

KING COUNTY
GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL
June 24, 2020
Remote Meeting via Zoom Webinar

MEETING SUMMARY

Members present:

Executive Dow Constantine, King County
Councilmember Jeanne Kohl-Welles, King County
Councilmember Kathy Lambert, King County
Councilmember Joe McDermott, King County
Councilmember Dave Upthegrove, King County

Councilmember Jennifer Robertson, Bellevue

Representing Sound Cities Association (SCA):

Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific
Councilmember Satwinder Kaur, Kent
Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie
Councilmember Tom McLeod, Tukwila
Councilmember Chris Reh, Issaquah
Councilmember Pam Stuart, Sammamish
Councilmember Syd Dawson, Maple Valley
Councilmember Ryan McIrvine, Renton
Councilmember Salim Nice, Mercer Island
Councilmember Debra Srebnik, Kenmore

Representing Special Purpose Districts:

Ron Speer, Soos Creek Water and Sewer District
Brian Buck, Lake Washington School District

King County Executive Dow Constantine convened the meeting at 4:00 pm. Executive Constantine noted that this is the first meeting of the GMPC to be held remotely.

Staff affirmed that a quorum was present after the roll call of members.

Agenda Item II – approval of the meeting summary from February 26, 2020 The summary was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item III – Public Comment

1. Nicholas Bratton, Sr. Director of Policy, Forterra
Mr. Bratton spoke against the proposed changes to the 4 to 1 Program expressing concern for the lower amount of land protected, which would be at odds with the goal of the program.
2. Ken Koningsmark, Rural Resident near Preston

Mr. Koningsmark spoke against the proposed changes to the 4 to 1 Program stating that they are in conflict with the Countywide Planning Policies. He stated that if land has such high conservation value, then more of the land should be protected rather than less.

3. Tim Trohimovich, Director of Planning and Law, Futurewise
Mr. Trohimovich spoke about the 4 to 1 Program stating support for the changes reviewed at the November, 2018 GMPC meeting but against the new proposed changes. He stated concern for the lower ratio and with the allowance for roads through the rural area.
4. Peter Rimpos, Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council *via email*
Mr. Rimpos spoke on behalf of the following community organizations: GV/LHA, EPCA, UBCUAC, SCAR, HHA, and FoSV. Mr. Rimpos stated the following:
 - We request the GMPC recommend no changes to the 4:1 Program, such as accepting a “reduced ratio” for “high-conservation properties” or “accepting non-UGA-adjacent parcels” to be considered.
 - We request the GMPC recommend no changes that would allow urban-serving roads in the Rural Area to ensure consistency with the CPPs.

Agenda Item IV – Motion 20-1 to Approve Proposed Changes to the UGA

Ivan Miller, King County, briefed the GMPC on the three proposed changes to the Urban Growth Area being considered in the 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan. The three proposed changes are:

1. Right-of-Way area adjacent to the City of Woodinville being added to the UGA due to the construction of a roundabout.
2. Utility tract parcels adjacent to the City of Maple Valley being added to the UGA because the facilities on these lands serve the urban area, exclusively.
3. Three parcels adjacent to the City of Issaquah being removed from the UGA and added to the Rural Area due to an outdated land use designation.

Mr. Miller stated that these changes remain unchanged from the previous briefing on February 26, 2020.

Motion 20-1 was unanimously approved following a roll call vote of the members.

Agenda Item V – 4 to 1 Program – Proposed Changes

Ivan Miller, King County, briefed the GMPC on the proposed set of amendments to the 4 to 1 Program under consideration in the 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendments are being brought to the GMPC for its review and consideration. The following table summarizes the substantive amendments under consideration by the King County Council:

<i>Proposed Amendments</i>	<i>Relevant CPP</i>
New urban lands	
Requires a city or town to agree to add new urban area to their potential annexation area.	DP-17 (g) 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....
For proposals adjacent to a city or town, gives them the option to agree to annex the urban portion, and if agreed to would require development to occur only after annexation, and require an interlocal agreement within 90 days approval. If the jurisdiction does not agree, development can occur prior to annexation.	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...
New open space lands	
Requires the open space portion of the proposal to be primarily on-site and buffer the urban portion from Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands	DP-16 (b)(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...
Allows a reduced open space dedication ratio if the proposal includes a property qualifying as high conservation value or provides affordable housing	DP-16 (b)(1) Is at least four times the acreage of the land added to the Urban Growth Area...
Requires that roads serving the new urban, to the maximum extent feasible, not be allowed within the open space or rural area.	DP-17 (c) Can be efficiently provided with urban services and does not require supportive facilities located in the Rural Area...
Program procedures	
Does not allow any parcels designated as natural resource lands to use the program	DP-17 (e) Is not currently designated as Resource Land...

Seattle City Councilmember Deborah Juarez, who was unable to attend the meeting, submitted comments via email regarding the 4 to 1 Program: *Item V on the agenda, proposed changes to the 4 to 1 Program, is of interest to Seattle in ensuring a strong urban-rural line, balanced growth and continued strong protections for rural areas in the county. Therefore, it would be helpful if the GMPC's review of this issue could be addressed at a future date.*

Seattle City Councilmember Dan Strauss, who was unable to attend the meeting, submitted comments via email regarding the 4 to 1 Program: *Item V on the agenda, proposed changes to the 4 to 1 Program, is of interest to the City of Seattle in ensuring continued strong protections for rural areas in the county. As the proposal is substantive and relates directly to similar provisions in the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), I would request that the GMPC review this issue in an inclusive way at a future meeting.*

Following discussion by the members of the GMPC, Executive Constantine offered the following motion for consideration:

GMPC MOTION NO. 2020-2

The Growth Management Planning Council recommends that the King County Council defer action on any changes to the Four-to-One program that are related to the Countywide Planning Policies, and recommends that those amendments be considered first as part of the 2021 update to the Countywide Planning Policies. This includes amendments related to the following topics that were identified in the June 24, 2020 Growth Management Planning Council agenda packet: allowing facilities that serve the new urban area to be located in the rural area, reducing the requirement for at least four acres of new open space for each new acre of urban land, prohibiting Four-to-One proposals on parcels that are designated as natural resource lands, and requiring the city or town affiliated with the new urban area to be required to add the land to their Potential Annexation Area. The Growth Management Planning Council makes no recommendation on the remaining Four-to-One program amendments under consideration by King County.

Motion 20-2 was approved by roll call vote 7.5 yes to 1 no, with Councilmember Lambert voting no.

Agenda Item VI – Briefing: 2020 CPP Update

Executive Constantine stated that the focus of the work of the GMPC this year will be to update the Countywide Planning Policies to reflect VISION 2050. Karen Wolf, King County, briefed the GMPC on the updated schedule and the Guiding Principles. The goal is to have the 2021 CPP Update Public Review Draft released during the first quarter of 2021 and action by the GMPC in Spring/early Summer, 2021. The GMPC members agreed to the Guiding Principles, which will be used by staff to prepare amendments to the CPPs. Rebecca Maskin, King County, also briefed the GMPC on the methodology to develop growth targets, which are a part of the CPP update. New growth targets will support the 2024-2044 planning period. The Regional Growth Strategy in VISION 2050 will be used to disaggregate a regional forecast to King County and Regional Geographies in King County. Initial target ranges for each city and potential annexation area will be created from data-based factors, and then jurisdictions will convene by Regional Geography to determine their final growth targets by Spring/early Summer, 2021.

Agenda Item VII – Briefing: Urban Growth Capacity Report

Rebecca Maskin, King County, briefed the GMPC on the revised schedule for the Urban Growth Capacity Report and status of the project. The 2021 Report is scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2021.

Agenda Item VIII – Briefing: Affordable Housing Committee

McCaela Daffern, King County, provided an update on the work of the Affordable Housing Committee. The Committee met in May to discuss how the AHC’s priorities should change as a result of COVID-19. Three things emerged for the Committee as new work plan priorities: 1) advocacy related to housing recovery, renter stability, and protecting and increasing affordable housing resources; 2) taking advantage of a shift in market conditions to further strategic acquisition and preservation/ redevelopment goals; and 3) a new member-driven initiatives effort. Staff also provided updates on the creation of a table composed of people most disproportionately negatively impacted by the affordable housing crisis to ensure that Committee’s decisions are shared and informed by their lived experience; progress on amendments to the Housing Chapter of the CPPs and changes to the timeline; the intent to launch an affordable housing dashboard by the end of the year; and an update on the Committee’s effort to analyze and identify new sources of affordable housing revenue.

Next meeting is scheduled for September 30, 2020.

Executive Constantine adjourned the meeting at 5:55 pm.