

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

AGENDA TITLE: School Siting Task Force

PRESENTED BY: Interjurisdictional Staff Team

BACKGROUND

The Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) approved the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) on September 21, 2011. However, the GMPC could not reach consensus on policies governing the siting of facilities and services. At issue was whether school districts serving urban and rural students should site schools in rural areas and whether such facilities should be served by sewers. The four proposed policies addressing this topic were set aside. The GMPC approved Motion 11-2 calling for the creation of a Task Force to study the issue. Motion 11-2 stated the mission of the Task Force, as:

Develop recommendations to better align city, county, and school districts' planning for future school facilities in order to provide quality education for all children and maximize health, environmental, programmatic, fiscal, and social objectives.

THE SCHOOL SITING TASK FORCE

The 30-member Task Force representing a broad coalition of stakeholders from throughout the region, as specified in Motion 11-2, was chaired by former King County Councilmember, Louise Miller. The Task Force met regularly from December 2011 through March 2012. The Task Force concluded that future schools should be sited in the Urban Growth Area or in rural towns. Further, the Task Force made recommendations as to the use or disposition of each of eighteen undeveloped school sites. The recommendations for the eighteen sites reflect the spirit of the Growth Management Act, while considering the investments that school districts made in good faith to plan for growth.

Motion 12-2 would add The School Siting Task Force Report to the CPPs as Appendix 5.

POLICIES SET ASIDE

On September 21, 2011, the GMPC approved the CPP Update and set aside the following four policies:

DP-50 Limit new public facilities located in the Rural Area to a size and scale appropriate to serve the Rural Area unless the public facilities are consistent with a rural location, such as a large passive park.

PF-12 Prohibit sewer expansion in the Rural Area and Resource Lands except where needed to address specific health and safety problems threatening existing structures. If needed, provide such sewer expansion in a manner that does not increase development potential in the Rural Area.

PF-18 Locate human, community, and educational services and facilities that serve urban populations within the Urban Growth Area, where they are accessible to the populations that they serve. Site these services and facilities in locations that are well served by transit and pedestrian and bicycle networks.

PF-19 Locate human, community, and educational services and facilities that serve rural residents in neighboring cities, rural towns, and rural neighborhood centers.

PROPOSED POLICIES

The following policies are proposed to replace the four policies that were set aside:

DP-50 Except as provided in Appendix 5 (March 31, 2012 School Siting Task Force Report), limit new nonresidential uses located in the Rural Area to those that are demonstrated to serve the Rural Area, unless the use is dependent upon a rural location. Such uses shall be of a size, scale, and nature that is consistent with rural character.

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

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

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

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

PF-19 Locate schools, institutions, and other community facilities and services primarily serving rural residents in neighboring cities and rural towns, or as provided in Appendix 5 (March 31, 2012 School Siting Task Force Report).

RECOMMENDATION

The IJT recommends that the GMPC move to recommend approval of the draft policies for the siting of facilities and services and to add The School Siting Task Force Report to the CPPs as Appendix 5 through the passage of Motion 12-2.

NEXT STEPS

- GMPC action on Motion 12-2
- King County Council consideration of GMPC approved CPPs including the revised policies on siting of facilities and services
- Ratification process for individual cities following King County Council action