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**Subject**

A motion adopting the scope of work for the Executive’s proposed 2016 review of the King County Comprehensive Plan.

**Summary**

This is the third committee discussion of Proposed Motion 2015-0104, which would adopt the scope of work and public outreach plan for the Executive’s proposed 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) revision.

On March 31, 2015, the Transportation, Economy and Environment Committee was briefed on the proposed motion and hosted a panel discussion on issues related to the KCCP revision. On April 21, 2015, the committee held a second briefing on the proposed motion and on a striking amendment, S1, that had been prepared at the Chair’s direction; however, no action was taken.

A revised striking amendment, S2, prepared at the Chair’s direction, is before the committee for consideration today. S2 is mostly the same as S1, but also includes changes to reflect direction from the committee’s discussion on April 21, 2015. The changes include:

* A new “Whereas” clause in the motion to reflect that the Council will adopt the scoping motion after the April 30 deadline contained in the King County Code[[1]](#footnote-1) and the Executive’s concurrence to adhere to the Council adopted version of the motion.
* Adding the word “urban” to “unincorporated King County” in Topical Areas Chapter 2.
* Clarifying language about the Transportation Concurrency Program update in Topical Areas Chapter 7 to include collaboration with other jurisdictions regarding infrastructure improvements.
* Clarifying language in Topical Areas Chapter 11 to work with the Washington State Department of Commerce (DOC) and the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) regarding targets for each housing type.
* Clarifying language in Topical Areas Chapter 11 to work with the DOC and GMPC regarding accuracy of the Buildable Lands Report.
* Removing the reference to Mountains to Sound Greenway in the Snoqualmie land use proposal.
* Adding two new four-to-one land use proposals.
* Clarifying language regarding agriculture supportive overlay zones in the development code section.

**Background**

The KCCP is the guiding policy document for land use and development regulations in unincorporated King County. The King County Code (K.C.C.) allows for amendments to the plan on either an annual or a once-every-four-years basis, depending on the scope of the change.[[2]](#footnote-2) The four-year cycle is considered a “major” review of the plan and, unlike annual reviews, allows for consideration of substantive policy changes and potential revisions to the Urban Growth Boundary. The next four-year revision to the KCCP will be in 2016.

The provisions of K.C.C. 20.18.060 require the Executive to submit a motion to the Council that outlines the scope of work for a major KCCP review. This “scoping” motion includes the issues that the Executive proposes to consider in the development of the proposed KCCP amendment. Review of the scoping motion (Proposed Motion 2015-0104) is the Council's formal opportunity to shape what the Executive will review in the crafting of the proposed revisions. The scope of work is required to be transmitted to the Council by the first business day of March in the year preceding the four-year review (March 2, 2015, for the forthcoming 2016 review). Following adoption of the scoping motion, the Executive will prepare the proposed KCCP amendment based on the scope of work. A public review draft of the proposal is then traditionally published in the fall preceding a four-year revision, allowing for public feedback on the draft as required by K.C.C 20.18.160. Lastly, the Executive is then required to transmit the finalized proposed KCCP amendment to the Council by the first business day of March in the following year (March 1, 2016, for the forthcoming plan revision).[[3]](#footnote-3)

In addition to indicating the overarching issues for the KCCP review, the scoping motion is one of the methods to ensure consideration of any proposals to expand the Urban Growth Area (UGA) during the 2016 KCCP process. In 2012, the KCCP was amended to clarify the process for considering UGA changes. First, KCCP policy RP-202 requires that, except for Four-to-One proposals, UGA expansion proposals must be acted on at the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC)[[4]](#footnote-4) prior to Council action. Furthermore, policy RP-203 states that the County may only forward proposals to the GMPC under the following instances:

1. The proposal is included in the scoping motion;
2. An area zoning study for the proposal is included in the Public Review Draft of the proposed KCCP update; or
3. The proposal goes through the Hearing Examiner site specific map amendment process.[[5]](#footnote-5)

This means that the scoping motion is the formal avenue for the Council to be able to identify possible UGA changes for consideration in the following year’s amendments. Otherwise, a UGA expansion proposal would need to be included unilaterally by the Executive in the Public Review Draft, or applied for by the property owner and have gone through the Hearing Examiner process, in order to be considered.

It is worth noting that the Countywide Planning Policies, particularly DP-16, set criteria for approval of UGA proposals, which would apply to any UGA amendments proposed for the 2016 KCCP review. In order to amend the UGA, a proposal must be one of the following:

1. Expansion warranted by a countywide analysis that determines the current UGA is insufficient in size and additional and is needed to accommodate housing and employment growth targets, including institutional and other non-residential uses, and there are no other reasonable measures, such as increasing density or rezoning existing urban land, that would avoid the need to expand the UGA;
2. A four-to-one proposal that is contiguous with the UGA, with at least a portion of the dedicated open space surrounding the proposed UGA expansion; or
3. An area that is currently a King County park being transferred by to the city to be maintained as a park in perpetuity or is park land that has been owned by the city since 1994 and is less than thirty acres in size.

**Analysis**

Proposed Motion 2015-0104 would adopt the scope of work for the 2016 review of the KCCP, as identified in Attachment A (Topical Areas) to the legislation. The motion would also adopt the Executive’s State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and public outreach work plan as outlined in Attachment B.

As noted above, the committee was briefed on the proposed motion on March 31, 2015, and on April 21, 2015. During its April 21, 2015, meeting, the committee also considered a striking amendment, S1, that had been prepared at the direction of the Chair. No action was taken.

**amendment**

The Chair has directed preparation of an updated striking amendment, S2, that incorporates information from the committee’s April 21 meeting. To summarize the new issues contained in S2, staff has prepared an updated “Topical Areas and Chair’s Striker” issues matrix, which is included as Attachment 6 to the staff report.

As noted above and summarized in the matrix in Attachment 6, items included in S2 that are different from S1 are:

* A new “Whereas” clause in the motion to reflect that the Council will adopt the scoping motion after the April 30 deadline required in the code and the Executive’s concurrence to adhere to the Council adopted version of the motion.
* Adding the word “urban” to “unincorporated King County” in Topical Areas Chapter 2.
* Clarifying language about the Transportation Concurrency Program update in Topical Areas Chapter 7 to include collaboration with other jurisdictions regarding infrastructure improvements.
* Clarifying language in Topical Areas Chapter 11 to work with the Washington State Department of Commerce (DOC) and the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) regarding targets for each housing type.
* Clarifying language in Topical Areas Chapter 11 to work with the DOC and GMPC regarding accuracy of the Buildable Lands Report.
* Removing the reference to Mountains to Sound Greenway in the Snoqualmie land use proposal.
* Adding two new four-to-one land use proposals.
* Clarifying language regarding agriculture supportive overlay zones in the development code section.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Amendment S2 with attachments
2. Proposed Motion 2015-0104 with attachments
3. Transmittal Letter
4. Redline version of Amendment S2
5. Redline version of Attachment A to Amendment S2
6. Topical Areas Issues and Chair’s Striker Summary Matrix
7. Redline version of Attachment B to Amendment S2
8. Growth Management Planning Hierarchy
9. Summary of 2012-2014 Docket Reports

**INVITED**

1. Ivan Miller, Comprehensive Planning Manager, Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget

**LINKS**

Executive’s 2016 Comprehensive Plan website: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/PSB/RegionalPlanning/KingCountyCompPlan.aspx>

King County Comprehensive Plan: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/property/permits/codes/growth/CompPlan/2012Adopted.aspx>

Growth Management Planning Council’s Countywide Planning Policies:

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/property/permits/codes/growth/GMPC/CPPs.aspx>

1. KCC 20.18.060 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. K.C.C. 20.18.030 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. K.C.C. 20.18.060 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The required GMPC “action” could be either in support of or against the proposal, and is a non-binding recommendation for the County Council to consider in its deliberations. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The GMPC may also take action on UGA proposals that are not forwarded by King County (i.e. another GMPC member jurisdiction could put a proposal forward for consideration), which could then also be considered by the County Council as part of a four-year KCCP revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)