

RESOLUTION NO. 385

A RESOLUTION OF THE WOODINVILLE CITY COUNCIL OPPOSING THE PROPOSED 2010 KING COUNTY COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICY AMENDMENT UNDER MOTION 09-2 TO ORDINANCE 16747.

WHEREAS, under RCW 36.70A 110, counties are responsible to update Countywide Planning Policies, and King County is updating these policies and has forwarded proposed amendments to all cities within the County for ratification;

WHEREAS, cities that do not respond to such proposed Countywide Planning Amendments by May 15, 2010 shall be seen as being in concurrence with the proposed amendment identified as Motion 09-2 along with associated Table LU-1;

WHEREAS, Woodinville continues to be arbitrarily classified as a Large City within the proposed Amendments which unreasonably allocates excessive growth to the community;

WHEREAS, the regional allocation of jobs and housing to Woodinville are significant and the promise of grants or other financial resources are meager and limited at best and will be inadequate to support the growth allocated to Woodinville;

WHEREAS, the distribution of housing and employment through the regional geography method failed to take into full account specific recently identified environmental constraints related to the Sammamish River, Woodin Creek, Little Bear Creek and Bear Creek and their watersheds identified by the City of Woodinville through various process and through its ecologically sustainable strategies analyses; and

WHEREAS, based upon extensive ecological analyses, including third party review, Woodinville has opted to protect, preserve, and enhance its urban forests, wildlife and wetland resources, aquifer resources and its geologically sensitive hillside environments to ensure that no further loss or further impairment of their long-term productivity will occur due to actions undertaken by the City of Woodinville.

NOW, THEREFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WOODINVILLE, WASHINGTON, HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City of Woodinville opposes the above-referenced Countywide Planning Policies Amendment, as it is not in the best interest of the citizens of the City of Woodinville for the reasons stated above.

Section 2. Severability. If any section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Resolution or any resolution adopted or amended hereby, should be held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality


shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section, sentence, clause or phase of this Resolution.

RESOLVED this 11th day of May 2010.



CHARLES E. PRICE, MAYOR

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:



**JENNIFER KUHN
CITY CLERK/CMC**



King County

Metropolitan King County Council

Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council
King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue, Room W1039
Seattle, WA 98104-3272
Tel: 206-296-1020
Fax: 206-205-8165
TTY/TDD: 206-296-1024
Email: anne.noris@kingcounty.gov
Web: www.kingcounty.gov/council/clerk

FEB 16 2010

City of Woodinville

February 17, 2010

The Honorable Chuck Price
City of Woodinville
17301 133rd Avenue Northeast
Woodinville, WA 98072

Dear Mayor Price:

We are pleased to forward for your consideration and ratification the enclosed amendments to the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPP).

On January 25, 2010, the Metropolitan King County Council approved and ratified the amendments on behalf of unincorporated King County. The Ordinances became effective February 14, 2010. Copies of the King County Council staff reports, ordinances and Growth Management Planning Council motions are enclosed to assist you in your review of these amendments.

In accordance with the Countywide Planning Policies, FW-1, Step 9, amendments become effective when ratified by ordinance or resolution by at least 30 percent of the city and county governments representing 70 percent of the population of King County according to the interlocal agreement. A city will be deemed to have ratified the amendments to the CPP unless, within 90 days of adoption by King County, the city takes legislative action to disapprove the amendments. **Please note that the 90-day deadline for this amendment is Saturday, May 15, 2010.**

If you adopt any legislation relative to this action, please send a copy of the legislation by the close of business, Friday, May 14, 2010, to Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council, W1039 King County Courthouse, 516 Third Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104, anne.noris@kingcounty.gov.

If you have any questions about the amendments or ratification process, please contact Paul Reitenbach, Senior Policy Analyst, King County Department of Development and Environmental Services, at 206-296-6705, or Rick Bautista, Metropolitan King County Council Staff, at 206-296-0329.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bob Ferguson, Chair
Metropolitan King County Council

Dow Constantine
King County Executive

Enclosures

cc: King County City Planning Directors
Suburban Cities Association
Paul Reitenbach, Senior Policy Analyst, DDES
Rick Bautista, Council Staff, Environment and Transportation Committee
(ETC)

November 19, 2009

The Honorable Dow Constantine
Chair, King County Council
Room 1200
COURTHOUSE

Dear Councilmember Constantine:

I am pleased to submit two motions that have been approved by the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC). Under the interlocal agreement that established the GMPC, motions are first approved by GMPC. King County Council must then approve the motions and ratify it for the unincorporated area. Finally, the motions are sent to all of the cities in King County for ratification. There are no fiscal impacts to King County government as a result of these motions.

The attached two motions are the result of regional cooperation. Each received unanimous approval by the Growth Management Planning Council; however the City of Seattle representatives abstained from voting on Motion 09-2. The first of these Motions, GMPC Motion 09-1, adopts a work plan and schedule to address the policy framework for allocation of regional services and facilities. The second Motion, GMPC Motion 09-2, amends the Countywide Planning Policies updating existing policies to provide for housing and employment targets for the period 2006-2031. This motion also amends Table LU-1 of the Countywide Planning Policies by replacing the existing Household and Employment Growth Targets for the 2001-2022 period with new Housing and Employment Growth Targets for the 2006-2031 period.

The Honorable Dow Constantine

November 19, 2009

Page 2

For further information regarding this transmittal, please contact Stephanie Warden, Director, Department of Department and Environmental Services, at 206-296-6700 or by email at Stephanie.warden@kingcounty.gov.

Sincerely,

Kurt Triplett
King County Executive

Enclosures

cc: King County Councilmembers

ATTN: Tom Bristow, Interim Chief of Staff

Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

Frank Abe, Communications Director

Beth Goldberg, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget

Stephanie Warden, Director, Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES)

Paul Reitenbach, Comprehensive Plan Project Manager, DDES



Signature Report

January 25, 2010

Ordinance 16747

Proposed No. 2009-0641.1

Sponsors Hague and Phillips

1 AN ORDINANCE adopting amendments to the
2 Countywide Planning Policies; adopting a work plan and
3 schedule to address policies related to allocation of regional
4 services, and adopting new housing and employment
5 growth targets, and ratifying the amended Countywide
6 Planning Policies for unincorporated King County; and
7 amending Ordinance 10450, Section 3, as amended, and
8 K.C.C. 20.10.030 and Ordinance 10450, Section 4, as
9 amended, and K.C.C. 20.10.040.

10 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

11 SECTION 1. Findings:

12 A. The metropolitan King County council adopted and ratified the Growth
13 Management Planning Council recommended King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
14 Policies (Phase I) in July 1992, under Ordinance 10450.

15 B. The metropolitan King County council adopted and ratified the Phase II
16 amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies on August 15, 1994, under Ordinance
17 11446.

18 C. The Growth Management Planning Council met on October 28, 2009 and
19 voted to recommend amendments to the King County Countywide Planning Policies,

20 adopting Motion 09-1 approving a work plan and schedule to address the policy
21 framework for allocation of regional services and facilities as shown in Attachment A to
22 this ordinance and adopting Motion 09-2 amending Table LU-1 of the Countywide
23 Planning Policies and approving related policy amendments as shown on Attachment B
24 to this ordinance.

25 SECTION 2. Ordinance 10450, Section 3, as amended, and K.C.C. 20.10.030 are
26 each hereby amended to read as follows:

27 A. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 Countywide Planning
28 Policies attached to Ordinance 11446 are hereby approved and adopted.

29 B. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
30 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 12027.

31 C. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
32 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 12421.

33 D. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
34 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 and 2 to Ordinance 13260.

35 E. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
36 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 through 4 to Ordinance 13415.

37 F. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
38 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 through 3 to Ordinance 13858.

39 G. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
40 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14390.

41 H. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
42 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14391.

43 I. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
44 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14392.

45 J. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
46 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14652.

47 K. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
48 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 through 3 to Ordinance 14653.

49 L. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
50 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14654.

51 M. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
52 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14655.

53 N. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
54 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 and 2 to Ordinance 14656.

55 O. The Phase II amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
56 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 14844.

57 P. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
58 Policies are amended as shown by Attachments A, B and C to Ordinance 15121.

59 Q. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
60 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 15122.

61 R. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
62 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 15123.

63 S. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
64 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments A and B to Ordinance 15426.

65 T. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
66 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments A, B, and C to Ordinance 15709.

67 U. Phase II Amendments to the King County 20.12 - Countywide Planning
68 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 16056.

69 V. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
70 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments A, B, C, D, E, F and G to Ordinance
71 16151.

72 W. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
73 Policies are amended as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 16334, and those items
74 numbered 1 through 11, 13 and 15 as shown on Attachment B to Ordinance 16334, are
75 hereby ratified on behalf of the population of unincorporated King County. Those items
76 numbered 12 and 14, shown as struck-through on Attachment B to Ordinance 16334, are
77 not ratified.

78 X. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
79 Policies are amended as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 16335.

80 Y. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
81 Policies are amended as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 16336.

82 Z. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
83 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments A and B to this ordinance.

84 SECTION 3. Ordinance 10450, Section 4, as amended, and K.C.C. 20.10.040 are
85 each hereby amended to read as follows:

86 A. Countywide Planning Policies adopted by Ordinance 10450 for the purposes
87 specified are hereby ratified on behalf of the population of unincorporated King County.

88 B. The amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies adopted by Ordinance
89 10840 are hereby ratified on behalf of the population of unincorporated King County.

90 C. The amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies adopted by Ordinance
91 11061 are hereby ratified on behalf of the population of unincorporated King County.

92 D. The Phase II amendments to the King County 2012 Countywide Planning
93 Policies adopted by Ordinance 11446 are hereby ratified on behalf of the population of
94 unincorporated King County.

95 E. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
96 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 12027 are hereby ratified on behalf of the
97 population of unincorporated King County.

98 F. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
99 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 12421, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
100 population of unincorporated King County.

101 G. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
102 shown by Attachments 1 and 2 to Ordinance 13260, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
103 population of unincorporated King County.

104 H. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
105 shown by Attachment 1 through 4 to Ordinance 13415, are hereby ratified on behalf of
106 the population of unincorporated King County.

107 I. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
108 shown by Attachments 1 through 3 to Ordinance 13858, are hereby ratified on behalf of
109 the population of unincorporated King County.

110 J. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
111 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14390, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
112 population of unincorporated King County.

113 K. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
114 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14391, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
115 population of unincorporated King County.

116 L. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
117 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14392, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
118 population of unincorporated King County.

119 M. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
120 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14652, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
121 population of unincorporated King County.

122 N. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
123 shown by Attachments 1 through 3 to Ordinance 14653, are hereby ratified on behalf of
124 the population of unincorporated King County.

125 O. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
126 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14654, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
127 population of unincorporated King County.

128 P. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
129 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14655, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
130 population of unincorporated King County.

131 Q. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
132 shown by Attachments 1 and 2 to Ordinance 14656, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
133 population of unincorporated King County.

134 R. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
135 shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 14844, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
136 population of unincorporated King County.

137 S. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
138 shown by Attachments A, B and C to Ordinance 15121, are hereby ratified on behalf of
139 the population of unincorporated King County.

140 T. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
141 shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 15122, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
142 population of unincorporated King County.

143 U. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
144 shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 15123, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
145 population of unincorporated King County.

146 V. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
147 shown by Attachments A and B to Ordinance 15426, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
148 population of unincorporated King County.

149 W. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies,
150 as shown by Attachments A, B, and C to Ordinance 15709, are hereby ratified on behalf
151 of the population of unincorporated King County.

152 X. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
153 shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 16056 are hereby ratified on behalf of the
154 population of unincorporated King County.

155 Y. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
156 shown by Attachments A, B, C, D, E, F and G to Ordinance 16151, are hereby ratified on
157 behalf of the population of unincorporated King County.

158 Z. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
159 shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 16334, and those items numbered 1 through 11, 13
160 and 15, as shown in Attachment B to Ordinance 16334, are hereby ratified on behalf of
161 the population of unincorporated King County. Those items numbered 12 and 14, shown
162 as struck-through on Attachment B to Ordinance 16334, are not ratified.

163 AA. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies,
164 as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 16335 are hereby ratified on behalf of the
165 population of unincorporated King County.


166 BB. The amendment to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies,
167 as shown by Attachment A of Ordinance 16336, is hereby ratified on behalf of the
168 population of unincorporated King County. Additionally, by Ordinance 16336, an
169 amendment to the Interim Potential Annexation Area Map to include any additional
170 unincorporated urban land created by the Urban Growth Area (UGA) amendment in the
171 Potential Annexation Area of the city of Black Diamond is hereby ratified on behalf of
172 the population of unincorporated King County.

173 CC. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies,
174 as shown by Attachments A and B to this ordinance are hereby ratified on behalf of the
175 population of unincorporated King County.

Ordinance 16747 was introduced on 11/23/2009 and passed by the Metropolitan King County Council on 1/25/2010, by the following vote:


Yes: 8 - Ms. Drago, Mr. Phillips, Mr. von Reichbauer, Ms. Hague,
Ms. Patterson, Ms. Lambert, Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Dunn
No: 0
Excused: 1 - Mr. Gossett

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON



Robert W. Ferguson, Chair


ATTEST:



Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

RECEIVED
2010 FEB -5 PM 4:05
CLERK
KING COUNTY COUNCIL

APPROVED this 4th day of February, 2010



Dow Constantine, County Executive

Attachments: A. Motion 09-1, B. Motion 09-2

16747

2009-0641 Attachment A

10/28/09

Sponsored By: Executive Committee

/th/pr

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

MOTION NO. 09-1

A MOTION to adopt a work plan and schedule to address the policy framework for allocation of regional services and facilities.

WHEREAS, the Growth Management Planning Council has directed staff to develop recommendations for a major update of the Countywide Planning Policies in 2010 to bring those policies into consistency with Vision 2040.

WHEREAS, the Growth Management Planning Council has developed proposed growth targets for housing and employment, that implement the Regional Growth Strategy contained in Vision 2040 while providing 20-year targets for cities to use in the next round of GMA comprehensive plan updates.

WHEREAS, since the Countywide Planning Policies were first adopted in 1992, significant amounts of growth have occurred inside the urban growth area, within cities and unincorporated King County, and particularly inside cities with designated urban centers, where pending growth targets would direct even greater amounts of growth .

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY HEREBY MOVES AS FOLLOWS:

Direct staff to pursue a work plan for phase I of an update of the Countywide Planning Policies.

Goal of Work Program:

The GMPC will update the Countywide Planning Policies to ensure consistency with the Multi-County Planning Policies contained within Vision 2040, to ensure consistency with the State Growth Management Act, to reflect current terminology and relevant references, and to establish the policy framework for advancing the Regional Growth Strategy through prioritized allocation of regional services and facilities. Phase One of the work plan is focused on establishing one or more Framework policies that will advance the Regional Growth Strategy through prioritized allocation of regional services and facilities, while continuing to serve all communities in King County

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

Context:

With the adoption of the new growth targets, King County is facing an increased amount of growth countywide and a pattern of growth that concentrates housing and employment in cities with Urban Centers. Communities throughout the county recognize that their ability to accommodate growth depends on adequate provision of services and facilities. Further, a number of cities are concerned that the existing provision of services and facilities are inadequate to meet current needs. The first priority in developing the work program will be to define the regional services and facilities that are necessary to support growth.

Direct staff to develop options for new CPP policy language that will prioritize regional service delivery in ways that promote the regional growth strategy. In developing that policy, staff should address these issues according to the schedule shown below:

- Define what constitutes the "regional services" affected by this policy;
- Identify the existing policy basis for delivering regional services;
- Draft new policy options that address regional service delivery for GMPC consideration by the end of the first quarter of 2010.

Schedule for further work on proposed policy options:

Task	Due Date
Define regional services and facilities that are tied to growth	4 th Qtr, 2009
Identify existing policy basis for future delivery of services and facilities	4 th Qtr, 2009
Draft policy options for guidance on delivering regional services and facilities	March 1, 2010
Present policy options to GMPC for first reading and discussion	End of 1 st Qtr, 2010
Revise policy options as directed by GMPC	Mid-April, 2010
Approval of policy amendment(s) and direction of next steps by GMPC	Late April, 2010

58
59
60
61
62
63

Adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council of King County on October 28, 2009 in open session, and signed by the chair of the GMPC.


Kurt Triplett, Chair, Growth Management Planning Council

64

16747

2009-0641 Attachment B

10/28/09

Sponsored By: Executive Committee

/pr

MOTION NO. 09-2

A MOTION by the Growth Management Planning Council of King County recommending the amendment of the Countywide Planning Policies updating existing policies to provide for housing and employment targets for the period 2006-2031. This motion also amends Table LU-1 of the Countywide Planning Policies by replacing the existing Household and Employment Growth Targets for the 2001-2022 period with new Housing and Employment Growth Targets for the 2006-2031 period.

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the 2002 Countywide Planning Policies established household and employment targets for each city and for King County through 2022; and

WHEREAS, the 2002 targets need to be updated to reflect projected growth through 2031 in accordance with the GMA (RCW 36 70A 110); and

WHEREAS, Countywide Planning Policy FW-3 states that the adopted household and employment targets shall be monitored by King County annually with adjustments made by the Growth Management Planning Council utilizing the process established in FW-1, Step 6; and

WHEREAS since June, 2008 staff from King County and the cities in King County have worked cooperatively to analyze and recommend new 20-year housing and employment targets; and

WHEREAS the Growth Management Planning Council met and discussed the updates of the housing and employment growth targets for the period 2006-2031, with opportunity for public comment on April 15, 2009, July 15, 2009 and September 16, 2009.

33 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL OF
 34 KING COUNTY HEREBY MOVES TO AMEND THE POLICIES, TEXT, AND TABLE
 35 LU-1 OF THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES AS FOLLOWS:

36 **C. Urban Areas**

37 *The following policies establish an Urban Growth Area (UGA), determine the amount of*
 38 *household housing and employment growth to be accommodated within the UGA in the*
 39 *form of targets for each jurisdiction, and identify methods to phase development within this*
 40 *area in order to bring certainty to long-term planning and development within the County.*
 41 *All cities are included in the UGA, with the cities in the Rural Area identified as islands of*
 42 *urban growth. The UGA is a permanent designation. Land outside the UGA is designated*
 43 *for permanent rural and resource uses. Countywide Policies on Rural and Resource Areas*
 44 *are found in Chapter IIIA, Resource Lands, and Chapter IIIB, Rural Areas.*

45
 46
 47 *In accordance with the State Growth Management Act (GMA) (RCW 36.70A.110), the State*
 48 *Office of Financial Management (OFM) provides a population projection to each county.*
 49 *The county, through a collaborative intergovernmental process established by the Growth*
 50 *Management Planning Council, allocates the population as growth targets to individual*
 51 *jurisdictions. Forecasts prepared by the Puget Sound Regional Council are used to*
 52 *establish the county employment projection.*

53
 54 *The process for allocating growth targets in King County is a collaborative exercise*
 55 *involving input from the county and cities. The allocations determined through this process*
 56 *are to be guided by existing relevant policies at the regional, countywide, and local levels*
 57 *and are to take into account best available data on factors influencing future growth in the*
 58 *region, as follows:*

- 59
 60 1. *The PSRC employment forecasts are calculated for the four geographic subareas of the*
 61 *UGA (Sea Shore, South, East, and Rural Cities). These then become subarea*
 62 *employment targets.*
 63 2. *The jurisdictions collectively allocate the OFM population projection to the four*
 64 *subareas based on the projected employment for each area. A small amount of*
 65 *population growth is assumed to occur in the Rural area.*
 66 3. *The technical staff translates the population projections into projected households,*
 67 *taking into account different average household sizes within each subarea. These*
 68 *projections then become subarea household targets.*
 69 4. *Jurisdictions within each subarea negotiate the distribution of subarea household and*
 70 *employment targets using criteria based on Countywide Planning Policies.*

71
 72 *The housing and employment capacity in the UGA, based on adopted plans and regulations,*
 73 *should accommodate the projected 20-year growth. Growth is to be accommodated within*
 74 *permanent Urban Areas by increasing densities, as needed. Phasing should occur within*
 75 *the UGA, as necessary, to ensure that services are provided as growth occurs.*

76

- 77 FW-11 The land use pattern for King County shall protect the natural environment by
78 reducing the consumption of land and concentrating development. An Urban
79 Growth Area, Rural Areas, and resource lands shall be designated and the
80 necessary implementing regulations adopted. This includes Countywide estab-
81 lishment of a boundary for the Urban Growth Area. Local jurisdictions shall
82 make land use decisions based on the Countywide Planning Policies.
83
- 84 FW-12 The Urban Growth Area shall provide enough land to accommodate future urban
85 development. Policies to phase the provision of urban services and to ensure
86 efficient use of the growth capacity within the Urban Growth Area shall be
87 instituted.
88
- 89 FW-12(a) All jurisdictions within King County share the responsibility to accommodate the
90 20-year population projection and job employment forecast. ~~The population~~
91 ~~projection shall be assigned to the four subareas of King County (Sea Shore, East,~~
92 ~~South and the Rural Cities) proportionate with the share of projected employment~~
93 ~~growth.~~ Anticipated growth shall be allocated pursuant to the following
94 objectives:
95 a. To plan for a pattern of growth that is guided by the Regional Growth
96 Strategy contained in Vision 2040, the growth management, transportation,
97 and economic development plan for the 4-county central Puget Sound region;
98 b. To ensure efficient use of land within the UGA by directing growth to Urban
99 Centers and Activity Centers;
100 c. To limit development in the Rural Areas;
101 d. To protect designated resource lands;
102 e. To ensure efficient use of infrastructure;
103 f. To improve the jobs/housing balance within the county on a subarea basis;
104 g. To promote a land use pattern that can be served by public transportation and
105 other alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle; and
106 h. To provide sufficient opportunities for growth within the jurisdictions.
107
- 108 FW-12(b) The growth targets established pursuant to the methodology described in LU-25c
109 and LU-25d shall be supported by both regional and local transportation
110 investments. The availability of an adequate transportation system is critically
111 important to accommodating growth. The regional responsibility shall be met by
112 planning for and delivering county, state, and federal investments that support the
113 growth targets and the land use pattern of the County. This includes investments
114 in transit, state highways in key regional transportation corridors, and in improved
115 access to the designated Urban Centers. The local responsibility shall be met by
116 local transportation system investments that support the achievement of the
117 targets.
- 118 FW-12(c) Ensuring sufficient water supply is essential to accommodate growth and
119 conserve fish habitat. Due to the substantial lead-time required to develop water
120 supply sources, infrastructure and management strategies, long-term water supply
121 planning efforts in the Region must be ongoing.
122

123

124

I. Urban Growth Area

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

LU – 25a Each jurisdiction shall plan for and accommodate the household housing and employment targets established pursuant to LU-25c and LU-25d. This obligation includes:

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

The targets will be used to plan for and to accommodate growth within each jurisdiction. The targets do not obligate a jurisdiction to guarantee that a given number of housing units will be built or jobs added during the planning period.

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

LU-25b Growth targets for each Potential Annexation Area shall be set as a proportional share of the overall Urban Unincorporated Area target commensurate with the PAA's share of total Unincorporated Urban Area housing and employment capacity determined in the most recent Buildable Lands Report. As annexations or incorporations occur, growth targets shall be adjusted. Household Housing and employment targets for each jurisdiction's potential annexation area, as adopted in Table LU-1, shall be transferred to the annexing jurisdiction or newly incorporated city as follows:

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

- a. King County and the respective city will determine new housing household and employment targets for areas under consideration for annexation prior to the submittal of the annexation proposal to the King County Boundary Review Board;
- b. A city's household housing and employment targets shall be increased by a share of the target for the potential annexation area proportionate to the share of the potential annexation area's development capacity located within the area annexed. In the case of incorporation, an equivalent formula shall be used to establish household housing and employment targets for the new city.

- 168 Each city will determine how and where within their corporate boundaries to
 169 accommodate target increases;
- 170 c. The County's unincorporated Urban areas targets shall be correspondingly
 171 decreased to ensure that overall target levels in the county remain the same;
- 172 d. The household housing and employment targets in Table LU-1 will be
 173 updated periodically to reflect changes due to annexations or incorporations.
 174 These target updates do not require adoption by the Growth Management
 175 Planning Council.

176
 177 LU -25c The target objectives identified in FW-12a shall be realized through the following
 178 methodology for allocating housing household targets:

- 179
 180 a. Determine the additional population that must be accommodated countywide
 181 ~~by calculating the difference between the most recent Census count and the~~
 182 ~~State Office of Financial Management population projection for the end of~~
 183 during the twenty year planning period based on the range of population
 184 projections made by the State Office of Financial Management for the county
 185 and 4-county central Puget Sound region and guided by the Regional Growth
 186 Strategy contained in Vision 2040;
- 187 b. ~~Subtract a percentage from that number to represent the amount of growth~~
 188 ~~that is assumed to occur in the unincorporated Rural Area;~~
- 189 b. Assign proportions of the urban countywide population growth to each of six
 190 Regional Geographies as defined by Vision 2040 to include Metropolitan
 191 Cities, Core Cities, Larger Cities, Small Cities, Unincorporated Urban
 192 Growth Areas, and Rural and Natural Resource Lands ~~the four subareas (Sea-~~
 193 ~~Shore, South, East, and Rural Cities) based on the proportion of future~~
 194 ~~employment growth forecasted for each of those subareas by the Puget Sound~~
 195 ~~Regional Council;~~
- 196 c. Allocate population growth to each Regional Geography as guided by Vision
 197 2040 and also taking into account additional factors;
- 198 d. Assume that a small amount of population growth, approximately 3% to 4%
 199 of the countywide total, will occur in the Rural area;
- 200 e. Convert the estimated projected population for each subarea Urban Regional
 201 Geography to an estimated number of households housing units needed,
 202 using projected average household sizes, group quarters population, and
 203 vacancy rates that reflect the variation among those subareas observed in the
 204 most recent Census;
- 205 f. Allocate a household housing target to individual jurisdictions, within each
 206 subarea Regional Geography, based on FW-12a and considering the
 207 following factors:
- 208 1. the availability of water and the capacity of the sewer system;
 - 209 2. the remaining portions of previously adopted household targets;
 - 210 3. the presence of urban centers and activity areas within each jurisdiction;
 - 211 4. the availability of zoned development capacity in each jurisdiction; and
 - 212 5. the apparent market trends for housing in the area.
- 213 f. Jurisdictions shall plan for housing household targets as adopted in Table LU-
 214 l; and

- g. Monitoring should follow the process described in policy FW-1.

A portion of the urban employment growth will occur in Activity Areas and neighborhoods in the Urban Area. This employment growth will support the Urban Centers, while balancing local employment opportunities in the Urban Area

LU - 25d The target objectives identified in FW-12a shall be realized through the following methodology for allocating employment targets:

- a. Determine the number of jobs that must be accommodated in each of the four subareas of King County (Sea Shore, South, East, and the Rural Cities) in accordance with the most recent PSRC job estimates and forecasts for during the 20-year planning period based on the most recent forecast of employment growth produced by the Puget Sound Regional Council for the four-county central Puget Sound region, and guided by the Regional Growth Strategy contained in Vision 2040. To account for uncertainty in the employment forecasts, establish a range of new jobs that must be accommodated in each subarea. Unless exceptional circumstances dictate, the range should be 5% on either side of the PSRC forecast.
- b. Assign proportions of the countywide employment growth to each of six Regional Geographies as defined by Vision 2040 to include Metropolitan Cities, Core Cities, Larger Cities, Small Cities, Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas, and Rural and Natural Resource Lands;
- c. Allocate employment growth to each Regional Geography as guided by Vision 2040 and also taking into account additional factors;
- d. Assume that a small amount of employment growth, less than 1% of the countywide total, will occur in the Rural area;
- e. Allocate an employment target to individual jurisdictions, within each Urban Regional Geography, based on FW-12a and considering the following factors:
 - b. ~~For each subarea, determine the point within the range upon which jurisdictions within the subarea will base their targets and allocate employment growth targets to individual jurisdictions based on consideration of the following:~~
 1. the PSRC small area forecasts;
 2. the presence of urban centers, manufacturing/industrial centers, and activity areas within each jurisdiction;
 3. the availability of zoned commercial and industrial development capacity in each jurisdiction and;
 4. the access to transit, as well as to existing highways and arterials.
- c. Jurisdictions shall plan for employment targets as adopted in Table LU-1.

260
262
264
266
268
270

Table EU-1: Housing and Employment Growth Targets (2006-2035)				
Regional Geography City / Subarea	Housing Target	PAA Housing Target	Employment Target	PAA Employment Target
	Net New Units	Net New Units	Net New Jobs	Net New Jobs
Metropolitan Cities				
Bellevue	17,000	290	53,000	
Seattle	86,000		146,700	
Subtotal	103,000		199,700	
Core Cities				
Auburn	9,620		19,350	-
Bothell	3,000	810	4,800	200
Burien	3,900		4,600	
Federal Way	8,100	2,390	12,300	290
Kent	7,800	1,560	13,200	290
Kirkland	7,200	1,370	20,200	650
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
Subtotal	75,255		167,250	
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	
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		-	
Covington	1,470		1,320	
Duvall	1,140		840	
Enumclaw	1,425		735	
Hunts Point	1		-	
Lake Forest Park	475		210	
Medina	19		-	
Milton	50	90	160	
Newcastle	1,200		735	
Normandy Park	120		65	
North Bend	665		1,050	
Pacific	285	135	370	
Skykomish	10		-	
Snoqualmie	1,615		1,050	
Yarrow Point	14		-	
Subtotal	10,922		8,168	
Urban Unincorporated				
Potential Annexation Areas	12,930		3,950	
North Highline	1,360		2,530	
Bear Creek UPD	910		3,580	
Unclaimed Urban Unincorporated	650		90	
Subtotal	15,850		10,150	
King County USA Total	233,077		428,068	
* Targets base year is 2006. PAA / city targets have been adjusted to reflect annexations through 2008.				
** Target for Maple Valley PAA contingent on approval of city - county joint plan for Summit Place.				

271 ADOPTED by the Growth Management Planning Council of King County on October 28,
272 2009 in open session, and signed by the chair of the GMPC.


273

274

275

276

277



Kurt Triplett, Chair, Growth Management Planning Council



King County

Metropolitan King County Council
Physical Environment Committee

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item:	8	Name:	Rick Bautista
Proposed No.:	2009-0641	Date:	January 12, 2010
Invited:	Paul Reitenbach, GMPC staff coordinator		

SUBJECT

An Ordinance adopting Growth Management Planning Council ("GMPC") recommendations relating to a policy framework for allocating regional services and facilities and to the updating of housing and employment targets.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to CPP FW-1 step 9¹, the GMPC voted unanimously to recommend GMPC Motions 09-1 and 09-2, however it is noted that the City of Seattle representatives abstained from voting on Motion 09-2. These GMPC motions recommend the following actions:

- **GMPC Motion 09-1:** adopts a work plan and schedule to address the policy framework for allocation of regional services and facilities; and
- **GMPC Motion 09-2:** amends the Countywide Planning Policies ("CPP") to (1) update policies relating to housing and employment targets for the period 2006-2031 and (2) amend Table-LU-1 by replacing the existing Household and Employment Growth Targets for the 2001-2022 period with new Housing and Employment Growth Targets for the 2006-2031 period.

Proposed Ordinance 2009-0641 would ratify the change on behalf of the population of unincorporated King County, as required by CPP FW-1, Step 9.

¹ **FW-1 (Step 9)** Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies may be developed by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor, or by the Metropolitan King County Council, as provided in this policy. Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, not including amendments to the Urban Growth Area pursuant to Step 7 and 8 b and c above, shall be subject to ratification by at least 30 percent of the city and County governments representing 70 percent of the population of King County. Adoption and ratification of this policy shall constitute an amendment to the May 27, 1992 interlocal agreement among King County, the City of Seattle, and the suburban cities and towns in King County for the Growth Management Planning Council of King County.

THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL

The GMPC is a formal body comprised of elected officials from King County, Seattle, Bellevue, the Suburban Cities, and Special Districts. The GMPC was created in 1992 by interlocal agreement, in response to a provision in the Washington State Growth Management Act ("GMA") requiring cities and counties to work together to adopt CPPs.

Under GMA, Countywide Planning Policies ("CPPs") serve as the framework for each individual jurisdiction's comprehensive plan, and ensure countywide consistency with respect to land use planning efforts. As provided for in the interlocal agreement, the GMPC developed and recommended the CPPs, which were adopted by the County Council and ratified by the cities. Subsequent amendments to the CPPs follow the same process: recommendation by the GMPC, adoption by the County Council, and ratification by the cities.

Amendments to the CPPs become effective when ratified by ordinance or resolution by at least 30% of the city and County governments representing at least 70% of the population of King County. A city shall be deemed to have ratified an amendment to the CPPs unless, within 90 days of adoption by King County, the city by legislative action disapproves it.

SUMMARY OF GMPC MOTIONS

GMPC MOTION 09-1 (Phase 1 of the Major Update to the CPPs)

The CPPs were first adopted in 1992 and have not been significantly amended. Directed to do so by the GMPC, staff began in 2009 to develop recommendations for a major update of the CPPs in 2010. The initial goals of the update were to:

- ensure consistency with the GMA;
- ensure consistency with the Multi-County Planning Policies contained within the Puget Sound Regional Council's ("PSRC") *Vision 2040* document; and
- reflect current terminology and relevant references.

However, during the discussions about the adoption of the new growth targets (see discussion of Motion 9-2 in this staff report), a number of cities stated concerns that the existing CPPs related to public services and facilities did not provide adequate linkage between future growth targets and the provision of such services and facilities to serve that future growth.

To address these concerns, Motion 9-1 adopts the work plan for Phase 1 of this major update to the CPPs. Phase 1 focuses on establishing one or more CCP Framework Policy that will advance the CPPs regional growth strategy through a prioritized allocation of regional services and facilities, while continuing to serve all communities in King County. The key tasks in Phase 1 of the work program will be to:

- Define what constitutes the "regional services";
- Identify the existing CPP basis for delivering regional services;
- Draft new policy options that address regional service delivery for GMPC consideration by the end of the first quarter of 2010.

Note: GMPC staff will continue work on the broader update the CPPs once Phase 1 is completed.

GMPC MOTION 09-2 (HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT TARGETS – 2006 TO 2031)

The CPPs establish household and job growth targets for cities, Potential Annexation Areas ("PAAs"), and unclaimed urban unincorporated areas.

Growth Target Update Required By State Growth Management Act

The state GMA requires that local growth targets be updated *at least* every ten years. The GMPC last updated growth targets in 2002 for a planning period extending to the year 2022.

The GMPC growth targets are statements of planning policy indicating the minimum number of housing units and jobs that each jurisdiction will accommodate during their respective 20-year planning periods. However, since many factors influencing growth and development are beyond local government control, the targets do not represent a commitment that a given level of population or employment increase will actually occur in each locality.

Every five years, the state Office of Financial Management ("OFM") issues population projections for each county in the state as a basis for determining growth targets under the GMA. In addition, employment forecasts are produced by PSRC. Based on these projections, counties and cities collaborate in determining local allocations of that growth.

According to the 2007 OFM and 2006 PSRC projections, King County remains an attractive region which, over the long term, is expected to see robust amounts of both residential and employment growth. The OFM projections show that King County is expected to grow by about 450,000 people between 2006 and 2031 to a total population of 2.3 million. The PSRC employment forecasts show growth in the County, over this same 25-year period, of about 490,000 jobs to a total of about 1.7 million jobs in 2031.

New Policy Guidance from Vision 2040

The GMPC adopted growth targets incorporate new policy guidance from the PSRC's recently adopted *VISION 2040*, a growth management, transportation, and economic development strategy for the 4-county region. With *VISION 2040*, the PSRC amended its Multicounty Planning Policies ("MPPs") to address coordinated action

around the distribution of growth and established a Regional Growth Strategy (“Strategy”) that provides substantive guidance for planning for new growth expected in the region between 2000 and 2040. The strategy retains much of the discretion that counties and cities have in setting local targets, while calling for broad shifts in where growth locates within the region.

It establishes six clusters of jurisdictions called “regional geographies” – four types of cities defined by size and status in the region and two unincorporated types, urban and rural. In comparison to current targets and plans, the Strategy calls for:

- Increasing the amount of growth targeted to cities that contain regionally designated urban centers (to include both Metropolitan Cities and Core Cities)
- Increasing the amount of growth targeted to other Larger Cities
- Decreasing the amount of growth targeted to Urban unincorporated areas, Rural designated unincorporated areas, and to many Small Cities
- Achieving a greater *jobs-housing balance* within the region by shifting projected population growth into King County and shifting forecasted employment growth out of King County

Proposed Changes

This GMPC Motion 09-2 recommends two amendments to the CPPs.

1. CPP Text Changes:

The first amendment revises CPP text to align with the following methodology and assumptions used in updating the growth targets:

- **Establish target time frame.** The year 2031 was established as the target horizon year, giving cities a full 20-year planning period from the GMA update deadline of 2011. The year 2006 was used as a base year because of the availability of complete data, including Buildable Lands estimates.
- **Establish county total for population growth.** Assuming that the entire 4-county region develops plans reflecting the mid-range OFM projection, King County gets 42% of the regional population growth through 2031, consistent with *VISION 2040*. The result: growth of 567,000 people between 2000 and 2031 to a total population of 2,304,000. This number represents a small shift of population to King County compared with state projections.
- **Establish county total for job growth.** Using the PSRC forecast of employment for the region, King County gets 58% of the regional employment growth through 2031, consistent with *VISION 2040*. The result: growth of 441,000 jobs between 2000 and 2031 to a total of 1,637,000 jobs. This number represents a shift of about 50,000 jobs out of King County to the other three counties in the region compared with current forecasts.

- **Allocate population to Regional Geographies.** The use of Regional Geographies is based closely on *VISION 2040*. In addition, the allocation accounts for other factors such as recent growth trends and anticipated annexation of major PAAs.
- **Convert population to housing units.** The current CPPs set targets by the number of “households”, which unfortunately cannot be effectively regulated or monitored. Jurisdictions now use “housing units”, which can be readily regulated and monitored. Also, *VISION 2040* calls for housing unit targets for each regional geography and jurisdiction. Total stock of housing units needed in 2031 was calculated based on the following assumptions:
 - Assumed group quarter (institutions) rates, 2.5% of the year 2031 population;
 - Assumed future average household size of 2.26 persons, a decline of 0.14 pph from the 2000 Census;
 - Assumed vacancy rates to convert households into housing units, a countywide average of 4.3%.
- **Calculate housing growth need within Regional Geographies.** As a final step, the base year (2006) housing stock was subtracted from the total 2031 units to determine the net additional new housing units needed by 2031 in each Regional Geography.
- **Allocate employment growth to Regional Geographies** The use of Regional Geographies is based closely on *VISION 2040*. In addition, the allocation accounts for employment changes since 2000.
- **Allocate housing units and jobs to individual jurisdictions.** Within each Regional Geography, the overall targeted level of housing and employment growth was sub-allocated to individual jurisdictions, based on a range of factors that included:
 - Fair share distribution of the responsibility to accommodate future growth
 - Existing CPPs, including 2022 growth targets
 - Development trends and land use capacity of current plans
 - Current population, jobs, and land area
 - Local policies, plans, zoning and other regulations
 - Local factors, such as large planned developments, and opportunities and constraints for future residential and commercial development
 - Location within the county
 - Recent annexations to the cities of Renton, Auburn, and Issaquah
- **Sub-allocate the Urban Unincorporated Area targets to smaller areas.** The housing and employment targets for the unincorporated UGA were further allocated to individual PAAs claimed by an individual city as well as to unclaimed or disputed unincorporated urban designated areas currently under County jurisdiction. PAA targets were based on the proportion share of

unincorporated Buildable Lands capacity located in each PAA. As annexations occur, a share of the unincorporated PAA targets will be shifted to cities.

Note: In 2010, more comprehensive policy review will occur as part of the overall update of the entire CPPs document, and that may result in additional policy amendments to the CPP section that describes the growth targets process.

2. New Growth Table:

Currently, Table LU-1, contains the household and employment growth targets for the 2001-2022 period and by this GMPC motion would be replaced with a new Table LU-1, which contains housing and employment targets for each city and unincorporated urban area covering the 2006-2031 period.

In the new Table LU-1, the ranges of potential future housing units and jobs for each jurisdiction have been narrowed further to single number targets. The target numbers shown reflect 25 years of growth. Over time, with the addition of new jobs and housing units, the target obligation of each jurisdiction is reduced, commensurate with the findings of monitoring efforts under the King County Buildable Lands and Benchmarks programs.

The new Table LU-1 also now shows targets for each PAA. As annexations occur, PAA growth targets will be shifted from the County to annexing cities, following a methodology that is described in the CPPs. The version of Table LU-1 contained in Motion 09-2 has been adjusted to reflect current city boundaries, including several annexations that occurred after 2006.

AMENDMENTS

None

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Ordinance 2009-0641, with attachments A and B
2. Transmittal Letter, dated November 19, 2009
3. Staff Reports to GMPC Motions 09-1 and 09-2