

Report to the
Growth Management Planning Council:
CPP PF-19A School/City/County Coordination Meetings

Revised 3/30/16

Prepared by the Interjurisdictional Staff Team (IJT)

March 30, 2016

Report to the Growth Management Planning Council:
CPP PF-19A School/City/County Coordination Meetings

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to bring to the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) the results of the school/city/county coordination meetings called for in Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) PF-19A. Specifically, Policy PF-19A calls for the agencies to work together to assess school capacity needs, identify future school sites within the UGA and, as necessary, prepare joint strategies for resolving school siting needs consistent with adopted comprehensive plan policies.

Background

In 2010 and 2011, the GMPC undertook the first comprehensive evaluation of the CPPs since their initial adoption to bring them into compliance with the multicounty planning policies (VISION 2040) adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council in 2008.

In September, 2011 the GMPC completed its review and voted to recommend an updated set of CPPs to the King County Council. However, members could not reach consensus on policies governing the siting of public facilities and services. At issue was whether public schools serving primarily urban populations should be sited in rural areas and whether such facilities should be served by sewers.

In order to address this longstanding policy issue, the GMPC agreed to set aside the policies related to siting public facilities and postpone its consideration until a task force comprised of school districts, cities, King County, rural residents and other experts could study the issue and report back to the King County Executive. The GMPC established guidance for formation of the School Siting Task Force in their Motion 11-2 on September 21, 2011.

The Task Force completed its work on March 31, 2012, issuing a report and final recommendations to the King County Executive.

To implement a portion of the Task Force's recommendations, the GMPC adopted two new policies in the CPPs as follows:

PF-18 Locate new schools, institutions, and other community facilities and services that primarily serve urban populations within the Urban Growth Area, where they are accessible to the communities they serve, except as provided in the March 31, 2012 School Siting Task Force Report. Locate these facilities in places that are well served by transit and pedestrian and bicycle networks.

PF-19 Locate new schools and institutions primarily serving rural residents in neighboring cities and rural towns, except as provided in the March 31, 2012 School Siting Task Force Report and locate new community facilities and services that primarily serve rural residents in neighboring cities and rural towns, with the limited exceptions when their use is dependent upon rural location and their size and scale support rural character.

Additionally, in 2013 the GMPC adopted a work program to implement the remainder of the Task Force recommendations. Specifically, the Task Force recommended the following:

“The Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) should identify policies and adopt a work program that commits jurisdictions to working together to identify future school sites within the UGA. These policies shall direct jurisdictions to use zoning and other land use tools to ensure a sufficient supply of land for siting schools”.

To implement the above Task Force recommendation, a **new policy PF-19A** was added (adopted by the GMPC on April 22, 2015 and subsequently ratified by the jurisdictions on October 31, 2015) to identify a process that commits local jurisdictions to working with school districts on collaborative planning:

Introduction

Public school facilities to meet the needs of growing communities are an essential part of the public infrastructure. Coordination between each jurisdiction’s land use plan and regulations and their respective school district[s] facility needs are essential for public school capacity needs to be met. The following policy applies countywide and requires engagement between each school district and each city that is served by the school district. The policy also applies to King County as a jurisdiction for areas of unincorporated King County that are within a school district’s service boundary. The policy initiates a periodic procedure to identify if there are individual school district siting issues and if so, a process for the school district and jurisdiction to cooperatively prepare strategies for resolving the issue.

PF-19A *Plan, through a cooperative process between jurisdictions and school districts, that public school facilities are available, to meet the needs of existing and projected residential development consistent with adopted comprehensive plan policies and growth forecasts.*

Cooperatively work with each school district located within the jurisdiction’s boundaries to evaluate the school district’s ability to site school facilities necessary to meet the school district’s identified student capacity needs. Use school district capacity and enrollment data and the growth forecasts and development data of each jurisdiction located within the school district’s service boundaries. By January 2016 and every two years thereafter, determine if there is development capacity and the supporting infrastructure to site the needed school facilities. If not, cooperatively prepare a strategy to address the capacity shortfall. Potential strategies may include:

- *Shared public facilities such as play fields, parking areas and access drives*
- *School acquisition or lease of appropriate public lands*
- *Regulatory changes such as allowing schools to locate in additional zones or revised development standards*
- *School design standards that reduce land requirements (such as multi-story structures or reduced footprint) while still meeting programmatic needs*

In 2017, and every two years thereafter, King County shall report to the GMPC on whether the goals of this policy are being met. The GMPC shall identify corrective actions as necessary to implement this policy.

Analysis

The requirement to accommodate student capacity primarily in the urban area is challenging, and has become even more so as King County continues to grow and as Washington state implements new policies impacting school capacity (for example, full-day Kindergarten and reduced class size initiatives). While this situation is most apparent in the school districts and cities that include both urban and rural areas, the need for increased school capacity is also apparent in many districts that are comprised only of urban territory.

There are 20 school districts with all or a part of their districts within King County. Of these, 17 districts held “PF-19A meetings” or otherwise communicated with the local jurisdictions in which the districts are located. The meetings offered opportunities for information sharing and collaborative thinking between the districts and the jurisdictions.

The following is a summary of the information submitted by local jurisdictions:

	School District	Jurisdiction	Meeting Date	Meeting Outcome Summary
1.	Lake Washington: Forrest Miller Denise Stiffarm, Counsel	City of Redmond: Rob Odle City of Kirkland: Eric Shields City of Sammamish: Jeff Thomas King County: Lisa Verner Karen Wolf	July 29, 2015	The group will reconvene discussions following the April 2016 Bond with agenda items dependent upon outcome of vote
2.	Issaquah: Jake Kuper Steve Crawford Denise Stiffarm, Counsel	City of Issaquah: Emily Moon Trish Heinonen Jeff Davis Hayes City of Newcastle: Tim McHarg City of Bellevue: Mike Kattermann King County: Lauren Smith	November 10, 2015	The group will reconvene discussions following the April 2016 Bond with agenda items dependent upon outcome of vote; District and City of Issaquah to have interim planning meeting

School Siting Report to GMPC
March 30, 2016

	School District	Jurisdiction	Meeting Date	Meeting Outcome Summary
		Lisa Verner Karen Wolf		
3.	Issaquah:	City of Renton: Paul Hintz		No response
4.	Northshore: Karen Mooseker Brian Fujiwara Laura Brent, Consultant Denise Stiffarm, Counsel	City of Bothell: Tom Burdett City of Kenmore: Brian Hampson City of Kirkland: Joan Liebermann-Brill City of Woodinville: Dick Zais Dave Kuhl King County: Lisa Verner	January 13, 2016	No need at this time to consider joint strategies for school siting issues but request to continue regular meetings (potentially annually at District's request)
5.	Snoqualmie Valley: Ryan Stokes Bill Davis Denise Stiffarm, Counsel	City of Snoqualmie: Mark Hofman Bob Sterbank, Counsel King County: Lisa Verner Karen Wolf City of North Bend Gina Estep (invited but unable to attend) City of Sammamish Jeff Thomas (invited but unable to attend)	December 9, 2015	No need at this time to consider joint strategies for school siting issues; parties agree continue regular meetings
6.	Kent: Dr. Calvin Watts Ralph Fortunato	City of Kent: Charlene Anderson Ben Wolters City of Covington: Richard Hart City of Maple Valley: Laura Philpot City of Tukwila: Nora Gierloff City of SeaTac: Mike Scarey King County: Lisa Verner	February 4, 2016	The district and jurisdictions want to meet at least annually to keep abreast of plans and developments. In general, the District's strategy to accommodate growth is to expand capacity at existing schools as well as tear down and rebuild old schools. The District is supportive of multi-storied schools.
7.	Seattle: Richard Best Joe Wolf	City of Seattle: Tom Hauger	Ongoing conversations; haven't had meeting yet	The district and city will get together to consider joint strategies for school siting issues
8.	Auburn: Bob Kenworthy	City of Kent: Charlene Anderson		No issues; no need to meet
9.	Auburn:	City of Auburn: Kevin Snyder		City and District are working on scheduling a meeting
10.	Highline:	City of SeaTac:		No need to meet; city has

	School District	Jurisdiction	Meeting Date	Meeting Outcome Summary
	Scott Hodgins Scott Logan Duggan Harman	Mike Scarey Jeff Robinson		representative on district's Capital Facilities Advisory Committee which meets/has been meeting October, 2015 through June, 2016. Any needed actions will be identified at the conclusion of the Advisory Committee work
11.	Highline: Scott Hodgins	City of Des Moines: Denise Lathrop Dan Brewer Laura Techico City of Burien Dan Trimble	February 17, 2016	Determined a need to further discuss land capacity; will have further meetings
12.	Federal Way: Jason Nelson	City of Des Moines: Denise Lathrop City of Federal Way: Michael Morales Isaac Conlen City of Kent Charlene Anderson	January 22, 2016	No issues identified
13.	Renton: Stewart Schustermann	City of SeaTac: Mike Scarey Steve Pilcher	February 17, 2016	No need at this time to consider joint strategies for school siting issues; only small portion of district within city boundaries
14.	Mercer Island:	City of Mercer Island: Scott Greenberg		No issues; no need to meet
15.	Bellevue:	City of Bellevue: Mike Kattermann		City and District have ongoing meetings
16.	Tukwila:	City of Tukwila: Nora Gierloff		City and District have ongoing meetings

The following school districts indicated no current school siting issues, and therefore no reason to meet at this time with local jurisdictions (as reported at King County's annual School Technical Review Committee meeting in July, 2015):

1. Enumclaw School District;
2. Fife School District;
3. Riverview School District; and
4. Tahoma School District.

Other school districts in King County that did not respond are:

1. Shoreline School District;
2. Skykomish School District; and
3. Vashon School District.

Conclusion and Next Steps

The GMPC recognized that a process was needed to start conversations between school districts and local jurisdictions and adopted CPP PF-19A last year in part for that purpose. The first step in the process calls for an initial conversation or meeting by January, 2016 to review growth projections and determine if there is development capacity and the supporting infrastructure to site the needed school facilities. The second step, if school siting issues are identified, is for the school district and local jurisdictions to develop a joint strategy for addressing the school siting issues. The GMPC must identify corrective action as necessary to implement the policy.

The results of the first step have been good but not with 100 percent participation. Of the 20 school districts in King County, representatives of 17 of them either participated in meetings with the representatives of local jurisdictions within the district boundaries or indicated no need to do so – a participation rate of 85 percent. Of the 40 jurisdictions within King County, representatives of 24 of them met with school district representatives or indicated they were already having ongoing meetings or conversations – a participation rate of 60 percent.

The next report to the GMPC will be in 2017 to identify the progress of school districts and local jurisdictions that did raise school siting issues to develop collaborative planning and joint strategies for addressing the issues. At that time, there may also be additional information regarding subsequent and continuing meetings between school districts and jurisdictions.

CPP Policy PF-18, as identified above, calls for schools to be located within the Urban Growth Area, for the most part. To address this policy as well as continue with the work identified in Policy PF-19A, the next steps will include collaboratively addressing some of the common issues raised at several of the district/jurisdiction meetings:

1. Review and consider zoning and building code amendments to facilitate school siting and address development/redevelopment of school sites in a manner that provides for efficient use of sites and predictability in siting considerations. Also consider code amendments to provide for more intensive use of existing sites for portable/temporary school buildings to assist school districts in accommodating rapid growth.
2. Review and consider structures and land feasible for potential joint use arrangements between school districts and jurisdictions to better accommodate school facility needs going forward.
3. Identify and review any regulatory or policy barriers to fully implement Policy PF-19A.

Overall, the GMPC realized the value of communications between school districts and local jurisdictions within King County. The improved communication that this report identifies demonstrates that both the goal of the CPPs as well as the capacity needs of the districts can be cooperatively addressed.

King County	
Auburn School District No. 408 also in Pierce County	Algona, Auburn, Black Diamond, Kent, Pacific
Bellevue School District No. 405	Beaux Arts, Bellevue, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Kirkland, Medina, New Castle, Redmond, Yarrow Point
Enumclaw School District No. 216	Black Diamond, Enumclaw
Federal Way School District No. 210	Algona, Auburn, Des Moines, Federal Way, Kent, Milton
Highline School District No. 401	Burien, Des Moines, Kent, Normandy Park, SeaTac, Seattle, Tukwila
Issaquah School District No. 411	Bellevue, Issaquah, New Castle, Renton, Sammamish
Kent School District No. 415	Auburn, Black Diamond, Kent, Maple Valley, Renton, SeaTac, Covington
Fife School District No. 888 also in Pierce County - Fife School District No. 417	Milton, Pacific
Lake Washington School District No. 414	Bellevue, Bothell, Kenmore, Kirkland, Redmond, Sammamish, Woodinville
Mercer Island School District No. 400	Mercer Island
Northshore School District No. 417 also in Snohomish County	Bothell, Kenmore, Lake Forest Park, Woodinville
Renton School District No. 403	Bellevue, Kent, New Castle, Renton, SeaTac, Tukwila
Riverview School District No. 407	Carnation, Duvall
Seattle School District No. 1	Tukwila, Seattle
Shoreline School District No. 412	Lake Forest Park, Shoreline
Skykomish School District No. 404	Skykomish
Snoqualmie School District No. 410	New Castle, North Bend, Snoqualmie
Tahoma School District No. 409	Black Diamond, Kent, Maple Valley, Covington
Tukwila School District No. 406	SeaTac, Tukwila
Vashon Island School District No. 402	