

## Summary of Striking Amendment S1 to Proposed Ordinance 2017-0317 2017 KCCP and Vashon-Maury Island CSA Subarea Plan

Council review of the transmitted legislative package for the 2017 update to the King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) and Vashon-Maury Island Community Service Area (CSA) Subarea Plan (Proposed Ordinance 2017-0317), has identified many policy issues for Council consideration. The substantive policy issues include inconsistencies with the Growth Management Act (GMA), adopted County policy, and County budget. Additionally, all documents in the transmittal have significant technical issues that need to be addressed. The following table outlines the key policy issues in each of the transmittal’s elements and associated proposed Striking Amendment S1 changes.

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<b>Ordinance</b>	
<p><b>1. Technical issues</b> The transmittal includes errors that need to be corrected, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistencies in references to and definitions of “subarea plans;”</li> <li>• Inaccurately reflecting the County’s comprehensive planning and Vashon-Maury Island subarea planning history;</li> <li>• Not utilizing current King County Code language; and</li> <li>• Lacking clarity that, with the adoption of the 2017 subarea plan, 1996 Town Plan is now repealed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes necessary technical corrections and non-substantive edits.</li> <li>• Reflects that the 1996 Town Plan is being repealed.</li> <li>• Proposed Title Amendment T1 reflects the proposed changes to the ordinance.</li> </ul>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>2. Affordable Housing Incentive SDO</b>            The ordinance proposes a new Special District Overlay (SDO), which would create an incentive program for affordable housing development on 246 parcels within the Vashon Rural Town boundary. The SDO would be a voluntary program for these eligible parcels (designated in transmitted Attachment D), where a development would have the option to receive a density bonus if certain affordable housing requirements are met. As transmitted, the proposed SDO may not be administrable, including income levels that are unclear, requirements for an administrative development agreement that does not comply with state law, combining procedural and substantive requirements, as well as numerous technical issues with the proposed language.</p>	<p>Amends the SDO, including the following key changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarified the income limits, so that a minimum of 50% of the units are required to be affordable at 60% AMI, and the remainder of the units are affordable at 80% AMI.</li> <li>• Sets rental and sales caps, similar to other affordable housing covenants and the County’s existing code requires.</li> <li>• Clarified which parcels the SDO would apply to, by tying it to the map amendments in Attachment B.</li> <li>• Clarifies density incentives, compliance with the development regulations, duration of affordability.</li> <li>• Requires a covenant recorded against the property for projects using the SDO provisions and clarifies the requirements of that covenant.</li> <li>• Removes cross references to the Residential Density Incentive (RDI) code, and instead incorporates the standards required under the RDI code for parking, landscaping and provision of recreation space into the SDO.</li> <li>• Removes energy conservation requirements carried over from the RDI code, as they are no longer more stringent than Energy Code requirements.</li> <li>• Clarifies some water conservation requirements.</li> <li>• Clarifies the standards that differ from other development regulations.</li> <li>• Clarifies the requirement for water and sewer connections.</li> <li>• Adds a requirement for a pre-application meeting, clarifies other procedural requirements.</li> </ul>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adds language to add in enforcement of the affordability levels for the duration of the covenant.</li> <li>• Clarifies the evaluation requirements to make it clear the evaluation, including public comment period, is required to be completed by the Executive branch.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Annual cycle KCCP amendments</b>            Staff review of existing language in the King County Code and the KCCP has identified that the ability to adopt CSA subarea plans during annual cycle KCCP updates may not be fully captured.</p>	<p>Amends the Code (K.C.C. 20.18.030) and the (Policy I-203, p. 29 of Attachment C) to clarify allowance of adoption of CSA subarea plans during annual cycle KCCP updates, consistent with adopted policy direction in the 2016 update of the KCCP.</p>

**Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal**

**Striking Amendment S1**

**Attachment A - Vashon-Maury Island CSA Subarea Plan**

**4. Technical and non-substantive issues**

The transmittal includes technical errors and non-substantive issues that need to be addressed, including:

- Inconsistencies in references to and definitions of “subarea plans;”
- Incorrect names for agencies, organizations, and other planning documents;
- Incorrectly stating that the entire island has a “Rural Area” land use designation;
- Outdated King County Strategic Plan language;
- Incorrect or outdated data;
- How the plan references current KCCP policies;
- Not reflecting the separate governance of the King County Flood Control District; and
- Not reflecting current elected membership of the King County Council.

Makes necessary technical corrections, clarifications, and non-substantive edits to text, policies, actions, and maps.

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>5. Non-editable format</b>                      The subarea plan was transmitted in a highly-designed, non-editable format on a specialized (9"x10") page size. This format is challenging for printing (either by Council staff or by members of the public) and makes it difficult for the Council to incorporate amendment language. To allow for Council amendments, the document will need to be reformatted into an editable text document on standard-sized paper.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subarea plan is reformatted into a non-designed Word format on traditional 8 1/2"x11 paper.</li> <li>• While photographs from the transmitted version were not able to be incorporated into the non-designed, text version of the plan, the transmitted version of text, tables, maps, and figures are all included in the reformatted version of the subarea plan in Attachment A to the striking amendment.</li> <li>• Aside from formatting changes, any additional striking amendment edits to the transmitted version of text, tables, maps, and figures are shown in legislative format: (<del>striketrough</del>) for removed language and <u>underline</u> for added language.</li> <li>• Many of the transmitted figures are shown as being removed in the striking amendment either due to: 1) Council staff not having access to source files for the figures and thus are not able to correct errors in them, and/or 2) needing to reflect consistency with the new text version of the plan.</li> </ul>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>6. Connections to repealed 1986 Community Plan</b>                      The transmittal includes various references to the 1986 Vashon Community Plan and proposes to carry forward many of the 1986 Plan’s text and policies. The 1986 Plan was adopted prior to adoption of the GMA, and thus includes text and polices that are non-consistent with current State growth management planning requirements. Following the passage of the GMA, the Community Plan was repealed in 1998. Incorporating elements from the repealed 1986 Plan into the new 2017 Subarea Plan would create inconsistencies with the GMA.</p>	<p>References to the repealed 1986 Community Plan are removed, aside from necessary information to reflect the legislative history for previous Vashon-Maury Island plans. Proposed subarea plan text and policies derived from the 1986 Plan are updated to reflect GMA requirements. A few of these type of changes are highlighted in the subject-area chapters below.</p>
<p><b>7. Inconsistences with the KCCP</b>                      The GMA (RCW 36.70A.080) requires subarea plans to be consistent with comprehensive plans. The transmittal also states that subarea plans will not duplicate policies that are already adopted in the KCCP. (p. 8) However, the transmitted subarea plan in Attachment A includes language in many policies and/or actions, as well as narrative text, that is inconsistent with or duplicative of the KCCP.</p>	<p>Text, policies, and actions throughout the plan are updated to reflect the 2016 KCCP. A few of these type of changes are highlighted in the subject-area chapters below.</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>8. Internally inconsistent policy and action language</b>            The transmittal includes the language for every policy and action twice in the document. For example, F-16 and its action is first listed in its subject-area chapter in Chapter 10 Services, Facilities and Utilities. (p. 94) Then, F-16 and its action is listed a second time in the implementation tables in Chapter 11 (p. 113). This is the same for every policy and action in the plan. However, Council staff review of the transmittal found that the language for F-16 and its action in Chapter 10 is not the same as the language for F-16 and its action in Chapter 11. This is the case for many of the policies and/or actions throughout the plan. Having two different versions of the same policy and action will cause confusion when the plan is implemented, both for the public and for the county, regarding what policy direction was really intended. Executive staff noted that this was not intentional, and was an error on staff's part to not incorporate revisions in both locations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council staff worked with Executive staff to incorporate changes to reflect the intended version of language for each policy and action.</li> <li>• The transmitted policy and action tables are deleted in each subject-area chapter. Consistent with the format of the KCCP, the language for individual policies are then re-integrated into the body of each chapter so as to align with the applicable lead-in narrative text. Tables are no longer used and action language is no longer listed in the subject-area chapters.</li> <li>• In the implementation tables in Chapter 11, the transmitted policy and action tables are deleted. New tables are added that include the language for all of the actions. Policy language is no longer listed in the implementation tables; instead, the applicable policy number is listed for each action item.</li> <li>• By listing only policy language in the subject-area chapters and only action language in the implementation tables, this removes the potential for inconsistencies.</li> <li>• Consistent with the transmitted version, the policies in the subject-area chapters continue to be organized by policy number and the actions in the implementation chapter continue to be organized by implementation priority (Priority 1, 2, 3, or Ongoing).</li> </ul>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
-------------------------------------	-----------------------

Executive Summary	
-------------------	--

**9. On-site sewage study in text and Policy F-12**  
 The transmittal proposes an island-wide study of on-site sewage systems to evaluate the impacts of sea level rise and the need for community systems or other options. (Policy F-12 p. 93, and Action p. 117) This is presented in the text as a key goal for community members. The Executive Summary highlights this as “one of the plan’s most ambitious goals.” (p. 4) Narrative text related to the study is also included on page 90 of Chapter 10: Services, Facilities and Utilities. Unfortunately, Public Health staff report that they do not have funding to implement this study, and cannot commit to the action as drafted in the transmitted plan.

The policy (previously Policy F-12 now F-11, p. 131) and Action (p.165) are reoriented to encourage DNRP to seek grant funds for the study. The Executive Summary and text in Chapter 10 is updated to reflect this shift in policy direction. (p. 10 and 126)

Chapter 1: CSA Subarea Planning Framework	
---	--

**10. Tool for communication**  
 The transmittal includes language that implies the subarea plan is what the community uses to communicate its priorities to the County, which the County will then use to prepare programs and budgets. (p. 8) While the community is heavily involved in plan development, and the plan incorporates many of the community’s priorities, the plan is still ultimately a County document that needs to reflect County policy goals and requirements, and is written and adopted by King County. The language in the plan should reflect such.

The language in Chapter 1 (p. 13), as well as similar language in Chapter 11 (p. 135-136), is amended to reflect that subarea plans are a tool used by the County to:

- Engage with a community to better understand local priorities;
- Communicate County policy goals; and
- Outline how the County will implement the policies/actions in the plan.



Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
-------------------------------------	-----------------------

**11. Budget dependent**

The transmitted version of plan includes various policies and actions that implement the plan. Many of the policies and actions are very ambitious and may be out of the scope of current county program, staffing, and/or funding resources. Budget decisions cannot be made in a silo, and need to consider countywide programs, needs, and priorities. As such, the plan should not presume that future budgetary appropriations will be approved in order to implement such policies and actions. The plan should accurately reflect the budget authorization process and the uncertainties of future resources.

Language is added to Chapter 1 (p. 13), as well as in Chapter 11 (p. 136), to reflect many of the policies and actions in the plan are budget dependent and subject to whether or not future funding can be obtained. Additionally, many of the policies and actions in the plan are clarified to reflect where cost, availability of funding, and public benefit associated with the policy’s purpose are considered as part of the implementation decision, consistent with the KCCP.

**Chapter 2: Demographic Profile**

**12. Demographic data**

Chapter 2 of the transmittal includes a six-page-long table with very technical demographic data. (p. 12-17) While the data was helpful background that informed development of narrative text in Chapter 2, it is a level of detail that may not be appropriate for inclusion in the body of the plan. Additionally, the data range is from 2000 to 2015, which will be two years out of date by the time the plan is adopted and will eventually be 10 years out of date by the time the scheduled plan update is adopted in 2025. Additionally, there was not the time or resources to verify the accuracy of the information in the table.

Data is removed from Chapter 2 and relocated to a new Appendix of the plan. (Appendix B, p. 182-185)

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<b>Chapter 3: Community Engagement</b>	
<p><b>13. Community engagement process</b>                      The transmitted plan includes information about the community engagement process that occurred during plan development. (p. 18-20) The information in the plan only addresses engagement up through transmittal of the proposed plan to the Council. It may be useful to update this chapter to reflect community engagement process that occurred during the Council’s review, amendment, and adoption of the plan.</p>	<p>The Council’s review and deliberation process is still ongoing and will not be complete until final action is taken by the full Council. As a result, this striking amendment offered during Committee review does not address this issue. It is anticipated that an amendment to update this chapter will be proposed during final adoption by the full Council, which will capture the entirety of the Council’s community engagement process.</p>
<b>Chapter 4: Land use</b>	
<p><b>14. Internal inconsistencies with Policy LU-5</b>                      Policy LU-5, related to architectural design within Vashon Town Core, was included in Chapter 4: Land Use of the transmittal. (p. 29) However, LU-5 was not included in the implementation tables in Chapter 11 of the transmittal. Executive staff stated that LU-5 was included in a prior version of the draft plan, but was then determined that it should not be included in the plan. The transmittal correctly removed the policy from Chapter 11, but erroneously included it in Chapter 4.</p>	<p>LU-5 is removed from Chapter 4, and the remaining policies are renumbered. (p. 41)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>15. Parking reduction waivers in Policy LU-6</b>                      Policy LU-6 (p. 29) directed the County to grant parking reduction waivers for certain parcels identified on the “Vashon Town Core Parking Reduction Zone” map in the plan (p. 28). Without amending the code and/or imposing a special district overlay, the policy and associated map cannot require parking requirement reductions beyond what property owners can currently apply for in the code; neither of which is proposed in the transmittal. Additionally, Executive staff has stated that LU-6 is intended to carry forward the same intent of the parking reduction zone that currently exists in the 1996 Town Plan. However, the transmitted version of LU-6 omits several of the key development conditions in the 1996 policy (C-6).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy LU-6 is updated to reflect current King County Code requirements. Language from the existing 1996 policy is also added. (now LU-5 on p. 42)</li> <li>• The Map is clarified to reflect the policy changes. (p. 42)</li> <li>• The associated Action is also updated to evaluate effectiveness of the policy and whether a future special district overlay may be useful further the goals of the policy. (p. 164)</li> </ul>
<p><b>16. Relocation of Policy LU-8 as H-8</b>                      Policy LU-8, related to County support for a community efforts to establishment of a medical care facility and other social service activities on the Island, is included in Chapter 4: Land Use of the transmittal. (p. 30) It would be more appropriate to locate this policy Chapter 6: Housing and Human Services.</p>	<p>Policy is deleted from Chapter 4 (p. 45), and added to Chapter 6 as a new policy, H-8, with minor edits. (p. 70)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
-------------------------------------	-----------------------

Chapter 5: Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands	
<p><b>17. Public Benefit Rating System in Policy R-2</b>                      Policy R-2 (p. 35) and its Action (p. 99) calls for enhanced public outreach and education to Vashon-Maury Island participants in the Public Benefit Rating System (PBRs) program. However, Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP) staff state they do not currently have funding to do this work. This policy and its Action may also result in higher PBRs outreach and education on Vashon-Island than in other unincorporated areas of the County.</p>	<p>Policy language for R-2 (p. 48) and its associated Action (p. 159) are reoriented towards encouraging the County to seek grant funding for enhanced outreach and education.</p>
<p><b>18. Agriculture zoning in Policy R-7</b>                      Policy R-7 proposes allowing applications for rezones to an Agriculture zone on parcels down to 5 acres. (p. 38). This would have countywide implications and is inconsistent with the KCCP and the King County Code.</p>	<p>Policy R-7 is removed. (p. 55) King County Code currently allows many agriculture activities and uses in Rural Area zones.</p>
<p><b>19. Food processing plants in Policy R-8</b>                      Policy R-8 would require food processing plants to continue to be an allowed use in all Agriculture (A) zones. (p. 38) The appropriate zoning for food processing plants is already addressed in KCCP Policy R-662. R-8 is inconsistent with the direction in the R-662 and would have countywide implications. If the County wishes to revisit the policy direction in the KCCP for this issue, it would need to be evaluated during a four-year cycle update to the KCCP.</p>	<p>Policy R-8 is removed. (p. 55) The general sentiment of the policy is added to narrative text elsewhere in the Chapter. (p. 51)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<b>Chapter 6: Housing and Human Services</b>	
<p><b>20. Home ownership and ESJ</b>                      The transmittal includes language that states high levels of home ownership and owner occupancy rates “contributes to neighborhoods with strong social bonds and community trust.” (p. 43) This statement not something that can be verified, and Council staff is not aware of any correlation between owners versus renters in terms of social bonds or community trust. Additionally, this statement is not consistent with Equity and Social Justice (ESJ) principles and KCCP housing policies that require the County to support a wide range of housing options.</p>	<p>The text is removed from the plan. (p. 61)</p>
<p><b>21. Alternative and Innovative Housing Approaches</b>                      During plan outreach and development, the community expressed a great deal of interest in alternative and innovative housing approaches, including options that may be able to help support affordable housing needs. As a result, the transmittal included Figure 12, which outlined a variety of such housing models. (p. 45) When reformatting the transmitted plan into a non-designed text document, this information would be more appropriate for narrative text.</p>	<p>Figure 12 of the transmittal is deleted. (p. 65) The text from the figure is incorporated into the “What can be done?” portion of the “Affordable Housing” section of the Chapter. (p. 66-67)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>22. Relocation of Policy LU-8 as H-8</b>                      Policy LU-8, related to County support for a community efforts to establishment of a medical care facility and other social service activities on the Island, is included in Chapter 4: Land Use of the transmittal. (p. 30) It would be more appropriate to locate this policy Chapter 6: Housing and Human Services.</p>	<p>Policy is deleted from Chapter 4 (p. 45), and added to Chapter 6 as a new policy, H-8, with minor edits. (p. 70)</p>
<p><b>Chapter 7: Environment</b></p>	
<p><b>23. Clarification of Policy E-3</b>                      The history of Policy E-3 (p. 51), relating to protection of domestic water resources, is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy V-57 was adopted in the 1986 Community Plan.</li> <li>2) When the 1986 Plan was repealed in 1998, Policy V-57 was rewritten and incorporated in the KCCP, and the policy is still in the KCCP today as Policy CP-612.</li> <li>3) The transmittal proposes to remove CP-612 from the 2016 KCCP and incorporate it into the subarea plan as Policy E-3, without edit.</li> </ol> <p>Unfortunately, when V-57 was originally revised in 1998, the new language in CP-612 lacked clarity about what the intent of the policy is. Policy E-3 carries forward that same unclear language. The policy should be revised to clarify its intent.</p>	<p>Policy E-3 is revised to provide clarity. There are no substantive changes to the policy’s underlying intent. (p. 74)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>24. Re-adopting KCCP Policy F-292 as subarea plan Policy E-6</b></p> <p>The 2016 KCCP includes policies that are specific to Vashon-Maury Island throughout the plan. Attachment F in the transmittal proposes to remove most of these Vashon-Maury Island-specific policies from the KCCP. Most of these policies are then proposed to be moved into subarea plan in Attachment A. The 2016 KCCP includes Policy F-292, which encourages consideration of increased water levels due to climate change when constructing new structures or substantially improving existing structures on the Island. The transmittal did not propose to move F-292 from the KCCP to the subarea plan. Executive staff state that this was an oversight, and the policy should be moved.</p>	<p>Policy F-292 is deleted from the 2016 KCCP (p. 12 of Attachment C) and added as Policy E-6 in the subarea plan (p. 81 of Attachment A).</p>
<p><b>Chapter 8: Parks, Open Space and Cultural Resources</b></p>	
<p><b>25. Regional and backcountry trails in Policies P-7 and P-8</b></p> <p>The transmittal proposes a feasibility study of developing a new regional trail on the Island, as well as a network of backcountry trails. (Policies P-7 and P-8, p. 68). However, DNRP staff state that they do not currently have funding to carry out these feasibility studies.</p>	<p>Policies P-7 and P-8 (p. 97), and their associated Actions (p. 161-162), are reoriented toward working with the community to seek funding to perform the feasibility studies.</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>26. Arts and Culture in Policies P-9 through P-13</b></p> <p>The transmittal calls for a variety of increased County arts and culture actions and activities in Policies P-9 through P-13, and their associated Actions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting proactive integration of art into private spaces as a high priority (Policies P-9 and P-12, p.60 and 70) and ensuring and maximizing public access to private spaces for cultural and arts events (Policy P-13, p. 70);</li> <li>• Development of an Arts Master Plan with 4Culture and a community-based organization (Policy P-10, p. 69); and</li> <li>• Playing local music on Metro bus routes on the Island (Action for Policy P-12, p. 70).</li> </ul> <p>The County does not have authority over 4Culture or its budget, and does not currently provide funding for arts and culture activities. Additionally, it would not be appropriate for the County to mandate art in and/or public access to private spaces.</p>	<p>Policies P-9 through P-13 (p. 98-99), and their associated Actions (p. 162, 172-174), are reoriented towards the role that the County has regarding support for: 1) integrating public art in County facilities and other publicly accessible spaces consistent with KCCP policy direction, and 2) community efforts to implement other arts and culture actions and activities.</p>



Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>27. Historic Preservation in Policy P-14</b>                      Policy P-14 (p. 72), and its Action (p. 112), requires the County to partner with the community to identify sites of historic value and nominate the sites for federal, state, and/or county historic designations. The County does not have programmatic, staff, or budget resources to proactively identify and nominate sites for historic designation. Additionally, the County does not have a role in federal or state designation of historic sites. Regarding county designation of historic sites, the King County Code (Chapter 20.62) outlines the requirements and process for which sites can be submitted for designation, which includes independent review and decision by the King County Landmarks Commission.</p>	<p>Policy P-14 (p. 102), and its Action (p. 174), is reoriented to reflect: 1) the requirements of the King County Code, and 2) the County's role in such processes, which is to support community efforts to identify and nominate sites for historic designation.</p>
<p><b>Chapter 9: Transportation</b></p>	
<p><b>28. Transit service in text and Policies T-2 and T-5</b>                      The transmittal calls for significant additional transit service, including specifically to residents in "remote areas beyond Metro's fixed-route bus lines." (text on page 75, and Policies T-2 and T-5 on p. 81) This direction would be inconsistent with the GMA, the KCCP, King County Metro service guidelines, and Metro's alternative services (Community Connections) plan. Such direction may also result in higher transit service levels for Vashon-Maury Island than in other rural communities in the County.</p>	<p>Policy language and text in the chapter is updated to reflect current planning requirements and policy direction that support transit service consistent with rural service levels. (text on page 104, and Policies T-1 and T-4 on p. 109)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>29. Roads and road capacity in Policies T-1 and T-8</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy T-1 prohibits new roads outside the Vashon Rural Town, unless other alternatives “have been implemented or are determined infeasible.” (p. 77). T-1 originated from the 1986 Community Plan (Policy V-73). This policy direction is inconsistent with the GMA, as well as KCCP policies prohibit construction of additional roads and/or roadway capacity in the Rural Area, including in Rural Towns, except in very limited instances.</li> <li>Similarly, Policy T-8, which directs how new roads or roadway capacity in the Rural Town should be implemented, does not reflect these GMA and KCCP requirements. (p. 84) Additionally, T-8 originated from language currently adopted in the 2016 KCCP related to application of rural road standards within the Rural Town (Policy CP-647), but the transmittal did not accurately reflect the existing policy intent. This intent should be maintained in the subarea plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy T-1 is removed from the plan. (p. 107)</li> <li>Policy T-8 (now Policy T-7) is updated to reflect the original policy language in Policy CP-647 and current KCCP requirements regarding development of roads and/or roadway capacity in the Rural Area. (p. 119)</li> </ul>
<b>Chapter 10: Services, Facilities and Utilities</b>	
<p><b>30. Treating septage on-Island in text and Policy F-10</b></p> <p>The transmittal calls for an evaluation of how the Vashon Treatment Plant can be adapted to accept septage. (text, p. 88; Policy F-10, p. 92; Action, p. 125). King County Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) staff state that the treatment plan cannot accept septage unless it is rebuilt.</p>	<p>The Action for F-10 (p. 169) and associated text (p. 125-126) is reoriented towards generally reducing the amount of septage that is transported off the island.</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>31. Reuse of greywater in Policy F-11</b>                      Policy F-11 calls for regulations to allow recycling and reuse of greywater from residential systems. (p. 92) This policy direction would have countywide implications. The KCCP currently includes countywide policy language, Policy F-263, that addresses the use of greywater. If the County wishes to revisit the policy direction in F-263, such a review would need to occur as part of a four-year cycle update to the KCCP</p>	<p>Policy F-11 is removed. (p. 131)</p>
<p><b>32. On-site sewage study in text and Policy F-12</b>                      The transmittal proposes an island-wide study of on-site sewage systems to evaluate the impacts of sea level rise and the need for community systems or other options. (Policy F-12 p. 93, and Action p. 117) This is presented in the text as a key goal for community members. The Executive Summary highlights this as “one of the plan’s most ambitious goals.” (p. 4) Narrative text related to the study is also included on page 90 of Chapter 10: Services, Facilities and Utilities. Unfortunately, Public Health staff report that they do not have funding to implement this study, and cannot commit to the action as drafted in the transmitted plan.</p>	<p>Policy F-12 (now Policy F-11, p. 131) and Action (p. 165) are reoriented to encourage DNRP to seek grant funds for the study. The Executive Summary and text in Chapter 10 is updated to reflect this shift in policy direction. (p. 10 and 126)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>33. Expansion of sewer service in Policy F-14</b>                      Policy F-14 proposes guidance for how expansions to the local service area (LSA) for the Vashon Sewer District should be evaluated. (p. 94) This policy originated from Policy V-50 from the 1986 Community Plan, with minor edits. Adoption of the sewer service area also dates back to at least the 1986 Community Plan. Subsequent to the adoption of the 1986 plan, the GMA was passed, which defined provision of sewer as an urban service. Provision of sewer service outside the urban growth boundary is tightly restricted. Because there was already sewer service on portions of Vashon-Maury Island, this existing sewer service area was continued in the County’s planning documents and code provisions (such as in K.C.C. Title 13), and the sewer service area boundary roughly mirrors that of the Rural Town. The KCCP currently includes Policy F-258, which prohibits the expansion of sewer service outside of the Rural Town except to address specific address health and safety problems, as allowed in Policy F-264. Continuation of language from 1986 Policy V-50 in the transmittal as F-14 would be inconsistent with the GMA and the KCCP.</p>	<p>Policy F-14 is removed. (p. 133) Workplan Action 2 is added which requires the Executive to complete a review of the LSA, including using an interbranch team and coordination with the Vashon Sewer District, to evaluate the current LSA and determine the correct boundary. (p. 139-140)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<b>Chapter 11: Implementation</b>	
<p><b>34. Tool for communication</b>                      The transmittal includes language that implies the subarea plan is what the community uses to communicate its priorities to the County, which the County will then use to prepare programs and budgets. (p. 8) While the community is heavily involved in plan development, and the plan incorporates many of the community’s priorities, the plan is still ultimately a County document that needs to reflect County policy goals and requirements, and is written and adopted by King County. The language in the plan should reflect such.</p>	<p>The language in Chapter 1 (p. 13), as well as similar language in Chapter 11 (p. 135-136), is amended to reflect that subarea plans are a tool used by the County to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage with a community to better understand local priorities;</li> <li>• Communicate County policy goals; and</li> <li>• Outline how the County will implement the policies/actions in the plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>35. Budget dependent</b>                      The transmitted version of plan includes various policies and actions that implement the plan. Many of the policies and actions are very ambitious and may be out of the scope of current county program, staffing, and/or funding resources. Budget decisions cannot be made in a silo, and need to consider countywide programs, needs, and priorities. As such, the plan should not presume that future budgetary appropriations will be approved in order to implement such policies and actions. The plan should accurately reflect the budget authorization process and the uncertainties of future resources.</p>	<p>Language is added to Chapter 11 (p. 13), as well as in Chapter 1 (p. 136), to reflect many of the policies and actions in the plan are budget dependent and subject to whether or not future funding can be obtained. Additionally, many of the policies and actions in the plan are clarified to reflect where cost, availability of funding, and public benefit associated with the policy’s purpose are considered as part of the implementation decision, consistent with the KCCP.</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>36. Outstanding policy issues</b>                      Adoption of the subarea plan will occur after almost two years of robust community engagement and plan development. As a result, the plan reflects the significant progress that has been made to address many of the important issues that arose during that process. However, additional work is still needed to further refine some of the planning elements and local regulations for the Island. While most of those issues will be able to be addressed during the next plan update that is currently scheduled to occur in 2024, some items may need to be resolved sooner.</p>	<p>A new Workplan section is added to the plan, which directs ongoing work related to review of p-suffix conditions and the sewer local service area for Vashon-Maury Island. (p. 138-140)</p>
<p><b>37. Non-County agencies and organizations</b>                      Some of the policies in the transmitted plan call for actions that would be performed by entities King County does not control, such as 4Culture, the Flood Control District, the Vashon Island Growers Association. This plan cannot mandate actions by non-County agencies and organizations, and the language in the plan should be updated to reflect such.</p>	<p>Proposed action items that cannot be accomplished by King County are removed from the implementation tables in Chapter 11 and added to a new table in Appendix A. (p. 172-174)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<b>Attachment B - Land Use Map Amendments</b>	
<p><b>38. Technical issues</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes various technical corrections and non-substantive edits (formatting, accuracy of effect statements, addressing potential zoning for one map amendment).</li> <li>• Consolidates Zoning Map Amendments (which was originally included in Attachment C in the transmittal package) with Land Use Map Amendments into one new “Map Amendment” attachment in Attachment B, for clarity and consistent with previous KCCP updates.</li> </ul>
<p><b>39. SDO designation process</b>            As noted above, the ordinance proposes a new SDO, which would create an incentive program for affordable housing development on 246 parcels within the Vashon Rural Town boundary. Attachment D of the transmittal would designate the parcels that would be eligible to participate in the program. The King County Code (21A.38.040) requires designation of SDO’s to be processed as a map amendment, which the transmittal does not do.</p>	<p>Incorporates the Special District Overlay designation for 246 parcels in the Vashon Rural Town (which was originally included in Attachment D in the transmittal package) as a formal map amendment, as required by King County Code, in Attachment B. Makes technical corrections and non-substantive edits. (Map Amendment 3, p. 7-15)</p>
<b>Attachment C - Zoning Map Amendments</b>	
<p><b>40. Technical issues</b></p>	<p>Consolidates Zoning Map Amendments with Land Use Map Amendments into one new “Map Amendment” attachment in Attachment B, for clarity and consistent with previous KCCP updates. The transmitted version of Attachment C is deleted.</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
-------------------------------------	-----------------------

Attachment D - Affordable Housing SDO Eligible Parcels Map	
--	--

<p><b>41. SDO designation process</b>          As noted above, Attachment D of the transmittal would designate the parcels that would be eligible to participate in the Affordable Housing Incentive SDO. The King County Code (21A.38.040) requires designation of SDO's to be processed as a map amendment, which the transmittal does not do.</p>	<p>As noted above, the designation of the SDO is incorporated into the Map Amendments in Attachment B. (Map Amendment 3, p. 7-15) The transmitted version of Attachment D is deleted.</p>
--	---

Attachment E – Vashon Rural Town Area Zoning	
--	--

<p><b>42. Changes to p-suffix conditions</b>          The transmittal proposes various changes to two property specific, or p-suffix, development conditions on the Island: VS-P28 and VS-P29. These are only two of the 30 p-suffix conditions that apply to properties on Vashon-Maury Island. Executive staff state that they did not perform a review of the other 28 p-suffix conditions as part of development of the subarea plan. There are concerns that the significant updates to these two p-suffix conditions on their own could have unintended consequences if not considered in the context of the remaining 28 conditions.</p>	<p>In order to allow for any substantive updates to the Island's development conditions to occur in a cohesive manner, the Council will not adopt the proposed changes to VS-P28 and VS-P29 this year and Attachment E is removed from the Proposed Ordinance. Instead, a Workplan action item is added to the subarea plan that directs the Executive to comprehensively review all 30 of the p-suffix conditions for potential updates. A report on the review and any recommended p-suffix changes will be due to the Council by December 31, 2018 (p. 138-139 of Attachment A) Other references in the subarea plan in Attachment A to the p-suffix changes are deleted. (p. 41)</p>
---	--



Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>43. Marijuana zoning</b>            Although the plan states that marijuana zoning is not changed (p. 29 of Attachment A), the transmitted P-suffix changes would <u>prohibit marijuana production and processing in the CB zones in the Rural Town</u> (p. E-8 of Attachment E). Executive staff state that the plan is incorrect and the P-suffix attachment is correct; this internal inconsistency will need to be addressed. In addition, this policy change would be inconsistent with County policy for CB zones in other unincorporated areas.</p>	<p>As noted above, all 2017 proposed changes to p-suffix conditions are proposed to be removed from the ordinance. As a result, the issue with the transmitted change to allowed marijuana uses is addressed. The text regarding changes to marijuana uses in the plan is also removed. (p. 41 of Attachment A) Instead, the aforementioned p-suffixes Workplan Action 1 includes direction to review conditions related to marijuana uses to ensure consistency with other unincorporated areas of the County and the forthcoming marijuana studies due at the end of 2018. (p. 138-139 of Attachment A)</p>
<p><b>Attachment F- Amendments to 2016 Comprehensive Plan</b></p>	
<p><b>44. Technical issues</b>            The transmittal includes errors that need to be corrected, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistencies in references to and definitions of “subarea plans;” and</li> <li>• Using “Vashon-Maury Island” to describe the geography, consistent with the new approach adopted in the Subarea Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renamed as a new “Attachment C” to reflect deletion of transmitted Attachments C, D, and E mentioned above.</li> <li>• Makes necessary technical corrections and non-substantive edits.</li> <li>• Reflects striking changes made in the Subarea Plan in Attachment A.</li> </ul>
<p><b>45. Expansion of sewer service in F-258</b>            2016 KCCP policy F-258 currently prohibits the expansion of sewer service outside of the Rural Town except to address specific address health and safety problems, as allowed in Policy F-264. The transmittal proposes to remove this prohibition. This would be inconsistent with the GMA.</p>	<p>The 2016 version of F-258 is reinstated, with technical edits and a strengthening of the policy to state that sewer service “shall not” be expanded outside of the Rural Town of Vashon. (p. 12)</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>46. Re-adopting KCCP Policy F-292 as subarea plan Policy E-6</b></p> <p>The 2016 KCCP includes policies that are specific to Vashon-Maury Island throughout the plan. Attachment F in the transmittal proposes to remove most of these Vashon-Maury Island-specific policies from the KCCP. Most of these policies are then proposed to be moved into subarea plan in Attachment A. The 2016 KCCP includes Policy F-292, which encourages consideration of increased water levels due to climate change when constructing new structures or substantially improving existing structures on the Island. The transmittal did not propose to move F-292 from the KCCP to the subarea plan. Executive staff state that this was an oversight, and the policy should be moved.</p>	<p>Policy F-292 is deleted from the 2016 KCCP (p. 12 of Attachment C) and added as Policy E-6 in the subarea plan (p. 81 of Attachment A).</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>47. Skyway-West Hill Action Plan</b>                      The transmitted version of the 2016 KCCP proposed adoption of the Skyway-West Hill Action Plan (SWAP), which was prepared prior to development of the County’s new CSA Subarea Planning Program. Council review of the SWAP identified: policy issues that needed to be addressed; the need to update the SWAP to conform with the CSA Subarea Planning Program goals and framework; and the need to comprehensively review the existing, and still active, 1994 West Hill Community Plan. Given this, the 2016 KCCP did not adopt the transmitted SWAP and, instead, included language directing the Executive to: 1) review and update the SWAP and the 1994 Community Plan, 2) perform community outreach, and 3) transmit a Skyway-West Hill subarea plan by September 2017 as part of the 2017 annual update to the KCCP. Executive staff have stated that the update to the SWAP and the 1994 Community Plan will not be able to be complete in time for inclusion in the 2017 KCCP annual update.</p>	<p>Updates the schedule for transmitting the Skyway-West Hill Subarea Plan from September 2017 as part of the 2017 KCCP annual update to March 2018 as part of the 2018 KCCP annual update, consistent with GMA and King County Comprehensive Plan update timelines and requirements. (p. 1 and 29)</p>
<p><b>48. Annual cycle KCCP amendments</b>                      Staff review of existing language in the King County Code and the KCCP has identified that the ability to adopt CSA subarea plans during annual cycle KCCP updates may not be fully captured.</p>	<p>Amends the Code (K.C.C. 20.18.030) and the KCCP (Policy I-203, p. 29 of Attachment C) to clarify allowance of adoption of CSA subarea plans during annual cycle KCCP updates, consistent with adopted policy direction in the 2016 update of the KCCP.</p>

Policy Issue Flagged In Transmittal	Striking Amendment S1
<p><b>49. Workplan Action 1: Initiation of the Community Service Area Subarea Planning Program</b></p> <p>Chapter 12: Implementation, Amendments and Evaluation of the 2016 KCCP included adoption of various Workplan action items for implementation of the Plan. The KCCP lists the Department of Permitting and Environmental Review (DPER) as the “lead party” for implementation of the Workplan Action. This is consistent with the King County Code (K.C.C. chapter 2.16) and Motion 14341 as it relates to roles and responsibilities for development of and updates to subarea plans. However, the Code and the Motion also requires DPER to develop and update subarea plans in “coordination” and “collaboration” with the Office of Performance Strategy and Budget (PSB). The Workplan Action does not reflect this requirement.</p>	<p>2016 KCCP Workplan Action 1 is updated to reflect current requirements that DPER must coordinate and collaborate with PSB to implement the Action. (p. 30)</p>