

**Report to the Growth Management Planning Council:**

**Countywide Planning Policy PF-22**

**School/City/County Coordination Meetings**

**April 2023**



**King County**

I. Contents .....2

II. Purpose ..... 3

III. Background..... 3

IV. Invitation to Coordination Meetings ..... 5

V. School District Capacity Assessment..... 6

VI. Conclusion ..... 9

## II. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the school/city/county coordination meetings called for in Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) PF-22 to the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC). Specifically, Policy PF-22 calls for the agencies to:

- Work together to assess school capacity needs;
- Identify future school sites within the UGA; and
- As necessary, prepare joint strategies for resolving school siting needs consistent with adopted comprehensive plan policies.

## III. Background

**Department Overview:** This report was prepared jointly by King County staff from the Permitting Division in the Department of Local Services and the Regional Planning Section in the Office of Performance, Strategy, and Budget. The Permitting Division provides infrastructure and land use planning services to the residents of rural and urban unincorporated King County. The Regional Planning Section is responsible for coordinating updates to the King County Comprehensive Plan, Countywide Planning Policies, Puget Sound Regional Council's VISION 2050, and the County's participation in the GMPC and other regional bodies.

**Historical Context:** In 2010 and 2011, the GMPC undertook the first comprehensive evaluation of the CPPs since their initial adoption in the 1990s to bring them into compliance with the multicounty planning policies (VISION 2040) adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council in 2008.

In September 2011, the GMPC completed its review and voted to recommend an updated set of CPPs to the King County Council. However, members 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.

In order to address this longstanding policy issue, the GMPC agreed to set aside the policies related to siting public facilities and postpone its consideration until a task force comprised of school districts, cities, King County, rural residents and other experts could study the issue and report back to the King County Executive. The GMPC established guidance for formation of the School Siting Task Force in their Motion 11-2 on September 21, 2011.

The Task Force completed its work on March 31, 2012, issuing a report and final recommendations to the King County Executive.

To implement a portion of the Task Force's recommendations, the GMPC adopted two new policies in the CPPs as follows:

**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 the 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 the 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 support rural character.

Additionally, in 2013 the GMPC adopted a work program to implement the remainder of the Task Force recommendations. Specifically, the Task Force recommended the following:

*“The Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) should identify 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”.*

To implement the above Task Force recommendation, a new policy PF-19A (renumbered to be Policy PF-22 in 2021) was proposed and in 2015 was approved by the GMPC in Motion 15-1 and adopted by the County Council in Ordinance 18084 that identified a process that commits local jurisdictions to working with school districts on collaborative planning. The policy, as amended in 2021, reads as follows.

**PF-22** Plan, through a cooperative process between jurisdictions and school districts, that public school facilities are available, to meet the needs of existing and projected residential development consistent with adopted comprehensive plan policies and growth forecasts. Cooperatively work with each school district located within the jurisdiction’s boundaries to evaluate the school district’s ability to site school facilities necessary to meet the school district’s identified student capacity needs. Use school district capacity and enrollment data and the growth forecasts and development data of each jurisdiction located within the school district’s service boundaries.

Commencing in January 2016 and continuing every two years thereafter, each jurisdiction and the school district(s) serving the jurisdiction shall confer to share information and determine if there is development capacity and the supporting infrastructure to site the needed school facilities. If not, cooperatively prepare a strategy to address the capacity shortfall. Potential strategies may include:

- a) Shared public facilities such as play fields, parking areas and access drives;
- b) School acquisition or lease of appropriate public lands;
- c) Regulatory changes such as allowing schools to locate in additional zones or revised development standards; and
- d) School design standards that reduce land requirements (such as multi-story structures or reduced footprint) while still meeting programmatic needs.

In 2017, and every two years thereafter, King County shall report to the GMPC on whether the goals of this policy are being met. The GMPC shall identify corrective actions as necessary to implement this policy.

**Report Methodology:** This report was developed based on information discussed at the 6 staff level coordination meetings between school districts and jurisdictions. Meetings were convened by King County. At the coordination meetings,

- School districts staff shared district enrollment data and trends, building and capacity needs, and information related to recent and planned capital projects and planning.
- City and county staff shared demographic information, growth projections, known or anticipated pipeline development, and salient upcoming legislative changes. In particular, the cities identified implementation efforts and planning related to current growth targets and the requirements of HB 1220.
- Based on this information, the coordination meetings were also used to determine whether a joint strategy—that is, a strategy to accommodate school facilities like those listed in PF-22—was needed to site future school development.

#### **IV. Invitation to Coordination Meetings**

King County staff reached to all the school districts serving King County residents in Fall of 2022 in an effort to coordinate meetings with the respective King County jurisdictions. Fourteen districts responded to the county’s outreach and 6 districts did not provide any response. Of those that responded, six (6) opted to participate in the PF-22 meetings. The details of the associated meetings are provided below.

The following districts chose to participate in the PF-22 meetings:

- Enumclaw
- Issaquah
- Northshore
- Highline
- Lake Washington
- Snoqualmie Valley

Some of the school districts that chose not to meet identified that they meet regularly with their cities and, therefore, did not require a facilitated PF-22 meeting.

## V. School District Capacity Assessment

Six school districts opted to participate in PF-22 coordination meetings convened by King County. A summary of the meetings is listed below<sup>1</sup>:

School District	Jurisdictions Represented	Meeting Date	Meeting Outcome Summary
<b>Northshore:</b> Todd Hall Dawn Mark Coby Zeifman	<b>City of Kenmore:</b> Lauri Anderson <b>King County:</b> Warren Cheney Ivan Miller Robin Proebsting <b>Snohomish County:</b> Eileen Canola Ryan Countryman Frank Slusser	Oct. 31, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NSD briefed the group on their 2022 bond and master plan update (all projects are planned to be in Snohomish County cities).</li> <li>NSD noted that student generation rates tend to be higher in affordable housing.</li> <li>The jurisdictions shared comprehensive plan update statuses and expected policy changes.</li> <li>No joint strategy was requested.</li> </ul>
<b>Highline:</b> Ellie Daneshnia Ruth Meraz-Caron Denise Stiffarm (legal counsel)	<b>King County:</b> Ivan Miller Robin Proebsting <b>City of Burien:</b> Nicole Gaudette <b>City of Des Moines:</b> Denise Lathrop, Laura Techico Joseph Messana-Croly <b>City of Kent:</b> Kristen Holdsworth <b>City of Normandy Park:</b> Nicholas Matz <b>City of SeaTac:</b> Kate Kaehny	Nov. 4, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HSD shared current plans related to implementation of the November 2022 bond, noting that enrollment has been in decline, but the bond projects address critical existing facilities needs.</li> <li>HSD identified a need for land (less than 5 acres) for a new Maritime High School. The parties discussed potential options</li> <li>The jurisdictions shared growth targets, plans to accommodate growth targets, relevant demographic information, and planned code updates.</li> <li>The parties agreed that there is not a need to consider a joint strategy pursuant to PF-22 at this time. The parties also agreed to meet regularly and discussed communication protocols.</li> <li>No joint strategy was requested</li> </ul>
<b>Issaquah:</b> Martin Turney Tom Mullins Denise Stiffarm (legal counsel)	<b>City of Bellevue:</b> Thara Johnson <b>City of Issaquah:</b> Minnie Dhaliwal Andrea Snyder <b>City of Sammamish:</b> David Pyle <b>City of Renton:</b> Angie Mathias <b>City of Newcastle:</b>	Nov. 14, 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The jurisdictions shared growth targets, plans to accommodate growth targets, relevant demographic information, and planned code updates.</li> <li>ISD noted a dip in elementary enrollment during the COVID-19 pandemic, after years of growth, with ISD monitoring enrollment as students return to pre-</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> King County staff have detailed meeting minutes on file.

	<p>Mark Hofman  <b>King County:</b>  Ivan Miller  Robin Proebsting</p>		<p>pandemic levels; secondary enrollment has been relatively stable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISD offered the jurisdictions feedback on the types of permit review processes that were easier to work through in recent school projects (i.e., administrative review is more efficient than quasi-judicial). ISD found the process for securing a site and permits for a new comprehensive high school in the urban area to be very challenging.</li> <li>• ISD observed, based on its recent property search for school sites for the 2016 Bond program, that there is little land left that is unencumbered by critical areas or other limitations and that ISD continues to need capacity relief at the 9-12 level.</li> <li>• ISD will continue to modify school design to address land constraints.</li> <li>• The parties agreed that there is not a need to consider a joint strategy pursuant to PF-22 at this time.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Lake Washington:</b>  Brian Buck  Denise Stiffarm  (legal counsel)</p>	<p><b>City of Kirkland:</b>  Adam Weinstein  Allison Zike  <b>City of Redmond:</b>  Carol Helland  Jeff Churchill  <b>City of Sammamish:</b>  David Pyle  <b>King County:</b>  Dan Cardwell  Ivan Miller  Robin Proebsting</p>	<p>Nov. 18, 2022</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Cities of Kirkland and Redmond are accommodating growth primarily through multifamily development.</li> <li>• The 85<sup>th</sup> Street Station project in Kirkland was held up as an example of a successful partnership between the district and city.</li> <li>• LWSD continues to see enrollment growth and capacity constraints exist and are likely to grow at schools throughout the district.</li> <li>• LWSD is implementing capital projects funded by the 2019 and 2022 capital levies and planning for a 2024 Bond.</li> <li>• LWSD recently purchased property in Redmond for a new school and is planning now for a new school on district-owned property in the Sammamish Town Center. Several existing school sites could have additional developable area with zoning/development regulation changes.</li> <li>• LWSD is interested in working with its cities/developers to consider creative options for on-site early learning facilities.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The parties agreed that there is not a need to consider a joint strategy pursuant to PF-22 at this time.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Enumclaw:</b>          Kyle Fletcher          Dr. Shaun Carey          Philip Engebretsen          Denise Stiffarm          (legal counsel)</p>	<p><b>City of Black Diamond:</b>          Mona Davis  <b>City of Enumclaw:</b>          Chris Pasinetti  <b>King County:</b>          Robin Proebsting          Dan Cardwell</p>	<p>January 5, 2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESD’s enrollment grew slower than expected during the pandemic but growth continues (with notable growth from new homes in Ten Trails Master Planned Development).</li> <li>ESD reviewed the February 2023 Bond proposal, with projects needed to address existing aging facilities as well as recent and projected growth.</li> <li>The City of Black Diamond is working on access and transportation needs of the Ten Trails development; there is also a lot of proposed development happening in other parts of the city. Their comprehensive plan has policies encouraging mixed-use and middle housing.</li> <li>The City of Enumclaw is seeing more multifamily development and will be looking at policies for future housing in its comprehensive plan.</li> <li>The parties agreed that there is not a need to consider a joint strategy pursuant to PF-22 at this time.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Snoqualmie Valley:</b>          Ryan Stokes          Dan Schlotfeldt          Denise Stiffarm          (legal counsel)</p>	<p><b>City of Snoqualmie:</b>          Emily Arteché          Jason Rogers  <b>City of North Bend:</b>          Rebecca Deming          Jamie Burrell  <b>City of Sammamish:</b>          David Pyle  <b>King County:</b>          Robin Proebsting          Dan Cardwell</p>	<p>January 18, 2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All three cities will need to plan for more affordable housing to comply with recently passed state legislation, which could affect student generation rates.</li> <li>SVSD shared that knowing about larger residential projects, especially ones with larger units (3-4+ bedrooms) is helpful to hear about early. The district is also undertaking a facilities study to inform future planning.</li> <li>SVSD is working with a community facilities committee to identify scope of future bond recommendation. The district needs additional elementary capacity in some form to address recent and ongoing growth.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The parties agreed that there is not a need to consider a joint strategy pursuant to PF-22 at this time.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

## VI. Conclusion

This was the fourth round of coordination meetings between the school districts, King County, and cities since the Task Force Report was adopted in 2012, the policy directing this work was adopted in 2015, and the process began in 2016/17.

The series of meetings have provided an opportunity for school districts and the jurisdictions they serve to share information on projected capacity needs and housing development so that future plans from all agencies can be guided into alignment. To date, the coordination meetings held since 2016 have not resulted in the need for the school districts and jurisdictions they serve to develop a joint strategy to resolve school siting needs.

In the coordination meetings and their capital facilities plans, many school district noted some continued enrollment anomalies, as many previously reported in 2020, the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. The school districts are monitoring the trajectory of these anomalies and their implications for future facility needs.

Another trend for school districts and jurisdictions to monitor will be the results of current and recent state-level legislation aimed at encouraging affordable housing development. Staff from Eastside and southeast King County cities in particular noted that they will need to adjust their zoning standards to make adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community as required by RCW 36.70A.070. This portion of statute will likely change the nature of development patterns and housing unit types. School districts have observed that housing intended or required to be affordable correlates to a higher student general factor, which may in turn change enrollment patterns.

Further, RCW 82.02.060 allows local governments to exempt low-income housing from impact fees, which may reduce impact fee collection. Taken together, school districts might face increased demand for services but reduced ability to fund them.

The next report will be provided to the GMPC in 2024.