



2018 King County Comprehensive Plan

**Policy I-207 Analysis
of Proposed Amendments**

In compliance with the 2017-2018 Biennial Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 18409, Sections 19 and 88, as amended by Ordinance 18602, Section 5, Proviso P2, and Ordinance 18602, Section 47, Proviso P3.

Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget

March 1, 2018

To support review of all policy amendments, the King County Comprehensive Plan contains a policy that directs analysis of proposed policy amendments. The policy states:

- I-207 Proposed amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan, including the Land Use Map, shall be considered by the King County Council only once each calendar year in accordance with the State Growth Management Act and so that the cumulative effect of the proposals can be determined. All proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments should include the following analysis:**
- a. Rationale: a detailed statement of what is proposed to be changed and why;**
 - b. Effect: a statement detailing the anticipated outcome of the change on the: geographic area affected, populations affected, and environment;**
 - c. Compliance: a statement confirming compliance with the:**
 - 1. Growth Management Act, including statutory references where applicable;**
 - 2. Countywide Planning Policies, including policy references where applicable;**
 - 3. King County Strategic Plan, including policy, objective or strategy references where applicable; and**
 - d. Public Review: an indication that the proposed policy amendment was included in the executive's public review draft or a statement of the public review process used to solicit comments on the proposal.**

This requirement is further codified in the King County Code and at 20.18.030.D states:

....The executive's recommendations for changes to policies, text and maps shall include the elements listed in Comprehensive Plan policy I-207 and analysis of their financial costs and public benefits, any of which may be included in environmental review documents....

The provisions of the Code expand the analysis to address the financial costs and public benefits. Given the high-level and long-term nature of the Comprehensive Plan policies, as well as the more detailed analysis conducted when policies are implemented through projects, programs or other enactments, the level of analysis is general. This analysis is shown in the "B. Effect" column of the subsequent table.

The analysis of the proposed 2018 Comprehensive Plan amendments are shown in the following table.

Proposed Policy Amendment	A. Rationale	B. Effect	C. Compliance	D. Public Review
CHAPTER 2 Urban Communities				
U-183 King County should actively pursue designating urban separators in the unincorporated area and work with the cities to establish permanent urban separators within the ((unincorporated))<u>incorporated</u> area that link with and enhance King County's urban separator corridors.	Fixes a typographical error. Cities have incorporated areas, not unincorporated areas.	None; fixed typographical error.	Language is corrected to be consistent with state law.	None; this is a non-substantive technical correction.
CHAPTER 3 Rural Areas And Natural Resource Lands				
R-683 King County may update the Mineral Resources Map to identify additional Potential Mineral Resource Sites only during the ((four)) <u>eight-year</u>	As part of the restructuring of the County's Community Service Area Subarea Planning program, and the creation of a new Department of Local Services, the County is proposing to shift its focus from countywide planning for the unincorporated area as whole,	This policy change shifts major update of Comprehensive Plan from a Four Year Cycle to an Eight Year Cycle. This is intended to increase capacity for subarea planning, and align the Comprehensive Plan with the Growth Management Act, regional and countywide	GMA: The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires an eight-year period review; this change makes the County's Comprehensive Plan cycle more consistent with GMA. CPPs: This eight year cycle is therefore consistent with the	Given the limited timeframe for responding to Ordinance 18602, Section 5, Proviso P2, public review will occur as part of Council review of the Proviso Response.

Proposed Policy Amendment	A. Rationale	B. Effect	C. Compliance	D. Public Review
<p>Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle.</p>	<p>to planning in smaller localized areas. This is intended to improve service delivery and governance in unincorporated areas.</p>	<p>planning activities, and align the County's planning with planning in the cities in King County.</p> <p>Financial cost: Shifting to an Eight Year Cycle, as proposed in this policy, when viewed in isolation from other changes, has potential to reduce staffing costs.</p> <p>Public benefit: Residents of the County can have more certainty in the adopted plan. Also, because the existing suite of land use tools – the Docket Process, the Zone Reclassification Process, the Four to One Program, the Annual Plan Amendment Cycle, and others – are proposed to remain unchanged, the public will continue to have annual access to land use planning. But, importantly, they can have certainty that these tools are implemented in a framework that have consistency and longevity.</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) as well.</p> <p>Strategic Plan: The change to an eight year cycle meets the Mission Statement that King County <u>provides fiscally responsible</u>, quality-driven local and regional services for healthy, safe, and vibrant communities. (emphasis added)</p> <p>Moving to an eight year cycle, rather than a four year cycle where amendments in recent years have been relatively minor even after a significant amount of work, is more fiscally responsible.</p> <p>It also fits with the goal of being an Efficient, Accountable Regional and Local Government. The change optimizes County operations through innovation and continuous improvement, and helps deliver consistent, responsive, equitable, high-</p>	

Proposed Policy Amendment	A. Rationale	B. Effect	C. Compliance	D. Public Review
			quality services to residents, cities, and districts.	
<p>R-650a The Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District is the first Agricultural Production District to undergo a watershed planning effort called for in R-650. King County shall implement the recommendations of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm and Flood Advisory Committee. The recommendations of the task forces and other actions identified in the final Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations will form the basis for a watershed planning approach to balance fish, farm and flood</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>

Proposed Policy Amendment	A. Rationale	B. Effect	C. Compliance	D. Public Review
<p>interests across the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District and an agreement on protecting a defined number of acres of agricultural land. The Advisory Committee, or a successor committee, will monitor progress of the task forces and will reconvene to evaluate the watershed planning approach to balancing interests prior to the next Comprehensive Plan Update. The policy issues and recommendations outlined in the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood Advisory Committee Report and</p>				

Proposed Policy Amendment	A. Rationale	B. Effect	C. Compliance	D. Public Review
<p>Recommendations are largely specific to the Snoqualmie Valley and are not intended to be applied broadly in other Agricultural Production Districts. Future Fish, Farm, Flood efforts focused in other Agricultural Production Districts will need to go through their own processes to identify barriers to success for all stakeholders in these geographic areas. R-649 continues to apply to the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District until the watershed planning effort outlined in the Fish, Farm and Flood recommendations is</p>				

Proposed Policy Amendment	A. Rationale	B. Effect	C. Compliance	D. Public Review
<p>complete. A policy reflecting the outcome of this effort shall be included in the next ((four)) <u>eight</u>-year cycle Comprehensive Plan Update.</p>				
<p>CHAPTER 12 Implementation, Amendments And Review</p>				
<p>I-202 Through the amendment process, King County Comprehensive Plan policies and supporting development regulations shall be subject to review, evaluation, and amendment according to an annual cycle and ((a four)) <u>eight</u>-year cycle in accordance with</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>

Proposed Policy Amendment	A. Rationale	B. Effect	C. Compliance	D. Public Review
<p>RCW 36.70A.130 (1) and (2).</p>				
<p>I-204 The ((four)) <u>eight</u>-year cycle shall consider proposed amendments that could be considered in the annual cycle and also those outside the scope of the annual cycle, proposed amendments relating to substantive changes to Comprehensive Plan policies and development regulations, and proposals to alter the Urban Growth Area Boundary in accordance with applicable provisions of Countywide Planning Policies.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>	<p>This is the same amendment as noted in R-683. See analysis above.</p>

Analysis of Text Changes per 20.18.030.D:

In addition to these policy amendments, related amendments are made to the text of the Comprehensive Plan. Text changes are identical or supportive of the policy changes, and do not introduce any additional substantive elements. Therefore, the aforementioned Rationale, Effect, Compliance, and Public Review analysis of the policy changes is relevant to the text changes. Additionally, a few non-substantive changes to fix typographical or grammatical errors such as the omission of a word, an incorrect cross-reference to another part of the Comprehensive Plan, or similar minor changes. The text changes are shown in Attachment A to the adopting Ordinance.