

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

Prepared by the Interjurisdictional Staff Team (IJT)

May 30, 2018

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 proposed and adopted by the GMPC on July 23, 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). Land for schools is scarce within the UGA and the regulatory structure can pose barriers to building quality schools. 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 21 school districts with all or a part of their districts within King County. Of these, 11 districts held “PF-19A meetings” or otherwise communicated with the local jurisdictions in which the districts are located. Other districts reported regular ongoing communication with their local jurisdictions. The meetings offered opportunities for information sharing and collaborative thinking between the districts and the jurisdictions.

In those cases where a clear solution, despite best efforts, is not readily foreseeable to address needed school capacity, the school district and the affected jurisdictions must collaboratively prepare a joint strategy aimed at resolving the capacity shortfall.

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

	School District	Jurisdiction	Meeting Date	Meeting Outcome Summary
1.	<b>Lake Washington:</b> Forrest Miller Denise Stiffarm, Counsel	<b>City of Redmond:</b> Karen Anderson Jae Hill <b>City of Kirkland:</b> Eric Shields <b>City of Sammamish:</b> Kellye Hilde <b>King County:</b> Lisa Verner	January 17, 2018	No need at this time to consider a Joint Strategy per PF-19A. The District and the cities of Kirkland and Redmond will meet to identify potential solutions for needed school sites.
2.	<b>Issaquah:</b> Jake Kuper Denise Stiffarm, Counsel	<b>City of Issaquah:</b> Trish Heinonen Keith Niven <b>City of Newcastle:</b>	March 6, 2018	The District reserved the need for consideration of a Joint Strategy per PF-19A pending the outcome of ongoing property negotiations and

School Siting Report to GMPC  
May 30, 2018

		<p>Steve Osguthorpe <b>City of Bellevue:</b> Toni Pratt <b>City of Renton:</b> Jennifer Henning <b>City of Sammamish:</b> Kellye Hilde <b>King County:</b> Lisa Verner Karen Wolf</p>		condemnation activities for needed schools. The District and the cities of Issaquah and Sammamish will continue to meet independently as needed.
3.	<p><b>Northshore:</b> Traci Rogstad Denise Stiffarm, Counsel</p>	<p><b>City of Kenmore:</b> Brian Hampson <b>City of Woodinville:</b> Dave Kuhl <b>King County:</b> Lisa Verner</p> <p>Invited but did not attend: City of Bothell, City of Kirkland</p>	January 26, 2018	No need at this time to consider a Joint Strategy per PF-19A. The District requested to continue regular meetings (potentially annually at District's request) and for the cities to send development information on a regular basis.
4.	<p><b>Highline:</b> Scott Logan Rod Sheffer Denise Stiffarm, Counsel</p>	<p><b>City of Burien:</b> Chip Davis <b>City of Des Moines:</b> Laura Techico <b>City of Kent:</b> Hayley Bonsteel <b>City of SeaTac:</b> Jeff Robinson <b>City of Tukwila:</b> Nora Gierloff <b>King County:</b> Lisa Verner</p>	March 1, 2018	No need at this time for a Joint Strategy per PF-19A. The District will renew requests for consideration of a school impact fee ordinance to the cities of Burien, Des Moines, Normandy Park, and SeaTac.
5.	<p><b>Renton:</b> Scott Hodgins Stewart Schustermann</p>	<p><b>King County:</b> Chandler Felt Lisa Verner Karen Wolf</p>	February 23, 2018	No need at this time to consider a Joint Strategy per PF-19A. The District was interested in specific sites the County might know are available.
6.	<p><b>Federal Way:</b></p>	<p><b>City of Federal Way, City of Des Moines, City of Kent, City of Auburn, King County</b></p>		The District independently engaged in conversations with King County to discuss the modernization of Thomas Jefferson High School located in unincorporated King County. The District is meeting with each of its cities on school siting and school impact fee issues.
8.	<p><b>Seattle:</b> Richard Best Stephen Nielson Flip Herndon</p>	<p><b>City of Seattle:</b> Tom Hauger Jackie Kirn Diana Canzoneri</p>	<p>November 20, 2017 April 30, 2018 (meetings between elected officials from City and District)</p>	Public Process Partnership Agreement signed by City and District elected officials; agreement established school planning technical team that includes staff from both City and District who

				continue to work collaboratively on school capacity and siting.
9.	<b>Mercer Island:</b>	<b>City of Mercer Island:</b> Scott Greenberg		No issues; district is not planning to build new schools
10.	<b>Bellevue:</b>	<b>City of Bellevue:</b> Terry Cullen		City and District have ongoing meetings
11.	<b>Tukwila:</b>	<b>City of Tukwila:</b> Nora Gierloff		City and District have ongoing meetings

The following school districts indicated no current emergent school siting issues and/or that they were conducting regular meetings with their respective jurisdictions, and therefore no reason to meet at this time with local jurisdictions (as reported King County's annual School Technical Review Committee meeting in June, 2017):

1. Auburn School District
2. Enumclaw School District;
3. Fife School District;
4. Kent School District;
5. Riverview School District;
6. Snoqualmie Valley School District; and
7. Tahoma School District.

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

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

### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

This is the second round of PF-19A discussions between the school districts and the jurisdictions. The first round occurred in 2016 and was reported to the GMPC in a report dated June 1, 2016. As with the first round, the second round, with the potential exception of the Issaquah School District, did not result in any need for districts and jurisdictions to develop a joint strategy for addressing school capacity shortfalls.

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. Of the 40 jurisdictions within King County, representatives of 19 of them met with school district representatives or indicated they were already having ongoing meetings or conversations.

The next report to the GMPC will be in 2020 to identify changes that have occurred and any need for school districts and local jurisdictions to 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 GMPC has before it for adoption at its May 30, 2018 meeting a resolution outlining best management practices. This resolution was developed with the intent to address some of the common issues raised at several of the 2016 and 2017 PF-19A meetings and in an effort to proactively facilitate adequate school capacity as the region continues to grow.

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, but will need ongoing monitoring and review.