

King County Countywide Planning Policies

Updated August 2000

NOTE

This document includes all amendments approved and ratified up through August 2000.
If you have questions about the Countywide Planning Policies document,
please contact Paul Reitenbach at the Dept. of Development & Environmental Services, 206-296-6705.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL MEMBERS*

Metropolitan King County:

Ron Sims, King County Executive, Chair
David Irons, Councilmember
Larry Phillips, Councilmember
Cynthia Sullivan, Councilmember
Chris Vance, Councilmember
Pete von Reichbauer, Councilmember

City of Bellevue

Mike Creighton, Mayor

Suburban Cities Association

Trish Borden, Councilmember, City of Auburn
Terry Brazil, Councilmember, City of Des Moines
Howard Botts, Mayor, City of Black Diamond
Judy Clibborn, Councilmember, City of Mercer Island
Shirley Thompson, Mayor, City of SeaTac
Joan Simpson, Mayor, City of North Bend

City of Seattle

Paul Schell, Mayor
Richard Conlin, Councilmember
Nick Licata, Councilmember

Ex-Officio Members

Walt Canter, Commissioner, Cedar River Water & Sewer District
Bob Edwards, Commission, Port of Seattle

Alternate GMPC Members:

King County

Jane Hague, Councilmember
Louise Miller, Councilmember

City of Bellevue

Grant Degginger, Mayor

Suburban Cities Association

Jeanne Burbidge, Councilmember, City of Federal Way
Richard Cole, Councilmember, City of Redmond
Scott Jepsen, Mayor, City of Shoreline
George Rossman, Mayor, City of Enumclaw

City of Seattle

Judy Nicastro, Councilmember
Margaret Pageler, Councilmember
Peter Steinbrueck, Councilmember

Ex-Officio

Richard Gaines, Commissioner, Fire District #10

* This list has been updated to reflect 2000 membership.

Introduction

Beginning in the fall of 1991, King County, the City of Seattle and the Suburban Cities of King County met jointly as the Growth Management Planning Council to develop and recommend Countywide Planning Policies for King County, as mandated by the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.210.

In July of 1992, the King County Council adopted the Countywide Planning Policies recommended to it by the Growth Management Planning Council. The Countywide Planning Policies adopted at that time have generally been referred to as Phase I. At that time, the Policies as adopted contemplated completion of a Phase II of Countywide Policies, to address issues not dealt with in sufficient detail in Phase I.

The particular issues to be addressed in Phase II included designation of Urban Centers for purposes of pursuing a regional transit plan, affordable housing, economic development, rural character, the preparation of a detailed fiscal analysis of the Countywide Planning Policies, and completion of a draft and a final Environmental Impact Statement.

Since July 1992, the Growth Management Planning Council, working with task forces to address the specific topics identified for further work in Phase II, has developed recommended amendments to the adopted Countywide Planning Policies.

On May 25, 1994, The Growth Management Planning Council took final action recommending Phase II amendments to the Phase I Countywide Planning Policies. The Growth Management Planning Council recommendations can be found in the document entitled *Recommended Amendments to King County 2021 Countywide Planning Policies, Adopted by the King County Growth Management Planning Council May 25, 1994*. Urban Growth Area maps provided in Appendix I are intended for policy planning purposes. The Urban Growth Area contained in these policies is a dynamic policy line which provides general guidance to the Metropolitan King County Council when it adopts the final Urban Growth Boundary in its 1994 Comprehensive Plan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	KING COUNTY 2012	1
	A. The Problem	1
	B. The Process	1
	C. The Growth Management Act	2
	D. Vision for King County 2012	2
	E. The Framework Policies (FW-1 through FW-3)	3
II.	CRITICAL AREAS	8
	A. Overall Environmental Protection (FW-4 through FW-5)	8
	B. Wetlands Protection (CA-1 through CA-4)	8
	C. Aquifers (CA-5 through CA-6)	9
	D. Fish and Wildlife Habitat (CA-7 through CA-11)	9
	E. Frequently Flooded Areas (CA-12)	10
	F. Geologic hazard Areas (CA-13)	10
	G. Air and Water Quality (CA-14 through CA-15)	11
	H. Implementation (CA-16)	11
III.	LAND USE PATTERN	11
	A. Resource lands: Agricultural, Forestry, and Mineral (FW-6, LU-1 through LU-5)	11
	B. Rural Areas (FW-7 through FW-10, LU-6 through LU-25)	12
	C. Urban Areas	17
	1. Urban Growth Area (FW-11 through FW-12, LU-26 through LU-27)	17
	2. Phasing Development within the Urban Growth Area (LU-28 through LU-30)	18
	3. Joint Planning and Urban Growth Areas around Cities (FW-13, LU-31 through LU-37)	19
	4. Cities in the Rural Area (LU-38)	20
	D. Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers (FW-14 through FW-16)	20
	1. Urban Centers Designation Process (LU-39)	21
	2. Urban Centers Criteria (LU-40 through LU-46)	22
	3. Incentives for Urban Centers (LU-47 through LU-50)	23
	4. Manufacturing/Industrial Center Designation Process (LU-51)	25
	5. Manufacturing/Industrial Center Criteria (LU-52 through LU-59)	25
	6. Incentives for Manufacturing/industrial Centers (LU-60 through LU-62)	26
	E. Activity Areas (FW-17, LU-63 through LU-65)	27
	F. Urban Growth Outside of Centers	27
	1. Urban Residential Areas (LU-66 through LU-67)	28
	2. Urban Employment Growth (LU-68)	29
	3. Infill Development (LU-69)	29
	4. Business/Office Parks (LU-70 through LU-74)	29
IV.	TRANSPORTATION	29
	A. Transportation Overview	29
	B. Transportation Policies (FW-18 THROUGH FW-20, T-1 through T-4)	31
	1. High Capacity Transit/Regional Transit Project (HCT/RTP) (T-5 through T-6)	32
	2. Non-motorized Transportation (T-7)	32
	3. Freeways/Highways/Arterials (FW-21 through FW-23, T-8)	33
	4. Transportaiton Level-of-Service (LOS) (T-9 through T-14)	33
	5. Reassessment (T-15)	33
	6. Financing (T-16 through T-19)	34
	7. State Transportation Role (T-20 through T-22)	34
	8. Siting Regional and Countywide Transportation Facilities (T-23)	34

V.	COMMUNITY CHARACTER AND OPEN SPACE (FW-24 through FW-26)	35
	A. Historic Resources (CC-1 through CC-2)	35
	B. Urban Design (CC-3)	35
	C. Human and Community Services (CC-4 through CC-5)	35
	D. Open Space (FW-27, CC-6 through CC-13)	36
VI.	AFFORDABLE HOUSING (FW-28, AH-1 through AH-6)	37
VII.	CONTINGUOUS AND ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT AND PROVISION OF URBAN SERVICES TO SUCH DEVELOPMENT (FW-29 through FW-31)	40
	A. General Policies	41
	1. Urban Services Required as Growth Occurs (CO-1)	41
	2. Conservation, Efficiency, Cost Effectiveness and New Technologies (CO-2 through CO-9)	41
	B. Urban Areas Identified for Growth for the Next Ten Years	42
	Urban Water and Sewer Systems Required (CO-10)	42
	C. Urban Areas Deisgnated for Growth Beyond 2002	42
	Phased and Cost Effective Extension of Urban Water and Sewer Systems (CO-11 through CO-13)	42
	D. Rural Areas and Resource lands	43
	Limited Extension of Urban Water and Sewer Systems (CO-14 through CO-16)	43
VIII.	SITING PUBLIC CAPITAL FACILITIES OF A COUNTYWIDE OR STATEWIDE NATURE (FW-32, S-1)	43
IX.	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (FW-33 through FW-36, ED-1 through ED-5)	44
	1. Strengthen, Expand and Diversify the Economy (ED-6 through ED-9)	45
	2. Environment (ED-10, ED-11)	46
	3. Human Resources: Economically Disadvantaged Citizens and Neighborhoods, Jobs, Training and Education (ED-12, ED-13)	46
	4. Direct Governmental Actions: Land Supply, Infrastructure and Permitting (ED-4 through ED-23)	46
	5. Public/Private Partnerships (ED-24)	47
X.	REGIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE	48
	A. Finance and Governance Plans (FW-37 through FW-39, RF-1 through RF-5)	48
	B. Implementation and Transition (TP-1 through TP-2)	49
	APPENDIX 1 - Urban Growth Areas Map	50
	APPENDIX 2 - Household and Employment Ranges	50
	APPENDIX 2A – Household Growth Target Re-allocation based on Annexations and Incorporations between April 1994 and January 1998	52
	APPENDIX 2B	
	- Household Growth Target Re-allocation based on Annexations and Incorporations after January 1, 1998 and Potential Annexation Areas	54
	- Interim Potential Annexation Areas Map	
	APPENDIX 3 - Affordable Housing Index	57
	APPENDIX 4 - Land Capacity Work Program	59
	APPENDIX 5 - Transportation	60

I. King County 2012

A. The Problem

King County has long been known for unsurpassed natural beauty and a dynamic human environment. It has thriving cities and suburbs and healthy rural communities. The County's attractive lifestyle and economy continue to draw people into our region.

But unmanaged growth and development endanger some of those very qualities. An additional 325,000 people will live here by the year 2010 (State of Washington Office of Financial Management), bringing the total population to 1.8 million. While growth fuels the area's strong economy, the absence of effective management of that growth threatens the features that are essential to a rich quality of life.

The effects of uncoordinated and unplanned growth are obvious. King County has the fifth worst traffic mess in the nation, declining air and water quality, flooding aggravated by development, and escalating housing costs. Many of the schools are over-crowded and local governments are struggling to pay for increased demands for services to control crime and to provide critical human resources.

The need facing the County and State is to provide the incentives necessary to promote a vigorous, sound, and diversified economy, while reducing, controlling and managing the potential adverse effects of uncoordinated and unplanned growth.

The Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA) in 1990 and strengthened it in 1991 to address these problems.

B. The Process

Growth management involves planning for economic and population growth, determining where new jobs and housing should go and then locating and phasing population growth in accordance with the ability to provide infrastructure and services. This should include economic development, a workable transportation system, quality drinking water, affordable housing, good schools, open space and parks and, at the same time, protection of our natural environment.

King County and the 34 cities within it are addressing growth management problems together and in their local jurisdictions. Planning at both levels is called for by the Growth Management Act.

All jurisdictions are working together to develop a vision for the future. This vision is embodied in this series of policies called Countywide Planning Policies. Realization of this vision involves trade-offs and difficult choices about the appropriate level of growth, its location, the type of growth to be encouraged, public spending, governance decisions, environmental protection, and the quality of life in King County.

A formal body, the Growth Management Planning Council, with elected officials from Seattle, the suburban cities, and King County, considered draft policies in May 1992, and based on public input, made a recommendation to the King County Council for adoption. King County Council adopted the initial Countywide Planning Policies in July 1992 by Ordinance #10450. The Ordinance adopted the Phase I Policies and initiated a Phase II work program which called for environmental and fiscal analysis and additional work on economic development, rural character, transportation and affordable housing. The Phase I Countywide Planning Policies were ratified by Seattle and the suburban cities in October 1992.

The Growth Management Planning Council initiated the Phase II Work Program in October 1992 and formed three Task Forces comprised of elected officials and citizens to develop policy recommendations and a Transportation Caucus to develop transportation strategies. These included the Affordable Housing Task Force, Rural Character Task Force and Fis/Ed (Fiscal Impact Analysis and Economic Development) Task Force. The Fis/Ed Task Force was responsible for conducting the fiscal analysis required for the Countywide Planning Policies as well as developing policy recommendations on economic development.

At the completion of the Phase II work, on May 25, 1994 the Growth Management Planning Council made policy recommendations to the Metropolitan King County Council. King County will adopt policies and then submit them for ratification to the cities.

The Countywide Planning Policies, as amended through the Phase II work, serve as the framework for each jurisdiction's own comprehensive plan, which must be consistent with Countywide Planning Policies by December 31, 1995. These individual comprehensive plans throughout the County, then, will be consistent with the overall vision for the future of King County.

C. The Growth Management Act

The Growth Management Act fundamentally changes the way that comprehensive planning is to be done and land use decisions are to be made in Washington State. The challenge of the Growth Management Act is to establish a Countywide vision and devise a strategy to achieve it. This includes balancing growth, economics, land use, infrastructure, and finance. If resources are inadequate to realize the vision, then the strategies and land use must be revised. The Growth Management Act required Countywide Planning Policies to be adopted by July 1, 1992. At a minimum, the policies were to address:

- a. Implementation of RCW 36.70A.110 (Urban Growth Areas);
- b. Promotion of contiguous and orderly development and provision of urban services;
- c. Siting of public capital facilities;
- d. Transportation facilities and strategies;
- e. Affordable housing;
- f. Joint County and city planning within Urban Growth Areas;
- g. Countywide economic development and employment; and
- h. Analysis of fiscal impact.

Special emphasis is placed on transportation. Future development activity will be constrained by a jurisdiction's ability to provide and finance transportation improvements or strategies. This fact has implications for all jurisdictions who can no longer finance and build the facilities necessary to retain current service levels.

D. Vision for King County 2012

Our County has significantly changed in the 20 years that have elapsed from 1992 to today. The paramount cause for this change has been the successful public/private partnership which has: supported a diversified, sound regional economy; managed and accommodated growth; and maintained the County's quality of life.

An effective stewardship of the environment has preserved and protected the critical areas in the County. This stewardship has extended to the conservation of our land, air, water and energy resources for future generations.

The Rural Areas first formally identified in 1985 and expanded in 1992 remain permanently preserved with a clear boundary between Rural and Urban Areas.

Development has emphasized the use and reuse of the existing urbanized areas. Much of the new growth after 1992 first occurred in the areas where there was existing capacity. Growth then occurred where existing infrastructure could be easily extended or enhanced. Lastly, areas which required significant new investment in infrastructure accommodated growth. Today, there still is ample room for new development within the Urban Area.

Much of the growth in employment, and a significant share of new housing, has occurred in Urban Centers. These Centers now provide a mixture of employment, residential, commercial, cultural and recreational opportunities. The Centers are linked by the high-capacity transit system, and transit stations within the Centers are located within walking distance to all parts of the Center. Each Center has its own unique character, and they are all noted for their livability, pedestrian orientation and superior design.

Smaller concentrations of businesses are distributed throughout the Urban Area, and focus on providing goods and services to surrounding residential areas. They are linked to Urban Centers by an effective local transit system.

Manufacturing/industrial areas continue to thrive and be key components in the Urban Area. They are served by a transportation system which emphasizes the movement of people and goods to and within these areas.

Rural cities provide unique environments within the Rural Area and provide commercial and employment opportunities for their residents. This includes retail, educational and social services for city residents and surrounding Rural Areas. Businesses in rural cities provide employment opportunities for local residents.

The entire Urban Area is increasingly characterized by superior urban design and an open space network which defines and separates, yet links the various Urban Areas and jurisdictions. Countywide and regional facilities have been located where needed, sited unobtrusively and with appropriate incentives and proper impact mitigation.

Attractive and workable alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle have been built and strategies adopted which assure the mobility of people, goods and information throughout the County and beyond.

Regional funds have been used to further the regional land use plan and fund needed regional facilities. Local resources have been focused on local facilities. The sharing of resources to accomplish common goals is done so that the regional plan can succeed and so that all can benefit.

The economy is vibrant and sustainable, and emphasizes diversity in the range of goods produced and services provided. Businesses continue to locate in our County because of the high quality of life, the emphasis on providing a superior education, and the predictability brought about by the management of growth and the effectiveness of the public/private partnership in these areas as well as the mutually beneficial partnership in economic development.

Housing opportunities for all incomes and lifestyles exist throughout the County, and with the balanced transportation system, access to employment is assured.

The needs of residents are attended to by a social service system that emphasizes prevention, but which stands ready to respond to direct needs as well.

The Urban Area is located within the incorporated cities, which are the primary urban service providers. Where appropriate, sub-regional consortiums have been created for certain services, and the County government is recognized as a regional service provider.

Through a clear understanding of growth management, residents and businesses have recognized that all problems will not be cured quickly, but clear and reasonable timelines and financing commitments demonstrate to them that problems will be solved. Residents and businesses trust in their local governments because the plans and promises made to manage growth in 1992 have been followed. Change is accepted and proceeds in an orderly fashion based on the growth management plan.

E. The Framework Policies

The Growth Management Act gives local officials new tools for planning and, for the first time, mandates that the County and cities work together to establish an overall vision. Through a collaborative process, the local jurisdictions of King County have prepared the following Countywide Planning Policies. These Policies rely on local choice to determine the density/intensity and character of each area. All jurisdictions must recognize that the smart, long term choices for the region will require compromises in local self-determination.

These Policies represent a cohesive set and are not individual, stand-alone concepts. The ideas represented here balance each other to establish a vision for the County which builds on existing land use patterns. The Policies are organized by topics in separate chapters. At the beginning of each chapter is a framework policy which establishes the overall direction for the following policies.

The Countywide Planning Policies can only be realized through local plans and regulations. A decision made locally must become a commitment that the region can rely upon. The following framework policies outline the Countywide planning process.

When a Countywide Policy states that a jurisdiction “shall” or “will” do something, such a policy requires the jurisdiction’s Comprehensive Plan to contain a policy that is written to accomplish the purpose of the Countywide Policy. When a Countywide Policy states that a jurisdiction “should” do something, such a policy requires the jurisdiction’s Comprehensive Plan to contain a policy that is written to accomplish the purpose of the Countywide Policy unless the jurisdiction identifies reasons why it has not done so. When a Countywide Policy states that a jurisdiction “may” do something, such a policy suggests the jurisdiction’s Comprehensive Plan contain a policy written to accomplish the purpose of the Countywide Policy if it is in their interest.

FW-1 Countywide growth management is a multi-step process:

- STEP 1. The Countywide Planning Policies became effective October 1992, upon adoption by the King County Council and ratification by at least 30 percent of the city and County governments representing 70 percent of the population in King County.

- STEP 2. The Growth Management Planning Council reconvened to conduct environmental and fiscal impact analysis of the Countywide Planning Policies and to consider policy amendments developed through implementation of tasks specified in the Countywide Planning Policies. When adopted by the Metropolitan King County Council and ratified, these actions are considered the Phase II policy amendments and include:
 - a. Confirmation of Urban Centers according to the procedures and criteria established in policies LU-39 and LU-40;
 - b. Confirmation of Manufacturing/Industrial Centers based on the procedures and criteria established policies in LU-51 and LU-52;
 - c. Adoption of 20-year targets of projected household and employment growth Countywide and target ranges for each jurisdiction according to the procedures and criteria in policy LU-67 and LU-68;
 - d. Confirmation of the Urban Growth Area based on criteria established in policy LU-26. The Urban Growth Area in the Countywide Planning Policies is a planning policy framework to be used by the Metropolitan King County Council when it adopts the final Urban Growth Area in its 1994 Comprehensive Plan; and
 - e. Adoption of additional policy amendments based on the recommendations of the Rural Character Task Force, the Affordable Housing Task Force, the Fiscal Impact Analysis and Economic Development Task Force, and public comments on the Countywide Planning Policies.
 - f. Housing and jobs to accommodate King County's growth targets shall be planned in the context of carrying capacity of the land. Housing density and affordability shall be considered co-equal objectives.

- STEP 3. The Countywide Planning Policies shall be implemented as follows:
 - a. All jurisdictions shall make the decisions required to implement the Countywide Planning Policies into their respective comprehensive plans.
 - b. All jurisdictions shall make the decisions required to implement the Countywide Planning Policies and their respective comprehensive plans through development regulations.
 - c. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall establish a process for resolving conflicts between local plans and the Countywide Planning Policies.
 - d. Phase II. Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies shall be subject to ratification by at least 30 percent of the city and County governments representing 70 of the population in King County. All jurisdictions shall amend comprehensive plans as needed by December 31, 1995 to be consistent with adopted and ratified Phase II amendments.

- STEP 4. Following adoption of comprehensive plans, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall review adopted household and employment target ranges and estimated capacity for each jurisdiction to ensure sufficient capacity within the Urban Growth Area.
- a. Each jurisdiction shall report to the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor the household and employment targets adopted in its comprehensive plan, and the estimated capacity for household and employment growth for the next 20 years. Jurisdictions containing Urban and/or Manufacturing/Industrial Centers shall report household and employment target ranges both for Centers and areas outside Centers. Each jurisdiction shall also evaluate the availability of infrastructure, as adopted in six-year capital improvement plans, to ensure that capacity is available to accommodate a six-year estimate of household and employment growth.
 - b. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall review growth targets and capacity for each jurisdiction to assure that local targets are within the adopted ranges and Countywide capacity is sufficient to meet 20-year growth targets. If a discrepancy exists between growth targets and capacity, either within an individual comprehensive plan or for the County as a whole, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall recommend amendments to Countywide Planning Policies or local plans to ensure that growth targets can be achieved by planned zoning and infrastructure capacity.
- STEP 5(a). The Growth Management Planning Council established a Land Capacity Task Force to accomplish the work program prepared in April 1994. The Task Force completed the Residential Land Capacity Report in 1997 and the Industrial and Commercial Land Capacity Report in 1998. In 1999, in order to comply with RCW 36.70A.215, the April 1994 work program was deleted and replaced with the State's review and evaluation program.
- STEP 5(b). The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall conduct a review and evaluation program in compliance with RCW 36.70A.215. The purpose of the review and evaluation program shall be to determine whether King County and its cities are achieving urban densities within Urban Growth Areas. This shall be accomplished by comparing the growth and development assumptions, targets and objectives contained in these policies (and in county and city comprehensive plans) with actual growth and development that has occurred. If the results of this program are inconsistent with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA), King County and its cities shall identify reasonable measures in accordance with GMA, other than adjusting the Urban Growth Areas, that will be taken to comply with those requirements.
- STEP 6. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall recommend to the Metropolitan King County Council a monitoring and benchmarks program to assess progress in meeting Countywide Planning Policies.
- a. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall establish a growth management monitoring advisory committee which shall recommend information to be reported annually to serve as indicators and benchmarks for growth management policies. The annual reporting shall incorporate the economic development policy indicators developed by the Fiscal Impact Analysis and Economic Development Task Force and other indicators as adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor, and shall consider housing indicators specified in policy AH-5. King County shall report the adopted growth management benchmarks annually.
 - b. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor should conduct a comprehensive evaluation to assess implementation of the Countywide Planning Policies. The evaluation should be based on the results of the monitoring program, and be coordinated with evaluation and reporting requirements of state law. The evaluation shall include opportunities for public involvement.
 - c. If the purposes of these Planning Policies are not being achieved as evidenced by results of benchmarks and monitoring reports, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor will reconvene at the request of a party to discuss, evaluate and recommend actions to achieve the purposes of the Policies.

STEP 7. The Countywide Planning Policies are based on an Urban Centers concept, growth phasing strategy, and establishment of an Urban Growth Area. King County shall actively pursue dedication of open space along the Urban Growth Area Boundary with a goal of creating a contiguous band of open space north and south along the Urban Growth Area Boundary.

When future growth requires additional capacity beyond what exists in the main Urban Area, jurisdictions should look first to the main Urban Area, and then to the rural cities and their expansion areas to accommodate new growth. This program shall follow the 1994 adoption of the final Urban Growth Area by the Metropolitan King County Council.

- a. Rural land, excluding agriculturally zoned land, may be added to the Urban Growth Area only in exchange for a dedication of permanent open space to the King County Open Space System. The dedication must consist of a minimum of four acres of open space dedicated for every one acre of land added to the Urban Growth Area, calculated in gross acres. The open space land shall be dedicated at the time the application is approved.
- b. Land added to the Urban Growth Area adopted in the 1994 Countywide Planning Policies must be physically contiguous to the existing Urban Growth Area, and must be able to be served by sewers and other urban services.
- c. The total area increased as a result of this policy shall not exceed 4,000 acres.
- d. Development on the land added to the Urban Growth Area under this policy shall be limited to residential development and shall be at a minimum density of four units to the acre. Proposals shall meet King County Comprehensive Plan density and affordable housing goals.
- e. Open space areas shall remain in rural designations and should generally be dedicated in such a way that it can connect with open space on adjacent properties. Open space areas should generally parallel the urban-rural line, according to criteria in k. below.
- f. The minimum depth of the open space buffer between the proposed addition to the Urban Growth Area and the Rural Area shall be at least one-half of the property width.
- g. The minimum size of property to be considered will be 20 acres, which includes both the proposed addition to the Urban Growth Area and the land proposed for open space dedication. Smaller properties may be combined to meet the 20 acre criterion.
- h. Initial proposals for open space dedication and urban development must be received between July 1, 1994 and June 30, 1996. Review by King County shall conclude by June 30, 1997.
- i. Where applications are adjacent to city boundaries or potential annexation areas, King County shall consult with and solicit recommendations from the city.
- j. The King County Executive will evaluate proposals for quality of open space and urban development. The highest quality proposals will be recommended by the Executive to the Metropolitan King County Council for adoption. This adoption will constitute an amendment to the Urban Growth Area. If the 4,000 acre limit on land added to the Urban Growth Area is not reached in the first round of proposals, due to either insufficient number of proposals or proposals of insufficient quality, additional rounds of applications may be accepted. King County will set the application and review periods for any additional rounds.
- k. Criteria for evaluating proposals shall include:
 1. The quality of wildlife habitat areas;
 2. Connections to regional open space systems;
 3. Protection of wetlands, stream corridors and water bodies;
 4. Unique natural features;
 5. The amount of dedicated open space and connections between dedicated open space lands along the urban rural boundary; and
 6. Ability to provide efficient urban governmental services to lands to be added to the Urban Growth Area.

- I. Proposals which add more than 200 acres to the Urban Growth Area shall include affordable housing consistent with King County policies for urban planned developments. As an incentive for additional affordable housing development, the required open space dedication shall be three and a half acres for each acre added to the Urban Growth Area for proposals smaller than 200 acres that provide 30 percent affordable housing units, or for larger developments that exceed 30 percent affordable housing units.
- STEP 8.
- a. The citizens and jurisdictions of King County are committed to maintaining a permanent Rural Area. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall review all Urban Growth Areas ten years after the adoption and ratification of Phase II Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies. The review shall be conducted utilizing monitoring reports and benchmark evaluation and be coordinated with evaluation and reporting requirements of state law. As a result of this review the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor may recommend to the Metropolitan King County Council amendments to the Urban Growth Area. Alternatively, King County may initiate consideration of Urban Growth Area amendments. Amendments shall be based on an evaluation of the following factors:
 - the criteria in policies LU-26 and LU-27;
 - the sufficiency of vacant, developable land and redevelopable land to meet projected needs;
 - the actual and projected rate of development and land consumption by category of land use including both development on vacant land and redevelopment projects;
 - the capacity of appropriate jurisdictions to provide infrastructure and service to the Urban Growth Areas;
 - the actual and projected progress of jurisdictions in meeting their adopted 20-year goals and targets of number of households and employees per acre;
 - the actual and projected rate of population and employment growth compared to adopted 20-year goals and target ranges, and compared to revised projections from the Washington State Office of Financial Management;
 - the actual and projected trend of economic development and affordable housing indicators, as reported annually through the adopted monitoring and benchmarks program;
 - indicators of environmental conditions, such as air quality, water quality, wildlife habitat, and others.
 - b. By 1998, all of the joint planning areas identified in the 1994 CPPs have be resolved, except for the City of Snoqualmie. Joint planning for any potnetial additional annexation of land to the City of Snoqualmie shall be conducted consistent with the terms of the 1990 Interlocal Agreement between King County and the City of Snoqualmie. Future Countywide Planning Policy amendments regarding the Snoqualmie joint planning area consistent with the 1990 Interlocal Agreement are not subject to ratification.
 - c. In the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan, the King County Executive may propose for adoption by the Metropolitan King County Council minor technical changes, not to exceed 300 acres, to the Urban Growth Area recommended by the Growth Management Planning Council in the Countywide Planning Policies. These minor technical changes are not subject to ratification under policy FW-1.

STEP 9. Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies may be developed by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor, or by the Metropolitan King County Council, as provided in this policy. Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, not including amendments to the Urban Growth Area pursuant to Step 7 and 8 b and c above, shall be subject to ratification by at least 30 percent of the city and County governments representing 70 percent of the population in King County. Adoption and ratification of this policy shall constitute an amendment to the May 27, 1992 interlocal agreement among King County, the City of Seattle, and the suburban cities and towns in King County for the Growth Management Planning Council of King County.

FW-2 Countywide Planning Policies are effective after King County adoption and city ratification for the purposes of updating comprehensive plans, and providing a policy framework for other governmental actions of all jurisdictions. Significant planning options will be precluded if interim actions are not taken to assure capacity and direct growth in the Urban Area, and to protect the Rural Area from the impacts of growth. The following interim actions will be taken by all jurisdictions no later than one month after ratification.

- a. King County shall adopt interim rural zoning consistent with the designation of rural for the "new" Rural Area adopted through the Countywide Planning Policies to ensure rural character is not threatened by additional subdivision activity.
- b. All jurisdictions in the Urban Area will adopt interim minimum density ordinances and review and, where appropriate, remove regulatory barriers to accessory dwelling units and manufactured homes on individual lots, to ensure that urban land is used efficiently.

FW-3 The final adopted household and employment target ranges shall be monitored by Metropolitan King County annually with adjustments made by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor organization every six years utilizing the process established by FW-1, Step 6.

II. Critical Areas

Most jurisdictions in King County have sensitive areas ordinances in place or under development. These regulations are tailored to the specific needs of each jurisdiction and are not likely to be modified based on another jurisdiction's regulations. It is important to promote regional policies that do not erode existing regulations while providing guidance for achieving consistency and compatibility among them.

A. Overall Environmental Protection

FW-4 All jurisdictions shall protect and enhance the natural ecosystems through comprehensive plans and policies, and develop regulations that reflect natural constraints and protect sensitive features. Land use and development shall be regulated in a manner which respects fish and wildlife habitat in conjunction with natural features and functions, including air and water quality. Natural resources and the built environment shall be managed to protect, improve and sustain environmental quality while minimizing public and private costs.

FW-5 Puget Sound, floodplains, rivers, streams and other water resources shall be managed for multiple beneficial uses including flood and erosion hazard reduction, fish and wildlife habitat, agriculture, open space, water supply, and hydropower. Use of water resources for one purpose shall, to the fullest extent possible, preserve and promote opportunities for other uses.

B. Wetlands Protection

CA-1 Until the Washington State Department of Ecology adopts a manual for the delineation of wetlands pursuant to section 11 of chapter 382 of the Laws of 1995, jurisdictions shall have the option of using either the 1989 manual of the United States Army Corps of Engineers or the Corps' 1987 manual in conjunction with the Corps' Washington Regional Guidance. Once the Department of Ecology adopts its manual for the delineation of wetlands, all jurisdictions shall use such state manual as it is initially adopted or thereafter amended.

- CA-2 In the long-term, all jurisdictions shall work to establish a single Countywide classification system for wetlands.
- CA-3 Within each basin, jurisdictions shall formulate their regulations and other non-regulatory methods to accomplish the following: protection of wetlands; assure no-net-loss of wetland functions; and an increase of the quantity and quality of the wetlands. The top class wetlands shall be untouched.
- CA-4 Implementation of wetland mitigation should be flexible enough to allow for protection of systems or corridors of connected wetlands. A tradeoff of small, isolated wetlands in exchange for a larger connected wetland system can achieve greater resource protection and reduce isolation and fragmentation of wetland habitat.

C. Aquifers

Currently, there are five Ground Water Management Plans being prepared in King County: Redmond, Issaquah, East King County, South King County, and Vashon. Most, but not all, important aquifers are contained within these areas. The state Department of Ecology has designated Seattle-King County Department of Public Health as the lead agency. Each plan is prepared in conjunction with an advisory committee with representatives from suburban cities, water utilities, businesses, private well owners, environmental groups, and state agencies. The plans will identify aquifer recharge areas and propose strategies for protection of aquifers through preservation and protection of groundwater. Local governments are required to adopt or amend regulations, ordinances, and/or programs in order to implement the plans following certification by Ecology in accordance with WAC 173-100-120.

- CA-5 All jurisdictions shall adopt policies to protect the quality and quantity of groundwater where appropriate:
 - a. Jurisdictions that are included in Ground Water Management Plans shall support the development, adoption, and implementation of the Plans; and
 - b. The Seattle-King County Department of Public Health and affected jurisdictions shall develop Countywide policies outlining best management practices within aquifer recharge areas to protect public health; and
 - c. King County and groundwater purveyors including cities, special purpose districts, and others should jointly:
 - 1. Prepare groundwater recharge area maps using common criteria and incorporating information generated by Ground Water Management Plans and purveyor studies;
 - 2. Develop a process by which land use jurisdictions will review, concur with, and implement, as appropriate, purveyor Wellhead Protection Programs required by the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act;
 - 3. Determine which portions of mapped recharge areas and Wellhead Protection Areas should be designated as critical; and
 - 4. Update critical areas maps as new information about recharge areas and Wellhead Protection Areas becomes available.
- CA-6 Land use actions should take into account the potential impacts on aquifers determined to serve as water supplies. The depletion and degradation of aquifers needed for potable water supplies should be avoided or mitigated; otherwise a proven, feasible replacement source of water supply should be planned and developed to compensate for potential lost supplies.

D. Fish and Wildlife Habitat

- CA-7 Adjacent jurisdictions shall identify and protect habitat networks that are aligned at jurisdictional boundaries. Networks shall link large protected or significant blocks of habitat within and between jurisdictions to achieve a continuous Countywide network. These networks shall be mapped and displayed in comprehensive plans.

- CA-8 All jurisdictions shall identify critical fish and wildlife habitats and species and develop regulations that:
- a. Promote their protection and proper management; and
 - b. Integrate native plant communities and wildlife with other land uses where possible.
- CA-9 Natural drainage systems including associated riparian and shoreline habitat shall be maintained and enhanced to protect water quality, reduce public costs, protect fish and wildlife habitat, and prevent environmental degradation. Jurisdictions within shared basins shall coordinate regulations to manage basins and natural drainage systems which include provisions to:
- a. Protect the natural hydraulic and ecological functions of drainage systems, maintain and enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and restore and maintain those natural functions;
 - b. Control peak runoff rate and quantity of discharges from new development to approximate pre-development rates; and
 - c. Preserve and protect resources and beneficial functions and values through maintenance of stable channels, adequate low flows, and reduction of future storm flows, erosion, and sedimentation.
- CA-10 Jurisdictions shall maintain or enhance water quality through control of runoff and best management practices to maintain natural aquatic communities and beneficial uses.
- CA-11 The Washington State Departments of Fisheries and Wildlife and the Indian Tribes both manage fish and wildlife resources. However, local governments have authority for land use regulation. Jurisdictions shall coordinate land use planning and management of fish and wildlife resources with affected state agencies and the federally recognized Tribes.

E. Frequently Flooded Areas

The State adopted comprehensive flood legislation in 1991 (Senate Bill 5411) that makes the Growth Management Act requirement for coordination and consistency on flood hazard regulations much more explicit. According to the new legislation, counties are to develop flood hazard control management plans with the full participation of jurisdictions within the planning areas. Once adopted by the County, cities within flood hazard planning areas must comply with the management plan. The Countywide Flood Hazard Reduction Plan was reviewed by affected jurisdictions and adopted by the King County Council on November 15, 1993 (Ordinance 11112).

- CA-12 The cities and the County should closely plan and coordinate implementation of their flood hazard reduction activities within the major river basins (the Snoqualmie, Skykomish, Sammamish, Cedar, Green, and White).
- a. Comprehensive plan policies, regulations, and programs of jurisdictions in any of the six major river basins should be consistent with the King County Flood Hazard Reduction Plan (FHRP) Policies.
 - b. Each jurisdiction's policies, regulations, and programs should effectively prevent new development and other actions from causing significant adverse impacts on major river flooding, erosion, and natural resources outside their jurisdiction.

F. Geologic Hazard Areas

- CA-13 All jurisdictions shall regulate development on certain lands to protect public health, property, important ecological and hydrogeologic functions, and environmental quality, and to reduce public costs. The natural features of these lands include:
- a. Slopes with a grade greater than 40 percent;
 - b. Severe landslide hazard areas;
 - c. Erosion hazard areas;
 - d. Mine hazard areas; and
 - e. Seismic hazards.
- Regulations shall include, at a minimum, provisions for vegetation retention, seasonal clearing and grading limits, setbacks, and drainage and erosion controls.

G. Air and Water Quality

- CA-14 All jurisdictions, in coordination with the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency and the Puget Sound Regional Council, shall develop policies, methodologies and standards that promote regional air quality, consistent with the Countywide Policy Plan.
- CA-15 All jurisdictions shall implement the Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan to restore and protect the biological health and diversity of the Puget Sound Basin.

H. Implementation

- CA-16 King County shall establish a technical committee by January 1995 to facilitate environmental protection which is to include representatives of the County, the cities, the federally recognized Tribes, business community, environmental community, public utilities, special districts, and interested citizens. The committee will serve as a depository of regulations and policies adopted by jurisdictions in King County.

The committee shall evaluate and comment upon new development regulations proposed by jurisdictions pursuant to FW-3, CA-1 through 15, LU-2 through 5. In reviewing the proposed regulations, the technical committee shall consider the consistency and compatibility of regulations and designations, and cumulative and long-term impacts. The committee shall also recommend environmental benchmarks.

III. Land Use Pattern

A. Resource Lands: Agricultural, Forestry, and Mineral

The protection and management of resource lands in King County is a regional concern and a major objective of the Countywide Planning Policies. The vast majority of resource lands are located in unincorporated King County. These areas were identified and protected under the 1985 King County Comprehensive Plan and subsequent community plans and regulations.

- FW-6 The land use pattern for the County shall protect the natural environment by reducing the consumption of land and concentrating development. Urban Growth Areas, Rural Areas, and resource lands shall be designated and the necessary implementing regulations adopted. This includes Countywide establishment of a policy planning boundary for the Urban Growth Area. Local jurisdictions shall establish these land use designations, based on the Countywide Planning Policies which are to be used as a framework for the adoption of the 1994 Metropolitan King County Comprehensive Plan.
- LU-1 Agricultural and forest lands are protected primarily for their long-term productive resource value. However, these lands also provide secondary benefits such as open space, scenic views and wildlife habitat. All jurisdictions should encourage utilization of natural resources through methods that minimize the impacts on these secondary benefits. Resource lands also contain an abundance of critical areas that shall be protected in accordance with adopted State and local regulations.
- LU-2 All jurisdictions shall protect existing resource lands within their boundaries that have long-term commercial significance for resource production. Any designated agricultural and forestry lands shall not be considered for urban development. Jurisdictions are required to enact a program authorizing the transfer or purchase of development rights for designated forest or agricultural areas within Urban Growth Areas. At the request of any city, King County will work to reinstate the King County Purchase of Development Rights Program and/or establish an interjurisdictional transfer of development rights program to protect these resource lands in accordance with the Growth Management Act.

- LU-3 Existing mineral extractive and processing operations or designated sites may be annexed or incorporated to a city only if there are policies and regulations in place to protect the long-term viability for continued operation and ensure adequate reclamation and enhancement of the site once operation ceases.
- LU-4 All jurisdictions shall encourage compatible land uses adjacent to natural resource areas which support utilization of the resource and minimize conflicts among uses. Each jurisdiction is responsible for implementing the plat and permit notification requirements for properties within 500 feet of the resource land, as specified in RCW 36.70A as amended. Jurisdictions will consider an increased distance for notification and notification to titles to property within or adjacent to the resource lands.
- LU-5 All jurisdictions shall require mineral extraction and processing operations and agricultural practices to implement best management practices to reduce environmental impacts and mitigate any unavoidable impacts.

B. Rural Areas

The vast majority of Rural Areas are located in unincorporated King County. These areas were identified and regulated through the 1985 King County Comprehensive Plan and subsequent community plans and regulations. While counties are the jurisdictions specified by the Growth Management Act as responsible for designating and regulating Rural Areas through their comprehensive plans, the protection of King County's Rural Area is a regional issue and a fundamental objective of the Countywide Planning Policies.

- FW-7 Urban Growth Areas, Rural Areas, and resource lands shall be designated and the necessary implementing regulations adopted. This includes Countywide establishment of an Urban Growth Area. Local jurisdictions shall establish these land use designations, based on the Countywide Planning Policies.
- FW-8 All jurisdictions acknowledge that Rural Areas provide an overall benefit for all residents of King County. Strategies to fund infrastructure and services in Rural Areas may be needed to support a defined rural level-of-service. Towns and cities in the Rural Areas play an important role as trade and community centers.
- FW-9 A fundamental component of the Countywide planning strategy is the maintenance of the traditional character of the Rural Area with its mix of forests, farms, high-quality natural environment, rural cities, unincorporated Rural Centers, and variety of low-density residential uses. The basic elements of this rural character are:
 - a. NATURAL FEATURES Such as water bodies and significant wetlands, scenic resources and habitat areas should be afforded long-term protection, minimizing long-term environmental degradation, and enhancing environmental quality where previous degradation has occurred.
 - b. RESOURCE-BASED INDUSTRIES Commercial and non-commercial farming, forestry, primary forest products manufacturing, mining and fisheries activities shall be encouraged to continue and to expand as possible.
 - c. RURAL TOWNS Valued attributes of small towns such as: public safety; historical continuity; small, independent business; and local availability of goods and services shall be encouraged to continue.
 - d. RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES Rural residents outside cities should anticipate lower levels of public services and infrastructure than those available in Urban Areas, maximizing self-sufficiency and independence.
 - e. OPEN SPACE SYSTEM Significant components of King County's Open Space System are found in Rural Areas. Trail corridors, habitat networks, recreational areas and scenic resources should be linked wherever possible to complete the system. Active recreational facilities shall be rural in character. Where a traditional landscape of fields cleared for agricultural purposes exists, new development should be clustered at the edges of fields to minimize the consumption of agricultural land and possible conflicts with current or future farming activity.

- f. RURAL HOUSING The Rural Areas shall offer important alternative and qualitative housing choices but shall not be considered a quantitatively significant part of the County's residential growth capacity;
 - g. RURAL ECONOMY.... The Rural Areas make a unique contribution to King County's economy. In addition to farming, fisheries and forestry, cottage industries shall be recognized as making a significant economic contribution in Rural Areas, and should be encouraged.
 - h. CITIES....Rural cities shall encourage, where appropriate, business opportunities which support the full range of rural activities occurring in their adjacent Rural Areas, including support services for agriculture and forestry. Cities should also provide a place for shopping, education, social services and other community functions at a scale consistent with the maintenance of rural character as well as the cities' household and employment target ranges.
- FW-10 To achieve and maintain rural character, King County, and the cities, as appropriate, shall use a range of tools including, at a minimum: land use designations, development regulations, level-of-service standards (particularly for infrastructure), and incentives.
- LU-6 Through the Countywide Planning Policy process, King County, with the cooperation of the cities, shall be responsible for designating Rural Areas consistent with Growth Management Act. In designating long-term Rural Areas, King County shall foster better use of limited public funds by allowing service providers to establish distinctly rural facility and service standards.
- LU-7 Designated Rural Areas are considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to an Urban Growth Area until reviewed pursuant to the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.130 (3)) and policy FW-1. Future growth should be accommodated to the maximum extent feasible by efficient use of existing urban land within the Urban Growth Area. Annexation of Rural Areas to cities shall be prohibited. When annexation of Rural Areas is necessary to link two Urban Areas, that intervening Rural Area shall be designated as permanent urban separator at low rural densities.
- LU-8 Retention of resource-based uses and conservation of natural resource lands are important to maintaining the traditional character, environmental functions and values of the Rural Area. King County shall identify appropriate districts within the Rural Area where farming and forestry are to be encouraged and expanded. These districts shall be designated by December 31, 1995. Areas to be considered should include:
- a. Large blocks of land, either identified by King County or proposed by the property owners, with resource land characteristics or agriculture or forestry production potential;
 - b. Land enrolled in the current use assessment program as farm and agricultural land or timber land under RCW 84.34 or enrolled for tax purposes as timber land under RCW 84.33;
 - c. Land in proximity to designated Agriculture and Forest Production Districts, offering mutual buffering benefits and low potential for conflicts with adjacent uses; and
 - d. Land with valuable environmental features such as wildlife habitat, groundwater recharge, salmonid streams, or high-value wetlands.
- LU-9 Permitted land uses within designated Rural Area farming and forestry districts should be limited to residences at very low densities and farming or forestry-related uses. Institutional uses or public facilities should not be permitted except for the siting of utility lines where no feasible alternative exists and the siting of K-12 public schools and K-12 public school facilities in conjunction with K-12 Public Schools. Development of adjacent lands should be conditioned to minimize land use conflicts and conversion pressures upon these districts.
- LU-10 The Rural Area shall have low densities which can be sustained by minimal infrastructure improvements, such as septic systems and rural roads. King County, cities adjacent to Rural Areas, and other agencies providing services to Rural Areas, shall adopt standards for facilities and services in Rural Areas that protect basic public health and safety, and enhance the environment, but urban facilities and services should not be provided to Rural Areas. Utilities, roads, and other infrastructure improvements may only be extended through Rural Areas to serve existing Urban Areas.

- LU-11 Comprehensive plans covering nearby Urban Areas shall consider the potential impacts of urban development upon the adjacent Rural Area. Development in Urban Areas shall not significantly increase peak flows or pollution in Rural Area streams. Urban-generated traffic should not cause rural roads to be upgraded to urban standards. Where a rural arterial must be upgraded to accommodate urban-generated traffic, it should include features such as screening and limited access within the Rural Area to lessen the road's impact on surrounding rural lands, including pressure to convert them to higher-intensity uses. Funding for such improvements should be primarily the responsibility of the benefiting jurisdiction.
- LU-12 Planning for Rural Areas should comply with the following density guidelines:
- a. One home per 20 acres to protect forest lands when designated in accordance with policy LU-8.
 - b. One home per ten acres to protect lands for small-scale farming when designated in accordance with policy LU-8;
 - c. One home per ten acres is also appropriate if the predominant lot size is ten acres or larger and the lands are within one-quarter of a mile of a designated Forest Production District or lower-density Agricultural Production District with livestock-based agriculture or a legally-approved long-term mineral resource extraction site, or the lands contain significant environmentally constrained areas as defined by County ordinance or Federal or State law;
 - d. One home per five acres where the land is physically suitable and can be supported by rural services; and
 - e. Development on existing sub-standard lots in the Rural Area shall be permitted when applicable development standards, such as Board of Health regulations for on-site sewage disposal, can be met.
- LU-13 To maintain rural character, and to minimize the need for additional infrastructure, very large lots (five acres or more) are the preferred residential development pattern. To further the goals of rural protection, clustering of development that will sustain rural land uses, require only rural levels-of-service and be designed, scaled and sited to be consistent with Rural Area character may be required:
- a. Where it would not result in a greater number of dwelling units than would be constructed under a conventional lotting pattern unless either:
 1. A substantial dedication of land to King County's Open Space System is provided and the impacts of the additional dwelling units are mitigated;
 2. Permanent protection, substantially greater than that attainable through existing regulations, is secured for a significant natural resource, or
 3. Substantial farming or forestry lands would be permanently protected from conversion to non-resource based uses.
 - b. Where clustering of development would:
 1. Provide greater protection for natural resources or environmentally sensitive features;
 2. Reduce the consumption of agricultural or forestry lands for residential purposes; or
 3. Minimize potential conflicts between residential and resource-based activities.
- LU-14 King County may allow transfer of density from Rural Area properties to other Rural or Urban Area properties in order to (1) secure a substantial dedication of significant land to the King County Open Space System; (2) provide permanent protection which is greater than that available through existing regulation to a significant natural resource; or (3) encourage retention of resource-based uses in the Rural Area. The County shall develop a mechanism to accomplish these objectives and provide that:
- a. Lands dedicated are first determined to be suitable for inclusion within the King County Open Space System;

- b. The protected natural resource is first determined to be of significance to King County citizens and the protection afforded is materially superior to that provided by existing regulations;
 - c. The resulting development is located in proximity to the lands to be dedicated to public ownership or where it can otherwise be shown that the residents of this development will share in an overriding public benefit to be derived from the preservation of the dedicated lands or the protection of the natural resource;
 - d. The resulting development within the Rural Area maintains rural character; and
 - e. There shall be no net increase in density within the Rural Area as a result of this density transfer.
- LU-15 Rural Areas should retain a high proportion of undisturbed soils to maintain groundwater recharge, high water quality and river and stream base flows essential to navigation, recreation and the survival of wildlife and fish. The long-term integrity of Rural Area ecosystems should be a guiding principle in establishing the location and intensity of land uses and public facilities in Rural Areas, the operating standards for resource-based activities, and rural facility standards.
- LU-16 Rural development standards should be designed to protect the natural environment. The tools to achieve this include: seasonal and maximum clearing limits; impervious surface limits; surface water management standards that emphasize preservation of natural drainage systems and water quality, groundwater recharge and best management practices for resource-based activities.
- LU-17 Rural Areas shall be recognized as significant for the recharge and storage of groundwater and as areas necessary for the maintenance of base flows in rivers and natural levels of lakes and wetlands. Measures to protect these areas shall include:
- a. A rural section within the King County Surface Water Design Manual requiring runoff be infiltrated except where potential groundwater contamination cannot be prevented by pollution source controls and stormwater pretreatment, and
 - b. Infiltration as the preferred method of volume control, with other methods allowable only after infiltration has been ruled out for technical reasons.
- LU-18 King County's Comprehensive Plan shall include policies to preserve opportunities for mining and to assure extractive industries maintain environmental quality and minimize impacts to adjacent land uses. The goal shall be to facilitate the efficient utilization of valuable mineral, oil and gas deposits when consistent with maintaining environmental quality and minimizing impacts.
- LU-19 Rural level standards for streets should be refined to minimize clearing and grading, and avoid conflicts with the natural landscape. Pavement width should be no wider than needed to meet safety considerations and accommodate designated bicycle/pedestrian routes.
- LU-20 Standards for rural water service, to be developed through the rural design manual, should assure adequate quality and quantity for domestic supply consistent with low rural residential densities and existing infrastructure commitments.
- LU-21 Regional public facilities which directly serve the public shall be discouraged from locating in Rural Areas.
- LU-22 King County should evaluate additional ways that small-scale farming and forestry, and land and watershed stewardship can be encouraged through landowner incentive programs and community-based education. This should include:
- a. Creating opportunities and incentives for voluntary cooperative management of woodlots and open space that is currently in separate ownerships;
 - b. Providing technical assistance and information to landowner groups and community associations seeking to implement stewardship, habitat restoration and management plans;

- c. Providing outreach and assistance to small landowners wishing to participate in open space tax incentive programs;
- d. Ongoing evaluation of existing tax incentive programs, including the County's Public Benefit Rating System and the timber and agricultural current use assessment programs, to ensure they meet the needs of rural character preservation;
- e. Implementation of "right to farm" and "right to forestry" ordinances;
- f. Development of expedited permit review processes and/or permit exemptions for activities complying with cooperatively developed stewardship, habitat restoration and resource management plans that include "best management practices".
- g. Cooperation with State and Tribal Agencies in expediting regulatory review and technical assistance to cooperating landowners.

LU-23 Rural Areas designated by King County shall remain rural. Additional Rural Areas shall be designated by King County through adoption of a land use map authorized by the Growth Management Planning Council. These additional areas meet at least one of the following criteria:

- a. Opportunities exist for small-scale farming and forestry which do not qualify for resource land designation;
- b. The rural designation serves as a buffer for designated resource lands or sensitive areas;
- c. Significant environmental constraints make the area generally unsuitable for intensive urban development;
- d. Major physical barriers exist to providing urban services at reasonable cost;
- e. The area is contiguous to other designated Rural Areas, resource areas or sensitive areas;
- f. The area has outstanding scenic, historic, and/or aesthetic value that can best be protected by rural land uses and densities; and
- g. The area has limited public services, extension of full services is not planned, and infill at higher densities is not feasible or necessary to meet regional goals.

Criteria specified in LU-23(g) permits the redesignation of urban lands in King County to rural. These areas have not received a full range of services, such as sewers, and are developed at densities which are too low to support cost-effective provision of all urban services. The inclusion of these new Rural Areas will carry out regional policies by focusing new development to Urban Areas that are planned to have full urban services.

LU-24 Low-density Urban Areas meeting the criteria of LU-23(g) may be redesignated rural and zoned for rural residential densities. Legally created existing lots within the Rural Area are legal building sites as authorized in the King County Code.

LU-25 King County, in collaboration with affected governments, agencies and citizens shall prepare the following products:

- a. A manual on rural infrastructure design (including an examination of alternative sewage treatment technologies), fire/wildfire protection, and service standards;
- b. Recommended revisions to King County's land development regulations to address issues such as incentives for reconsolidation of nonconforming and unbuildable lots, application of current regulations if discretionary extensions of preliminary plat approvals are allowed, and subdivision site design to minimize conflict with nearby farming and forestry activities;
- c. A strategy to persuade the banking industry and its regulators to revise lending criteria to remove obstacles to affordable housing on large lots, and to invest in environmentally sound land management practices; and
- d. A strategy to persuade the federal and state governments to devise domestic water quality standards and monitoring requirements that protect the environment and public health at a reasonable cost so as to avoid financial pressure to convert Rural Areas to higher densities.

C. Urban Areas

The following policies establish an Urban Growth Area and methods to phase development within this area in order to bring certainty to long-term planning and development within the County. The Urban Growth Area is a permanent designation. Land outside the Urban Growth Area is designated for permanent rural and resource uses, except for the cities in the Rural Area. Countywide Policies on Rural and Resource Areas are found in Chapter IIIA, Resource Lands, and Chapter IIIB, Rural Areas.

The capacity in the Urban Growth Area for growth, based on adopted plans and regulations, meets the 20-year minimum requirement of the Growth Management Act according to the current population forecasts. In the future, all urban growth is to be accommodated within permanent Urban Areas by increasing densities. Phasing is to occur within the Urban Growth Area to ensure that services are provided as growth occurs. All cities are to be within the Urban Growth Area. Cities in the Rural Area are to be Urban Growth Area islands.

- FW-11 The land use pattern for King County shall protect the natural environment by reducing the consumption of land and concentrating development. An Urban Growth Area, Rural Areas, and resource lands shall be designated and the necessary implementing regulations adopted. This includes Countywide establishment of a boundary for the Urban Growth Area. Local jurisdictions shall make land use decisions based on the Countywide Planning Policies.
- FW-12 The Urban Growth Area shall provide enough land to accommodate future urban development. Policies to phase the provision of urban services and to ensure efficient use of the growth capacity within the Urban Growth Area shall be instituted.

1. Urban Growth Area

The Growth Management Act requires King County to designate an Urban Growth Area in consultation with cities. The Countywide Planning Policies must establish an Urban Growth Area that contains enough urban land to accommodate at least 20 years of new population and employment growth. The Growth Management Act states: “based upon the population forecast made for the County by the Office of Financial Management, the Urban Growth Areas in the County shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit urban growth that is projected to occur in the County for the succeeding 20-year period. Each Urban Growth Area shall permit urban densities and shall include greenbelt and open space areas.” A Urban Growth Area map is attached as Appendix I, which guides the adoption of the 1994 Metropolitan King County Comprehensive Plan.

- LU-26 The lands within Urban Growth Areas shall be characterized by urban development. The Urban Growth Area shall accommodate the 20-year projection of household and employment growth with a full range of phased urban governmental services. The Countywide Planning Policies shall establish the Urban Growth Area based on the following criteria:
- a. Include all lands within existing cities, including cities in the Rural Area and their designated expansion areas;
 - b. The Growth Management Planning Council recognizes that the Bear Creek Master Plan Developments (MPDs) are subject to an ongoing review process under the adopted Bear Creek Community Plan and recognizes these properties as urban under these Countywide Planning Policies. If the applications necessary to implement the MPDs are denied by King County or not pursued by the applicant(s), then the property subject to the MPD shall be redesignated rural pursuant to the Bear Creek Community Plan. Nothing in these Planning Policies shall limit the continued review and implementation through existing applications, capital improvements appropriations or other approvals of these two MPDs as new communities under the Growth Management Act;
 - c. Not include rural land or unincorporated agricultural, or forestry lands designated through the Countywide Planning Policies plan process;
 - d. Include only areas already characterized by urban development which can be efficiently and cost effectively served by roads, water, sanitary sewer and storm drainage, schools and other urban governmental services within the next 20 years;
 - e. Do not extend beyond natural boundaries, such as watersheds, which impede provision of urban services;

- f. Respect topographical features which form a natural edge such as rivers and ridge lines; and
- g. Include only areas which are sufficiently free of environmental constraints to be able to support urban growth without major environmental impacts unless such areas are designated as an urban separator by interlocal agreement between jurisdictions.

LU-27 Urban separators are low-density areas or areas of little development within the Urban Growth Area. Urban separators shall be defined as permanent low-density lands which protect adjacent resource lands, Rural Areas, and environmentally sensitive areas and create open space corridors within and between Urban Areas which provide environmental, visual, recreational and wildlife benefits. Designated urban separators shall not be redesignated in the future (in the 20-year planning cycle) to other urban uses or higher densities. The maintenance of these urban separators is a regional as well as a local concern. Therefore, no modifications should be made to the development regulations governing these areas without King County review and concurrence.

2. Phasing Development within the Urban Growth Area

Development in the Urban Area will be phased to promote efficient use of the land, add certainty to infrastructure planning, and to ensure that urban services can be provided to urban development. The minimum densities required by LU-66 help ensure the efficient use of the land. Phasing will further ensure coordination of infrastructure and development. Urban Areas in jurisdictions which do not have urban services and are not scheduled to receive urban services within ten years shall be subject to phasing requirements.

LU-28 Within the Urban Growth Area, growth should be directed as follows: a) first, to Centers and urbanized areas with existing infrastructure capacity; b) second, to areas which are already urbanized such that infrastructure improvements can be easily extended; and c) last, to areas requiring major infrastructure improvements.

LU-29 All jurisdictions shall develop growth phasing plans consistent with applicable capital facilities plans to maintain an Urban Area served with adequate public facilities and services to meet at least the six-year intermediate household and employment target ranges consistent with LU-67 and LU-68. These growth phasing plans shall be based on locally adopted definitions, service levels, and financing commitments, consistent with State Growth Management Act requirements. The phasing plans for cities shall not extend beyond their potential annexation areas. Interlocal agreements shall be developed that specify the applicable minimum zoning, development standards, impact mitigation and future annexation for the potential annexation areas.

LU-30 Where urban services cannot be provided within the next ten years, jurisdictions should develop policies and regulations to:

- a. Phase and limit development such that planning, siting, density and infrastructure decisions will support future urban development when urban services become available; and
- b. Establish a process for converting land to urban densities and uses once services are available.

3. Joint Planning and Urban Growth Areas around Cities

The Growth Management Act requires each County to designate Urban Growth Areas, in consultation with cities. Within the Countywide Urban Growth Area, each city will identify land needed for its growth for the next 20 years. Although the Growth Management Act does not explicitly equate Urban Growth Areas with municipal annexation areas, the Urban Growth Areas around cities may be considered potential expansion areas for cities.

- FW-13 Cities are the appropriate provider of local urban services to Urban Areas either directly or by contract. Counties are the appropriate provider of most Countywide services. Urban services shall not be extended through the use of special purpose districts without the approval of the city in whose potential annexation area the extension is proposed. Within the Urban Area, as time and conditions warrant, cities should assume local urban services provided by special purpose districts.
- LU-31 In collaboration with adjacent counties and cities and King County, and in consultation with residential groups in affected areas, each city shall designate a potential annexation area. Each potential annexation area shall be specific to each city. Potential annexation areas shall not overlap. Within the potential annexation area the city shall adopt criteria for annexation, including conformance with Countywide Planning Policies, and a schedule for providing urban services and facilities within the potential annexation area. This process shall ensure that unincorporated urban islands of King County are not created between cities and strive to eliminate existing islands between cities.
- LU-32 A city may annex territory only within its designated potential annexation area. All cities shall phase annexations to coincide with the ability for the city to coordinate the provision of a full range of urban services to areas to be annexed.
- LU-33 Land within a city's potential annexation area shall be developed according to that city's and King County's growth phasing plans. Undeveloped lands adjacent to that city should be annexed at the time development is proposed to receive a full range of urban services. Subsequent to establishing a potential annexation area, infill lands within the potential annexation area which are not adjacent or which are not practical to annex shall be developed pursuant to interlocal agreements between the County and the affected city. The interlocal agreement shall establish the type of development allowed in the potential annexation area and standards for that development so that the area is developed in a manner consistent with its future annexation potential. The interlocal agreement shall specify at a minimum the applicable zoning, development standards, impact mitigation, and future annexation within the potential annexation area.
- LU-34 Several unincorporated areas are currently considering local governance options. Unincorporated Urban Areas that are already urbanized and are within a city's potential annexation area are encouraged to annex to that city in order to receive urban services. Where annexation is inappropriate, incorporation may be considered.

Development within the potential annexation area of one jurisdiction may have impacts on adjacent jurisdictions.

- LU-35 A jurisdiction may designate a potential impact area beyond its potential annexation area in collaboration with adjacent jurisdictions. As part of the designation process the jurisdiction shall establish criteria for the review of development proposals under consideration by other jurisdictions in the impact area.

The Growth Management Act has a provision granting counties the discretion to disband Boundary Review Boards after comprehensive plans and development regulations are adopted. The following policy provides direction for considering whether to disband the Boundary Review Board for King County.

- LU-36 Upon the adoption and ratification of the Countywide Policies, the King County Council shall convene a meeting with municipal elected officials to determine a process for disbanding the Washington State Boundary Review Board for King County and establishing criteria to oversee municipal and special district annexations, mergers, and incorporations in King County. Until the Washington State Boundary Review Board for King County is disbanded, it should be governed in its decisions by the interim Urban Growth Area boundary and the adopted and ratified Countywide Planning Policies. The criteria shall include, but not be limited to:
- a. Conformance with Countywide Planning Policies;
 - b. The ability of the annexing jurisdiction to demonstrate a capability to provide urban services at standards equal to or better than the current service providers; and
 - c. Annexations in a manner which discourages unincorporated islands of development.

The Growth Management Act requires that city and County comprehensive plans be coordinated and consistent with one another. Consistency is required “where there are common borders or related regional issues” (RCW 36.70A.100). Joint planning is fundamental to all the framework policies.

LU-37 All jurisdictions shall cooperate in developing comprehensive plans which are consistent with those of adjacent jurisdictions and with the Countywide Planning Policies.

4. Cities in the Rural Area

The cities and unincorporated towns in the Rural Areas are a significant part of King County's diversity and heritage. Cities in this category include: Black Diamond, Carnation, Duvall, Enumclaw, North Bend, Snoqualmie and Skykomish. They have an important role as local trade and community centers. These cities and towns are the appropriate providers of local rural services for the community. They also contribute to the variety of development patterns and housing choices within the County. As municipalities, the cities are to provide urban services and be located within designated Urban Growth Areas. The urban services, residential densities and mix of land uses may differ from those of the large, generally western Urban Growth Area.

LU-38 In recognition that cities in the Rural Area are generally not contiguous to the Countywide Urban Growth Area, and to protect and enhance the options cities in Rural Areas provide, these cities shall be located within Urban Growth Areas. These Urban Growth Areas generally will be islands separate from the larger Urban Growth Area located in the western portion of the County. Each city in the Rural Area and King County and the Growth Management Planning Council shall work cooperatively to establish an Urban Growth Area for that city. The Urban Growth Area for cities in the Rural Area shall:

- a. Include all lands within existing cities in the Rural Area;
- b. Be sufficiently free of environmental constraints to be able to support rural city growth without major environmental impacts;
- c. Be contiguous to city limits;
- d. Have boundaries based on natural boundaries, such as watersheds, topographical features, and the edge of areas already characterized by urban development;
- e. Be maintained in large lots at densities of one home per five acres or less with mandatory clustering provisions until such time as the city annexes the area;
- f. Be implemented through interlocal agreements among King County, the cities and special purpose districts, as appropriate, to ensure that annexation is phased, nearby open space is protected and development within the Urban Growth Area is compatible with surrounding Rural and Resource Areas; and
- g. Not include designated Forest or Agricultural Production District lands unless the conservation of those lands and continued resource-based use, or other compatible use, is assured.

D. Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

Urban Centers are envisioned as areas of concentrated employment and housing, with direct service by high-capacity transit, and a wide range of other land uses such as retail, recreational, public facilities, parks and open space.

Urban Centers are designed to 1) strengthen existing communities, 2) promote housing opportunities close to employment, 3) support development of an extensive transportation system to reduce dependency on automobiles, 4) consume less land with urban development, 5) maximize the benefit of public investment in infrastructure and services, 6) reduce costs of and time required for permitting, and 7) evaluate and mitigate environmental impacts.

Manufacturing/Industrial Employment Centers are key components of the regional economy. These areas are characterized by a significant amount of manufacturing, industrial, and advanced technology employment. They differ from other employment areas, such as business/office parks (see FW-16 and LU-70-74), in that a land base and the segregation of major non-manufacturing uses are essential elements of their operation.

- FW-14 Within the Urban Growth Area, a limited number of Urban Centers which meet specific criteria established in the Countywide Planning Policies shall be locally designated. Urban Centers shall be characterized by all of the following:
- a. Clearly defined geographic boundaries;
 - b. Intensity/density of land uses sufficient to support effective rapid transit;
 - c. Pedestrian emphasis within the Center;
 - d. Emphasis on superior urban design which reflects the local community;
 - e. Limitations on single-occupancy vehicle usage during peak hours or commute purposes;
 - f. A broad array of land uses and choices within those uses for employees and residents;
 - g. Sufficient public open spaces and recreational opportunities; and
 - h. Uses which provide both daytime and nighttime activities in the Center.
- FW-15 Within the Urban Growth Area, the Countywide Planning Policies shall assure the creation of a number of locally determined Manufacturing/Industrial Centers which meet specific criteria. The Manufacturing/Industrial Centers shall be characterized by the following:
- a. Clearly defined geographic boundaries;
 - b. Intensity/density of land uses sufficient to support manufacturing, industrial and advanced technology uses;
 - c. Reasonable access to the regional highway, rail, air and/or waterway system for the movement of goods;
 - d. Provisions to discourage large office and retail development; and
 - e. Fast-track project permitting.
- FW-16 Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers shall be complemented by the land use pattern outside the Centers but within the Urban Area. This area shall include: urban residential neighborhoods, Activity Areas, business/office parks, and an urban open space network. Within these areas, future development shall be limited in scale and intensity to support the Countywide land use and regional transportation plan.

1. Urban Centers Designation Process

- LU-39 The location and number of Urban Centers in King County were determined through the joint local and Countywide adoption process, based on the following steps:
- a. The Countywide Planning Policies include specific criteria for Urban Centers;
 - b. Jurisdictions electing to contain an Urban Center provided the Growth Management Planning Council with a statement of commitment describing the city's intent and commitment to meet the Centers' criteria defined in these Policies and a timetable for the required Centers Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement or identification of existing environmental documentation to be used; and
 - c. The Growth Management Planning Council reviewed the Centers nominated by local jurisdictions consistent with policy FW-1, and the following criteria:
 1. The Center's location in the region and its potential for promoting a Countywide system of Urban Centers;
 2. The total number of Centers in the County that can be realized over the next 20 years, based on 20 years projected growth;
 3. The type and level of commitments that each jurisdiction has identified for achieving Center goals; and
 4. Review of other jurisdictional plans to ensure that growth focused to Centers is assured.

- d. The Growth Management Planning Council confirmed the following Urban Centers:
 - Bellevue CBD
 - Federal Way CBD
 - Kent CBD
 - Redmond CBD
 - Renton CBD
 - Seattle CDD
 - Seattle Center
 - First Hill/Capitol Hill
 - University District
 - Northgate
 - SeaTac CBD
 - Tukwila CBD

2. Urban Centers Criteria

Urban Centers vary substantially in the number of households and jobs they contain today. The intent of the Countywide Planning Policies is to encourage the growth of each Urban Center as a unique, vibrant community that is an attractive place to live and work, that will support efficient public services including transit, and that responds to local needs and markets for jobs and housing.

Two approaches are used to set guidelines and track the growth of Urban Centers. First, the Countywide Planning Policies establish levels of households and jobs needed to achieve the benefits of an Urban Center. Some Urban Centers will reach these levels over the next 20 years, while for others the criteria set a path for growth over a longer term and provide capacity to accommodate growth beyond the 20-year horizon. Second, jurisdictions establish 20-year household and employment growth target ranges for each Urban Center. The target ranges reflect the diversity of the Centers, allowing communities to envision changes over the next 20 years and plan for needed services. The target ranges set a policy for the level of growth envisioned for each Center that not only considers land capacity but also the timing and funding of infrastructure. Reaching the target ranges will require planning, public investment, and incentives for private investments. Over time the Centers will move toward the development pattern envisioned in the Countywide Planning Policies.

Within the County, Urban Centers are expected to account for up to one-half of employment growth and one-quarter of household growth over the next 20 years. Additional capacity for household and employment growth is provided in the Urban Growth Areas outside of designated Urban Centers to ensure that, Countywide, 20-year growth projections will be accommodated.

- LU-40 Each jurisdiction which has designated an Urban Center shall adopt in its comprehensive plan a definition of the Urban Center which specifies the exact geographic boundaries of the Center. All Centers shall be up to one and a half square miles of land. Infrastructure and services shall be planned and financed consistent with the expected rate of growth. For the purposes of achieving a long-range development pattern that will provide a successful mix of uses and densities that will efficiently support high-capacity transit, each Center shall have planned land uses to accommodate:
 - a. A minimum of 15,000 jobs within one-half mile of a transit center;
 - b. At a minimum, an average of 50 employees per gross acre; and
 - c. At a minimum, an average 15 households per gross acre.
- LU-41 In order to be designated as Urban Centers, jurisdictions shall demonstrate both that an adequate supply of drinking water is available to serve projected growth within the Urban Center and that the jurisdiction is capable of concurrent service to new development.
- LU-42 Jurisdictions which contain Urban Centers, in conjunction with METRO, shall identify transit station areas and rights-of-way in their comprehensive plan. Station areas shall be sited so that all portions of the Urban Center are within walking distance (one-half mile) of a station.

- LU-43 In order to reserve rights-of-way and potential station areas for high-capacity transit or transit hubs in the Urban Centers, jurisdictions shall:
- a. Upon adoption of specific high-capacity transit alignments by METRO, adopt policies to avoid development which would restrict establishment of the high-capacity transit system;
 - b. Preserve rights-of-way controlled by the jurisdiction which are identified for potential transit use; and
 - c. Provide METRO an option to acquire property owned by the jurisdiction.
- LU-44 To encourage transit use, jurisdictions should establish mechanisms to limit the use of single-occupancy vehicles for commuting purposes. Such mechanisms could include charging for long-term single-occupancy vehicle parking and/or limiting the number of off-street parking spaces for each Urban Center; establishing minimum and maximum parking requirements that limit the use of the single-occupant vehicle; and developing coordinated plans that incorporate Commuter Trip Reduction guidelines. All plans for Urban Centers shall encourage bicycle travel and pedestrian movement.
- LU-45 Jurisdictions' comprehensive plans for Urban Centers shall demonstrate compliance with the Urban Centers criteria. In order to promote urban growth within Centers, the Urban Center plan shall establish strategies which:
- a. Support pedestrian mobility, bicycle use and transit use;
 - b. Achieve a target housing density and mix of use;
 - c. Provide a wide range of capital improvement projects, such as street improvements, schools, parks and open space, public art and community facilities;
 - d. Emphasize superior urban design;
 - e. Emphasize historic preservation and adaptive reuse of historic places;
 - f. Include other local characteristics necessary to achieve a vital Urban Center; and
 - g. Include facilities to meet human service needs.
- LU-46 The system of Urban Centers shall form the land use foundation for a regional high-capacity transit system. Urban Centers should receive very high priority for the location of high-capacity transit stations and/or transit centers. (See also LU-59)

3. Incentives for Urban Centers

In order to help create Urban Centers, incentives to jurisdictions to establish Urban Centers, and to the community to build in Urban Centers, should be established.

The provision of high-capacity transit (HCT) is one such incentive. Others include funding, and streamlined permitting.

- LU-47 Countywide financing strategies shall be developed by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor, which:
- a. Identify regional funding sources; and
 - b. Set priorities and allocate funds for urban facilities and services including social and human services, and subarea planning efforts, in Urban Centers.
- LU-48 Each jurisdiction electing to contain an Urban Center shall prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for each proposed Center. The PEIS shall be prepared in a comprehensive manner and shall address probable significant adverse environmental impacts from and reasonable alternatives to the proposal. These may include, but are not necessarily limited to subjects of areawide concern such as cumulative impacts, housing, schools, public utilities, and transportation. Subsequent project-specific proposals shall not be required to perform duplicative environmental review of issues which have been adequately reviewed in the PEIS, but shall provide additional environmental review of other issues. These may include, but are not necessarily limited to the direct impacts of the specific proposal, substantial changes in the nature of the proposal or information regarding impacts which indicate probable significant adverse environmental impacts which were not adequately analyzed in the

PEIS. Examples of project-specific direct impacts include local traffic impacts, site aesthetics, and other issues not addressed by the PEIS.

LU-49 In support of Centers, additional local action should include:

- a. Strategies for land assembly within the Center, if applicable;
- b. Infrastructure and service financing strategies and economic development strategies for the Centers;
- c. Establishing expected permit processing flow commitments consistent with the PEIS; and
- d. Establishing a streamlined and simplified administrative appeal process with fixed and certain timelines.

LU-50 Jurisdictions should consider additional incentives for development within Urban Centers such as:

- a. Setting goals for maximum permit review time and give priority to permits in Urban Centers;
- b. Policies to reduce or eliminate impact fees;
- c. Simplifying and streamlining of the administrative appeal processes;
- d. Eliminating project-specific requirements for parking and open space by providing those facilities for the Urban Center as a whole; and
- e. Establishing a bonus zoning program for the provision of urban amenities.

4. Manufacturing/Industrial Center Designation Process

- LU-51 The location and number of regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers in King County were determined through the joint local and Countywide adoption process, based on the following steps:
- a. Countywide Planning Policies include specific criteria for Manufacturing/Industrial Centers;
 - b. Jurisdictions electing to contain a Manufacturing/Industrial Center provided the Growth Management Planning Council with a statement specifying how the Center will meet the intent of the Countywide Policies, including plans to adopt criteria, incentives, and other commitments to implement Manufacturing/Industrial Centers;
 - c. The Growth Management Planning Council reviewed the Manufacturing/Industrial Centers elected by local jurisdictions consistent with policy FW-1, and the following criteria:
 1. The Center's location in the region, especially relative to existing and proposed transportation facilities and its potential for promoting a Countywide system of Manufacturing/Industrial Centers;
 2. The total number of Centers that are needed in the County over the next 20-years based on 20 years projected need for manufacturing land to satisfy regional projections of demand for manufacturing land that assume a ten percent increase in manufacturing jobs over this period;
 3. The type and level of commitments that each jurisdiction has identified for achieving Manufacturing/Industrial Center goals;
 4. Review of other jurisdictional plans to ensure that growth focused to Manufacturing/Industrial Centers is assured; and
 5. The accessibility of the Center to existing or planned transportation facilities.
 - d. The Growth Management Planning Council confirmed the following Manufacturing/Industrial Centers: North Tukwila, Duwamish and Ballard/Interbay in Seattle, the Kent Industrial Area, and Redmond Overlake.

5. Manufacturing/Industrial Center Criteria

- LU-52 Each jurisdiction which contains a regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center shall adopt in its comprehensive plan a definition of the Center which specifies the exact geographic boundaries of the Center. Jurisdictions with Manufacturing/Industrial Centers shall have zoning and detailed plans in place to achieve the following goals by the year 2010.
- a. Preserve and encourage the aggregation of vacant or non-manufacturing/industrial land parcels sized for manufacturing/industrial uses;
 - b. Discourage land uses which are not compatible with manufacturing, industrial and advanced technology uses;
 - c. Accommodate a minimum of 10,000 jobs; and
 - d. Limit the size of offices and retail unless as an accessory use.
- LU-53 All jurisdictions support the development of a regional industrial siting policy to promote industrial activity.
- LU-54 Jurisdictions shall design access to the regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers to facilitate the mobility of employees by transit, and the mobility of goods by truck, rail or waterway as appropriate. Regional comprehensive plans shall include strategies to provide capital improvement projects which support access for movement of goods.
- LU-55 Jurisdictions which contain regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers in conjunction with transit agencies, shall identify transit station areas and rights-of-way in each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan. Where transit stations exist or are planned, jurisdictions in conjunction with transit agencies shall identify various options such as feeder systems, bicycle routes and pedestrian systems to link the Center with its transit stations.

- LU-56 In order to reserve rights-of-way and potential station areas for high-capacity transit or transit hubs in the regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, jurisdictions shall:
- a. Upon adoption of specific high-capacity transit alignments by METRO, adopt policies to avoid development which would restrict establishment of the high-capacity transit system;
 - b. Preserve rights-of-way controlled by the jurisdiction which are identified for potential transit use; and
 - c. Provide METRO an option to acquire property owned by the jurisdiction.
- LU-57 Transit agencies shall strive to provide convenient and economical mass transit service for the Manufacturing/Industrial Centers that will result in a decrease in single-occupancy non-commercial vehicle trips within the Centers.
- LU-58 Jurisdictions' comprehensive plans for regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers shall demonstrate compliance with the criteria. In order to promote manufacturing/industrial growth, the Manufacturing/Industrial Center plan for each jurisdiction shall establish strategies:
- a. To provide capital facility improvement projects which support the movement of goods and manufacturing/industrial operations;
 - b. To coordinate planning with serving utilities to ensure that utility facilities are available to serve such Centers;
 - c. To provide buffers around the Center to reduce conflicts with adjacent land uses;
 - d. To facilitate land assembly; and
 - e. To attract the type of businesses that will ensure economic growth and stability.
- LU-59 Each Manufacturing Center containing a minimum of 15,000 jobs and having sufficient employment densities to support high-capacity transit should be served by high-capacity transit. It is recognized that by their nature, Manufacturing/Industrial Centers may not achieve densities necessary to make high-capacity transit service viable. Nevertheless, Manufacturing/Industrial Centers which are located on the regional high-capacity transit alignment and which meet the transit-friendly criteria in policies LU-54 through LU-58 above should receive one or more high-capacity transit stations and/or transit centers.

6. Incentives for Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

- LU-60 Countywide financing strategies shall be developed by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor which:
- a. Identify regional funding sources; and
 - b. Set priorities and allocate funds for urban facilities and services including social and human services in regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, and subarea planning efforts in Manufacturing/Industrial Centers.
- LU-61 Jurisdictions shall consider conducting detailed State Environmental Policy Act review for the regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center at the planning stage so that project-specific environmental review is minimized.
- LU-62 To reduce or prevent conflicts, jurisdictions shall develop policies to establish and support normal manufacturing/industrial practices such as notices on development permits for properties adjacent to a Manufacturing/Industrial Center.

E. Activity Areas

Activity Areas are envisioned as areas containing moderate concentrations of commercial development and housing that function as a focal point for the local community. Activity Areas contain a mix of land uses such as retail, recreation areas, public facilities, parks and open space. Although smaller in scale than Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, Activity Areas contain a sufficient density and mix of uses to provide similar benefits. Activity Areas are designed to 1) provide housing and employment opportunities, 2) provide retail, services and business opportunities, 3) reduce automobile use and support efficient transit service, and 4) consume less land with urban development. Encouraging compact development within Activity Areas is an important part of the Countywide Planning Policy vision promoting infill development and preventing sprawl.

Activity Areas are designated in local comprehensive plans. The size of the Activity Area and the mix and density of land uses are locally determined to meet community goals. Examples of Activity Areas include the central business districts of Kirkland, Burien, and Des Moines; East Hill in Kent; and a number of business districts in Seattle, such as Lake City, Wallingford, and West Seattle Junction.

- FW-17 Within the Urban Growth Area, jurisdictions may locally designate one or more Activity Areas characterized by the following:
- a. An array of land uses, including commercial development, housing, public facilities and public open spaces;
 - b. Intensity/density of land uses sufficient to encourage frequent transit;
 - c. Pedestrian emphasis within the Activity Area;
 - d. Emphasis on superior urban design which reflects the local community; and
 - e. Disincentives for single-occupancy vehicle usage for commute purposes during peak hours.
- LU-63 Jurisdictions shall designate the boundaries, and uses within all Activity Areas to provide for local employment, a mix of housing types, commercial activities, public facilities and open space.
- LU-64 All Activity Areas that achieve sufficient employment and household densities should receive frequent peak-hour transit service. Activity Areas may contain a high-capacity transit station or transit hub if the Activity Area:
- a. Is on an high-capacity transit corridor, or can serve as a transit hub;
 - b. Has pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-supportive site planning, building design and road design regulations; and
 - c. Has parking regulations to encourage transit use.
- LU-65 To encourage transit use, jurisdictions should establish minimum and maximum parking requirements that reduce dependence on the single-occupant vehicle. Jurisdictions should establish mechanisms to charge for single-occupancy vehicle parking and/or limit on the number of off-street parking spaces for each Activity Center. All plans for Activity Areas shall encourage bicycle travel and pedestrian activity.

F. Urban Growth Outside of Centers

A variety of land uses and concentrations of growth occur within the Urban Growth Area and outside of the Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers. Local land use plans will be responsible for the designation, character, and utilization of Urban Areas outside of Centers. However, Countywide Policies are presented below to provide guidance for these areas to ensure that they support the Centers growth concept. These Policies do not apply to the rural cities whose land use pattern is described by policy LU-38.

Households and employment target ranges by jurisdiction are described in this section in order to establish the ability, Countywide, to accommodate the projected 20-year population and employment growth. The Countywide population growth has been established by the State of Washington Office of Financial Management as required by the Growth

Management Act. The Countywide employment growth has been derived from projections prepared by the Puget Sound Regional Council. For purposes of this section, target ranges are defined as: the commitment by each jurisdiction to ensure the ability to accommodate, at a minimum, growth within the next 20 years in housing (expressed in-households) and employment (expressed in employees). This commitment implies not only the policy and regulatory framework (comprehensive plan and zoning), but the commitment for funded infrastructure as well, consistent with the jurisdiction's financing capacity, level-of-service standards and concurrency requirements.

1. Urban Residential Areas

Urban residential areas form the bulk of the Urban Growth Area, and are home to a large portion of the County's population. They will contain a mix of uses and will have different characteristics in different neighborhoods. Generally, the character, form, preservation and development of these areas is a local jurisdictional responsibility. However, the residential areas need to support the Centers concept and provide sufficient opportunity for growth within the Urban Growth Area. A substantial majority of new residential units will be constructed within urban residential areas.

- LU-66 In order to ensure efficient use of the land within the Urban Growth Area, provide for housing opportunities, and to support efficient use of infrastructure, each jurisdiction shall:
- a. Establish in its comprehensive plan a target minimum number of net new households the jurisdiction will accommodate in the next 20 years. Jurisdictions shall adopt regulations to and commit to fund infrastructure sufficient to achieve the target number;
 - b. Establish a minimum density (not including critical areas) for new construction in each residential zone; and
 - c. Establish in the comprehensive plan a target mix of housing types for new development and adopt regulations to achieve the target mix.
- LU-67 The targets and regulations in LU-66 are based on the following steps:
- a. The Growth Management Planning Council adopted the target number of net new households to be accommodated Countywide over the next 20 years as 195,000;
 - b. The interjurisdictional staff committee reported to the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor target ranges for net new households for each jurisdiction based on the following criteria:
 1. The capacity and condition of existing and forecast capital facilities and utilities,
 2. Proximity to major employment centers,
 3. Access to existing and projected regional transit,
 4. Capacity of undeveloped land and potential for redevelopment given the character of existing development,
 5. The need for a range of housing types,
 6. Each jurisdiction's share of affordable housing as required by affordable housing policies,
 7. Consistency with the Countywide numbers;
 - c. The target ranges as shown in Appendix 2 were recommended by the Growth Management Planning Council, adopted and ratified pursuant to policy FW-1, Step 4c;
 - d. The target ranges in each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan shall be consistent with the target ranges in Appendix 2 or shall state the reasons for deviating from the target ranges;
 - e. Through the process established under FW-1 Step 4b, if the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan differs from the target, the Growth Management Planning Council may recommend amendments to either the Countywide Planning Policies or local plans; and
 - f. Monitoring should follow the process described in policy FW-1.

2. Urban Employment Growth

A portion of the urban employment growth will occur in Activity Areas and neighborhoods in the Urban Area. This employment growth will support the Urban Centers, while balancing local employment opportunities in the Urban Area.

LU-68 Target ranges for employment growth outside Urban Centers were established for cities and for unincorporated King County through the joint local and Countywide adoption process based on the following steps:

- a. The Growth Management Planning Council adopted the 20-year target number for employment growth as 347,400. The interjurisdictional staff committee developed preliminary recommendations for target ranges for employment growth inside and outside Urban Areas for each jurisdiction based on the following criteria:
 1. Consistency with the Countywide numbers;
 2. The need to direct growth to Urban Centers based on consistency with the multiple Centers strategy;
 3. Access to regional rapid transit and existing highway and arterial capacity;
 4. Availabilities of undeveloped land and potential for redevelopment given the character of existing development;
 5. The willingness of local jurisdictions to implement policies which encourage transit such as single-occupancy vehicle parking charges and/or limits, transit, bicycle and pedestrian supportive design, and the adoption of policies that encourage clustering of commercial and residential areas;
- b. The target ranges as shown in Appendix 2 were recommended by the Growth Management Planning Council, adopted and ratified pursuant to policy FW-1, Step 4;
- c. As part of their comprehensive plans, all jurisdictions shall indicate planned employment capacity and targeted increases in employment for 20 years inside and outside Urban Centers and shall show how their plans reflect the criteria in this policy; and
- d. Through the process established under FW-1 Step 4, if the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan differs from the target range, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor may recommend amendments to either the Countywide Planning Policies or local plans.

3. Infill Development

Urban growth occurs both in "new" neighborhoods and in existing neighborhoods. Existing neighborhoods have a history of development patterns which have created a sense of identity. At the same time a vital neighborhood adapts to change and develops its own image. New development in these neighborhoods should build on the existing patterns in a manner which respects and enriches the neighborhood. For example in single-family neighborhoods selective permitting of accessory units and carriage houses may be more compatible than new apartment buildings.

LU-69 All jurisdictions shall develop neighborhood planning and design processes to encourage infill development and enhance the existing community character and mix of uses.

4. Business/Office Parks

Business/office parks are areas where low-density office development is collected at locations separated from an identified retail commercial core. These parks tend to have low densities and thus tend not to be supportive of transit or pedestrian circulation. These employment opportunities generally do not require extensive land for their operations, and could be accommodated in Urban Centers. Because the further development of these areas may compete with the employment growth that is planned to support Urban Centers, significant future employment will not be encouraged in these areas.

- LU-70 Office building development is directed primarily to Urban Centers. Office building development outside Urban Centers including business/office parks should occur within Activity Areas, which can be supported by and promote transit, pedestrian and bicycle uses.
- LU-71 Jurisdictions where consistent with their land use plans should provide incentives for the development and redevelopment of an adequate supply of land suitable for mixed light industrial/commercial and high technology.
- LU-72 All jurisdictions shall establish mechanisms to encourage transit use. Examples of potential mechanisms include a charge for single-occupancy vehicle parking and/or a limit on the number of parking spaces for single-occupancy vehicles within each existing business/office park. Bicycle and pedestrian supportive design should be encouraged.
- LU-73 Jurisdictions are encouraged to site business/office parks where they can be served by adequate surface transportation and transit. Where transit is available and can result in decreased demand for parking, higher density development should be considered.
- LU-74 All jurisdictions should develop planning mechanisms to assist in the conversion of business/office parks to mixed use areas. Jurisdictions should provide for inclusion of residential and neighborhood commercial land uses and open space within existing business/office parks.

IV. Transportation

A. Transportation Overview

RCW 36.70A.070(6) Growth Management Act fundamentally changes the way that comprehensive planning will be done within the State of Washington. The Act places special emphasis on transportation making it unlawful to approve development for which the approving jurisdiction cannot demonstrate the availability of facilities, strategies and services which are needed to accommodate the growth in traffic at the adopted level-of-service within six years. Future development activity will be constrained by a jurisdiction's ability to finance and provide transportation improvements or strategies. This fact has some very significant implications for all jurisdictions which are dependent upon the region's transportation systems because:

1. *Projected traffic growth on the freeway and arterial system within the region greatly exceeds the foreseeable collective ability to finance and construct the improvements needed to retain historical levels-of-service.*
2. *Maintaining the current level of personal mobility by single-occupant vehicles will be a costly public investment that will negatively impact the regional quality of life, create severe impacts to sensitive areas, degrade environmental quality, and increase energy use and the consumption of land.*
3. *Development within any one jurisdiction can be severely impacted by decisions and actions beyond that jurisdiction's control:*
 - *Washington State Department of Transportation may be unable to program improvements concurrent with a jurisdiction's approval of a development permit.*
 - *METRO may not be able to respond to transit levels-of-service adopted by local jurisdictions.*
 - *A jurisdiction may adopt level-of-service standards for arterials within its jurisdiction and decline to accept improvements necessary to mitigate transportation impacts from a proposed development in an adjoining jurisdiction.*
 - *Cumulative growth throughout the region will cause traffic growth on the existing network and may thereby exhaust the capacity for local jurisdictions to approve development.*

In light of these financial constraints and potential dangers, it will be necessary to undertake a dramatically different approach for both transportation planning and land use planning than has been done in the past. This is necessary if the region is to avoid haphazard denials of development permits following the July 1994 deadline for implementing ordinances. In order to limit sprawl, create the desired urban form, and provide some measure of predictability for landowners and developers, the region's scarce resources for transportation capacity improvements must be used prudently to focus on areas where zoning and densities support a multi-modal transportation system. System capacity investments should be targeted first to those areas where the existing land use and transportation system provides some hope of achieving the desired multi-modal level-of-service within six years.

B. Transportation Policies

- FW-18 The land use pattern shall be supported by a balanced transportation system which provides for a variety of mobility options. This system shall be cooperatively planned, financed, and constructed. Mobility options shall include a high-capacity transit system which links the Urban Centers and is supported by an extensive high-occupancy vehicle system, local community transit system for circulation within the Centers and to the non-center Urban Areas, and non-motorized travel options.
- FW-19 All jurisdictions in the County, in cooperation with METRO, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and the State, shall develop a balanced transportation system and coordinated financing strategies and land use plan which implement regional mobility and reinforce the Countywide vision. Vision 2020 Regional Growth Strategies shall be recognized as the framework for creating a regional system of Centers linked by high-capacity transit and an interconnected system of freeway high-occupancy vehicle lanes, and supported by a transit system.
- FW-20 In recognition of the fact that King County is the regional freight distribution hub and a major international trade gateway, and that freight transportation is one of the state's most important basic sector economic activities, goods mobility by all modes shall be included as a component of comprehensive plans.
- T-1 The Countywide transportation system shall promote the mobility of people and goods and shall be a multi-modal system based on regional priorities consistent with adopted land use plans. The transportation system shall include the following:
- a. An aggressive transit system, including high-capacity transit;
 - b. High-occupancy vehicle facilities;
 - c. Freight railroad networks;
 - d. Marine transportation facilities and navigable waterways;
 - e. Airports;
 - f. Transportation Demand Management actions;
 - g. Non-motorized facilities; and
 - h. Freeways, highways, and arterials.
- T-2 King County, its cities, adjacent counties, METRO, and the Washington State Department of Transportation shall support the continuous, comprehensive and cooperative transportation planning process conducted by the Puget Sound Regional Council pursuant to its Metropolitan Planning Organization designation. The primary forum for the development of regional transportation systems plans and strategies shall be the Puget Sound Regional Council, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization.
- T-3 The annual update and approval of the six-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) by the Puget Sound Regional Council should be the primary tool for prioritizing regional transportation improvements and programming regional transportation revenues.

- T-4 The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall have the ongoing responsibility for the following:
- a. Developing and maintaining coordinated level-of-service standards and a concurrency system for Countywide transit routes and arterial streets, including state facilities;
 - b. Developing regionally consistent policies for implementing Countywide Transportation Demand Management actions and the Commute Trip Reduction Act including, but not limited to, parking policies, with an examination of price as a determinant of demand; and
 - c. Developing and recommending transportation financing strategies, including recommendations for prioritizing capacity improvements eligible to receive federal funds available to the region under the Inter-modal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

1. High Capacity Transit/Regional Transit Project (HCT/RTP)

T-5 Each Urban Center will be providing for a minimum of 15,000 jobs and should be served by high-capacity transit. Each Manufacturing Center containing a minimum of 15,000 jobs and having sufficient employment densities to support high-capacity transit should be served by high-capacity transit. All jurisdictions that would be served by high-capacity transit shall plan for needed high-capacity transit rights-of-way, stations and station supportive transportation facilities and land uses in their comprehensive plans. The land use and transportation elements of comprehensive plans shall incorporate a component to reflect future improvement needs for high-capacity transit. Interim regional transit service should be provided to Centers until the Center is served by high-capacity transit. If voters do not approve high-capacity transit local option taxes, jurisdictions shall address this implication in the reassessment phase.

T-6 Washington State Department of Transportation should assign a high priority to completion of the core high-occupancy vehicle lanes in the central Puget Sound region. King County, its cities, and METRO Council representatives on the Transportation Policy and Executive Boards of the Puget Sound Regional Council shall make completion of this system a high priority in programming the federal funds available to the region.

2. Non-motorized Transportation

T-7 The transportation element of Comprehensive Plans shall include pedestrian and bicycle travel as part of the transportation system and be developed on a coordinated, regional basis. The bicycle and pedestrian element shall be a part of the funding component of the capital improvement program.

3. Freeways/Highways/Arterials

T-8 In order to maintain regional mobility, a balanced multi-modal transportation system shall be planned that includes freeway, highway and arterial improvements by making existing roads more efficient. These improvements should help alleviate existing traffic congestion problems, enhance high-occupancy vehicle and transit operations, and provide access to new desired growth areas, as identified in adopted land use plans. General capacity improvements promoting only single-occupant vehicle traffic shall be a lower priority. Transportation plans should consider the following mobility options/needs:

- a. Arterial high-occupancy vehicle treatments;
- b. Driveway access management for principal arterials within the Urban Growth Area; and
- c. Improvements needed for access to Manufacturing and Industrial Centers, marine and air terminals.

- FW-21 Infrastructure planning and financing shall be coordinated among jurisdictions to direct and prioritize Countywide facility improvements to implement the Countywide vision and land use plans.
- FW-22 Where appropriate, King County and its cities shall adopt a clear definition of level-of-service and concurrency requirements and establish a consistent process for implementing concurrency, including accountability for impacts for adjacent jurisdictions.
- FW-23 Each jurisdiction shall identify the facilities needed to ensure that services are provided consistent with the community's adopted service levels. Timelines for the construction of the needed facilities shall be identified.

4. Transportation Level-of-Service (LOS)

- T-9 Level-of-service standards shall be used as a “tool” to evaluate concurrency for long-range transportation planning, development review and programming of transportation investments.
- T-10 Each local jurisdiction shall establish mode-split goals for non-single-occupancy vehicle travel to all significant employment centers to reflect that center’s contribution to the solution of the region’s transportation problem. Mode-split goals will vary according to development densities, access to transit service and other alternative travel modes and levels of congestion. Comprehensive plans shall demonstrate what transportation system improvements, demand management and land use strategies will be implemented to achieve these mode-split goals. These local goals shall be coordinated to achieve County and regional goals.
- T-11 Elements to be considered in the level-of-service standard are mobility options that encourage the use of transit, other high-occupancy vehicles, demand management actions, access to transit, and non-motorized modes of travel. These standards shall be consistent with the requirements of the Commute Trip Reduction Act.
- T-12 Mode split goals and measures of mobility for transit, ridesharing and non-motorized travel shall be established by local jurisdictions and METRO.
- T-13 Level-of-service standards shall vary by differing levels of development patterns and growth management objectives. Lower arterial standards, tolerating more congestion, shall be established for Urban Centers. Transit level-of-service standards may focus on higher service levels in and between Centers and decrease as population and employment densities decrease.
- T-14 METRO should develop transit level-of-service standards which provide the County and cities with realistic service expectations to support adopted land uses and desired growth management objectives. These standards should consider that route spacing and frequency standards are necessary for differing service conditions including:
 - a. Service between designated Centers served by high-capacity transit;
 - b. Service between designated Centers not served by high-capacity transit; and
 - c. Service to areas outside Centers.

5. Reassessment

- T-15 Local governments shall work together to reassess regional land use and transportation elements if transportation adequacy and concurrency cannot be met. Should funding fall short for transportation improvements or strategies needed to accommodate growth, the following actions should be considered:
 - a. Adjust land use and level-of-service standards to better achieve mobility and the regional vision;

- b. Make full use of all feasible local option transportation revenues authorized but not yet implemented; and
- c. Work with Washington State Department of Transportation, METRO, and the private sector to seek additional State transportation revenues and local options to make system improvements necessary to accommodate projected employment and population growth.

6. Financing

- T-16 Transportation elements of Comprehensive Plans shall reflect the preservation and maintenance of transportation facilities as a high priority to avoid costly replacements and to meet public safety objectives in a cost-effective manner.
- T-17 Developer impact fees shall be structured to ensure that new development contributes its fair share of the resources needed to mitigate the impact on the transportation system. Adjoining jurisdictions shall execute interlocal agreements for impact fees which recognize that traffic generated in one jurisdiction contributes to the need to make transportation improvements across jurisdictional boundaries. Impact fees shall not be assessed to cure that portion of the improvement attributable to correcting existing deficiencies.
- T-18 Existing local option transportation funding shall be applied within King County as follows:
- a. Employee tax base—reserved for city street utility development;
 - b. Commercial parking tax—defer action, pending development of a regional Transportation Demand Management strategy;
 - c. High-occupancy vehicle acceleration financing—defer until after high-capacity transit vote; and
 - d. Local option gas tax—consider as potential source to address transportation “concurrency” needs of County and cities only after vote on high-capacity transit.
- T-19 Regional revenues (such as Inter-modal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act funds) which provide discretion should be used to address regional mobility projects and strategies, including such strategies as creating Centers or enhancing transit/high-occupancy vehicle single-occupancy vehicle mode-split.

7. State Transportation Role

- T-20 Consistent with the Countywide vision, local governments shall coordinate with the State on land use and transportation systems and strategies which affect State facilities and programs.
- T-21 State capital improvement decisions and policy actions shall be consistent with regional and Countywide goals and plans. The State shall ensure its transportation capital improvement decisions and programs support the adopted land use plans and transportation actions.
- T-22 The State and local governments shall use the same capital programming and budgeting time frame that all local governments and the County use, a minimum of six years, for making capital decisions and for concurrency management.

8. Siting Regional and Countywide Transportation Facilities

- T-23 King County, the cities, the Puget Sound Regional Council, the State, METRO, and other transportation providers shall identify significant regional and/or Countywide land acquisition needs for transportation and establish a process for prioritizing and siting the location of transportation facilities.

V. Community Character and Open Space

A measure of the success of planning for growth is the extent to which we restore, maintain and create good places to live, work and play. We must encourage growth which improves our neighborhoods and landscapes, and builds a strong sense of place. The following policies on cultural resources, civic architecture and landmarks, multi-use roadways, infill development, and incentives for urban and rural design, aim to promote good community character.

- FW-24 All jurisdictions shall support the County's existing diversity of places to live, work and recreate and the ethnic diversity of our communities. The Countywide development pattern shall include sufficient supply of quality places for housing, employment, education, recreation, and open space and the provision of community and social services.
- FW-25 Each Urban Area shall be characterized by superior urban design as locally defined.
- FW-26 Significant historic, archaeological, cultural, architectural and environmental features shall be respected and preserved.

A. Historic Resources

Historic resources create a sense of local identity and history, enhance the quality of life, support community vitality, and otherwise enrich our lives. Historic resources are non-renewable: they embody the unique heritage and evolution of particular places. Thoughtful management of these resources contributes to economic development and moderates some of the harmful effects of rapid growth. Planning for historic resources includes protecting archaeological sites and historic buildings and landscapes, encouraging expression of diverse ethnic and folk traditions, and supporting activities for children and youth.

- CC-1 All jurisdictions should work individually and cooperatively to identify, evaluate, and protect historic resources including continued and consistent protection for historic resources and public art works.
- CC-2 All jurisdictions shall encourage land use patterns and implement regulations that protect and enhance historic resources, and sustain historic community character.

B. Urban Design

Governments should be leaders in providing structures, public spaces, parks and streets which support the quality of our region. Civic design should express the region's values and vision, and should provide landmarks which contribute to our sense of place. Additionally, individual jurisdictions can nurture their individual character by developing a clear set of goals and policies which outline the public interest in the design of private development in the urban and rural communities.

- CC-3 All jurisdictions shall promote a high quality of design and site planning in publicly-funded construction (such as civic buildings, parks, bridges, transit stops), and in private development.

C. Human and Community Services

Human and community services are: social and health services; emergency shelters; meeting places; performing arts and cultural activities; schools; libraries; parks and recreation; and fire and police protection.

- CC-4 Human and community service planning activities shall support Countywide Planning Policies and the Countywide land development pattern.
- CC-5 All jurisdictions shall identify essential community and human services and include them in land use, capital improvement, and transportation plans.

D. Open Space

Open space lands are essential to the community character of King County. They provide visual variety and relief from developed areas, protect environmental quality, and provide wildlife habitat and foster opportunities for outdoor recreation. Open space corridors physically and functionally link open space lands.

The challenge for jurisdictions is to establish programs that contribute to the protection, accessibility and stewardship of open space lands and corridors. The Growth Management Act requires jurisdictions to form linkages between and within population centers with lands useful for recreation, trails, wildlife habitat and connection of critical areas. These open space lands and corridors or greenways should be selected and preserved to form an interconnected system regionally and within jurisdictions locally and should be stewarded to ensure continuing environmental and ecological significance. Where appropriate, the regional system and its local components should provide for multiple benefits and functions, which will require careful planning and management to ensure compatibility and long-term viability of the benefits and functions.

Open space lands and corridors have significance at both the local and regional scale. Identification and protection of local open spaces will be considered within the comprehensive plans of each jurisdiction. On an individual basis, jurisdictions should strive to identify, establish and protect open space lands of local significance that also complement, adjoin or enhance the regional system. The regional open space system includes open space lands and corridors that have importance beyond jurisdictional boundaries and will require multi-jurisdictional coordination to identify, protect and steward.

- FW-27 All jurisdictions shall cooperatively identify, establish, protect and steward urban and rural open space corridors of regional significance.
- CC-6 A regional open space system shall be established to include lands which:
- Provide physical and/or visual buffers such as open spaces which help to separate incompatible uses, distinguish the Urban and Rural Areas, define Urban Growth Boundaries, or establish the character of a neighborhood, community, city or region;
 - Provide active and passive outdoor recreational opportunities which are compatible with the environmental and ecological values of the site; and/or
 - Contain natural areas, habitat lands, natural drainage features, and/or other environmental, cultural, and scenic resources.
- CC-7 All jurisdictions shall work cooperatively to identify and protect open space corridors of regional significance. This process shall include:
- Identification of regional open space lands and corridors which form a functionally and physically connected system with environmental, ecological, recreational and aesthetic significance and which is readily accessible to our urban populations;
 - Identification of implementation strategies and regulatory and non-regulatory techniques to protect the lands and corridors, including collaboration and coordination with land trusts and other land preservation organizations; and
 - Development of management plans and strategies to sustain the corridors' open space benefits and functions of the preserved lands and corridors.
- CC-8 Water bodies and rivers of the Puget Sound region form an important element of the open space system. Jurisdictions shall work to protect visual access to water bodies and rivers, and provide for physical access where appropriate.
- CC-9 Countywide funding shall be available for the acquisition, maintenance and stewardship of parks and open space, a) advancing the development of the regional open space system which has been cooperatively identified by the jurisdictions, and b) ensuring the ready access of our citizens residing in Urban Centers to the regional open space system.
- CC-10 The conceptual map of open space systems contained in the 1988 King County Open Space Plan shall be used as the planning basis for regional open space lands and corridors. All

jurisdictions will work cooperatively to revise and supplement this map to direct the protection of these valuable resources throughout the County.

- CC-11 All jurisdictions shall work cooperatively to ensure parks and open spaces are provided as development and redevelopment occur.
- CC-12 All jurisdictions shall use the full range of regulatory and land preservation tools available to create, maintain and steward the regional open space system which has been cooperatively identified.
- CC-13 All jurisdictions shall develop coordinated level-of-service standards for the provision of parks and open spaces.

VI. Affordable Housing

Adequate housing, for all economic segments of the population, is a basic need of King County's residents and an issue of Countywide concern. Affordable housing needs must be addressed by local governments working in cooperation with the private sector and nonprofit housing agencies.

The Growth Management Act requires Countywide Policies to address parameters for the distribution of affordable housing, including housing for all income groups. This complex issues requires adequate information regarding current housing resources and housing needs, which is being developed for comprehensive plan housing elements, as well as in-depth discussion of values and priorities for housing development.

Providing sufficient land for housing development is an essential step in promoting affordable housing. Affordable housing can be encouraged by zoning additional land for higher residential densities, which helps provide needed capacity for growth, reduces land development cost per unit, and allows for lower cost construction types such as attached dwellings. Higher density housing includes a range of housing types: small-lot single family, attached single family, mobile home parks, apartments and condominiums. In addition, zoning changes that permit additional housing in established areas, such as accessory units, carriage houses, and residences built above commercial uses, increase affordable housing opportunities.

- FW-28 All jurisdictions shall provide for a diversity of housing types to meet a variety of needs and provide for housing opportunities for all economic segments of the population. All jurisdictions shall cooperatively establish a process to ensure an equitable and rational distribution of low-income and affordable housing throughout the County in accordance with land use policies, transportation, and employment locations.
- AH-1 All jurisdictions shall plan for housing to meet the needs of all economic segments of the population. Each jurisdiction shall specify, based on the projected number of net new housing units anticipated in its comprehensive plan, the estimated number of units which will be affordable for the following income segments: Zero to 50 percent of the Countywide median household income, 50 to 80 percent of median, 80 to 120 percent of median, and above 120 percent median. The estimates for housing affordable to households below 80 percent of median-income shall be consistent with Countywide objectives for low and moderate income housing in policy AH-2. The estimated number of units for each income segment shall be reported to the Growth Management Planning Council following adoption of the comprehensive plan, for the purpose of Countywide monitoring of capacity for housing development.

Within the Urban Growth Area, each jurisdiction shall demonstrate its ability to accommodate sufficient, affordable housing for all economic segments of the population. Local actions may include zoning land for development of sufficient densities, revising development standards and permitting procedures as needed to encourage affordable housing, reviewing codes for redundancies and inconsistencies, and providing opportunities for a range of housing types,

such as accessory dwelling units, manufactured homes, group homes and foster care facilities, apartments, townhouses and attached single family housing.

AH-2

All jurisdictions shall share the responsibility for achieving a rational and equitable distribution of affordable housing to meet the housing needs of low and moderate-income residents in King County. The distribution of housing affordable to low and moderate-income households shall take into consideration the need for proximity to lower wage employment, access to transportation and human services, and the adequacy of infrastructure to support housing development; recognize each jurisdiction's past and current efforts to provide housing affordable to low and moderate-income households; avoid over-concentration of assisted housing; and increase housing opportunities and choices for low and moderate-income households in communities throughout King County. Each jurisdiction shall give equal consideration to local and Countywide housing needs.

A. Existing Needs for Affordable Housing

Each jurisdiction shall participate in developing Countywide housing resources and programs to assist the large number of low and moderate-income households who currently do not have affordable, appropriate housing. These Countywide efforts will help reverse current trends which concentrate low-income housing opportunities in certain communities, and achieve a more equitable participation by local jurisdictions in low income housing development and services. Countywide efforts should give priority to assisting households below 50 percent of median-income that are in greatest need and communities with high proportions of low and moderate income residents.

By October, 1994, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall appoint elected and community representatives to develop recommendations for providing low and moderate-income housing and related services. Within one year the committee shall recommend to the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor:

1. New Countywide funding source(s) for housing production and services, and a plan to establish this funding within three years;
2. Participation by local governments, including appropriate public and private financing, such that each jurisdiction contributes on fair share basis; and
3. Objectives for housing and related services, including measurable levels of housing production and costs to provide necessary related service.

Countywide programs should provide the following types of housing and related services:

1. Low-income housing development, including new construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation;
2. Housing assistance, such as rental vouchers and supportive services;
3. Assistance to expand the capacity of nonprofit organizations to develop housing and provide housing related services;
4. Programs to assist homeless individuals and families;
5. Programs to prevent homelessness; and
6. Assistance to low and moderate-income home buyers.

B. Future Needs for Affordable Housing

Each jurisdiction shall specify the range and amount of housing affordable to low and moderate-income households to be accommodated in its comprehensive plan. Each jurisdiction shall plan for a number of housing units affordable to households with incomes between 50 and 80 percent of the County median household income that is equal to 17 percent of its projected net household growth. In addition, each jurisdiction shall plan for a number of housing units affordable to households with incomes below 50 percent of median income that is either 20 percent or 24 percent of its projected net household growth. For this housing, the target percentage shall be determined using the Affordable Housing Job/Housing Index developed using Census-based information, which is contained in Appendix 3.

Each jurisdiction shall show in its comprehensive plan how it will use policies, incentives, regulations and programs to provide its share of housing affordable to low and moderate-income households. Each jurisdiction should apply strategies which it determines to be most appropriate to the local housing market. For example, units affordable to low and moderate income households may be developed through new construction, projects that assure long-term affordability of existing housing, or accessory housing units added to existing structures. Local actions may include:

1. Identifying the costs to develop and preserve subsidized housing and other low-cost housing not provided by private development in the local housing market, and identifying sources of funding;
2. Revising land use regulations as needed to remove any unreasonable requirements that may create barriers to siting and operating housing for special needs groups. Special needs housing serves persons, who, by virtue of disability or other circumstances, face difficulty living independently and require supportive services on a transitional or long-term basis; and
3. Adopting land use incentives programs or other regulatory measures to encourage private and nonprofit development

Small, fully built cities and towns that are not planned to grow substantially under Growth Management Act may work cooperatively with other jurisdictions and/or subregional housing agencies to meet their housing targets. In areas identified as city expansion areas, King County and cities should plan cooperatively for affordable housing development and preservation.

AH-3 Each jurisdiction shall evaluate its existing resources of subsidized and low-cost non-subsidized housing and identify housing that may be lost due to redevelopment, deteriorating housing conditions, or public policies or actions. Where feasible, each jurisdiction shall develop strategies to preserve existing low-income housing and provide relocation assistance to low-income residents who may be displaced.

AH-4 The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall identify ways to expand technical assistance to local jurisdictions in affordable housing techniques. Technical assistance should include project case studies and model ordinances covering such topics as development and financing of nonprofit housing, provision of housing-related services, incentives programs for affordable housing, regulations that encourage well-designed higher density housing, improvements to development permit processing and standards to reduce development costs, and public education and involvement. The Affordable Housing Task Force Report, dated March 1994 contains a summary of actions that local governments may use to encourage affordable housing.

AH-5 All jurisdictions shall monitor residential development within their jurisdiction and determine annually the total number of new and redeveloped units receiving permits and units constructed, housing types, developed densities and remaining capacity for residential growth. Housing prices and rents also should be reported, based on affordability to four income categories: Zero to 50 percent of median income, 50 to 80 percent of median, 80 to 120 percent of median, and above 120 percent of median. King County shall report annually on housing development, the rate of housing cost and price increases and available residential capacity Countywide in its annual growth reporting.

The Affordable Housing and Data Technical Forums, which are comprised of city and County staff and private housing industry representatives, shall develop a uniform approach for monitoring housing permit activity, construction, and affordability. Where feasible, the Affordable Housing and Data Technical Forums shall consider collecting statistics such as: housing units receiving building permits by income category, total units constructed by income category, low and moderate-income housing acquired or preserved, households receiving rental assistance, and other local housing activities. In addition where feasible, planning and monitoring for affordable housing should use the median household income for King County indexed by household size, published annually by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Calculations of affordable house prices should assume standard Federal Housing Administration lending criteria and minimum down payments.

AH-6 Beginning in 1999, and subsequently in coordination with evaluation and reporting requirements of state law, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor organization responsible for monitoring growth management implementation shall evaluate achievement of Countywide and local goals for housing for all economic segments of the population. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall consider annual reports prepared under policy AH-5 as well as market conditions and other factors affecting housing development. If the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor determines that housing planned for any economic segment falls short of the need for such housing, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor may recommend additional actions.

As part of its evaluation, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall review local performance in meeting low and moderate income housing needs. The basis for determining local performance shall be a jurisdiction's participation in Countywide or subregional efforts to address existing housing needs and actual development of the target percentage of low and moderate-income housing units as adopted in its comprehensive plan. In establishing planning targets to address future affordable housing needs, it is recognized that success will be dependent in part upon regional factors beyond the control of any single jurisdiction. Any one jurisdiction acting alone, or even in concert with other local governments, may or may not be able to achieve its targets in these policies, despite its best efforts. Success will require cooperation and support for affordable housing from the state, federal and local governments, as well as the private sector. The significant role of the market must also be recognized. In determining performance the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall therefore use reasonable judgment, and also shall consider these market and other factors, as well as action taken to encourage development and preservation of low and moderate-income housing, such as local funding, development code changes, and creation of new programs.

VII. Contiguous and Orderly Development and Provision of Urban Services to Such Development

Chapter II, "Land Use Pattern," contains policies for phasing development within the Urban Growth Area. An integral component of the phasing process is ensuring that development is accompanied by a full range of urban services. Equally important is ensuring that infrastructure improvements are not provided in advance of development which could undermine the Countywide development pattern. This chapter provides policies which support phasing within the Urban Growth Area and ensure the integrity of the Countywide land development pattern.

FW-29 Planning for and financing of services shall be coordinated among jurisdictions to direct and prioritize Countywide facility improvements to implement the Countywide policies.

FW-30 Jurisdictions shall identify the services needed to achieve adopted service levels. Timelines for constructing needed services shall be identified.

FW-31 Protection of public health and safety and the environment shall be given high priority in decision-making about infrastructure improvements. County residents in both Urban and Rural Areas shall have reasonable access to a high-quality drinking water source meeting all Federal and State drinking water requirements. Management and operation of existing on-site septic systems shall not result in adverse impacts to public health or the environment.

A. General Policies

To ensure that land use is accompanied with the maximum possible use of existing facilities and cost-effective service provisions and extensions, and to encourage development of strong, interrelated communities, policies are needed which integrate a full range of urban services with land-use planning and environmental protection. Urban service definitions should be guided by “public services,” “public facilities,” and “urban governmental services” as defined in RCW 36.70A (Growth Management Act).

Community and human services policies are included under Chapter IV, “Community Character and Open Space,” and transportation policies are included under Chapter III, “Transportation.” Several Countywide planning efforts provide direction for achieving the integration of services, aquifer and natural resource protection, and land use planning. These include the Coordinated Water System Plans, Seattle Regional Comprehensive Water Supply Plan, Groundwater Management Plans, Basin Plans, Chelan Agreement Regional Water Resources Planning Process, Flood Hazard Reduction Plan, Wastewater 2020 Plus, Human Services Strategies Report, and the King County Sewerage General Plan. Furthermore, there are State mandates which affect the provision of services. For example, water resource allocation must accommodate all reasonable out-of-stream needs and maintain sufficient flows for in-stream uses. The following policies transcend Urban and Rural land use designations and apply Countywide.

1. Urban Services Required as Growth Occurs

CO-1 Jurisdictions shall identify the full range of urban services and how they plan to provide them.

2. Conservation, Efficiency, Cost Effectiveness and New Technologies

CO-2 Jurisdictions and other urban service providers shall provide services and manage natural resources efficiently, through regional coordination, conjunctive use of resources, and sharing of facilities. Interjurisdictional planning efforts shall evaluate approaches to share and conserve resources.

CO-3 Service provision shall be coordinated to ensure the protection and preservation of resources in both Rural Areas and in areas that are developing, while addressing service needs within areas currently identified for growth.

CO-4 All jurisdictions acknowledge the need to develop a regional surface water management system which crosses jurisdictions’ boundaries and identifies and prioritizes program elements and capital improvements necessary to accommodate growth and protect the natural and built environment. The Growth Management Planning Council shall develop and recommend a financing and implementation strategy to meet this need.

CO-5 Water supply shall be regionally coordinated to provide a reliable economic source of water and to provide mutual aid to and between all agencies and purveyors. The region should work toward a mechanism to address the long-term regional water demand needs of all agencies and water purveyors.

CO-6 Aggressive conservation efforts shall be implemented to address the need for adequate supply for electrical energy and water resources, protect natural resources, and achieve improved air quality. Efforts shall include, but not be limited to, public education, water reuse and reclamation, landscaping which uses native and drought-resistant plants and other strategies to reduce water consumption, small lot size, low-flow showerheads, conservation credits, and energy efficiency incentives in new and existing buildings.

CO-7 Water reuse and reclamation shall be encouraged, especially for large commercial and residential developments, and for high water users such as parks, schools, golf courses, and locks.

- CO-8 When planning for the future demand on wastewater treatment and conveyance, alternatives to the expansion of the METRO centralized system such as decentralized treatment and other treatment technologies, and wastewater reclamation and reuse shall be identified and incorporated into plans as viable options.
- CO-9 The presence of tightline sewers or availability of sewer pipeline capacity and water supply above what is required to meet local needs shall not be used to justify development counter to the Countywide Policies, and any such land use development proposal shall be denied by the permitting agency.

B. Urban Areas Identified for Growth for the Next Ten Years

The designation of the Urban Growth Area establishes the service area for the County. The detailed arrangement and timing of services and the installation of infrastructure improvements is left to be determined through shorter-term capital improvement plans. To support the densities and land uses of Urban Areas identified for immediate development, urban water and sewer systems are essential to support growth anticipated in the Urban Area over the next ten years. Urban water systems are defined as a network of pipes which are designed to meet all user needs and provide fire protection. Urban sewer systems are defined as a system of pipes providing conveyance to a sewage treatment facility.

Urban Water and Sewer Systems Required

- CO-10 In the Urban Area identified for growth within the next ten years, urban water and sewer systems are preferred for new construction on existing lots and shall be required for new subdivisions. However, existing septic systems, private wells, and/or small water systems may continue to serve the developments so long as densities and physical conditions are appropriate, the systems are allowed by the relevant jurisdictions, and management keeps the systems operating properly and safely.

C. Urban Areas Designated for Growth Beyond 2002

In Urban Areas designated for growth beyond 2002, there will be a mix of existing services which may or may not be at urban service levels. The appropriate infrastructure improvements for sewer and water systems will vary according to existing site conditions. New developments should occur contiguous to existing, fully-developed areas so that extension of services occurs in an orderly and cost-effective manner.

Phased and Cost Effective Extension of Urban Water and Sewer Systems

- CO-11 To the extent practicable, all new plats shall be contiguous to the areas identified for growth for the next ten years. The phased expansion should respect basin boundaries or other natural landscape features.
- CO-12 Preferred sewer and water systems in areas designated for growth beyond 2002 are community drainfields and water systems which are professionally managed. These systems shall be designed, sited, and built to facilitate eventual conversion to urban sewer and water systems. Jurisdictions shall require all known and projected costs of infrastructure improvement to urban service levels be funded at the permitting stage.
- CO-13 Urban sewer system extensions in unincorporated King County shall be permitted consistent with the provisions of the King County Sewerage General Plan, Countywide Policies, and the policies of the jurisdiction in whose potential annexation area the extension is proposed.

D. Rural Areas and Resource Lands

Residents in Rural Areas and resource lands need to have many of the same types of services as Urban Areas. However, the service standards in Rural Areas and resource lands are not at urban levels. Rural water systems are defined as individual or community wells or piped water systems designed to meet all user needs but, in most cases, not providing for fire protection.

Limited Extension of Urban Water and Sewer Systems

- CO-14 Sewer expansion shall not occur in Rural Areas and resource lands except where needed to address specific health and safety problems threatening structures permitted before July 1, 1992 or the needs of public facilities such as schools. Sewers may be extended only if they are tightlined and only after a finding is made that no alternative technologies are feasible. Mechanisms to reduce cost and limit the number of individual hookups shall be explored and actions recommended to the Growth Management Planning Council.
- CO-15 Urban water system extensions are not preferred in Rural Areas. However, Group A (WAC 246.290.020) water systems are permissible under the following criteria:
- a. Water quality or quantity problems of existing systems as of December 31, 1994, that threaten public health can best be solved by Group A service; or
 - b. Group A service is financially feasible at rural densities and shall not be justification for any increase in residential density; prior to approval, the specific number of rural connections shall be specified for the line or system for the total Rural Area being served; and the area has either been approved for Group A service through a King County-adopted coordinated water system plan or has been designated for Group A service through prior establishment of a utility local improvement district or other financial mechanisms.
- CO-16 Rural water systems should be provided through private wells or small public systems. In the Rural Area, all new Group A water systems should be operated by a certified water system operator and all new Group B systems should be overseen by the County to ensure they comply with applicable health regulations. If the area to be served is included in the planning area of an existing water purveyor as identified in a Coordinated Water System Plan, the water system should be operated by the purveyor through either satellite management arrangement or by direct service.

VIII. Siting Public Capital Facilities of a Countywide or Statewide Nature

Public capital facilities of a Countywide or statewide nature generally have characteristics that make these facilities extremely difficult to site. Such characteristics include the number of jurisdictions affected or served by the facility, the size of the facility, and the facility's potential adverse impacts, such as noise, odor, traffic, and pollution generation. The facilities can be either desirable or undesirable to jurisdictions. Some of the facilities are privately owned and regulated by public entities. Facilities also can be owned by the State and used by residents from throughout the State, such as universities and their branch campuses.

The County and the cities need to develop a process for siting public capital facilities with these types of characteristics, including but not limited to, utility and transportation corridors, airports, wastewater treatment plants, solid waste landfills, higher educational facilities, correctional and in-patient treatment facilities and energy-generating facilities.

- FW-32 Public capital facilities of a Countywide or statewide nature shall be sited to support the Countywide land use pattern, support economic activities, mitigate environmental impacts, provide amenities or incentives, and minimize public costs. Amenities or incentives shall be provided to neighborhoods/jurisdictions in which facilities are sited. Facilities must be prioritized, coordinated, planned, and sited through an interjurisdictional process established by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor.
- S-1 The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall establish a process by which all jurisdictions shall cooperatively site public capital facilities of a Countywide or statewide nature. The process shall include:
- a. A definition of these facilities;
 - b. An inventory of existing and future facilities;
 - c. Economic and other incentives to jurisdictions receiving facilities;
 - d. A public involvement strategy;
 - e. Assurance that the environment and public health and safety are protected; and
 - f. A consideration of alternatives to the facility, including decentralization, demand management, and other strategies.

IX. Economic Development

Jurisdictions should cooperatively create an environment which sustains the economic vitality of the region and which contributes to manageable economic growth. Jurisdictions shall recognize that King County is part of a larger regional economy, which is strongly linked by trade to the national and international economies. Infrastructure investments should be focused into Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers which are supported by transit. Countywide Policies shall be integrated with economic development.

- FW-33 All jurisdictions shall contribute to the economic sustainability of the County in a manner which supports the Countywide land use pattern. This is to be accomplished by providing cost-efficient quality infrastructure and public services at an adopted level-of-service specific to the local situation, providing affordable housing, promoting excellence in education, and protecting the environment.
- FW-34 All jurisdictions shall act to increase work training and job opportunities for all residents and communities.
- FW-35 All jurisdictions shall support the development of a regional economic development strategy consistent with the Countywide land use pattern.

Definition of Economic Development

Economic Development is growth and change in the economy whereby the economic health of the region—its people, its business, its governments—is enhanced. An important component of achieving economic development is through the purposeful undertaking of public and private actions designed to achieve:

- the maintenance of a strong economic base;
- a diversification of the economy;
- improved job training and educational opportunities;
- the protection of the natural environment;
- the empowerment of economically disadvantaged citizens and neighborhoods,
- a partnership between the private and public sectors; and
- the maintenance and creation of higher (family) wage jobs.

This element of the Countywide Planning Policies is intended to provide a vision and policy direction for King County jurisdictions.

- FW-36 The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor and jurisdictions shall develop monitoring and evaluation systems, including benchmarks, by which they can evaluate performance in achieving the goals of their comprehensive plans.
- ED-1 The Growth Management Planning Council has adopted economic development policies which:
- a. Establish the County's role in the regional economy;
 - b. Maintain a strong economic base within King County;
 - c. Encourage diversification of the economy;
 - d. Maintain an adequate supply of land to support future economic development;
 - e. Identify geographic areas to target public resources promoting economic development;
 - f. Foster job training opportunities to maintain a highly educated work force;
 - g. Protect the natural environment as a key economic value in this region;
 - h. Consider the special needs of economically disadvantaged citizens and neighborhoods; and
 - i. Include the assistance of private sector.
- ED-2 By July 1, 1995 regional planning shall produce a regional industrial siting policy based on a regional assessment of the need for industrial zoned land and the availability of transportation and other infrastructure to serve it.
- ED-3 Jurisdictions' comprehensive plans shall include economic development policies. These policies shall address the local economic concerns of each jurisdiction within the context of a regional economic development strategy.
- ED-4 Each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan shall include an economic development element which will include an estimate of the type and number of jobs to be accommodated in the jurisdiction during the next 20 years.
- ED-5 The County shall work with Snohomish and Pierce Counties to develop a joint 20-year regional economic development strategy.

1. Strengthen, Expand, and Diversify the Economy

- ED-6 Local jurisdictions' plans shall include policies that actively support the retention and expansion of the economic base of the multi-County region. Local jurisdictions and the County shall work cooperatively on a regional basis and invite private sector participation to evaluate the trends, opportunities and weaknesses of the existing economy and to analyze the economic needs of key industries.
- Local jurisdictions' comprehensive plans shall include policies intended to foster:
- a. The development and retention of those businesses and industries which export their goods and services outside the region. These businesses and industries are critical to the economic strength and diversification of the economy; and
 - b. A business climate which is supportive of business formation, expansion, and retention and recognizes the importance of small businesses in creating new jobs.
- ED-7 Jurisdictions shall cooperate to establish economic diversification and development goals for the multi-County region. Jurisdictions shall, in process of comprehensive planning, identify the contribution they will make to the regional diversification and development goals.
- ED-8 Where appropriate, jurisdictions' plans shall include policies intended to attract and retain industries, firms and jobs, within their locally determined or zoned manufacturing and industrial areas.
- ED-9 Jurisdictions shall recognize businesses, facilities, and institutions within their boundaries that provide opportunities to maintain economic stability and realize economic growth for the entire region. These include major educational facilities, research institutions, health care facilities,

high value added manufacturing facilities and port facilities among others. The County and local jurisdictions shall encourage these institutions, businesses and facilities to thrive while maintaining the environmental and other goals of the local comprehensive plans.

2. Environment

- ED-10 Jurisdictions shall adopt economic development and other policies which will recognize and help protect the environment as a key economic value in the region. Local policies shall seek to achieve an appropriate balance between the needs for economic growth and the need for protecting the environment. Local governments are encouraged to look for ways to work cooperatively with businesses to help them comply with environmental regulations and to develop policies that result in environmental protection through regulatory processes that are understandable and efficient.
- ED-11 In cooperation with water and electricity providers, local jurisdictions, including sewer and water districts, shall encourage programs for water and power conservation in public facilities and in the private sector.

3. Human Resources: Economically Disadvantaged Citizens and Neighborhoods, Job Training and Education

- ED-12 Jurisdictions' comprehensive plans shall address the historic disparity in income and employment opportunities for minorities, women and economically disadvantaged individuals. Jurisdictions shall develop strategies and support community-based actions to involve minorities, women and economically disadvantaged individuals in improving their economic future. The plans shall recognize their special needs and each jurisdiction should commit, based on their plans, resources in human services, community development, housing, economic development and the public infrastructure, to address the inequalities referred to above.
- ED-13 Job training, retraining, and educational opportunities are critical to develop and maintain a highly skilled workforce. Jurisdictions shall cooperate in efforts to meet these training and educational needs on a Countywide basis by facilitating the implementation of programs to meet the educational and training needs and to identify partnerships and funding opportunities where appropriate.

4. Direct Governmental Actions: Land Supply, Infrastructure and Permitting

- ED-14 Jurisdictions shall cooperate on a Countywide basis to inventory, plan for, and monitor the land supply for commercial, industrial, institutional, resource and residential uses. Local jurisdictions shall, in coordination with evaluation and reporting requirements of state law, identify the amount, character and uses of land needed to achieve the jurisdictions' job growth goals.
- ED-15 Local comprehensive plans should include policies which foster a climate supportive of the siting needs of industrial users and that recognize the important role they play in creating high-wage jobs. Local plans are encouraged to include policies designed to ensure that industrial use of industrial-zone land is not unduly encroached upon or limited by non-supporting or incompatible uses.
- Local policies and plans are encouraged to support the continued availability of land for those industrial and supporting or compatible activities dependent on critical infrastructure as identified in local comprehensive plans. Jurisdictions should consider zoning or other means to provide opportunities for those uses in areas where infrastructure facilities can be utilized to exploit the economic benefit of that infrastructure.
- ED-16 Jurisdictions are encouraged to promote the siting of resource-based and agricultural-based industrial activities close to the location of the natural resource whether outside or inside the Urban Growth Boundary. Jurisdictions are encouraged to recognize forest land as a sustainable economic resource.

- ED-17 Where jurisdictions, including water and sewer districts, have responsibility to provide infrastructure and/or services or to plan for them they shall include the goals of economic development as an important part of their decision making process.
- ED-18 Jurisdictions shall cooperatively develop funding strategies for governmental infrastructure which take into account economic development goals, and consider the costs and benefits for the jurisdictions, and the region.
- ED-19 Jurisdictions shall seek state legislative approval of state funding and regulatory strategies to fund environmental clean-up of industrial sites. Jurisdictions shall work together on a collaborative basis to develop alternative local, County and state financing and regulatory strategies to assist with the funding of environmental clean-up of industrial sites.
- ED-20 Jurisdictions shall identify geographic areas that can be developed or redeveloped into Manufacturing/Industrial Areas, and coordinate with utility providers to build the necessary infrastructure. Jurisdictions are encouraged to provide public incentives to promote basic employment associated with manufacturing.
- ED-21 To maintain the economic vitality of King County, regulatory reform must occur with the implementation of Growth Management Act requirements. To carry out this goal, jurisdictions shall adopt permitting processes with defined milestones for prompt approval of projects that conform with the local jurisdiction's development regulations. To carry out this policy the following actions shall be taken:
- a. No later than January 1996, jurisdictions shall identify to the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor current permit process timeframes and barriers to speedy permit approval, including discussion of operational and cost considerations;
 - b. Eliminate redundant permit reviews and appeals;
 - c. Establish consistent mitigation requirements containing clear standards, and facilitating projects that meet these established standards;
 - d. Focus the scope of public appeal processes for a project to those issues that relate directly to specific impacts of the project; and
 - e. Adopt procedures to perform concurrent permit review whenever possible.
- ED-22 Jurisdictions may prepare non-project environmental impact statements to address, in a comprehensive manner, the probable significant adverse impacts of future development.
- ED-23 Jurisdictions are encouraged to establish a master utility permit process in conjunction with approval of land use permits such as short plats, subdivisions and master planned developments. Utilities may include both publicly and privately owned utilities for electricity, natural gas, water, sanitary sewer, surface water management and telecommunications. All utility extensions and required new construction may be reviewed as part of the master utility permit.

5. Private/Public Partnerships

- ED-24 Jurisdictions shall foster the development and use of private/public partnerships to implement economic development policies, programs and projects.

X. Regional Finance and Governance

A. Finance and Governance Plans

A fiscal analysis is required by the Growth Management Act. The purpose of the fiscal analysis is for King County to realistically assess the fiscal costs and constraints of implementing the Countywide Planning Policies and thereby to contribute to the design of an effective strategy to overcome those constraints.

In order to evaluate the Fiscal Impacts of the initial Countywide Planning Policies adopted by King County in 1992 and Phase II Amendments pursuant to Growth Management Act, and King County Ordinance #10450, the Growth Management Planning Council created the Fiscal Impact Analysis and Economic Development (Fis/Ed) Task Force. The Growth Management Planning Council directed this Task Force to perform the required fiscal analysis and recommend appropriate policies to the Growth Management Planning Council. The Growth Management Act requires an analysis of the fiscal impacts to be completed when adopting Countywide Planning Policies. King County Ordinance #10450 requires that an in-depth analysis be conducted to evaluate the fiscal and economic impacts of the Countywide Planning Policies on governments, businesses and individuals. The 1992 Countywide Planning Policy FW-32 requires that jurisdictions cooperatively identify regional funding sources and establish regional financing strategies. Fiscal analysis of the Countywide Planning Policies contains discussion of anticipated fiscal impact on the County and cities. The Fis/Ed Task Force completed the work program adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council to accomplish the legal requirements for the fiscal analysis and transmitted their findings to the Growth Management Planning Council in a Final Report on May 4, 1994.

The Fiscal Analysis, Chapters 1 through 8, of the Final Report of the Fiscal Analysis and Economic Development Task Force which was transmitted to the Growth Management Planning Council on May 4, 1994 is hereby incorporated by reference as the Fiscal Analysis for the Countywide Planning Policies.

- FW-37 To implement the Countywide Planning Policies, jurisdictions shall cooperatively identify regional funding sources and establish regional financing strategies by July 1, 1996. Such strategies shall consider the infrastructure and service needs of Urban Centers, Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, Activity Areas, business/office parks, other activity concentrations, and Rural Areas. Such strategies shall also provide incentives to support the Countywide Planning Policies and should:
- a. Make existing and newly identified funding sources respond in the most flexible way to meet Countywide needs;
 - b. Ensure that a balance of services is available Countywide to meet, among others, human service, public safety, open space and recreation, education, and transportation needs; and
 - c. Evaluate current revenue and service demands and the potential for more effective coordination of service delivery.
- FW-38 In order to implement the Countywide Planning Policies, key investments need to be identified and implemented. Public resources shall include Countywide, regional, State and Federal funds. King County and its cities shall develop a Regional Financing Plan including sources for the key investments by July, 1996.
- a. The Regional Financing Plan should establish priorities for regional infrastructure investments including transportation, water, sanitary sewer, storm water, parks and open space.
 - b. The Regional Financing Plan should emphasize strategies to achieve environmental clean-up, redevelopment, affordable housing and regulatory reform.
 - c. The Regional Financing Plan should consider the recommendations on regional infrastructure investments which may be contained in the Foundations for the Future: Regional Economic Strategy's Action Plan due out in late 1994.
 - d. Local jurisdictions' eligibility for shared funding through regional agencies and consortia shall be dependent upon collaboration in development and execution of this work program.
- FW-39 In order to implement the Countywide Planning Policies, a Regional Governance Plan shall be adopted by King County and the cities. This Plan shall be developed in a collaborative process

with local jurisdictions, special districts, citizens and business representing a broad range of stakeholders. This proposal shall:

- a. Evaluate opportunities for government consolidation;
- b. Match service responsibilities of jurisdictions with the fiscal capacity to maintain services at the level desired by taxpayers; and
- c. Define appropriate regional and local responsibilities for service delivery.

- RF-1 King County and its cities shall seek authority from the State Legislature to facilitate public sector assemblage of land for the purpose of redevelopment.
- RF-2 King County and its cities shall seek authority from the State Legislature to establish special “Urban Center Districts” where increments of new revenues resulting from redevelopment can be allocated for infrastructure financing.
- RF-3 All jurisdictions shall adopt policies to stimulate construction or preservation of affordable housing in Centers, infill and redevelopment areas.
- RF-4 Each city with a potential annexation area shall enter into an interlocal agreement with the County for defining service delivery responsibilities. A financing plan for investments in the annexation areas shall be included in the interlocal agreement for capital facilities and service delivery. Level-of-service standards and financial capacity should be considered for each area, together with density issues and phasing of developments.
- RF-5 In order to transition governmental roles so that the cities become the provider of local urban services and the County becomes the regional government providing Countywide and rural services, unincorporated Urban Growth Areas are encouraged to annex or incorporate within the 20-year timeframe of these Policies. To achieve this goal, all cities that have identified potential annexation areas shall enter into interlocal agreements with King County that includes a plan for development standards and financing of capital and operating expenditures during the period prior to annexation.

B. Implementation and Transition

Countywide Planning Policies are intended to affect directly only local comprehensive plans. However, the Growth Management Planning Council recognizes that, indirectly, Countywide Planning Policies will ultimately have a broad ranging impact on zoning, existing uses, lots and structures throughout the adoption of development regulations that are consistent with local comprehensive plans. It is not possible to fashion on a Countywide basis rules of transition that will account for these impacts. Cities and the County need flexibility to adopt rules that govern transition issues allowing local implementation to occur in an orderly, fair and predictable manner. Anticipating, understanding and providing reasonable rules to govern the conversion from old to new Growth Management Act plans and development regulations is best addressed in local plans and development regulations.

- TP-1 All jurisdictions shall implement these Countywide Planning Policies through adoption of comprehensive plans. Countywide Planning Policies will affect existing legal zoning uses, structures, and lots only through locally adopted development regulations that are consistent with adopted comprehensive plans.
- TP-2 Local plans and development regulations may provide rules of transition, governing such matters as zoning and existing legal uses, structures and lots, including pending applications for development approval.

APPENDIX 1

Urban Growth Areas Map

This Urban Growth Area map is a planning policy recommendation to be followed by the Metropolitan King County Council when it adopts the final Urban Growth Area in its 1994 Comprehensive Plan.

**note: insert updated Countywide Growth Map here
and remove page**

APPENDIX 2

Household and Employment Ranges

Proposed Growth Target Ranges for Household and Employment

CITIES	Net New Households	Net New Hhld Ranges		Net New Employment	Net New Hhld Ranges	
		Low	High		Low	High
Algona	404	346	462	350	300	400
Auburn	8,082	6,553	9,610	11,100	9,000	13,200
Beaux Arts	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bellevue	8,575	7,680	9,550	28,250	25,300	31,200
Black Diamond	1,033	947	1,119	1,200	1,100	1,300
Bothell (KC part)	1,931	1,448	2,413	2,900	2,150	3,600
Burien	1,796	1,596	1,995	450	400	500
Carnation	404	404	404	0	0	0
Clyde Hill	12	12	12	0	0	0
Des Moines	1,796	1,437	2,155	2,500	2,000	3,000
Duvall	1,886	1,563	1,759	1,700	1,600	1,800
Enumclaw	2,626	2,182	2,667	1,000	900	1,100
Federal Way	14,996	13,425	16,566	14,800	13,300	16,400
Hunts Point	4	4	4	0	0	0
Issaquah	2,694	1,879	3,508	4,300	3,000	5,600
Kent	6,735	6,120	7,500	11,500	10,450	12,550
Kirkland	5,837	5,328	6,346	8,600	7,800	9,300
Lake Forest Park	135	101	168	200	150	250
Medina	17	17	17	0	0	0
Mercer Island	1,122	1,056	1,188	1,700	1,600	1,800
Milton	18	18	18	0	0	0
Normandy Park	135	135	135	0	0	0
North Bend	1,527	1,266	1,787	2,050	1,700	2,400
Pacific	1,212	606	1,818	100	50	150
Redmond	11,458	9,637	12,760	29,509	29,500	34,750
Renton	8,890	7,730	10,049	23,000	20,000	26,000
SeaTac	3,592	3,546	7,500	15,800	15,600	26,900
Seattle	53,877	48,233	59,520	132,700	118,800	146,600
Skykomish	27	27	27	0	0	0
Snoqualmie	2,784	1,942	3,625	4,500	3,100	5,820
Tukwila	5,388	4,761	6,014	22,250	19,000	24,000
Woodinville	1,796	1,750	1,842	1,950	1,900	2,000
Yarrow Point	18	18	18	0	0	0
Cities Total	150,803	131,768	172,558	322,409	288,700	370,620
Uninc. KC	44,897	40,048	50,000	25,000	23,300	28,700
GRAND TOTAL	195,700	171,816	222,558	347,409	312,000	399,320

Source: Growth Management Planning Council, May 14, 1994.

APPENDIX 2-A

**Household Growth Target Re-allocation based on Annexations and
Incorporations between April 1994 and January 1998**

Adjusted 20-Year Household Growth Targets
King County and its Cities
Household Growth Target including Adjustment Based on Annexations and
Incorporations between April, 1994 and January, 1998

Jurisdiction	A	C		D	F	
	1990 Households	Original 1994 Growth Target		Target Added by Annex. and Incorp. 4/94 to 1/98	Adjusted Range of Household Growth from 1992-2012	
		Low:	High:		Low:	High:
Algona	587	346	462	0	346	462
Auburn	13,357	6,553	9,610	6	6,559	9,616
Beaux Arts	119	0	0	0	0	0
Bellevue	35,756	7,680	9,550	112	7,792	9,662
Black Diamond	541	947	1,119	591	1,538	1,710
Bothell	4,807	1,448	2,413	20	1,468	2,433
Burien	12,000	1,596	1,995	0	1,596	1,995
Carnation	439	404	404	0	404	404
Clyde Hill	1,063	12	12	0	12	12
Covington	3,400	n/a	n/a	1,493	1,343	1,642
Des Moines	7,054	1,437	2,155	358	1,795	2,513
Duvall	946	1,563	1,759	0	1,563	1,759
Enumclaw	2,936	2,182	2,667	0	2,182	2,667
Federal Way	25,705	13,425	16,566	243	13,668	16,809
Hunts Point	187	4	4	0	4	4
Issaquah	3,170	1,879	3,508	686	2,565	4,194
Kent	16,246	6,120	7,500	2,265	8,385	9,765
Kirkland	17,211	5,328	6,346	0	5,328	6,346
Lake Forest Pk	1,488	101	168	316	417	484
Maple Valley	2,250	n/a	n/a	1,539	1,385	1,692
Medina	1,129	17	17	0	17	17
Mercer Island	8,007	1,056	1,188	0	1,056	1,188
Milton	266	18	18	11	29	29
Newcastle	2,000	n/a	n/a	833	749	916
Normandy Park	2,570	135	135	0	135	135
North Bend	1,044	1,266	1,787	0	1,266	1,787
Pacific	1,707	606	1,818	0	606	1,818
Redmond	14,153	9,637	12,760	418	10,055	13,178
Renton	18,219	7,730	10,049	70	7,800	10,119
Seattle	236,702	48,233	59,520	0	48,233	59,520
SeaTac	9,611	3,546	7,500	2	3,548	7,502
Shoreline	na	n/a	n/a	2,559	2,303	2,814
Skykomish	103	27	27	0	27	27
Snoqualmie	611	1,942	3,625	0	1,942	3,625
Tukwila	5,639	4,761	6,014	0	4,761	6,014
Woodinville	3,000	1,750	1,842	1	1,751	1,843
Yarrow Point	371	18	18	0	18	18
City Total:	454,400	131,767	172,556	11,523	142,646	184,719
Unincorp. KC:	161,400	40,048	50,000	-11,523	28,525	38,477
- urban	123,400	34,248	41,800	-11,523	22,725	30,277
- rural	38,000	5,800	8,200	0	5,800	8,200
King County Total	615,800	171,815	222,556	0	171,171	223,196

Notes: Columns B through F are hhld. growth targets, expressed as numbers of hhlds. to accommodate during the 20-yr Growth Mngmt. Period 1992-2012. Columns B and C represent range of adopted household targets from Appx 2 of the Countywide Planning Policies, 1994. Column D represents nnid. targets associated with new cities and annexed areas between 4 / 94 and 1 / 98. Columns E and F represent adjusted range of 20-year growth target. The cities of Kenmore and Sammamish, incorporated after January 1998, are not included in this table.

Methodology: Col. B growth targets were based on city boundaries as of April 1994. Col. D are the additional households to be accommodated during incorporation and annexation between April '94 and January '98. These additional households constitute a proportional share of the urban unincorp. target by Community Planning Area. The additional households are based on the land-area proportion of urban unincorp. areas less designated parks and major water bodies. That proportion is applied to the Planning Area's urban target, the midrange of the table on pg. 30 of the King County Comprehensive F

APPENDIX 2-B

Household Growth Target Re-allocation based on Annexations and Incorporations after January 1, 1998 and Potential Annexation Areas

Interim Potential Annexation Areas Map

The Interim Potential Annexation Areas Map describes the areas receiving target allocations in Table CPP Appendix 2B. This map is considered interim until all unincorporated urban areas are included in city PAAs without gaps or overlaps. This map may also be amended to reflect other CPP policy direction.

Adjusted 20-Year Household Growth Targets King County and its Cities

Household Growth Target Re-Allocation Based on Annexations and Incorporations after 1/1/98 & Potential Annexation Areas

These are draft estimates of growth targets associated with recent incorporations and potential annexation areas (PAAs).

Jurisdiction	A H'hold Growth Target to 1/98		B-1 Target from Completed Annexation or Incorp	B-2 Target Remaining in PAAs	C Total Target (A + B)	
	Low:	High:			Low:	High:
Algona	346	462	0	15	361	477
Auburn	6,559	9,616	1	1,977	8,537	11,594
Beaux Arts	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bellevue	7,792	9,662	6	515	8,313	10,183
Black Diamond	1,538	1,710	0	353	1,891	2,063
Bothell	1,468	2,433	4	309	1,781	2,746
Burien	1,596	1,995	71	0	1,667	2,066
Carnation	404	404	0	0	404	404
Clyde Hill	12	12	0	0	12	12
Covington	1,343	1,642	0	0	1,343	1,642
Des Moines	1,795	2,513	38	0	1,833	2,551
Duvall	1,563	1,759	0	0	1,563	1,759
Enumclaw	2,182	2,667	0	0	2,182	2,667
Federal Way	13,668	16,809	45	1,606	15,319	18,460
Hunts Point	4	4	0	0	4	4
Issaquah	2,565	4,194	11	1,538	4,114	5,743
Kenmore %	0	0	1,082	0	974	1,190
Kent	8,385	9,765	0	1,980	10,365	11,745
Kirkland	5,328	6,346	0	1,248	6,576	7,594
Lake Forest Park	417	484	18	38	473	540
Maple Valley	1,385	1,692	0	0	1,385	1,692
Medina	17	17	0	0	17	17
Mercer Island	1,056	1,188	0	0	1,056	1,188
Milton	29	29	11	59	99	99
Newcastle	749	916	3	2	754	921
Normandy Park	135	135	0	0	135	135
North Bend	1,266	1,787	0	0	1,266	1,787
Pacific	606	1,818	0	73	679	1,891
Redmond	10,055	13,178	0	293	10,348	13,471
Renton	7,800	10,119	60	4,260	12,120	14,439
Sammamish %	0	0	5,465	0	4,919	6,012
Seattle	48,233	59,520	0	33	48,266	59,553
SeaTac	3,548	7,502	0	5	3,553	7,507
Shoreline	2,303	2,814	0	108	2,411	2,922
Skykomish	27	27	0	0	27	27
Snoqualmie	1,942	3,625	0	0	1,942	3,625
Tukwila	4,761	6,014	0	36	4,797	6,050
Woodinville	1,751	1,843	0	0	1,751	1,843
Yarrow Point	18	18	0	0	18	18
City Total:	142,646	184,719	6,815	13,973[^]	162,779	206,162
Unincorp. County	28,525	38,477	-6,815	-13,973	7737[*]	17,689
- urban	22,725	30,277	-6,815	-13,973	1,937	9,489
- rural	5,800	8,200	0	0	5,800	8,200
Total KC Target:	171,171	223,196	0	0	170,516	223,881

Notes: Column A represents nouseoid growth targets adjusted for annexation and incorporation through 1/98.

Column B represents nouseoid targets associated with recent annexations, two new cities and potential annexation areas.

Column C represents sum of adopted targets, annexed / incorporated targets, and targets in PAAs.

[^] Due to overlapping PAAs, some duplication occurs in PAA targets. This total eliminates duplicate targets.

^{*} Represents areas of King County not covered by potential annexation areas.

% Target for Kenmore and Sammamish, incorporated after January 1998, is draft for discussion purposes.

Insert Interim PAA Map Here

APPENDIX 3

Affordable Housing Index

AFFORDABLE HOUSING JOBS/HOUSING INDEX

The Jobs/Housing Index was developed by the Affordable Housing Technical Forum as a way to adjust housing targets based on each jurisdiction's existing concentrations of low-cost housing and low-wage employment. A Low-Wage Jobs Index greater than one indicates that the proportion of lower wage employment is greater than the county average; a Low-Cost Housing Index greater than one indicates that the proportion of lower cost housing is less than the county average. The Jobs/Housing Index is computed by multiplying the jobs and housing indexes together.

Policy AH-2 establishes planning targets for housing affordable to households with incomes between 0 and 50 percent of the county median income. Based on the Jobs/Housing Index, jurisdictions should plan for a number of units that is either 20 or 24 percent of projected net new housing units, as follows:

Jobs/Housing Index greater than one: 24 percent

Jobs/Housing Index less than one: 20 percent

Jurisdiction for which Index could not be computed (shown as NA): 20 percent

Jurisdiction	Low Wage Jobs		Low Cost Housing		Jobs/Housing Index ⁵
	Jobs ¹	Index ²	Units ³	Index ⁴	
Algona	73	0.85	406	0.61	0.52
Auburn	5,362	0.83	9,245	0.65	0.54
Beaux Arts	NA	NA	3	20.75	NA
Bellevue	22,297	1.08	12,801	1.39	1.50
Black Diamond	59	1.28	259	0.73	0.93
Bothell	1,691	1.19	1,704	1.2	1.43
Carnation	64	0.85	248	0.81	0.69
Clyde Hill	31	0.52	21	26.07	13.56
Des Moines	1,564	1.27	4,473	0.74	0.94
Duvall	56	0.87	229	1.74	1.51
Enumclaw	1,174	1.17	2,106	0.65	0.76
Federal Way	6,384	1.26	14,107	0.89	1.12
Hunts Point	0	0	7	14.14	NA
Issaquah	1,676	1.17	1,594	1.01	1.18
Kent	8,067	0.78	11,526	0.69	0.54
Kirkland	5,472	1.17	6,955	1.17	1.37
Lake Forest Park	554	1.28	251	2.98	3.81
Medina	25	0.91	54	10.67	9.71
Mercer Island	1,697	1.11	1,227	3.21	3.56
Milton	NA	NA	77	1.08	NA
Normandy Park	352	1.23	488	2.68	3.30
North Bend	506	1.15	595	0.84	0.97
Pacific	147	0.85	1,107	0.67	0.57
Redmond	7,296	0.96	5,103	1.34	1.29
Renton	9,675	0.77	11,999	0.75	0.58
SeaTac	4,497	0.91	6,528	0.69	0.63
Seattle	129,451	1.02	134,526	0.87	0.89
Skykomish	NA	NA	72	0.63	NA
Snoqualmie	444	1.18	426	0.74	0.87
Tukwila	10,875	0.85	4,256	0.65	0.55
Yarrow Point	0	0	17	11.2	NA
Cities	219,489	1.00	232,410	0.91	0.91
Uninc. KC	32,885	1.03	66,775	1.32	1.36
KC TOTAL	252,374	1.00	299,185	1.00	1.00

Source: King County Planning and Community Development Division, 1993.

¹ Low-wage jobs are estimated using Puget Sound Regional Council employment data for five sectors, converted to lower income quartile households. King County Planning and Community Development, 1992.

² Proportion of low-wage jobs relative to the county average.

³ Rental housing units with rents less than \$700 per month, plus owned housing units valued at less than \$100,000 in 1990 dollars. 1990 Census

⁴ Proportion of low-cost housing relative to the county average.

⁵ Low-wage jobs index (2) multiplied by the low-cost housing index (4).

Appendix 4

Land Capacity Work Program

In compliance RCW 36.70A.215, the April 1994 Land Capacity Work Program was deleted and replaced with the Growth Management Act review and evaluation program.

APPENDIX 5

TRANSPORTATION

TRANSPORTATION: Requirements of the Growth Management Act

Countywide Policies (ReESHB 1025, Section 2)

Countywide planning policies must be adopted by July 1, 1992 to provide a framework from which consistent County and city comprehensive plans will be developed. Policies for transportation must address:

1. Policies for promotion of contiguous and orderly development and provision of urban services to such development [32.2 (3) (b)];
2. Policies for siting public capital facilities of a Countywide or state-wide nature[32.2 (3)(c)];
3. Policies for Countywide transportation facilities and strategies [32.2 (3) (d)];
4. Policies for joint County and city planning within growth areas [32.2 (3) (f)];
5. An analysis of the fiscal impact.[32.2 (3) (h)].
6. Level of Service, concurrency, and parking policy guidelines [as required by Countywide Planning Policy T-4].

Comprehensive Plans (RCW 36.70A.070)

The transportation element of comprehensive plans adopted by the County or cities will be measured against the policies and standards approved and ratified as part of the Countywide framework plan. By July 1, 1994 the County and cities are required to adopt a comprehensive plan with a mandatory transportation element that includes the following sub-elements:

1. Land use assumptions used in estimating travel demand;
2. Facility and service needs for attaining and sustaining level-of-service standards for arterials and transit routes;
3. Six-year financing plan based upon the needs of the comprehensive plan; reassess land use element if level-of-service standards cannot be met with funding resources; this plan will be updated and adopted annually;
4. Intergovernmental coordination with adjacent jurisdictions;
5. Transportation Demand Management strategies.

Within six months of adopting a comprehensive plan, the County and cities are required to meet:

1. Adequacy Requirements: Adopt an ordinance which prohibits development approval if the development causes the level-of-service to decline below the standard adopted in the transportation element.
2. Concurrency Requirements: Deny development unless improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development can be in place at the time of development or a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years.

Other Laws and Regulations

Federal law requires an on-going cooperative, continuous and comprehensive transportation planning process as a condition of federal transportation grants. To comply with this requirement, the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for long-range transportation planning and short-range transportation improvement programming (TIP).

The MPO planning and programming responsibilities are strengthened and enhanced under the recent re-authorization of the Federal Surface Transportation Act. The Inter-modal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) eliminates several categorical funding programs and creates a new flexible Surface Transportation Program (STP) and a new Congestion Mitigation Program. Funds available to the region under these two highway programs may be used for multi-modal solutions; and the MPO has project selection authority for these programs, as well as the federal transit program funds for the region. In addition, Washington State Department of Transportation's (WSDOT) project selections under the Interstate Maintenance, Bridge, and National Highway System (NHS) programs must be made in cooperation with the MPO and in conformance with the regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The Federal Clean Air Act Amendment (CAAA) of 1990 requires substantial reduction of emissions from the transportation sector. The Puget Sound Regional Council's transportation plans and projects must conform to Transportation Control Measures contained in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) prepared by the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency. The current strategy for meeting CAAA vehicle emissions requirements include:

- expanded inspection and maintenance program, and
- a regional implementation of the Commute Trip Reduction Law cited below.

The State Commute Trip Reduction Law of 1991 requires reductions in vehicle miles traveled. Employers of 100 or more employees are directed to reduce work travel demand by 35 percent by 1999. Ordinances adopted by the County and cities must be coordinated with transit agencies, regional planning organizations and major employers; and they must be consistent with commute trip reduction plans of neighboring jurisdictions.

State law provides for the development of a High Capacity Transit (HCT) system within the Puget Sound Area. The law requires that transit agencies (METRO, Pierce Transit, Snotran, Community Transit and Everett Transit) jointly plan the implementation of such a system. For that purpose, the Joint Regional Policy Committee was formed and charged with the responsibility of recommending a system plan and financial program that would implement the high-capacity transit system. This plan is being developed in support of the Vision 2020 Regional Growth Strategies; this vision calls for creation of a regional system of central places linked by High Capacity Transit facilities, and an interconnected system of freeway High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes.

The 1990 State Legislature passed various legislation granting local governments authority to establish a number of taxing programs for funding transportation projects and programs. An interim and informal group called the Local Options Strategy Development Steering Committee was formed to recommend how these funding authorities should be exercised. This initial work was completed in September of 1991 with a comprehensive recommendation as to how each funding source should be assigned. As local jurisdictions take actions on these recommendations, it would be useful to reconvene this Steering Committee or a similar group for coordinating transportation funding decisions.

Countywide Level of Service Framework

The following Countywide Level of Service Framework Guiding Principles were adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council on July 21, 1993 in response to Countywide Planning Policy T-4. They are provided as advisory guidelines for local jurisdictions to consider as they develop level of service standards.

Use a multi-modal LOS approach

1. Jurisdictions should use a multi-modal approach for long-range transportation planning. Instead of relying on traditional measurements for passenger cars, new LOS standards should encourage the use of transit, transportation demand management, and nonmotorized travel.

Establish non-single occupancy vehicle mode split goals

2. Local jurisdictions should work with METRO to establish non-single occupancy vehicle mode split goals. These local goals shall be coordinated to achieve County and regional goals. Local jurisdictions and the County should work with the state, transit agencies, and the Puget Sound Regional Council to develop regional mode split goals.

Develop (supply-side) transit performance measures

3. METRO should develop supply-side transit LOS measures that include service availability and service quality. Transit service availability describes the types of service available (rail, regular bus, and express bus) and its orientation (service to designated centers and service to areas outside centers). Service quality describes the minimum route coverage, frequencies, and headways. Transit travel times and on-time performance standards are optional, appropriate jurisdiction policies and actions shall accompany their use.

Develop demand-side transit performance measures

4. In order to achieve non-single occupancy vehicle mode split goals, jurisdictions should adopt policies and implement actions that support transit investments. Transit supportive policies create the operating environment to promote increased transit mode share. Supportive policies and actions include, but are not limited to, the following: parking minimums and maximums, provisions for transit facilities, transit-oriented development guidelines, provisions for High Occupant Vehicle (HOV) and Transportation System Management (TSM) treatments, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), and Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) ordinances.

Develop regional LOS standards and thresholds

5. Local jurisdictions, the state, and transit agencies should work with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) to develop LOS standards for regional facilities. Local Jurisdictions and agencies should provide on-going review of the Puget Sound Regional Council's regional LOS studies, and make recommendations to the Growth Management Planning Council and Transportation Policy Board regarding LOS standards for regional transportation systems, including freeways, High Capacity Transit, and ferries.

Average arterial LOS

6. Jurisdictions will determine the appropriate areas or corridors to measure LOS. Each jurisdiction should average LOS either by a geographic zone, based on land use or travel sheds, or along a travel corridor. Averaging techniques should analyze the general congestion of arterials instead of a single intersection or link.

Vary LOS standards by land use or growth management objectives

7. The LOS standard should vary by differing levels of development patterns and growth management objectives. For example, lower arterial standards that tolerate more congestion should be established for Urban Centers. Transit LOS standards may also vary based upon population and employment densities.

Support the Countywide land use vision

8. Each jurisdiction should devise their LOS approach in ways that support the Countywide land use vision. For example, jurisdictions may use LOS factors that measure relative trip lengths or travel time, in support of the Countywide land use vision.

Develop a nonmotorized LOS component

9. Local jurisdictions should develop a nonmotorized component of their LOS standard. For example, jurisdictions may use a checklist that indicates whether or not fundamental nonmotorized policies, standards, and facilities are in place.

Include state facilities in LOS evaluations

10. State facilities are an integral element of the transportation network. Therefore, it is important to include state facilities in long-range planning LOS evaluations.

Determine LOS thresholds at the local level

11. Each jurisdiction will determine LOS thresholds and weights appropriate for their jurisdiction that are consistent with the Countywide vision. For example, one city may set a LOS threshold at LOS D citywide, and an adjacent jurisdiction may set an LOS E threshold for its Urban Center and an LOS D threshold for the remainder of the city.

Establish interlocal agreements

12. Applying LOS standards may use interlocal agreements with adjacent jurisdictions to coordinate LOS methodologies and resolve differences.

Guidelines for Local Transportation Plan Consistency and Development Concurrency in King County

The following Guidelines for Local Transportation Plan Consistency and Development Concurrency in King County were adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council on January 19, 1994 in response to Countywide Planning Policy T-4. They are intended to guide local jurisdictions as they develop transportation plans and concurrency regulations.

Conclusions

King County and the cities in King County should use these guidelines in the preparation of their transportation elements and comprehensive plans to achieve the directives of the Growth Management Act and the Countywide Planning Policies. Such consistency and coordination will serve as the basis for developing the Countywide transportation system to serve the expected growth, change, and development in the cities and County.

Introduction

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide for the consistency and coordination of transportation and land use plans by local planning and transportation agencies within King County so that the County will be served by a balanced, multimodal transportation system that functions effectively and efficiently under the guidance of the Countywide Planning Policies. Autos (single occupancy vehicle and high occupancy vehicle), public transportation (rail, bus, paratransit and ferry services), freight (rail, truck, ship, and air), and non-motorized modes of travel, as well as demand management strategies, should be planned to meet the urban and rural travel needs of King County and to support the land use policies of the County and its cities. Local transportation elements should balance their land use, level-of-service standards, travel needs, and financial expectations so that plans can be implemented and used as the basis to determine the transportation concurrency of individual development projects.

Growth Management Act

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the comprehensive plans of cities and counties be consistent with and coordinated with the comprehensive plans of other cities and counties with which they have common boundaries. (36.70A.100) The Growth Management Act also requires that counties prepare Countywide planning policies (CPP) so that the required consistency will be achieved. Such policies for Countywide transportation facilities and strategies are required by section 36.70A.210(3)(d) of the Growth Management Act.

Countywide Planning Policies

Following the direction of the Growth Management Act, the King County Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) adopted its Countywide Planning Policies in 1992. Policy T-4 of the CPP states that the Growth Management Planning Council has the ongoing responsibility to develop and maintain coordinated level-of-service (LOS) standards and a concurrency system for Countywide transit routes and arterial streets (which includes state facilities)

The Countywide Planning Policies also state in policy FW-17 that infrastructure planning and financing be coordinated among jurisdictions so that Countywide improvements may be prioritized in order to implement the Countywide vision and land use plans.

Policy FW-18 enables the County and cities to adopt a clear definition of LOS and consistency requirements, and to establish a consistent process for implementing concurrency.

Consistency and Coordination Guidelines for Local Transportation Plans and Development Concurrency

1. Definitions

The terms consistency, coordination, and concurrency should be used with the meanings described in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC 365-195) and the RCW. These definitions are as follows:

“Concurrency” means that adequate public facilities are available when the impacts of development occur. This definition includes two concepts of “adequate public facilities” and of “available public facilities” as defined elsewhere in the WAC. Also, the RCW states that “concurrent with the development” as applied to transportation means that “improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years.” (36.70A.070(6)(e))

“Consistency” means that no feature of a plan or regulation is incompatible with any other feature of a plan or regulation. Consistency is indicative of a capacity for orderly integration or operation with other elements in a system.

“Coordination” means consultation and cooperation among jurisdictions.

2. Land Use and Growth

The amounts, timing, and locations of growth that are planned by all jurisdictions should be consistent with the Office of Financial Management forecasts for King County and with the growth targets and vision adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council.

3. Travel

The expected travel demands that are forecast in the transportation elements should be consistent with the land use forecasts, and coordinated with other local jurisdictions. The use of compatible analytical techniques will enable forecast results to be compared across jurisdictional lines.

4. Level of Service Standards

The LOS standards adopted by local jurisdictions should be consistent with the LOS Framework Guidelines adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council, and should be coordinated with other local jurisdictions. The LOS standards should be used to identify deficiencies and improvements associated with concurrency.

5. Transportation Needs

The new and improved transportation facilities and strategies recommended in transportation plans should be consistent with local mobility needs and LOS standards, and should be coordinated. Facilities should include arterials, transit routes, and state facilities. Strategies should include transportation demand management and system management measures.

6. Funding

The sources and funds to pay for the transportation improvements needed to meet LOS standards should be consistent with federal, state, regional, and local funding policies. Projects needing regionally administered funds should be coordinated through the Puget Sound Regional Council planning and funding approval process. The funding of transportation elements should include the consideration of the timing and availability of anticipated funds.

7. Concurrency

Concurrency applies to the regulation of individual land use actions as described in RCW 36.70A.070(6)(e). It should be derived from the coordination and balancing of land use, LOS standards, transportation needs, and financial resources in the comprehensive plans of local jurisdictions.

8. Monitoring and Evaluation

The local jurisdictions and transportation agencies in King County should work together to establish performance benchmarks for the Countywide transportation system, so that each can monitor its performance and evaluate the need to improve it. This activity should include the exchange of information, data, and technical analyses.

9. Certification and Review

The Puget Sound Regional Council should consider the use of these guidelines in its certification review of local transportation elements of planning jurisdictions in King County. Problems of inconsistency with other local and regional plans may be resolved through a reassessment of local transportation plans as provided in the Growth Management Act.

Guidelines for Commuter Parking Policies

The following Guidelines for Commuter Parking Policies were adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council on January 19, 1994 in response to Countywide Planning Policy T-4. These policies were proposed and endorsed by the King County Planning Directors and approved by the Transportation Caucus on November 11, 1993. They are provided as advisory guidelines for local jurisdictions to consider as they develop parking policies.

Preamble

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide a framework for local jurisdictions to use as they review and revise their parking policies. While it is recognized they may need some tailoring to fit the needs of individual jurisdictions, they are strongly recommended as a means to achieve consistency among local governments in the drafting of their parking policies.

Revision of parking codes is seen as a process requiring evaluation and modification on an iterative basis. Local elected officials should review parking policies and codes every few years and adjust them as transportation alternatives improve and experience with their impacts gained. To implement these policy recommendations, jurisdictions will need to monitor parking demand, perhaps on a biennial basis. The extent to which local governments constrain parking supply will ultimately depend on the availability of alternative transportation modes.

The incremental nature of these policies should increase the willingness of developers and lenders to consider reduced parking supply. The success of these policies will be measured, in part, by local agencies' ability to work with the financial community to encourage lender approval of projects with a less than traditional parking supply.

Policy Guidelines

- I. It is recommended that cities and the County adopt policies in their comprehensive plans to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles (single occupancy vehicles) by constraining supply of commuter/employee parking as called for in the King County Countywide Planning Policies and the State Commute Trip Reduction Task Force Guidelines.

(Background: Research has demonstrated that strategies involving parking supply and price are the most cost-effective of all transportation demand management program elements. Parking policy must not stand alone but must form part of a coherent transportation policy. The Countywide Planning Policies' land use element calls for jurisdictions to establish maximum parking requirements that limit the use of single occupancy vehicles in Urban Centers, and to establish a limit on the number of parking spaces for single occupancy vehicles in Urban Centers, manufacturing/industrial centers, activity areas, and business/office parks. The parking policy review process offers an opportunity to start to constrain supply as alternative transportation modes become available to meet the intent of these Countywide Planning Policies.)

- A. Encourage cities to coordinate on a subregional basis to reduce parking requirements for office, industrial, institutional, and mixed-use development so that the required supply better matches demand. It is proposed that supply outside Urban Centers be adjusted just to fit existing demand at this time and drop below demand only at such time when adequate transportation alternatives are in place. It is recommended that supply within Urban Centers be set below existing demand when improvements that provide alternative modes of transportation are in place. Reduction of supply may be accomplished by eliminating minimum requirements altogether, reducing minimum requirements, and/or by establishing maximum requirements.

(Background: It is recommended that parking policy changes be agreed upon at a Countywide level and that a common framework for code changes be coordinated at a subregional level, working through already established organizations such as ETP on the Eastside and SCATBD in the south end. It should be noted that the policy recommendations do not deal with retail or residential land uses, only with office, industrial, institutional, and multi-use development.

1. Adjust minimum parking requirements outside Urban Centers to fit the level of existing demand. Reduce this requirement further as transportation options increase with development of enhanced transit service and/or as demand drops with achievement of CTR goals.

(Background: The CTR law mandates that employers with 100 or more employees reduce the number of single occupancy vehicle trips to their worksites 15% by 1995, 25% by 1997, and 35% by 1999. Because some of these single occupancy vehicle trips will transfer to carpools, still requiring a parking space, this does not mean parking demand will drop by the same percentages. Under one set of assumptions, assuming a 2% employee growth rate per year, the projected parking reductions resulting from implementation of the CTR law for a suburban non-CBD area would be 4% by 1995, 7.3% by 1997, and 11.4% by 1999. It is recognized these assumptions are based on one methodology found in the CTR Task Force Guidelines and should be tailored to individual situations in each jurisdiction. It is not recommended that jurisdictions require less than the demand where transit service is not frequent.)

2. Set the minimum parking requirements in Urban Centers and areas with enhanced transit service below the level of existing parking demand. A good benchmark would be to use the level of demand based on the achievement of 1995 commute trip reduction goals.

(Background: As noted above, demand for parking is expected to drop as the CTR law is implemented. Parking supply can be tightened more in Urban Centers where public transportation alternatives are already available. It should be noted that this policy is not intended to apply to park-and-ride lots.)

3. Establish a maximum parking ratio for employee parking, with administrative flexibility to allow exceptions to the maximum if appropriate.

(Background: Even when minimum parking requirements are reduced, a significant percentage of developers will still provide parking above the minimum requirement if they believe the market demand is there. The State CTR Guidelines Parking Policy Report recommends that maximums be set to meet

actual demand, including a cushion of ten to 15 percent for practical capacity to guard against spillover.)

4. Evaluate and revise parking standards on a regular basis, starting in 1997, based on assessed impacts and effectiveness at reducing reliance on single occupancy vehicles.

(Background: This will enable jurisdictions to determine how the revised parking standards are working and fine-tune requirements incrementally based on actual experience.)

- B. Make it easier to adjust parking to a ratio less than the required minimum for office, industrial, institutional and mixed-use land uses.

1. Streamline the process for new development to provide less than the minimum where the demand for employee parking is below normal.

(Background: A survey sent to local planning officials of 29 Washington jurisdictions in 1991 indicated that a significant number receive requests from developers to supply less than the minimum parking required in the local code. However, the need to go through a lengthy variance process discourages many developers from providing less parking than required.)

2. Establish a process and actively encourage property owners of major worksites to reduce their parking supply, especially where an excess exists, to support commute trip reduction goals.

(Background: Since parking codes will apply only to new and expanding development, they will not affect existing development impacted by the CTR law without a provision like this.)

3. Allow parking to be provided below the minimum where there are incentives to redevelop existing sites in centers supported by transit and where such actions do not present a situation where "spillover" parking negatively impacts adjacent land uses.

(Background: Developments in areas with good transit service should be able to provide less than the minimum even if other characteristics of the development would not normally indicate a lower than normal demand.)

- C. In addition to the code revisions suggested above, insure the following common elements are included in individual local parking codes:

1. Encourage shared parking. (Shared parking refers to parking spaces that can be used to serve two or more individual land uses without conflict.)

(Background: Most jurisdictions already have provisions for shared parking in their codes; this would merely insure that all jurisdictions encourage reduced parking requirements through this means.)

2. Require reserved parking for high-occupancy vehicles close to the front entrance of a building.

(Background: Requirements to reserve a certain ratio of the total parking area for high occupancy vehicle parking are becoming more common. This may appear as a requirement for all development in a certain land use category or as an option for developers who wish to reduce their parking supply below the jurisdiction standard.)

3. Set standards for bicycle parking.

(Background: Bicycling has the potential to be a reasonable alternative to single occupancy vehicle travel both in high-density areas, where there is already a significant amount of bicycle commuting, and in low-density areas, where there is less traffic and transit service is minimal or unavailable.)

Bicycle parking should be provided as a ratio of total parking stalls, with a minimum specified. A higher ratio may be warranted in dense Urban Areas. Bicycle parking facilities should be well-lit, secure from theft, and located in an area that is protected from inclement weather.)

4. Set design standards for parking lots to encourage direct pedestrian access between sidewalks and building entrances and to ensure that parking lots are not a barrier to pedestrians.

(Background: Typically, transit patrons have had to walk through vast expanses of parking to get from transit stops to building entrances. One way to change this situation is to locate employee parking to the rear and sides of a building, rather than in front of the building.)

5. Allow parking supply to exceed the maximum standard or provide a bonus such as increased density for developments that provide a portion of their site for P&R use or other public uses. This would apply primarily to new retail projects or to existing sites that have an excess parking supply.

(Background: Park-and-Ride capacity in King County is in short supply, and construction of new parking costs approximately \$20,000 per space. Providing an incentive in off-street parking codes for the private sector to lease space to transit agencies would help accommodate this need. The additional parking supply could still be used by the development at night and on weekends.)

6. Review on-street short-term parking supply as a means of accommodating cities' economic development needs.

(Background: The recommendations contained in this paper deal with long-term commuter parking supply. Parking supply for retail uses should be addressed separately by jurisdictions.)

7. Agree on a regionally consistent set of measures for establishing parking ratios.

(Background: It is often difficult to compare parking standards of local jurisdictions because different measures are used to set parking ratios. For most land uses, this measure should be spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross leasable area. However, consistent measures for such uses as schools, hospitals, and churches need to be discussed further and agreement reached.)

Parking Policy Initiatives

- I. Local jurisdictions should develop workshops and other techniques to promote a closer working relationship with the financial and development communities.
- II. Local jurisdictions and METRO should work together to identify parking pricing techniques that should be implemented in the region and obtain legislative authority at the state level to introduce such strategies.

(Background: The State CTR Task Force recommended that educational and incentive strategies be pursued before regulatory strategies were sought to determine if CTR goals can be achieved without the need to require parking charges. However, the need for regulatory strategies will be reviewed by the Task Force in 1995. There are a number of King County Planning Directors that believe pricing techniques are currently appropriate in Urban Centers.)

Techniques such as the following could be considered:

- A. Provide tax incentives and other credits to employers that eliminate employee parking subsidies.

(Background: Deciding to take advantage of tax incentives and credits would be voluntary on the part of the employer or developer. Several cities have expressed interest in providing such incentives.)

B. Charge for parking.

(Background: There is currently no enabling legislation allowing local jurisdictions to require a charge for parking at existing development. However, this is an option that can be pursued through the State Environmental Policy Act process as a mitigation measure required of new developments.)

C. Impose a parking tax on privately provided, non-commercial parking.

(Background: The 1990 Local Option Commercial Parking Tax is currently limited to commercial parking businesses, which are rare outside of Seattle, and to facilities which charge for parking. Because the Local Option Commercial Parking Tax is unable to target free parking, it dilutes the effectiveness of the tax as a TDM tool.)

D. Encourage employers who subsidize employee parking to provide employees the option to give up their parking space and receive a cash amount equivalent to the parking subsidy.

(Background: This parking pricing technique already being used in California requires any employer who subsidizes an employee's parking space to give that employee the option of taking the market value of that parking space instead of the free or subsidized parking. The only drawback to this idea is that parking is currently a tax-free benefit under IRS regulations while employees would be taxed if they accepted the market value of parking.)