

KING COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

AGENDA TITLE: 2024 School/County/City Coordination Meetings Report

PRESENTED BY: Dan Cardwell, King County Department of Local Services

Today's Meeting

At its December meeting, the GMPC will hear a briefing on the *2024 School/County/City Coordination Meetings Report*.

Background

Since the adoption of the 2012 Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), school siting has been a significant issue for the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC).ⁱ Policies regarding school siting were includedⁱⁱ in the CPPs that directed schools to be located in the Urban Growth Area (UGA). In 2015, policies were added that directed biannual meetings between school districts and jurisdictions in King County, and the development of a report to the GMPC to document the outcomes of the meetings. In adopting these policies, the GMPC recognized that siting schools in the UGA was a shared responsibility between school districts and the local jurisdictions.

The 2021 CPP updateⁱⁱⁱ made minor wording changes to the primary policy that directed that the meetings occur (also, policy PF-19A was renumbered to PF-22). In addition, policies PF-20 and PF-23 were added to incorporate the work done in GMPC Motion 18-1^{iv} which outlined actions that jurisdictions could take to facilitate the development and renovation of schools within the UGA.

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.

Shown below are the relevant policies that guide the coordination work.

PF-20 Jurisdictions shall work collaboratively with school districts to ensure the availability of sufficient land and the provision of necessary educational facilities within the Urban Growth Area through compliance with PF-22 and PF-23 and through the land use element and capital facilities element of local comprehensive plans.

PF-21 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). 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 a rural location and their size and scale supports rural character.

Public school facilities to meet the needs of growing communities are an essential part of the public infrastructure. Coordination between each jurisdiction's land use plan and regulations and their respective school district[s] facility needs are essential for public school capacity needs to be met. The following policy applies countywide and requires engagement between each school district and each city that is served by the school district. The policy also applies to King County as a jurisdiction for areas of unincorporated King County that are within a school district's service boundary. The policy initiates a periodic procedure to identify if there are individual school district siting issues and if so, a process for the school district and jurisdiction to cooperatively prepare strategies for resolving the issue.

[POLICY DIRECTING REPORT] **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.

PF-23 Coordinate and collaborate with school districts to build new and expand existing school facilities within the Urban Growth Area. Jurisdictions and school districts should work together to employ strategies such as:

- a) Identifying surplus properties and private properties that could be available for new school sites;
- b) Creating opportunities for shared use of buildings, fields, and other facilities;
- c) Reviewing development regulations to increase the areas where schools can be located and to enable challenging sites to be used for new, expanded, and renovated schools;
- d) Prioritizing and simplifying permitting of schools;
- e) Considering the feasibility of locating playfields on land in the rural area directly adjacent to school sites located within the urban area and with direct access from the urban area;
- f) Partnering with school districts in planning and financing walking and biking routes for schools; and
- g) Encouraging more walking, biking, and transit ridership for students, teachers, and staff. Strategies should recognize the school district's adopted educational program requirements, established and planned school service areas, limited availability of developable sites, and established and planned growth patterns and enrollment projections.

2024 Report

This is the fifth round of meetings held in accordance with PF-22 (formerly PF-19A). As described more fully in the 2024 report, for many districts, actual and projected student enrollment continued to decrease based on pandemic impacts and recent low birth rates. This has allowed some districts to catch-up with past growth demands through existing or replacement facilities, and enabled districts to accommodate students in permanent school facilities rather than portables. As jurisdictions are currently amending local comprehensive plans and development regulations in response to state-level legislation, resulting development projects will be monitored to determine if and how the regulatory changes may alter demographic characteristics and student enrollment projections. The 2024 meetings did not result in the need for districts and jurisdictions to cooperatively develop a strategy for addressing any school capacity shortfall.

Future Activity

Review is concluded for the 2023-2024 biennium. Jurisdictions and school districts will continue to work together as their planning needs dictate. The next report will be developed in 2026.

For More Information

Please contact Dan Cardwell, King County Department of Local Services – King County School Technical Review Committee Chair, at dcardwell@kingcounty.gov or 206-263-3733.

Attachment

A. 2024 Report on School/City/County Coordination Meetings

-
- i King County School Siting Website [\[LINK\]](#)
 - ii 2012 Countywide Planning Policies [\[LINK\]](#)
 - iii 2021 Countywide Planning Policies [\[LINK\]](#)
 - iv GMPC Motion 18-1 [\[LINK\]](#)

Report to the Growth Management Planning Council:

Countywide Planning Policy PF-22

School/City/County Coordination Meetings

October 2024



King County

I. Contents2

II. Purpose 3

III. Background..... 3

IV. Invitation to Coordination Meetings 6

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

VI. Conclusion12

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, cooperatively prepare 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, in addition to coordination for the annual review of school district capital facility plans for the purpose of collecting impact fees. 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, in 2012 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.

In 2018, the GMPC approved Motion 18-1 which endorsed a set of best practices for cities and the county working together with school districts to build new schools and school facilities within the UGA. These strategies were reviewed in the 2021 update of the CPPs and, in addition to strategies noted previously in PF-22, an additional set of strategies for collaborative work between jurisdictions and school districts were included in PF-23. The policy reads as follows:

PF-23 Coordinate and collaborate with school districts to build new and expand existing school facilities within the Urban Growth Area. Jurisdictions and school districts should work together to employ strategies such as:

- a) Identifying surplus properties and private properties that could be available for new school sites;
- b) Creating opportunities for shared use of buildings, fields, and other facilities;
- c) Reviewing development regulations to increase the areas where schools can be located and to enable challenging sites to be used for new, expanded, and renovated schools;
- d) Prioritizing and simplifying permitting of schools;
- e) Considering the feasibility of locating playfields on land in the rural area directly adjacent to school sites located within the urban area and with direct access from the urban area;
- f) Partnering with school districts in planning and financing walking and biking routes for schools; and
- g) Encouraging more walking, biking, and transit ridership for students, teachers, and staff.

Strategies should recognize the school district's adopted educational program requirements, established and planned school service areas, limited availability of developable sites, and established and planned growth patterns and enrollment projections.

Report Methodology: This report was developed based on information discussed at the 7 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 proposed legislative changes through the jurisdiction's required GMA periodic update, due in December 2024.
- County staff shared a potential approach to meeting the requirements of SB 5258 as it pertains to the calculation of school impact fees.
- Based on this information, the coordination meetings were also used to determine

whether a strategy—that is, a cooperative strategy established between a school district and appropriate jurisdiction(s) 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 contacted all the school districts serving King County residents in March of 2024 to coordinate meetings with the respective King County jurisdictions. Seventeen districts responded to the county’s outreach and 3 districts did not provide any response. Of those that responded, seven (7) 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:

- Highline
- Issaquah
- Northshore
- Shoreline
- Renton
- Lake Washington
- Snoqualmie Valley

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

V. School District Capacity Assessment

Seven school districts and 19 jurisdictions which they serve opted to participate in PF-22 coordination meetings convened by King County. Prior to each of the meeting participants presenting information, King County staff provided a summary of the relevant countywide planning policies and the objective of the meeting series. A summary of the meetings is summarized in the following table¹:

2024 PF-22 Meeting Series			
School District	Jurisdictions Represented	Meeting Date	Meeting Summary
Snoqualmie Valley (SVSD): Ryan Stokes Denise Stiffarm (legal counsel)	City of North Bend: Rebecca Deming City of Sammamish: David Pyle City of Snoqualmie Andrew Levins King County: Dan Cardwell Ivan Miller	June 28, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SVSD shared their enrollment projections; following massive growth over the last 15 years, the District is now forecasting flat enrollment at the K-12 level over the next five years but with increases in K-5 and 6-8 grades during that same time, followed by an overall K-12 increase thereafter. • SVSD noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ school building renovations needed due to age of facilities;

¹ King County staff have detailed meeting minutes and power point presentations on file.

2024 PF-22 Meeting Series

School District	Jurisdictions Represented	Meeting Date	Meeting Summary
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ opportunity to add capacity as a part of the elementary school renovation projects and a new Snoqualmie Middle School (moving from current location to other land owned by the District); and, ○ they are not looking to acquire additional property for school facilities or operations. ● The jurisdictions shared development activity information and well as growth policy changes proposed through their respective 2024 comprehensive plan updates. ● It was agreed upon that there is not a need to pursue a strategy as identified in PF-22 to address a capacity shortfall.
<p>Highline (HSD): Jackie Bryan Ellie Daneshnia Denise Stiffarm (legal counsel)</p>	<p>King County: Dan Cardwell Ivan Miller City of Des Moines: No Representative City of Kent: Kristen Holdsworth City of Normandy Park: Nicholas Matz City of SeaTac: Zack Shields City of Tukwila Nancy Eklund</p>	<p>July 8, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● HSD shared current plans related to implementation of the November 2022 bond – this is focused primarily on the replacement of schools. ● HSD noted it anticipates that its student enrollment will continue to decrease over the next 5 years, and then start to increase beginning in 2028. ● HSD discussed lessons learned about the permitting process for new facilities; an example being the time necessary to address changes to new stormwater provisions. ● The jurisdictions shared their growth targets and plans to accommodate the growth, relevant demographic information, and planned code updates associated with 2024 comprehensive plan updates. ● In response to a request from the HSD, cities indicated a willingness to meet more often with district staff about projects in addition to participation in project pre-application meetings.

2024 PF-22 Meeting Series

School District	Jurisdictions Represented	Meeting Date	Meeting Summary
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed upon that there is not a need to pursue a strategy as identified in PF-22 to address a capacity shortfall.
Issaquah (ISD): Martin Turney Tom Mullins Denise Stiffarm (legal counsel)	City of Issaquah: Minnie Dhaliwal Stephen Padua City of Sammamish: David Pyle City of Renton: Angie Mathias City of Newcastle: Erin Fitzgibbons King County: Dan Cardwell	July 8, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ISD shared enrollment projections; it projects near term a slight decrease in K-12 student enrollment but expects enrollment numbers to come back up soon. ISD noted the continued need for the planned new high school based on existing enrollment/capacity. A bond is proposed to go to voters in November 2024 for the remaining funding. ISD has a site and land use entitlements for the new high school and anticipates that it would open in fall of 2027. ISD expressed a desire to keep discussion open about future school sites as it anticipates increased need associated with growth in 5 to 15 years from now. The jurisdictions shared their growth targets and plans to accommodate growth, relevant demographic information, and planned code updates associated with 2024 comprehensive plan updates. The City of Sammamish noted it included a school theme, with policies that reference schools throughout the comprehensive plan. The City of Sammamish recognizes challenges exist for students to walk to school due the cul-de-sacs. The city is exploring opportunities to find opportunities to increase walkability and access through the identification of potential easements between cul-de-sac neighborhoods. The City of Renton noted interest in talking with ISD about its plans for a new early learning center in the Renton area.

2024 PF-22 Meeting Series

School District	Jurisdictions Represented	Meeting Date	Meeting Summary
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cities noted a willingness to partner with the districts to discuss and potentially improve the process for permitting new schools. • It was agreed upon that there is not a need to pursue a strategy as identified in PF-22 to address a capacity shortfall.
Shoreline (SSD): Angela Von Essen Dan Stevens	City of Shoreline: Andrew Bauer City of Lake Forest Park: Mark Hofman King County: Dan Cardwell	July 11, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSD shared student enrollment projections which include a steady decline in student enrollment with a noticeable decrease in kindergarten students. • SSD noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ it does not have need for additional property for new schools; it has closed schools and has vacant property. Four additional schools are being considered for closure; ○ closed schools could be used to house classrooms if it pursues a bond to replace an existing elementary school; ○ the City of Shoreline maintains some vacant school property as publicly accessible parks; ○ it is looking at opportunities to balance attendance areas between both sides of the freeway to allow students to live close to the school they attend; and, ○ it has regularly scheduled meetings with the City of Shoreline staff. • The jurisdictions shared growth targets and plans to accommodate growth, relevant demographic information, and planned code updates associated with 2024 comprehensive plan updates. • It was agreed upon that there is not a need to pursue a strategy as identified in PF-22 to address a capacity shortfall.

2024 PF-22 Meeting Series

School District	Jurisdictions Represented	Meeting Date	Meeting Summary
<p>Lake Washington (LWSD): Brian Buck Denise Stiffarm (legal counsel)</p>	<p>City of Kirkland: Allison Zike City of Redmond: Glenn Coil City of Sammamish: Miryam Laytner King County: Dan Cardwell Ivan Miller</p>	<p>July 26, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWSD stated that it has a great working relationship with all the jurisdictions that it serves. • LWSD shared student enrollment projections and noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ enrollment has not returned from pre-pandemic levels (when LWSD was one of the fastest growing school districts in the state); its 2023-24 student headcount was higher than expected, however, it still projects a decrease in K-12 enrollment through 2034; ○ it forecasts that most of the housing growth will occur through multi-family development which typically generates fewer students than single-unit detached housing; ○ planning for continuing capacity needs at all grade levels including a 5th comprehensive high school, which it does have an existing site for, and a smaller Choice high school on District-owned property in Sammamish; and, ○ LWSD continues to look for opportunities to site early learning centers and transition academies in commercial and mixed-use development. • The jurisdictions shared growth targets and plans to accommodate growth, relevant demographic information, and planned code updates associated with 2024 comprehensive plan updates. • The City of Kirkland noted that through its 2024 Comprehensive Plan update, it is increasing development capacity at existing school sites citywide; giving the school district more flexibility in the location and site design requirements. • The City of Redmond noted it is interested in working with the school

2024 PF-22 Meeting Series

School District	Jurisdictions Represented	Meeting Date	Meeting Summary
			<p>district to identify shared use and co-location opportunities areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of Sammamish noted it included a school theme , with policies that reference schools throughout the comprehensive plan. • It was agreed upon that there is not a need to pursue a strategy as identified in PF-22 to address a capacity shortfall.
<p>Northshore (NSD): Dri Ralph Chelsea Starkey Denise Stiffarm (legal counsel)</p>	<p>City of Kenmore: Todd Hall Reilly Rosbotham City of Bothell No Representative City of Woodinville No Representative King County: Dan Cardwell</p>	<p>July 26, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSD shared its student enrollment projections and noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ its student enrollment is roughly the same as pre-covid and is being maintained. NSD does anticipate growth over the next 6 years across all grade levels, with the majority occurring at the high school level; ○ it is not seeking new school sites as anticipated student growth is being accommodated at existing school sites with programmed additions through its existing bond projects; ○ it is attempting to replace portables with permanent classroom space; and, ○ sporting facilities used by the community at one school are scheduled for replacement. • NSD expressed a desire to hold annual meetings with the cities that it serves. • The jurisdictions shared growth targets and plans to accommodate growth, relevant demographic information, and planned code updates associated with 2024 comprehensive plan updates. • It was agreed upon that there is not a need to pursue a strategy as identified in PF-22 address a capacity shortfall.

2024 PF-22 Meeting Series			
School District	Jurisdictions Represented	Meeting Date	Meeting Summary
Renton (RSD): Matt Feldmeyer	City of Bellevue: Thara Johnson City of Newcastle: Erin Fitzgibbons City of Renton: Angie Mathias King County: Dan Cardwell	July 26, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSD shared its student enrollment projections and noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ its student enrollment peaked in 2018; ○ the decrease in student enrollment through the pandemic has allowed its building capacity to catch up with growth as it replaces portables with permanent classroom space; ○ despite a significant drop in student enrollment, there is not a need to close schools; ○ more student capacity will be provided through replacement of older school facilities with design and modern teaching facilities; and, ○ the possibility of changing school attendance areas. • The jurisdictions shared growth targets and plans to accommodate growth, relevant demographic information, and planned code updates associated with 2024 comprehensive plan updates. • It was agreed upon that there is not a need to pursue a strategy as identified in PF-22 to address a capacity shortfall.

VI. Conclusion

The 2024 PF-22 meeting series is the fifth 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.

It is evident that staff from those districts and cities that have consistently participated in this meeting series have developed mutually beneficial relationships and city staff are more conscious of the need to ensure that local regulations allow for the accommodation of school facilities. Furthermore, many districts desire to have more frequent coordination meetings with the cities they serve to discuss specific projects and challenges. New staff with both districts and cities expressed that these meetings

were beneficial and provided an opportunity to connect with a staff contact at the respective organizations.

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 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 cooperatively prepare a strategy to address a capacity shortfall. While a need to develop such a strategy does not currently exist at the time of this report, as shared through these meetings, some cities, at their accord, have considered or are pursuing regulatory changes through their 2024 GMA comprehensive plan periodic updates to provide school districts with greater flexibility in siting and designing new school facilities.

In the coordination meetings and their capital facilities plans, many school districts noted a continued decrease in actual and projected student enrollment following the pandemic and with recent low birth rates. While this decrease has not been consistent across all grade levels, staff noted it has allowed some districts to catch-up with past growth demands through existing or replacement facilities, and enabled districts to accommodate students in permanent school facilities rather than portables. For a one district, a decrease in enrollment has resulted in the closing or initiated consideration of closing school facilities. While the closure of a school may provide future accommodations for students when a district remodels or replaces another school, staff noted that a district is still responsible for continuing facility maintenance to ensure it does not become a blight in the community.

As mentioned in the 2022 report, local jurisdictions are amending comprehensive plans and associated development regulations to respond to state-level legislation aimed at encouraging affordable housing and middle residential unit types, increased density, and meeting updated growth targets. School districts and jurisdictions will be monitoring the resulting development projects. It is anticipated that these new provisions will have a minimal effect in those communities like Sammamish where a large amount of property is subject to homeowner association covenants which restrict development opportunities. For other areas, the resulting development may significantly alter a district's enrollment projection and student generation ratio, i.e. assumed number of students per unit type. The result, being a greater number of students stemming from attached single-units and multi-unit developments and potentially a lower percentage of students from detached single-units, in certain areas of the county. The impact of these regulatory changes will be evident in future school district capital facility plans and resulting calculated impact fees.

The next report will be provided to the GMPC in 2026.