.

#

PF-12 Prohibit sewer service in the Rural Area and on Resource Lands except:

a) where needed to address specific health and safety problems threatening existing structures; or
b) as allowed by Countywide Planning Policy DP-47; or
c) as provided in Appendix 5 (March 31, 2012 School Siting Task Force Report).

Sewer service authorized consistent with this policy shall be provided in a manner that does not increase development potential in the Rural Area.

Solid Waste

King County and the entire Puget Sound region are recognized for successful efforts to collect recyclable waste. Continuing to reduce and reuse waste will require concerted and coordinated efforts well into the future. It is important to reduce the waste stream going into area landfills to extend the usable life of existing facilities and reduce the need for additional capacity.

PF-13 Reduce the solid waste stream and encourage reuse and recycling.

DMS CITY CLERK

Energy

While King County consumers have access to electrical energy derived from hydropower, there are challenges for securing long-term reliable energy and for becoming more energy efficient.

PF-14 Reduce the rate of energy consumption through efficiency and conservation as a means to lower energy costs and mitigate environmental impacts associated with traditional energy supplies.

PF-15 Promote the use of renewable and alternative energy resources to help meet the county's long-term energy needs, reduce environmental impacts associated with traditional energy supplies, and increase community sustainability.

Telecommunications

A telecommunications network throughout King County is essential to fostering broad economic vitality and equitable access to information, goods and services, and opportunities for social connection.

PF-16 Plan for the provision of telecommunication infrastructure to serve growth and development in a manner consistent with the regional and countywide vision.

Human and Community Services

Public services beyond physical infrastructure are also necessary to sustain the health and quality of life of all King County residents. In addition, these services play a role in distinguishing urban communities from rural communities and supporting the Regional Growth Strategy.

PF-17 Provide human and community services to meet the needs of current and future residents in King County communities through coordinated planning, funding, and delivery of services by the county, cities, and other agencies.

Locating Facilities and Services

VISION 2040 calls for a full range of urban services in the Urban Growth Area to support the Regional Growth Strategy, and for limiting the availability of services in the rural area. In the long term, there is increased efficiency and cost effectiveness in siting and operating facilities and services that serve a primarily urban population within the Urban Growth Area. At the

2015 CITY CLERK

same time, those facilities and services that primarily benefit rural populations provide a greater benefit when they are located within neighboring cities and rural towns.

PF-18 Locate new schools, institutions, and other community facilities and services that primarily serve urban populations within the Urban Growth Area, where they are accessible to the communities they serve, except as provided in Appendix 5 (March 31, 2012 School Siting Task Force Report). Locate these facilities in places that are well served by transit and pedestrian and bicycle networks.

PF-19 Locate new schools and institutions primarily serving rural residents in neighboring cities and rural towns, except as provided in Appendix 5 (March 31, 2012 School Siting Task Force Report) and locate new community facilities and services that primarily serve rural residents in neighboring cities and rural towns, with the limited exceptions when their use is dependent upon rural location and their size and scale supports rural character.

Siting Public Capital Facilities

While essential to growth and development, regional capital facilities can disproportionately affect the communities in which they are located. It is important that all jurisdictions work collaboratively and consider environmental justice principles when siting these facilities to foster the development of healthy communities for all.

PF-20 Site or expand public capital facilities of regional or statewide importance within the county in a way that equitably disperses impacts and benefits and supports the Countywide Planning Policies.

2015 CITY CLERK



Chapter: APPENDIX 1: LAND USE MAP

DMS CITY CLERK



Chapter: APPENDIX 1: LAND USE MAP

CITY CLERK

APPENDIX 3: URBAN SEPARATORS MAPS



CITY CLERK


Panther Lake
North Soos Creek
South Soos Creek
North Green River
Green River
Kent
Auburn
Covington
King County
Department of Development and Environmental Services
Urban Separators: South Overview - June 2012
Urban Growth Area Boundary
King County Parks
Urban Separators in Annexed Areas
Incorporated Areas
Greenbelt/Urban Separator
Unincorporated Activity Center
Agriculture
Community Business Center
Commercial Outside of Centers
Forestry
Industrial
Mining
Neighborhood Business Center
Other Parks/Wilderness
King County Open Space System
Rural Area (2.5-10 du/ac)
Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center
Rural Town
Rural City Urban Growth Area
Urban Residential, High (>12 du/ac)
Urban Residential, Medium (4-12 du/ac)
Urban Residential, Low (1 du/ac)
Urban Planned Development
1 inch = 0.75 miles

CITY CLERK


Woodinville
Kirkland
Redmond
King County
Department of Development and Environmental Services
Urban Separators: Kirkland/Willows- June 2012
Urban Growth Area Boundary
King County Parks
Urban Separators in Annexed Areas
Incorporated Areas
Greenbelt/Urban Separator
Unincorporated Activity Center
Agriculture
Community Business Center
Commercial Outside of Centers
Forestry
Industrial
Mining
Neighborhood Business Center
Other Parks/Wilderness
King County Open Space System
Rural Area (2.5-10 du/ac)
Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center
Rural Town
Rural City Urban Growth Area
Urban Residential, High (>12 du/ac)
Urban Residential, Medium (4-12 du/ac)
Urban Residential, Low (1 du/ac)
Urban Planned Development
1 inch = 800 feet

APPENDIX 4: HOUSING TECHNICAL APPENDIX

Affordable Housing Need

Each jurisdiction, as part of its Comprehensive Plan housing analysis, will need to address affordability and condition of existing housing supply as well as its responsibility to accommodate a significant share of the countywide need for affordable housing. In order for each jurisdiction to address its share of the countywide housing need for very-low, low and moderate income housing, a four step approach has been identified:

1. Conduct an inventory and analysis of housing needs and conditions;
2. Implement policies and strategies to address unmet needs;
3. Measure results; and
4. Respond to measurement with reassessment and adjustment of strategies.

The methodology for each jurisdiction to address countywide affordable housing need is summarized as follows:

Countywide need for Housing by Percentage of Area Median Income (AMI)

1. **Moderate Income Housing Need.** Census Bureau estimates[1] indicate that approximately 16 percent of households in King County have incomes between 50 and 80 percent of area median income; establishing the need for housing units affordable to these moderate income households at 16 percent of each jurisdiction's total housing supply.

2. **Low Income Housing Need.** Census Bureau estimates[1] indicate that approximately 12 percent of households in King County have incomes between 30 and 50 percent of area median income; establishing the need for housing units affordable to these low income households at 12 percent of each jurisdiction's total housing supply.

3. **Very-Low Income Housing Need.** Census Bureau estimates[1] indicate that approximately 12 percent of households in King County have incomes between 0 and 30 percent of area median income; establishing the need for housing units affordable to these very-low income households at 12 percent of each jurisdiction's total housing supply. This is where the greatest need exists, and should be a focus for all jurisdictions.

Housing Supply and Needs Analysis

Context: As set forth in policy H-3, each jurisdiction must include in its comprehensive plan an inventory of the existing housing stock and an analysis of both existing housing needs and housing needed to accommodate projected population growth over the planning period. This policy reinforces requirements of the Growth Management Act for local Housing Elements. The h ousing supply and needs analysis is referred to in this appendix as the housing analysis. As is noted in policy H-1, H-2, and H-3, the housing analysis must consider local as well as countywide housing needs because each jurisdiction has a responsibility to address a significant share of the countywide affordable housing need.

2013 CITY CLERK

The purpose of this section of Appendix 4 is to provide further guidance to local jurisdictions on the subjects to be addressed in their housing analysis. Additional guidance on carrying out the housing analysis is found in the Puget Sound Regional Council's report, "Puget Sound Regional Council Guide to Developing an Effective Housing Element," and the Washington Administrative Code, particularly 365-196-410 (2)(b) and (c). The state Department of Commerce also provides useful information about housing requirements under the Growth Management Act.

Housing Supply

Understanding the mix and affordability of existing housing is the first step toward identifying gaps in meeting future housing needs. Combined with the results of the needs analysis, these data can provide direction on appropriate goals and policies for both the housing and land use elements of a jurisdiction's comprehensive plan. A jurisdiction's housing supply inventory should address the following:

- Total housing stock in the community;
- Types of structures in which units are located (e.g., single-family detached, duplex or other small multiplex, townhome, condominium, apartment, mobile home, accessory dwelling unit, group home, assisted living facility);
- Unit types and sizes (i.e., numbers of bedrooms per unit);
- Housing tenure (rental vs. ownership housing);
- Amount of housing at different price and rent levels, including rent-restricted and subsidized housing;
- Housing condition (e.g. age, general condition of housing, areas of community with higher proportion of homes with deferred maintenance);
- Vacancy rates;
- Statistics on occupancy and overcrowding;
- Neighborhoods with unique housing conditions or amenities;
- Location of affordable housing within the community, including proximity to transit;
- Transportation costs as a component of overall cost burden for housing;
- Housing supply, including affordable housing, within designated Urban Centers and local centers;
- Capacity for additional housing, by type, under current plans and zoning; and
- Trends in redevelopment and reuse that have an impact on the supply of affordable housing.

Housing Needs

The housing needs part of the housing analysis should include demographic data related to existing population and demographic trends that could impact future housing demand (e.g. aging of population). The identified need for future housing should be consistent with the jurisdiction's population growth and housing targets. The information on housing need should be evaluated in combination with the housing supply part of the housing analysis in order to assess housing gaps, both current and future. This information can then inform goals, policies, and strategies in the comprehensive plan update.

CITY CLERK

A comprehensive housing needs analysis should address the following population, household, and community characteristics:

- Household sizes and types;
- Age distribution of population;
- Ethnic and racial diversity;
- Household income, including the following income groupings:
    - 30 percent of area median income or lower (very-low-income),
    - Above 30 percent to 50 percent of area median income (low-income)
    - Above 50 percent to 80 percent of area median income (moderate-income)
    - Above 80 percent to 100 percent of area median income (middle-income)
    - Above 100 percent to 120 percent of area median income (middle-income)
    - Above 120 percent of median income;
- Housing growth targets and countywide affordable housing need for very-low, low and moderate income households as stated in the Countywide Planning Policies;
- The number and proportion of households that are "cost-burdened." Such households pay more than thirty percent of household income toward housing costs. "Severely-cost-burdened" households pay more than fifty percent of household income toward housing costs.
- Trends that may substantially impact housing need during the planning period. For example, the impact that a projected increase in senior population would have on demand for specialized senior housing, including housing affordable to low- and moderate-income seniors and retrofitted single family homes to enable seniors to age in place.
- Housing demand related to job growth, with consideration of current and future jobs-housing balance as well as the affordable housing needs of the local and subregional workforce.
- Housing needs, including for low- and moderate-income households, within designated Urban Centers and local centers.

Note on Adjusting for Household Size

As currently calculated, the affordable housing targets do not incorporate differences in household size. However, the reality is that differently-sized households have different housing needs (i.e., unit size, number of bedrooms) with different cost levels. A more accurate approach to setting and monitoring housing objectives would make adjustments to reflect current and projected household sizes and also unit sizes in new development. Accounting for household size in providing affordable units could better inform local policies and programs as well as future updates of the Countywide Planning Policies and affordable housing targets.

Implementation Strategies

As stated in policy H-5, local jurisdictions need to employ a range of strategies for promoting housing supply and housing affordability. The Puget Sound Regional Council's Housing

2015 CITY CLERK

Innovations Program Housing Toolkit[1] presents a range of strategies. The strategies are identified as being generally applicable to single family development, multifamily development, ownership housing, rental housing, market rate projects, and subsidized projects. Strategies marked as a "Featured Tool" are recommended as being highly effective tools for promoting affordable and diverse housing in the development markets for which they are identified.

Measuring Results

Success at meeting a community's need for housing can only be determined by measuring results and evaluating changes to housing supply and need. Cities are encouraged to monitor basic information annually, as they may already do for permits and development activity. Annual tracking of new units, demolitions, redevelopment, zoning changes, and population growth will make periodic assessments easier and more efficient. A limited amount of annual monitoring will also aid in providing timely information to decision makers.

Policy H-18 requires jurisdictions to review their housing policies and strategies at least every five years to ensure periodic reviews that are more thorough and that provide an opportunity to adapt to changing conditions and new information. This five-year review could be aligned with a jurisdiction's five-year buildable lands reporting process.

[1] PSRC Housing Innovations Program Housing Toolkit http://psrc.org/growth/hip/

PDS CITY CLERK

APPENDIX 5: KING COUNTY SCHOOL SITING TASK FORCE REPORT

On March 31, 2012 the School Siting Task Force issued the following report and recommendations related to 18 undeveloped school sites in King County, and future school siting. Countywide Planning Policies DP-50, PF-12, PF-18 and PF-19 contain references to this report, and in particular the Site Specific Solutions table found on pages 15-19.

2015 CITY CLERK

DMS CITY CLERK

17486

March 31, 2012

Dow Constantine, King County Executive
King County Chinook Building
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Executive Constantine,

With this letter we transmit to you the final report and recommendations of the School Siting Task Force. The critical issues of quality education, efficient use of taxpayer dollars, equitability, preservation of rural character, and sustainable growth made consideration of undeveloped rural school sites and all other future school siting a complex and important undertaking.

Together, we have worked diligently since December to craft these recommendations. We represent diverse perspectives and through our discussions we have reached agreement on specific solutions and recommendations that we believe to be in the best interests of all King County residents, particularly our schoolchildren. We are pleased to present to you these recommendations informed by accepted data collected by our Technical Advisory Committee.

We would be happy to serve as a resource in any way we can as you consider these recommendations. We look forward to your review, and we stand ready to assist in their implementation.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve on the Task Force. We look forward to having these recommendations incorporated in future planning.

Sincerely,

King County School Siting Task Force members

(signatures on reverse)

CITY CLERK

17486

Table of Contents

SECTION 1: ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 1

SECTION 2: GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS 1

SECTION 3: OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION 4

- Overview 4
- GMPC Guidance for the Task Force 5

SECTION 4: THE TASK FORCE PROCESS 6

- Appointing the Task Force 6
- Hiring a Facilitator 6
- Structure and Roles of the Task Force 7
- Technical Advisory Committee 7
- Framing Work Group 7
- Meeting Structure and Process 7
- Decision Making: A Consensus Approach 8
- Public Process 9
- Information Considered by the Task Force 9
- Task Force Report 11

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATIONS 11

- Introduction 11
- Recommended Solutions for Undeveloped Rural Sites 11
- Recommendations for Future School Siting 20

SECTION 6: IMPLEMENTING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS 22

- Next Steps 22

APPENDICES (Attached)

- A. Task Force Membership ..... Attached
- B. Framing Work Group Membership ..... Attached
- C. Technical Advisory Committee Membership ..... Attached
- D. Map of 18 Undeveloped School Sites ..... Attached
- E. GMPC Motion 11-2 ..... Attached

APPENDICES (ON CD)

- F. Matrix of Technical Information on Undeveloped Sites ..... on attached CD
- G. Maps of Undeveloped Sites ..... on attached CD
- H. Demographic Information ..... on attached CD
- I. Enrollment Projections ..... on attached CD
- J. Public Health Aspects of School Siting ..... on attached CD
- K. Technical Advisory Committee Work (13 Tasks) ..... on attached CD
- L. State School Siting Guidelines ..... on attached CD
- M. Existing Policy and Regulatory Framework ..... on attached CD
- N. Excerpt from PSRC Issue Paper on Rural Areas ..... on attached CD
- O. Land Use Planning Overview ..... on attached CD
- P. Meeting Summaries ..... on attached CD
- Q. Operating Protocols ..... on attached CD
- R. Process Schematic ..... on attached CD

PIS CITY CLERK

S. TASK FORCE MEMBER INTERESTS ..... ON ATTACHED CD
T. INTERVIEW SUMMARY ..... ON ATTACHED CD
U. PUBLIC COMMENTS ..... ON ATTACHED CD

DMS CITY CLERK

SECTION 1: Acknowledgements

The School Siting Task Force thanks the King County Executive and the Growth Management Planning Council for the opportunity to provide input on an issue critical to supporting K-12 education and to preserving natural resources, public health, and quality of life in King County.

The Task Force would especially like to thank its members who agreed to serve on the Framing Work Group. This group met on multiple occasions throughout the process, generally twice between each Task Force meeting, to develop and frame issues and meeting approaches for the full Task Force. Without the considerable efforts of this group, the Task Force would not have been able to accomplish its work.

The Task Force also thanks the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), whose members worked throughout January, February, and March of 2012 to gather data and information on the undeveloped rural school sites and to compile additional information relevant to future school siting.

The Task Force also acknowledges the many members of the public who submitted comments and/or attended one or more Task Force or TAC meetings. Their contributions provided valuable insight for the Task Force's consideration.

Finally, the Task Force thanks Triangle Associates for their exemplary support throughout the process.

See Appendices A, B, and C for Task Force, Framing Work Group, and TAC membership.

SECTION 2: Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Comprehensive Plan

A generalized coordinated land use policy statement of the governing body of a county or city that is adopted pursuant to 36.70A RCW. *(Washington State Growth Management Act)*

Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs)

A written policy statement or statements used solely for establishing a countywide framework from which county and city comprehensive plans are developed and adopted pursuant to the Growth Management Act. *(Washington State Growth Management Act)*

Growth Management Act (GMA)

The GMA was enacted in 1990 in response to rapid population growth and concerns with suburban sprawl, environmental protection, quality of life, and related issues. The GMA requires the fastest growing counties and the cities within them to plan for growth. The GMA provides a framework for regional coordination; counties planning under the GMA are required to adopt county-wide planning policies to guide plan adoption within the county and to establish urban growth areas (UGAs). Local comprehensive plans must include the following elements: land use, housing, capital facilities, utilities,

DMS CITY CLERK

transportation, and, for counties, a rural element. (*Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington*)

Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC)

The GMPC, which was established by an Interlocal agreement, is a 15-member council of elected officials from Seattle, Bellevue, suburban cities and King County. The GMPC has been responsible for the preparation and recommendation of the Countywide Planning Policies to the Metropolitan King County Council, which then adopts the policies and sends them to the cities for ratification. *(King County Comprehensive Plan)*

Identified Need

Identified need exists if a school district has determined the type of school needed and a timeframe for development on one of the 18 undeveloped school sites. *(Source: School Siting Task Force)*

Multi-County Planning Policies

An official statement, adopted by two or more counties, used to provide guidance for regional decision-making, as well as a common framework for countywide planning policies and local comprehensive plans. *(Puget Sound Regional Council)*

Nonconformance

Any use, improvement or structure established in conformance with King County rules and regulations in effect at the time of establishment that no longer conforms to the range of uses permitted in the site's current zone or to the current development standards of the code, due to changes in the code or its application to the subject property. *(King County Code)*

Regional Growth Strategy

An approach for distributing population and employment growth within the four-county central Puget Sound region (King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish). *(Puget Sound Regional Council)*

Rural Area

Outside the urban growth area, rural lands contain a mix of low-density residential development, agriculture, forests, open space and natural areas, as well as recreation uses. Counties and adjacent small towns provide a limited number of public services to rural residents. *(Puget Sound Regional Council)*

Rural Character

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

a. In which open space, the natural landscape, and vegetation predominate over the built environment;
b. That foster traditional rural lifestyles, rural-based economies, and opportunities to both live and work in rural areas;

CITY CLERK

c. That provide visual landscapes that are traditionally found in rural areas and communities;
d. That are compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat;
e. That reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development;
f. That generally do not require the extension of urban governmental services; and
g. That are consistent with the protection of natural surface water flows and groundwater and surface water recharge and discharge areas
(*Washington State Growth Management Act*)

Rural Cities

A free-standing municipality that is physically separated from other cities and towns by designated rural lands. Also referred to as "Cities in the Rural Area." The incorporated rural cities are Black Diamond, Carnation, Duvall, Enumclaw, North Bend, Skykomish and Snoqualmie. *(Puget Sound Regional Council, King County Comprehensive Plan)*

Rural Towns

Rural towns are unincorporated areas governed directly by King County. They provide a focal point for community groups such as chambers of commerce or community councils to participate in public affairs. The purposes of rural town designations within the County's Comprehensive Plan are to recognize existing concentrations of higher density and economic activity in rural areas and to allow modest growth of residential and economic uses to keep them economically viable into the future. Rural towns in King County include Alpental, Fall City and Vashon. *(King County Comprehensive Plan)*

Rural Zoning

The rural zone is meant to provide an area-wide, long-term, rural character and to minimize land use conflicts with nearby agricultural, forest or mineral extraction production districts. These purposes are accomplished by: 1) limiting residential densities and permitted uses to those that are compatible with rural character and nearby resource production districts and are able to be adequately supported by rural service levels; 2) allowing small scale farming and forestry activities and tourism and recreation uses that can be supported by rural service levels and are compatible with rural character; and 3) increasing required setbacks to minimize conflicts with adjacent agriculture, forest or mineral zones. *(King County Comprehensive Plan)*

Tightline Sewer

A sewer trunk line designed and intended specifically to serve only a particular facility or place, and whose pipe diameter should be sized appropriately to ensure service only to that facility or place. It may occur outside the local service area for sewers, but does not amend the local service area. *(King County Comprehensive Plan)*

Unincorporated Area

Unincorporated areas are those areas outside any city and under King County's jurisdiction. *(King County Comprehensive Plan)*

DMS CITY CLERK

Urban Growth Area (UGA)

The area formally designated by a county, in consultation with its cities, to accommodate future development and growth. Given that cities are urban, each city is within a county-designated urban growth area. Cities may not annex lands outside an urban growth area, nor may they formally identify additions to the urban growth area independently of the county designation process. Development that is urban in character is to occur within the designated urban growth area, preferably in cities. Development outside the designated urban growth area is to be rural in character. *(Puget Sound Regional Council)*

VISION 2040

VISION 2040 is the growth management, environmental, economic, and transportation vision for the central Puget Sound region. It consists of an environmental framework, a regional growth strategy, policies to guide growth and development, actions to implement, and measures to track progress. *(Puget Sound Regional Council)*

SECTION 3: Overview and Background Information

Overview

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires counties and cities to work together to plan for growth. In King County, the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) is the countywide planning body through which the County and cities collaborate. The GMPC is comprised of elected officials from King County, Seattle, Bellevue, the Suburban Cities Association, and special purpose districts. The GMPC develops and recommends Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) to the King County Council where they are reviewed, adopted, and sent to the cities for final ratification. The CPPs were initially adopted in 1992; certain elements of the policies have been updated over the years.

In 2010 and 2011, the GMPC undertook the first comprehensive evaluation of the CPPs since their initial adoption. A full set of updated policies is required to bring the CPPs into compliance with the multicounty planning policies (VISION 2040) adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council in 2008. VISION 2040 is the regional growth strategy for the four-county region including King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish Counties.

On September 21, 2011 the GMPC completed its review and voted to recommend an updated set of CPPs to the King County Council. However, they could not reach consensus on policies governing the siting of public facilities and services. At issue was whether public schools serving primarily urban populations should be sited in rural areas, and whether such facilities should be served by sewers. The recent update of VISION 2040 included policies stating that schools and other community facilities serving primarily urban populations should be sited in the urban growth area, and that urban services (sewers) should not be provided in rural areas. In the interest of consistency, the GMPC was considering adding similar policies to the CPPs.

THIS CITY CLERK

While the GMA is clear that sewers are not permitted in rural areas (except in limited circumstances), the CPPs have since 1992 contained a policy that allows public schools to be served by sewer when a finding is made that no alternative technologies are feasible. King County implements this policy by authorizing a tightline sewer connection after the finding is made.

This potential change in policy was of concern to school districts, many of which owned or had an interest in undeveloped rural properties. While some had acquired their properties before the adoption of the GMA and CPPs, most had not. Those school districts purchasing land after 1992 did so under a regulatory framework that permitted schools in rural areas and that allowed a tightline sewer if needed. At the time, with rising land costs in urban areas and rapid growth, choosing less expensive rural sites seemed the most judicious use of limited taxpayer funds. Many school districts pointed out the difficulty of finding large parcels in urban areas, and the importance of siting schools so that they are convenient for all students, including those in rural areas. School districts leaders testified that they do not distinguish between the urban and rural portions of their service areas; their planning takes into account the needs of their districts as a whole.

The policy debate generated testimony from rural residents, many of whom expressed concerns about the impacts of siting schools in rural areas, including traffic congestion, environmental degradation, and loss of rural character. They pointed out that while initial land costs might be lower in rural areas, the total costs to society of siting schools in non-urban areas might be greater. In addition to the impacts of transporting large numbers of urban students to schools in rural areas, the cost of transportation investments needed to support new schools are borne only by unincorporated area residents. These community impacts and financial burdens are not shared equally by residents in incorporated areas.Mu ch of the testimony from rural residents questioned the fairness and sustainability of siting in rural areas infrastructure supporting primarily urban development.

In order to address these concerns, to acknowledge the changing environment and to support school districts in their obligation to provide quality education for the children of King County, the GMPC agreed to set aside the policies related to siting public facilities and postpone their consideration until a task force made up of school districts, cities, King County, rural residents, and other experts could study the issue and report back to the King County Executive.

GMPC Guidance for the Task Force

The GMPC established guidance for formation of the School Siting Task Force in their Motion 11-2 (Appendix E) on September 21, 2011.

The Task Force was given the Mission to:

> *Develop recommendations to better align city, county, and school districts' planning for future school facilities in order to provide quality education for all children and maximize health, environmental, programmatic, fiscal, and social objectives.*
> *-GMPC Motion 11-2, School Siting Task Force Work Plan, Task Force Mission*

RMS CITY CLERK

To fulfill this Mission, the GMPC recommended a specific scope of work. As described in GMPC Motion 11-2, the Task Force's primary task is "*to evaluate the current inventory of rural properties owned by King County school districts*" and to make recommendations as to their use or disposition. Collectively, the Task Force identified 18 undeveloped sites in rural areas. To further support the fulfillment of its Mission, it was anticipated that the Task Force might recommend legislative and other strategies.

The GMPC established a set of eight principles to guide the Task Force in its work. All of the solutions recommended by the Task Force in this Report reflect the Guiding Principles established by GMPC:

- *Academic Excellence*: Educational facilities should promote and support the academic achievement of students.
- *Equitable*: All children should have access to quality educational facilities.
- *Financially Sustainable*: School siting should be financially sustainable for each impacted jurisdiction (school districts, cities, county unincorporated areas, and sewer/water districts) and make the most efficient use of total tax dollars.
- *Support Sustainable Growth*: Planning for school facilities shall comply with state law and be integrated with other regional and local planning, including land use, transportation, environment, and public health.
- *Community Assets*: Schools should unite the communities in which they are located and be compatible with community character.
- *Based on existing data and evidence*: The Task Force process shall utilize recent demographic, buildable lands inventory, and other relevant data and information.
- *Public Engagement*: The Task Force process should include robust community engagement with impacted communities. Meetings will be transparent and open to the public for observation. The Task Force shall provide opportunities for public comment.
- *Best Practice and Innovation*: Lasting recommendations should serve the region well for years to come and support education, health, environmental, programmatic, fiscal, and social objectives.

SECTION 4: The Task Force Process

Appointing the Task Force

The GMPC designated categories of membership in Motion 11-2, but did not specify individual members. Task Force members were appointed by the King County Executive (see Appendix A).

Hiring a Facilitator

Public Health - Seattle King County hired Triangle Associates as the independent facilitator to help coordinate the work of the Task Force, including conducting initial assessment interviews of all Task Force members, organizing Task Force meetings, facilitating development of recommendations by the Task Force and providing support through drafting and production of the Task Force's Final Report and Recommendations.

2015 CITY CLERK

Structure and Roles of the Task Force

The Task Force established two workgroups to assist in the effort: the Technical Advisory Committee, (also recommended by the GMPC) and the Framing Work Group. Both are described below.

Technical Advisory Committee

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was comprised of representatives from King County, the Puget Sound Regional Council, school districts, water and sewer districts, and the Suburban Cities Association. A membership list is included in Appendix C. The TAC met throughout the beginning and middle stages of the Task Force process; its role was to provide data and information to support Task Force decision making. TAC meetings were open to the public and included dialogue with those who attended. Meeting summaries (Appendix P) were developed to provide a record of their work.

The primary work product of the TAC involved compiling a matrix containing information related to the 18 undeveloped school sites (Appendix F). In addition to populating the matrix with site-specific information, the TAC was asked to collect data and information in several other areas of inquiry, which collectively were referred to as the "13 Tasks". This included subject areas such as demographic trends and school enrollment projections. A complete list of the 13 tasks is included as Appendix F.

The TAC work and products enabled swift evaluation of, and development of solutions for, specific sites by the Task Force. The breadth and detail of the data compiled by the TAC, and that Committee's timely response to Task Force requests, played a critical role in the accomplishments of the Task Force.

Framing Work Group

Due to the short timeline for the Task Force to complete its work, the Task Force created a Framing Work Group (Appendix B) to frame issues for its consideration. Prior to each meeting of the full Task Force, the Framing Work Group met to review information gathered by the TAC and to discuss how best to organize information and issues for discussion. Doing so helped the Task Force have focused and substantive discussions and stay on task to meet their deadlines.

The Framing Work Group made recommendations on process to the Task Force; however, all decision-making power remained with the full Task Force. Framing Work Group members were appointed by the Task Force Chair from the general Task Force roster. The group met on average twice between each Task Force meeting, and meeting summaries (Appendix P) were included in the materials that the Task Force received.

Meeting Structure and Process

The Task Force met six times from December 2011 through March 2012, using the process schematic (Appendix R) as a visual guide for navigating its work effort:

2015 CITY CLERK

1. The first meeting, December 14, 2011, focused on introducing Task Force members, establishing a process for the work effort, and hearing Task Force member perspectives on hopes and desired outcomes from the process.

2. The second meeting, January 25, 2012, focused on learning information from the TAC and creating a set of interests (Appendix S) based on the Task Force's Guiding Principles as established in the GMPC Motion 11-2. The Task Force also agreed upon a set of Operating Protocols (Appendix Q).

3. On February 16, 2012, the Task Force held a 4-hour workshop to begin developing solutions for the 18 undeveloped rural school sites and for future school siting. The Technical Advisory Committee presented data on each of the 18 sites, and each school district was given the opportunity to present additional information on their sites. The Task Force reached consensus on an approach for evaluating sites that was developed by the Framing Work Group. This approach involved identifying the critical or "threshold" factors that would allow Task Force members to create four categories into which the 18 sites would eventually be sorted. The first step was to brainstorm potential solutions for each category.

4. On March 1, 2012, the Task Force met for the fourth time, also in a 4-hour workshop. Working in small groups, Task Force members accepted possible solutions for the four categories of sites. They then sorted the 18 sites into the four categories and also considered future school siting. The Task Force reached consensus agreement on several items, including:
    - The "Solutions Set and Criteria" document (Document 1 in the Recommendations section), with agreement that a few items needed additional definition, clarification, and confirmation at its next meeting
    - The placement of all school sites in appropriate quadrants of the solutions table

5. On March 15, 2012, the Task Force accepted by 100% consensus:
    - A final version of the "Solutions Set and Criteria" document
    - Recommended and prioritized solutions for 12 specific sites
    - The following technical documents: Matrix of school sites, list of 13 tasks, population and demographic information, enrollment trends by school district, public health aspects of school siting.
    - Recommendations to the Growth Management Planning Council and Washington State legislature related to school siting

6. On March 29, 2012, the Task Force accepted the Recommendations Report to be submitted to the King County Executive.

Decision Making: A Consensus Approach

At the second Task Force meeting, the Task Force members accepted the Operating Protocols (Appendix Q). This document established roles for all non-Task Force members involved in the process, clarified communications protocols and workgroup composition, and defined a specific decision-making approach.

CITY CLERK

The Task Force defined consensus as obtaining the full acceptance of all members; short of that, decisions and recommendations would move forward with the approval of at least 70% of the Task Force members present, with at least one member from each primary interest group (county, cities, school districts, and residents) voting in favor to accept a document or decision.

Public Process

The GMPC Motion stated that the Task Force process should include robust public engagement. All Task Force meetings and TAC meetings were open to the public. All written materials (agendas, meeting summaries, and other information) were made available on the Task Force website, and public comments were accepted throughout the process at Task Force meetings, through the Task Force website and via email. Comments from the public were summarized by the facilitator at the beginning of every Task Force meeting, and the compiled comments were emailed to Task Force members after each meeting (see Appendix U).

Information Considered by the Task Force

As Task Force members studied the issues associated with siting schools in rural areas, they considered a range of data and information. The majority of this information was provided by the TAC. It included the following documents, reports and policy frameworks, many of which are included in the appendices to this Report.

- **18 undeveloped rural school sites**. The TAC prepared a matrix containing factual information related to each of the 18 sites including: general site information (e.g., zoning, acreage, assessed value), land use and transportation considerations (e.g., landscape position, distance to UGA, distance to sewer/water connection, environmental features), and the school districts' plans (e.g., intended use, development timeline). School districts were given the opportunity to correct and/or augment the information about their school sites.

- **Planning context.** King County staff provided the Task Force with a brief history of the land use planning in two areas where many of the undeveloped sites are located: the Bear-Evans Corridor and the Soos Creek Basin. The county's land use strategy in both areas employed zoning and development regulations on an area-wide basis so the cumulative impact of development would not cause environmental degradation. A summary of this history is included as Appendix O.

- **GMA policy framework.**T here is a strong policy basis in Washington State for focusing growth in urban areas, protecting rural areas and the environment, and the efficient provision of government services and facilities. The growth management framework considered by the Task Force included GMA, VISION 2040, the Countywide Planning Policies, King County Comprehensive Plan and King County Code. Relevant portions of these documents can be found in Appendix M.

- **Demographic information.** The Task Force was presented with information from the 2010 census that identified population trends in the urban and rural portions of each school district, and

DIS CITY CLERK

also district-wide. Significant demographic shifts have occurred in the past decade: from 2000 to 2010, the overall rural population in King County declined by 1%, and the rural population under the age of 18 declined by 18.4%. During the same time, the urban population saw an overall increase of 12.1% and under-18 increase of 8.3%. This information can be found in Appendix H.

- **School district enrollment projections.** The Task Force was presented with information related to current and projected school enrollment, which illustrates that district populations will continue to grow to varying degrees and that urban students will continue to comprise the majority of those populations. The anticipated enrollment for students from rural areas generally failed to materialize in the vicinities of the sites owned by school districts. The enrollment projections can be found in Appendix I.

- **Funding for school construction**. Although there was no formal presentation on this topic, it came up on several occasions and was an important consideration for the Task Force. The State of Washington does not provide funding to school districts for acquisition of properties; school districts must rely on their own funding sources (through bonds, levies, grants, and donations). Once properties are acquired, school districts can apply for state assistance for school construction as part of a state match program.

- **Current criteria and process for school siting**. Using both state regulations and locally adopted standards, school districts consider many factors when locating a site to develop a public school facility. Following guidance set forth by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Washington Administrative Code (392-342-020 WAC), districts look at site quality, cost, projected enrollment, distance to students/ transportation, and timing of school construction. The WAC guidelines can be found in Appendix L.

- **Funding for county road maintenance**. The TAC determined that the cost for upgrading, operating and maintaining county roads to serve future schools on the 18 undeveloped sites could range from $30-35 million over 20 years. This is important to consider because the County road fund has become severely strained, and because that cost would be borne solely by unincorporated area residents through the county road levy. In addition to cost of road infrastructure and tax equity issue, there are climate impacts associated with transporting large numbers of students to schools in rural areas, in the form of increased greenhouse gas emissions.

- **Public health aspects of school siting.** One member of the TAC and one member of the Task Force presented information on the public health aspects of school siting. In recent years, best practices in school siting have evolved to reflect a more community-centered approach, placing schools in urban areas where children can walk to school and where school facilities can serve as community assets. The major themes identified in this research (included in Appendix J) include:

    a. School siting determines the proximity of schools to a student's home and larger community and can affect whether children achieve and maintain good health,
    b. Physical activity is key to children's health,
    c. School travel impacts children's health in multiple ways, and

PAS CITY CLERK

d. Education policy is also health policy.

Task Force Report

This Report was drafted by the independent facilitation team. The Framing Work Group refined the initial draft document, which the Task Force considered at the March 15th meeting. Between the March 15th and March 29th meetings, the Framing Work Group, project team, and facilitation team refined iterations of the Report, with a final draft presented to the Task Force at its last meeting on March 29, 2012. The Task Force accepted the document, with revisions, at that meeting. The facilitation team made final revisions based on Task Force input before submitting this Report to the King County Executive.

SECTION 5: Recommendations

Introduction

The GMPC and King County Executive requested that the Task Force recommend solutions for the 18 undeveloped rural sites and guidelines for future school siting. The Task Force analyzed data and information to create and prioritize specific solutions for each of the sites and to develop recommendations for future sites. These are encapsulated below in *Recommended Solutions for Undeveloped Sites* and *Recommendations for Future School Siting*, respectively. Throughout the process, Task Force members identified other recommendations in support of its Mission; the other recommendations are listed under *Recommendations for Future School Siting.*

Recommended Solutions for Undeveloped Rural Sites

The Task Force focused the major part of its effort on the 18 undeveloped sites, seeking logical and sustainable solutions. Once the Task Force process was underway, the Task Force surveyed all the school districts to ensure the Task Force's scope included the universe of undeveloped rural property with a school district interest. No other undeveloped rural sites were identified by the school districts.

The Task Force, with guidance from the Framing Work Group, decided to use a "threshold" approach for determining solutions for each of the 18 undeveloped sites. This threshold approach identified two specific criteria; a site must possess one or the other in order to be considered for development. After some refinement, the Task Force accepted the following criteria for decision making:

1) **Does the school district have an identified need for a school site?** *(Identified need exists if a district has identified a type of school and a time frame in which the school is needed.)*

2) **Does the site border the Urban Growth Area (UGA) or have an existing sewer connection?** *(Bordering the UGA means the site is directly contiguous to the UGA. An existing sewer connection means sewer line is on site. This does not include sites with sewer on an adjacent parcel or across the street.)*

2015 CITY CLERK

Based on these criteria, the Task Force accepted the threshold approach for sorting the 18 sites and created the *Solutions Table*, which separated the school sites into four quadrants:

- **Box A**, in the upper left corner, includes sites that border the UGA and/or have an existing sewer connection and for which school districts have an identified need.
- **Box B**, in the upper right corner, includes sites that do not border the UGA and have no sewer connection and for which school districts have an identified need.
- **Box C**, in the lower left corner, includes sites for which school districts do not have an identified need and that border the UGA and/or have an existing sewer connection on site.
- **Box D**, in the lower right corner, includes sites for which school districts do not have an identified need and that do not border the UGA and have no existing sewer connection on site.

Any and all other undeveloped rural school sites (those not among the 18 recognized sites) fall into "future school siting" in Box E of the Solutions Table. Future school siting issues are addressed in greater detail in the section entitled *Recommendations for Future School Siting.*

The Task Force then developed possible solutions for each box and ranked these possible solutions in order of preference, recognizing that circumstances for specific sites within each category might merit a different order.

The recommended Solutions Set and Criteria are shown here as Document 1.

BMS CITY CLERK

Document 1—Solutions Set and Criteria

Existing Undeveloped School Sites in the Rural Area

Assumptions for Solution Set:

- For any solution that would result in a school district not being permitted to use a site for a school, the Task Force recommends options through which the school district could receive fair and appropriate value.
- All solutions resulting in site development should mitigate impacts and provide community benefits.
- Any solutions that involve a change in the UGA or allow/prohibit sewer service shall be governed by the laws, policies, and/or administrative procedure(s) in place at the time.
- Additional solutions may apply; detailed analysis may be required to determine optimal solution for any site.
- All sites, site conditions, and identified needs are included in the Matrix. School districts were asked to bring forward any additional sites and no other sites emerged so the full and final list of specific sites is shown in Documents 2-3.

NOTE: Solution Sets in each box is listed in priority order.

	Site borders UGA or has sewer connection. *"Sewer connection" defined as having sewer on site already (not adjacent).*	**Site does not border UGA and has no sewer connection.**
School district has an identified need for a school site. *"Identified need" exists if district has identified a type of school and a time frame in which they need the school.*	*A* 1. Find an alternative site in the UGA 2. Allow school district to connect to existing sewer 3. Incorporate site into adjacent UGA *Prohibit: Extending additional sewer outside UGA*	*B* 1. Find an alternative site in the UGA 2. Find an alternative site bordering UGA (*if this occurs,* see *Box A for possible solutions*) 3. Sell, or hold with the understanding that any future development must be consistent with Vision 2040 as implemented by King County Code *Prohibit: Moving UGA; tight-line sewer*
School district does not have an identified need for a school site.	*C* 1. Find an alternative site in the UGA 2. If the site is of value to the county, cities or community, facilitate the purchase, sale, or land swap of property 3. Sell, or hold with the understanding that any future development must be consistent with Vision 2040 as implemented by King County Code *Prohibit: Moving UGA; new sewer connections*	*D* 1. If the site is of value to the county, cities or community, facilitate the purchase, sale, or land swap of property 2. Find an alternative site in the UGA 3. Sell, or hold with the understanding that any future development must be consistent with Vision 2040 as implemented by King County Code *Prohibit: Moving UGA; tight-line sewer*

All Other Undeveloped School Sites (Future)

Future School Siting	*E* All future school siting should be consistent with Vision 2040.

DAS CITY CLERK

Once the Task Force accepted these criteria and categories plus the prioritized solution sets for each quadrant, members considered each undeveloped school site.A t the March 1st meeting, the Task Force reached consensus agreement for the placement of each site in accordance with the accepted criteria.

The accepted placement of each rural school site is shown below as Document 2.

Document 2—Site Categorization

Task Force breakout groups identified the sites in each category. The full Task Force reached 100% Consensus on March 1, 2012 on the following site categorization:

Existing Undeveloped Sites in the Rural Area (18 sites)

	Site borders UGA or has sewer connection.	**Site does not border UGA and has no sewer connection.**
School district has an identified need for a school site	*A* Sites: Enumclaw A, D Lake Washington 2, 4 Snoqualmie Valley 1 Tahoma 1	*B* Sites: Enumclaw B Issaquah 1
School district does not have an identified need for a school site	*C* Sites: Kent 4	*D* Sites: Auburn 1, 2, 3 Kent 1, 2, 3 Lake Washington 1, 3 Northshore 1

All Other Undeveloped School Sites (Future)

Future School Siting	*E* All future school siting should be consistent with Vision 2040.

Once the Task Force accepted the threshold criteria and site categories, developed the basic solution sets for each quadrant, and placed the school sites in categories based on the threshold criteria, members brainstormed possible solutions for each site. Task Force members developed a preferred solution for each site, with a prioritized list of additional solutions. Where appropriate, they included notes, considerations, and rationale to support each site's recommended solution(s).

The Task Force recognized that VISION 2040, the CPPs, the King County Comprehensive Plan, and the King County Code will ultimately govern what happens on both current undeveloped school sites and on any other future school sites in rural areas. In addition, school districts will control the timing and specific actions within that framework. The involvement of cities is needed to facilitate siting within urban areas.

Document 3 below shows the recommended solution(s) for each school site, along with site-specific considerations.

DMS CITY CLERK

Document 3—Site-Specific Solutions

Box A

	SITE BORDERS UGA or HAS SEWER CONNECTION
School district has an identified need for a school site.	**<u>Overview:</u>** In general, while the Task Force's preference is to find alternative sites in the UGA, the Task Force finds that for the sites in Box A the particular site conditions and circumstances facing the impacted school districts may warrant other solutions. Thus the recommended solutions vary by site. For any recommendations that allow for development on a site, the Task Force recommends that the district work with the county and community to minimize impacts on the rural surroundings and rural residents. Because of the identified need by the school districts, the Task Force recommends that these sites receive prioritized attention from city, county and school district decision makers. **<u>Sites and their Solutions</u>:** **Snoqualmie Valley 1** 1. Allow school district to connect to existing sewer *Site specific: The high percentage of floodplain land in this school district makes finding an alternate site very challenging. The site does not have significant conservation value. The site has an existing school, which was developed with the intent that another school would be built on the site. The district has undertaken site preparation for the addition of an elementary school on the site. The school district invested in the Local Improvement District that enabled the sewer to reach the site.* **Tahoma 1** 1. Find alternative site in the UGA 2. Allow school district to connect to existing sewer *Site specific: The Task Force encourages the district to work with the county and cities in the district to explore opportunities for finding an alternative site in the UGA that would meet the pressing need for additional capacity that development of another school would provide. If no viable alternative site that fits within the district's financial plans can be expeditiously found, the availability of sewer and an existing school on the site present compelling reasons for development of the site to meet the district's needs. The site does have conservation value and the Task Force recommends that any new development on the site occur adjacent to the existing school so that impacts to the site's forest cover are minimized.* **Lake Washington 2** 1. Find alternative site in the UGA 2. Incorporate site into adjacent UGA *Site specific: The site borders the Redmond watershed and has conservation value. The Task Force therefore encourages the school district, the county and the City of Redmond to find an alternative site within the UGA that would meet the district's need for additional capacity that development of another school would provide. The parties should identify other partners and funding mechanisms that would allow for purchase of the property (perhaps in conjunction with the Lake Washington 1 site) for permanent conservation as well as provide resources to the district for purchase of an alternative site. If no viable alternative site can be expeditiously identified, the Task Force recommends that the school district develop the site in a manner that preserves as much of the conservation value of the site as*

DMS CITY CLERK

possible. This may be accomplished through, for example, incorporation of a small developable portion of the site (about five acres) into the UGA for a small environmental school while placing the remainder of the site into permanent conservation. The district should also work closely with the county and community to minimize other impacts, such as transportation. The Task Force does not recommend extension of sewer to any portion of that site that remains outside of the UGA. If the site is proposed for incorporation into the UGA, it shall go through the King County docket process.*

**Environmental School will have sustainable or "green" buildings and grounds (refer to State RCW 39.35D, "High Performance Public Buildings – Guidelines for School Districts").*

Lake Washington 4

1. Allow school district to connect to existing sewer

Site specific: The Task Force recognizes the school district's need for additional capacity in the eastern portion of the district, which straddles the City of Redmond, the rural area, and an unincorporated urban "island" surrounded by rural area. The site is part of a large parcel on which there is an existing elementary and middle school, both already connected to sewer. The undeveloped portion of the site was previously used as a mink farm and portions of the site are cleared. The Task Force recommends that the district work closely with King County and the community to minimize both existing and additional impacts on the area surrounding the parcel, particularly the transportation impacts related to several facilities being located or developed on the site.

Enumclaw A & D:

1a. Find alternative site/s in the UGA

1b. Place all school buildings and impervious surfaces on the *urban* side of the UGB and place ballfields/playfields on the *rural* side of the UGB.

Site specific (1a): This joint site lies on the south-eastern boundary of the Black Diamond UGA and a master-planned development (MPD) that has yet to be constructed. The identified need of the school district is associated primarily with the population projections of the MPD and with students residing outside of the MPD but in the northern part of the district; the sites are planned for an elementary and a middle school. The fee title to both sites is held by the developer, with the district's property interest recorded as an encumbrance on title, and would only be conveyed to the school district if the MPD materializes. The Task Force recommends that no sewer be extended to the rural portion of the site and that the City of Black Diamond and county work with the developer and the school district to site all schools associated with the MPD completely within the UGA. The Black Diamond City Council supported this solution in a resolution passed 3-1-12. The Black Diamond City Council previously approved the Comprehensive School Mitigation Agreement identifying Enumclaw Sites A, B, and D as agreed-upon school sites.

Site specific (1b): The Enumclaw School District and the developer have identified as an alternative to 1a the placement of a portion of the proposed school-related facilities on rural lands. If attempts to site each of these schools fully within the UGA are unsuccessful, alternative 1b may be contemplated. Alternative 1b consists of siting all school buildings, storm water detention and other support facilities, and all parking and impervious surfaces within the UGA and limiting any development in the adjacent rural area to ballfields/playfields. The Task Force further recommends maintaining significant forest buffers between the ballfields/playfields and adjacent rural lands including the Black Diamond Natural Area. Recommendation of this urban/rural alternative by the Task Force is meant to address the unique circumstances of the Enumclaw A & D sites and is not to be construed as a precedent for locating schools on adjacent rural lands. Consequently, it is not recommended for any other sites.

BHS CITY CLERK

Box B

	SITE DOES NOT BORDER UGA and HAS NO SEWER CONNECTION
School district has an identified need for a school site.	**<u>Overview:</u>** The Task Force recommends that alternative sites in the UGA be found for all sites in this box and that sewer not be extended to these sites. Because of the identified need by the school districts and the recommendation to find alternative sites, the Task Force recommends that these sites receive prioritized attention by school district, county and city decision makers. **<u>Sites and their Solutions</u>:** **Issaquah 1** 1. Find alternative site in the UGA *Site specific: The site is a large parcel (80 acres) on May Valley Road between Squak Mountain to the north and Cedar Hills Landfill to the south. The site has conservation value. The Task Force recommends that the school district work expeditiously with King County, the City of Issaquah and the City of Renton. These partners shall work diligently to find an alternative site within the UGA that would meet the school district's need for additional capacity that development of another school would provide. The county, cities and school district should identify other partners and funding mechanisms that may allow for purchase of the property for permanent conservation or other rural-related uses while also providing resources to the district for purchase of an alternative site.* **Enumclaw B:** 1. Find alternative site in the UGA *Site specific: The site is in the rural area west of the Black Diamond UGA and a master-planned development (MPD) that has been approved but is yet to be constructed. The identified need of the school district is associated with the population projections of the MPD; the site is planned for a middle school. The fee title for the site is held by the developer, with the district's property interest recorded as an encumbrance on title, and would only be conveyed to the school district if the MPD materializes. The Task Force recommends that no sewer be extended to the site and that the City of Black Diamond and the county work with the developer and the school district to site schools associated with the MPD in the UGA.*

2005 CITY CLERK

Box C

	SITE BORDERS UGA or HAS SEWER CONNECTION
School district does not have an identified need for a school site.	**Overview:** Because the site in this box is not associated with an identified need, the Task Force recommends that the school district plan to develop the site consistent with Vision 2040 or manage the site as part of its capital portfolio. **Site and its solution:** **Kent 4** 1. Sell, or hold with the understanding that any future development must be consistent with Vision 2040 as implemented by King County code.

BDS CITY CLERK

Box D

	SITE DOES NOT BORDER UGA and HAS NO SEWER CONNECTION
School district does not have an identified need for a school site.	**<u>Overview:</u>** Because sites in this box are not associated with an identified need, the Task Force recommends that school districts plan to develop the sites consistent with Vision 2040 or manage the sites as part of their capital portfolio. The Task Force also recommends that while the school districts will ultimately determine how sites are handled, the county, cities, and other interested parties should investigate whether sites may be suitable for permanent conservation or other public purposes; if so, these entities should work to facilitate the acquisition of the properties for the identified public purposes. **<u>Solutions for sites with conservation value:</u>** 1. If the site is of value to the county, cities or community, facilitate the purchase, sale, or land swap of property The Task Force recommends that the county, cities and school districts investigate whether the properties may be appropriate for permanent conservation or acquisition for other public purposes. • **Auburn 1**: *The site has value for flood hazard reduction.* • **Kent 3**: *The site has forestland of value for environmental, social, and potentially economic benefits.* • **Lake Washington 1**: *The site has value for flood hazard reduction and regionally significant aquatic or terrestrial natural resources. Facilitating the sale of the property into conservation may assist with solutions for other Lake Washington sites in Box A.* • **Northshore 1**: *The site has forestland of value for environmental, social, and potentially economic benefits.* **<u>Solutions for sites without identified conservation value:</u>** **Auburn 3, Kent 1, and Lake Washington 3** 1. Sell, or hold understanding that any future development must be consistent with Vision 2040. *The Task Force recommends that school districts plan to develop the sites consistent with Vision 2040 or manage the sites as part of their capital portfolio.* **<u>Solution for Auburn 2:</u>** **Auburn 2**: *The site has an existing elementary school, but no sewer extension. The school district plans to redevelop the existing elementary school or build a middle school to replace the elementary school. No time frame has been specified. The Task Force recommends that the school district be allowed to redevelop, if no sewer connection is needed and as allowed by development regulations in place at the time of development.*

BHS CITY CLERK

Note: In developing the above recommendations for schools sites, Task Force members reached out to all school districts whose service area includes rural land, even those districts not represented on the Task Force. To make sure the solutions recommended by the Task Force would encompass all known sites and create lasting solutions, school districts were asked if they owned or had interest in any rural sites not already under consideration in this process. School district representatives stated there were no additional rural sites needing to be addressed at this time. Therefore, no other sites are included and all future school siting should be guided by the recommendations below.

Recommendations for Future School Siting

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) comprehensively updated VISION 2040 in 2008. In preparation for the update, the PSRC developed an issue paper regarding Rural Areas that included a discussion on Special Purpose Districts and Institutional Uses (Appendix N). The issue paper noted that special purpose district planning is disconnected from GMA, and that many facilities (including schools) had expanded into rural areas, taking advantage of relatively low land values and large tracts of land.T he issue paper recommended that policies be established that provide regional guidance on siting special purpose districts within rural areas. Thus, the following policies were established and incorporated into VISION 2040:

> **MPP-PS-4** Do not provide urban services in rural areas. Design services for limited access when they are needed to solve isolated health and sanitation problems, so as not to increase the development potential of the surrounding rural area.
>
> **MPP-PS-5** Encourage the design of public facilities and utilities in rural areas to be at a size and scale appropriate to rural locations, so as not to increase development pressure.
>
> **MPP-PS-21** Site schools, institutions, and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plan.
>
> **MPP-PS-22** Locate schools, institutions, and other community facilities serving rural residents in neighboring cities and towns and design those facilities in keeping with the size and scale of the local community.

Also in 2008, VISION 2040 incorporated new policies integrating public health considerations into land use and transportation planning, and addressing climate change through the regional growth strategy (reducing greenhouse gas emissions by focusing growth in urban centers).

Consistent with all of the above, VISION 2040 now encourages the siting of public facilities in urban areas, and states that *"Schools should be encouraged to become the cornerstone of their communities by locating in more urban settings and designing facilities to better integrate with their urban neighborhoods."*

PDS CITY CLERK

Given the adopted policies in VISION 2040 and after consideration of the wide range of technical information presented, the Task Force recommends that all future school siting be consistent with VISION 2040.

Box E

The Task Force recommends that all future school siting be consistent with VISION 2040.

In support of this recommendation, the Task Force further recommends:

1. The Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) should develop policies and adopt a work program that commits jurisdictions to working together to identify future school sites within the UGA. These policies shall direct jurisdictions to use zoning and other land use tools to ensure a sufficient supply of land for siting schools.
2. King County should work with the school districts, community representatives, and other stakeholders to address any future redevelopment of existing schools on rural sites to accommodate school districts' needs while protecting rural character.
3. The Growth Management Planning Council should add a school district representative to its membership.
4. The Puget Sound Regional Council should collaborate with counties and cities in working with school districts to ensure coordination in regional (4-county) growth management discussions (per VISION 2040 PS-Action-6).
5. The Washington State Legislature and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction should examine, together with the State Department of Commerce, how state laws, guidelines, policies and administrative procedures can influence school siting decisions, including:
    a. Reconsideration of existing transportation policies and funding that incentivize busing and siting schools away from population centers
    b. Identifying new funding for school land acquisition, including incentives for purchases, land swaps, and other avenues for obtaining land inside the UGA
    c. Revising existing guidelines for school siting such that districts who build on small sites in urban areas are eligible for state match funds
    d. Increasing the compensation to school districts for the construction costs of schools sited within the UGA

Note: The Task Force did not specifically consider redevelopment of existing schools on sites in the rural area. Redevelopment issues were not included in the Task Force scope of work. Information emerged late in the Task Force process regarding redevelopment and will be passed on to appropriate officials for consideration at a future date. Redevelopment is addressed in #2 in Box E.

THIS CITY CLERK

Communicating Task Force Findings to Stakeholders

To help communicate its findings, Task Force members are available to speak with interested parties (school boards, city councils, etc.) to discuss its work, its process, and its recommendations.

SECTION 6: IMPLEMENTING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Implementation of these recommendations will require additional work by and ongoing coordination between King County, the cities, school districts, and other stakeholders. For this reason, the Task Force has recommended including school districts in regional planning bodies.

Recognizing that the Task Force's recommendations will require school districts to reconsider their real estate portfolios and/or financial plans, one of the first implementation items should be to explore the recommended solutions for specific sites, including:

- Finding alternative sites in the UGA
- Exploring land swaps for undeveloped sites
- Exploring acquisition of undeveloped rural sites for public purposes, including conservation, recreation, or other rural-based uses

The Task Force suggests that this work commence immediately, and defers to the King County Executive on identifying the appropriate forum(s).

Next Steps

The following are the next formal steps in the development of new policies to support the Task Force's recommendations:

1. The King County Executive will review this Task Force Report and propose new Countywide Planning Policies for Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) consideration
2. The GMPC will review the Executive's proposal, and recommend new Countywide Planning Policies to the King County Council for their consideration
3. The King County Council will review the GMPC's recommendation, adopt new Countywide Planning Policies, and send them to the cities for ratification
4. The King County Council will adopt new Comprehensive Plan policies and development regulations that are consistent with the new Countywide Planning Policies

2015 CITY CLERK

Appendices (Attached)

A. Task Force Membership

B. Framing Work Group Membership

C. Technical Advisory Committee Membership

D. Map of 18 Undeveloped School Sites

E. GMPC Motion 11-2

Appendices (on CD)

F. Matrix of Technical Information on Undeveloped Sites

G. Maps of Undeveloped Sites

H. Demographic Information

I. Enrollment Projections

J. Public Health Aspects of School Siting

K. Technical Advisory Committee Work (13 Tasks)

L. State School Siting Guidelines

M. Existing Policy and Regulatory Framework

N. Excerpt from PSRC Issue Paper on Rural Areas

O. Land Use Planning Overview

P. Meeting Summaries

Q. Operating Protocols

R. Process Schematic

S. Task Force Member Interests

T. Interview Summary

U. Public Comments

BHS CITY CLERK

GLOSSARY

Affordable Housing: Housing that is affordable at 30 percent or less of a household's monthly income. This is a general term that may include housing affordable to a wide range of income levels.

Agricultural Production District: A requirement of the Growth Management Act for cities and counties to designate, where appropriate, agricultural lands that are not characterized by urban growth, have soils suitable for agriculture, and that have long-term significance for commercial farming. The King County Comprehensive Plan designates Agricultural Production Districts where the principal land use should be agriculture.

Area Median Income: The annual household income for the Seattle-Bellevue, WA Metro Area as published on approximately an annual basis by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Buildable Lands Program: A requirement of the Growth Management Act for certain counties in western Washington to report on a regular basis the amount of residential and commercial development that has occurred, the densities of that development, and an estimate of each jurisdiction's ability to accommodate its growth target based on the amount of development that existing zoning would allow.

Climate Change: The variation in the earth's global climate over time. It describes changes in the variability or average state of the atmosphere. Climate change may result from natural factors or processes (such as change in ocean circulation) or from human activities that change the atmosphere's composition (such as burning fossil fuels or deforestation.)

Climate Change Adaptation refers to actions taken to adapt to unavoidable impacts as a result of climate change.

Climate Change Mitigation refers to actions taken to reduce the future effects of climate change.

Comprehensive Plan: A plan prepared by a local government following the requirements of the Washington Growth Management Act, containing policies to guide local actions regarding land use, transportation, housing, utilities, capital facilities, and economic development in ways that will accommodate at least the adopted 20-year targets for housing and employment growth.

Environmental Justice: The fair distribution of costs and benefits, based on a consideration for social equity. Environmental justice is concerned with the right of all people to enjoy a safe,

BHS CITY CLERK

clean, and healthy environment, and with fairness across income, ethnic, and racial groups in the siting and operation of infrastructure, facilities, or other large land uses.

Forest Production District. A requirement of the Growth Management Act for cities and counties to designate, where appropriate, forest lands that are not characterized by urban growth and that have long-term significance for the commercial production of timber. The King County Comprehensive Plan designates Forest Production Districts where the primary use should be commercial forestry.

Growth Management Act: State law (RCW 36.70A) that requires local governments to prepare comprehensive plans (including land use, transportation, housing, capital facilities and utilities) to accommodate 20 years of expected growth. Other provisions of the Growth Management Act require developing and adopting countywide planning policies to guide local comprehensive planning in a coordinated and consistent manner.

Greenhouse Gas: Components of the atmosphere that contribute to global warming, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases. Human activities have added to the levels of most of these naturally occurring gases.

Healthy Housing: Housing that protects all residents from exposure to harmful substances and environments, reduces the risk of injury, provides opportunities for safe and convenient daily physical activity, and assures access to healthy food and social connectivity.

High-capacity Transit: Various types of transit systems, such as light rail and bus rapid transit, operating on fixed guideway or dedicated right-of-way designed to carry a large number of riders at higher speeds.

Industry Clusters: Specific economic segments that are the focus of the Regional Economic Strategy. As of June 2011, the identified regional industry clusters included: aerospace, clean technology, information technology, life sciences, logistics and international trade, military, and tourism.

King County Open Space System: A regional system of *county-owned* parks, trails, natural areas, working agricultural and forest resource lands, and flood hazard management lands.

Low-Income Households: Households earning between 31 percent and 50 percent of the Area Median Income for their household size.

Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers: Designated locations within King County cities meeting criteria detailed in policies DP 35-37.

Mixed-Use Development: A building or buildings constructed as a single project which contains more than one use, typically including housing plus retail and/or office uses.

DIS CITY CLERK

Moderate-Income Households: Households earning between 51 percent and 80 percent of the Area Median Income for their household size.

Potential Annexation Area: A portion of the unincorporated urban area in King County that a city has identified it will annex at some future date. See Appendix 2: Interim Potential Annexation Areas Map.

Purchase of Development Rights: Programs that buy and then extinguish development rights on a property to restrict development and limit uses exclusively for open space or resource-based activities such as farming and forestry. Covenants run with the land in perpetuity so that the property is protected from development regardless of ownership.

Regional Growth Strategy: The strategy defined in VISION 2040 that was developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council to help guide growth in the four-county region that includes King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish counties. VISION 2040 directs most of the region's forecasted growth into designated Urban Areas, and concentrates growth within those areas in designated centers planned for a mixes of uses and connection by high-capacity transit

Resource Lands: Designated areas within King County that have long-term significance for agricultural, forestry, or mining. See Appendix 1: Land Use Map.

Rural Area: Designated area outside the Urban Growth Area that is characterized by small-scale farming and forestry and low-density residential development. See Appendix 1: Land Use Map.

Rural Cities: Cities that are surrounded by Rural Area or Resource Lands. Rural Cities are part of the Urban Growth Area.

Stormwater Management: An infrastructure system that collects runoff from storms and redirects it from streets and other surfaces into facilities that store and release it – usually back into natural waterways.

Sustainable Development: Methods of accommodating new population and employment that protect the natural environment while preserving the ability to accommodate future generations.

Transfer of Development Rights: Ability to transfer allowable density, in the form of permitted building lots or structures, from one property (the "sending site") to another (the "receiving site") in conjunction with conservation of all or part of the sending site as open space or working farm or forest.

Transportation 2040: A 30-year action plan for transportation investments in the central Puget Sound region intended to support implementation of VISION 2040.

DMS CITY CLERK

Transportation Demand Management: Various strategies and policies (e.g. incentives, regulations) designed to reduce or redistribute travel by single-occupancy vehicles in order to make more efficient use of existing facility capacity.

Transportation System: A comprehensive, integrated network of travel modes (e.g. airplanes, automobiles, bicycles, buses, feet, ferries, freighters, trains, trucks) and infrastructure (e.g. sidewalks, trails, streets, arterials, highways, waterways, railways, airports) for the movement of people and goods on a local, regional, national and global scale.

Universal Design: A system of design that helps ensure that buildings and public spaces are accessible to people with or without disabilities.

Urban Centers: Designated locations within King County cities meeting criteria detailed in Development Pattern chapter policies 31-32.

Urban Growth Area: The designated portion of King County that encompasses all of the cities as well as other urban land where the large majority of the county's future residential and employment growth is intend to occur. See Appendix 1: Land Use Map.

Very Low-Income Households: Households earning 30 percent of the Area Median Income or less for their household size.

VISION 2040: The integrated, long-range vision for managing growth and maintaining a healthy region—including the counties of King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish. It contains an environmental framework a numeric Regional Growth Strategy, the Multicounty Policies, and implementation actions and measures to monitor progress.

Water Resource Inventory Area: Major watershed basins in Washington identified for water-related planning purposes.

Workforce Housing: Housing that is affordable to households with one or more workers. Creating workforce housing in a jurisdiction implies consideration of the wide range of income levels that characterize working households, from one person working at minimum wage to two or more workers earning the average county wage or above. There is a particular need for workforce housing that is reasonably close to regional and sub-regional job centers and/or easily accessible by public transportation.

2012 CITY CLERK

Form revised: December 12, 2012

FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Legislative	Rebecca Herzfeld.684-8148	Not applicable

Legislation Title:
A RESOLUTION of the City Council of the City of Seattle approving and ratifying the decision of the Metropolitan King County Council to adopt a revised set of Countywide Planning Policies.

Summary of the Legislation:
This legislation ratifies the amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) that were adopted by King County Ordinance 17486 on December 3, 2012.

Background:
The CPPs guide how all jurisdictions in King County manage growth as they develop and amend their Comprehensive Plans, as required by the State Growth Management Act. As the CPPs had not been comprehensively updated since they were adopted in 1992, in 2010 King County began a collaborative effort with other jurisdictions to revise the CPPs. In carrying out this work, the County was advised by the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC). The GMPC was established in 1992 by interlocal agreement. It is comprised of local officials, including three representatives from Seattle.

After three years of work, including public review opportunities before the GMPC and Metropolitan King County Council, the updated CPPs were adopted by the County on December 3, 2012. The interlocal agreement that created the GMPC also states that amended CPPs must be ratified by 30 percent of the jurisdictions representing at least 70 percent of the population of King County, within 90 days of CPP adoption by the County Council. The proposed resolution states Seattle's approval and ratification of the amended CPPs.

Please check one of the following:

__X__ **This legislation does not have any financial implications.**
(Please skip to "Other Implications" section at the end of the document and answer questions a-h. Earlier sections that are left blank should be deleted. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each question.)

Other Implications:

a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?
No.

b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?

2013 CITY CLERK

There are no financial costs if the resolution is not adopted. The interlocal agreement assumes that if a local jurisdiction does not take action, it is assumed to approve the CPP amendments.

c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?
The CPPs provide direction for the City's Comprehensive Plan, and will be used by the Department of Planning and Development as changes to the Comprehensive Plan are developed.

d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?
Not applicable.

e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?
No.

f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?
No.

g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?
No.

h) Other Issues:

List attachments to the fiscal note below:
None.

CITY CLERK

CITY OF SEATTLE
RESOLUTION 31432

A RESOLUTION of the City Council of the City of Seattle approving and ratifying the decision of the Metropolitan King County Council to adopt a revised set of Countywide Planning Policies.

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan King County Council adopted the original Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) in July 1992; and

WHEREAS, the CPPs are a series of policies that provide a countywide vision and serve as a framework for each jurisdiction in King County to develop its own comprehensive plan under the State Growth Management Act; and

WHEREAS, the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) was established by interlocal agreement in 1992 to provide for the collaborative development of CPPs; and

WHEREAS, the City of Seattle representation on the GMPC includes the Mayor and two City Councilmembers; and

WHEREAS, through a series of actions in September 2011, April 2012 and June 2012, the GMPC recommended adoption of amendments to the CPPs; and

WHEREAS, on December 3, 2012, the Metropolitan King County Council adopted amended CPPs by King County Ordinance 17486; and

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs support efforts for providing affordable housing by describing the countywide need and by emphasizing the implementation of specific strategies that will increase the supply of affordable housing; and

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs clarify that sewer service shall not be extended into rural areas, including for public schools; and

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs make minor adjustments to the urban growth boundary consistent with the overall policy direction; and

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs describe more specific connections between growth management actions and positive outcomes for human health; and

THIS VERSION IS NOT ADOPTED

BOS CITY CLERK

WHEREAS, the amended CPPs include substantial revisions that update references and improve the document's usability; and

WHEREAS, the amended countywide planning policies do not change the targets for housing and employment growth that were adopted by the Metropolitan King County Council, through adoption of King County Ordinance No. 16747 on January 25, 2010 and ratified by the City of Seattle on May 10, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the 1992 interlocal agreement remains in effect, requiring ratification of Countywide Planning Policies and amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies by 30 percent of the jurisdictions representing at least 70 percent of the population of King County, within 90 days of adoption by the Metropolitan King County Council.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THAT:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Seattle hereby approves and ratifies the amendments to the King County Countywide Planning Policies adopted by King County Ordinance 17486 (a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A).

Section 2. The Mayor is hereby authorized to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Clerk of the Metropolitan King County Council.

THIS VERSION IS NOT ADOPTED

DIS CITY CLERK

Section 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage and signatures hereon.

Adopted by the City Council the ____ day of _____, 2013, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this_____ day of _____, 2013.

_____

President _____of the City Council

Filed by me this ____ day of _____, 2013.

_____

Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

(Seal)

Attachment A: Amended King County Countywide Planning Policies

THIS VERSION IS NOT ADOPTED

DMS CITY CLERK

Received
APR 04 2013
City of Seattle
Office of the City Clerk

STATE OF WASHINGTON -- KING COUNTY

--ss.

295444 No. 31429,31432,31433

CITY OF SEATTLE,CLERKS OFFICE

Affidavit of Publication

The undersigned, on oath states that he is an authorized representative of The Daily Journal of Commerce, a daily newspaper, which newspaper is a legal newspaper of general circulation and it is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continuously as a daily newspaper in Seattle, King County, Washington, and it is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of this newspaper. The Daily Journal of Commerce was on the 12th day of June, 1941, approved as a legal newspaper by the Superior Court of King County.

The notice in the exact form annexed, was published in regular issues of The Daily Journal of Commerce, which was regularly distributed to its subscribers during the below stated period. The annexed notice, a

CT:TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION

was published on

03/25/13

The amount of the fee charged for the foregoing publication is the sum of $50.99 which amount has been paid in full.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on

03/25/2013

Notary public for the State of Washington,
residing in Seattle

JENNIFER A. BORRERO
NOTARY PUBLIC
COMMISSION EXPIRES 10-24-15
STATE OF WASHINGTON

State of Washington, King County

City of Seattle

Title Only Resolutions

The full text of the following legislation, passed by the City Council on March 4, 2013, and published below by title only, will be mailed upon request, or can be accessed at http://clerk.seattle.gov. For information on upcoming meetings of the Seattle City Council, please visit http://www.seattle.gov/council/calendar.

Contact: Office of the City Clerk at (206) 684-8344.

RESOLUTION NO. 31429

A RESOLUTION relating to Seattle Public Utilities; describing the goals of Seattle Public Utilities' 2015-2020 Strategic Business Plan and establishing a Customer Review Panel to provide input to the Plan.

RESOLUTION NO. 31432

A RESOLUTION of the City Council of the City of Seattle approving and ratifying the decision of the Metropolitan King County Council to adopt a revised set of Countywide Planning Policies.

RESOLUTION NO. 31433

A RESOLUTION establishing the 2013 work program for the Office of Housing.

Date of publication in the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce, March 25, 2013.

3/25(295444)