

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

AGENDA TITLE: GMPC Work Plan – Status Update

PRESENTED BY: Interjurisdictional Staff Team

SUMMARY

The approval of the 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies has given rise to a number of work plan items to ensure successful and timely implementation. These work plan items are guided by CPP policy language and direction from VISION 2040.

Interjurisdictional Team (IJT) staff recognizes that responsibility for these action items falls on multiple parties, *including* the GMPC, King County, and cities within the county. While IJT staff has taken a lead role in managing these work plan items, they each require a collaborative effort involving staff from King County, interested cities, and representatives of other relevant agencies. Following is a brief update on each of the major work program items currently being undertaken by the IJT.

BUILDABLE LANDS REPORT

The Growth Management Act (GMA) and the updated CPPs call for King County to conduct a periodic Review and Evaluation program commonly called “Buildable Lands.” Under the 1997 Buildable Lands amendment to the GMA, six western Washington counties, including King County, must analyze and report on the supply of land that can accommodate residential, commercial and industrial uses. King County published Buildable Lands Reports in 2002 and 2007. In 2006 and 2007, the GMPC was briefed on progress of the 2007 Buildable Lands Report (BLR) and acknowledged its completion late in 2007. The 2007 BLR was jointly prepared by King County and the Suburban Cities Association (now the Sound Cities Association) with assistance from the cities of Seattle and Bellevue.

King County’s next BLR is due in June 2014. There is no grant funding available for this BLR. The state Department of Commerce (DOC) has issued a memo recognizing the extremely limited resources available for the 2014 BLR, as well as the decline in construction activity during recent years.

King County will take advantage of the DOC option, dividing jurisdictions into those that already demonstrate sufficient growth capacity to meet targets, and those that do not. We will take advantage of the robust data available in the 2007 BLR for a majority of county jurisdictions and will carry forward that information into the 2014 BLR where it is still valid. County staff will assist other jurisdictions to prepare new analyses of land supply and capacity where necessary.

King County has put together a Buildable Lands team, surveyed each jurisdiction to agree on methods and sources for the 2014 BLR, and held a stakeholder meeting on May 16th. The stakeholders were engaged and asked clarifying questions on the methodology. Issues and concerns raised at the meeting will be brought to the IJT for their consideration and reply.

Next Steps

This is a progress report on work so far. The IJT is asking the GMPC to affirm that King County and its cities should utilize the DOC approach to the 2014 BLR. Staff will complete a draft 2014 BLR early in 2014 and report to the GMPC on conclusions regarding capacity to accommodate residential and job growth within the King County UGA. We will ask the GMPC to adopt or otherwise acknowledge the 2014 BLR once it is completed in June 2014.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The 2012 Countywide Planning Policies do not depend on explicit affordable housing targets. Instead of targets based on growth, as was used in the previous approach, a countywide need for affordable housing is established, which is specified within several income categories. All jurisdictions are working to achieve a proportional share of these needs through strategies tailored to local conditions. The CPPs prescribe a four-step process for cities to address housing needs:

1. Conduct an inventory and analysis of housing needs and conditions;
2. Implement policies and strategies to address unmet needs;
3. Measure results; and
4. Respond to measurement with reassessment and adjustment of strategies.

Next Steps

The IJT has convened a workgroup consisting of staff from local jurisdictions with housing expertise and other housing specialists to assist with the third step in the four step-process. This workgroup is focusing on identifying data sources that can be readily accessed by each jurisdiction so that numbers are reflective of a common database and progress toward housing goals can be monitored. This group is also evaluating updating the table of existing affordability levels in each jurisdiction and assisting with creating a table of the inventory of explicit affordable housing by jurisdiction. The workgroup is working closely with PSRC staff on our data needs.

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

In 2012, the IJT convened the Healthy Communities staff workgroup to explore ways of introducing the health-related CPPs to planners in King County. This is a timely effort because planners are now working on updating policies in their comprehensive plans to meet a June 30, 2015 deadline.

The workgroup decided to pick a subset of health-related CPPs (18 of 32 policies) and create a menu-like tool for planners (see example below). The tool is a table that cross-references each health-related CPP to specific information (e.g., model policies, health-planning resources, and community design ideas).

Next Steps

Once complete (Summer 2013), the Healthy Communities planning tool will be distributed to all cities in King County for their use. Accompanying the tool will be new “City Health Profiles”—health data and demographic information organized by city boundaries—so that planners can craft or modify policies and programs that help address the root causes of poor health in the communities in which they work.

Countywide Planning Policy (CPP)	Examples of Planning Strategies, Implementation, and Additional Ideas for Integrating CPPs into Comprehensive Plans	Health Connection
<p>DP-8 Increase access to healthy food in communities throughout the Urban Growth Area by encouraging the location of healthy food purveyors, such as grocery stores and farmers markets, and community food gardens in proximity to residential uses and transit facilities.</p>	<p><i>Strategies:</i> <u>Review of Food Planning and Policy for Comp Plans</u></p> <p><i>Implementation:</i> Zoning to manage density of healthy food retail uses</p> <p><u>City Zoning Codes for Urban Agriculture</u></p> <p><u>Urban Agriculture Land Use Background and Model Policies</u></p> <p><i>Additional Information:</i> <u>Food in Planning: Funding-Policies-Economic Growth</u></p>	<p>can influence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - nutrition - mental health

CLIMATE CHANGE

Countywide Planning Policies EN-17 and EN-18 direct the GMPC to establish a countywide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target and a measurement framework to measure progress towards that target. Staff from the nine cities of the King County-Cities Climate Collaboration (a voluntary partnership between King County and the cities of Issaquah, Kirkland, Mercer Island, Redmond, Renton, Seattle, Shoreline, Snoqualmie, and Tukwila), with support from staff from interested non-member cities, have been collaborating with the IJT to provide relevant information and recommendations to support implementation of EN-17 and EN-18. Staff from Climate Solutions' New Energy Cities Program are partners on this work and are helping integrate their experience working with communities across the PNW on establishing meaningful GHG emission reduction targets.

Research to date has provided information about (1) existing state, county and city greenhouse gas reduction goals, targets and requirements, (2) scientific background focused on the link between climate change impacts and different emissions reduction scenarios, (3) details about existing measurement frameworks and (4) a "solutions menu" that highlights example projects, programs, decisions and policies to illustrate how cities might achieve GHG reduction targets.

Next Steps

An initial meeting between the IJT and staff occurred in the Fall of 2012, and a second is scheduled for May 24, 2013. City staffers working on this issue have also developed "straw" recommendations and a supporting rationale that will help inform this IJT and GMPC work.