



**King County**

**Department of Permitting and Environment Review  
State Environmental Policy Act**

**ADDENDUM to an Existing Environmental Document  
For the 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies  
Prepared in Compliance with**

The Washington State Environmental Policy Act of 1971  
Chapter 43.21C Revised Code of Washington  
Chapter 197-11, Washington Administrative Code  
Revised SEPA Guidelines, Effective April 4, 1984, and  
Chapter 20.44, King County Code

## **FACT SHEET**

Action Sponsor: Dow Constantine, King County Executive

Contact Person: Karen Wolf, Sr. Policy Analyst  
Office of Performance, Strategy, & Budget  
206-263-9649

Lead Agency: Department of Permitting and Environmental Review  
35030 SE Douglas Street  
Snoqualmie, WA 98065

Proposed Action: Adoption of the 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies in accordance with the state Growth Management Act and King County Code Title 20. The Countywide Planning Policies serve as a framework for each King County jurisdiction's comprehensive plan and ensure countywide consistency with respect to land use planning efforts.

Responsible Official: Kimberly Claussen  
Department of Permitting and Environmental Review

Approvals Required: Adoption by the King County Council

EIS Addendum issued by: Department of Permitting and Environmental Review

Location of Background Data & Supporting Documents: Department of Permitting and Environmental Review  
35030 SE Douglas Street  
Snoqualmie, WA 98065

Date of Issuance: November 26, 2012

# **PROPOSED ACTIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

## **Overview**

The adoption of the 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies is a non-project action under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). This Addendum is not intended to satisfy individual project SEPA requirements for future site-specific land use or building permit applications. This Addendum does not significantly change the analysis of impacts and alternatives contained in the VISION 2040 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), nor does it identify new or significantly different impacts

## **Prior Environmental Review**

VISION 2040 is the regional long range growth management, environmental, economic, and transportation strategy for the central Puget Sound region. VISION 2040 contains a numeric Preferred Growth Alternative (referred to as the Regional Growth Strategy), the region's Multicounty Planning Policies, implementation actions, and monitoring measures. VISION 2040 recognizes that the Puget Sound communities are connected by shared ecosystems, transportation systems, and the economy. VISION 2040 also recognizes that the way land is developed affects air and water quality, the character of neighborhoods, and the cost of transportation.

The VISION 2040 FEIS analyzes the Regional Growth Strategy (referred to as the Preferred Growth Alternative in the environmental review), as well as four other conceptual growth alternatives, for accommodating forecasted growth. For each element of the built and natural environment, the FEIS describes existing conditions, potential environmental impacts associated with each alternative, potential measures to mitigate the impacts of growth, and potential unavoidable adverse impacts.

The VISION 2040 FEIS combines the information found in the Draft and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statements, which were released in May 2006 and July 2007.

The CPPs were first adopted by the King County Council in July of 1992. The CPPs 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 the CPPs to address issues not sufficiently dealt with in Phase I. Phase II was adopted in 1994. A consultant was retained to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Phase II of the CPPs. The EIS for Phase II analyzed the environmental impacts of the policies that served as the framework for the comprehensive plans for King County and the cities in King County.

## **EIS Addendum Environmental Review**

### **Summary of Proposal**

This Addendum is being issued pursuant to WAC 197-11-625 to meet King County's SEPA responsibility. The VISION 2040 FEIS evaluated alternatives and impacts that encompassed

similar general policy direction, land use patterns, and environmental impacts that are expected to be associated with the proposal identified in this Addendum.

The state Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the adoption of countywide planning policies to provide a countywide framework for ensuring coordination among local comprehensive plans. The King County CPPs address those issues that benefit from consistency across jurisdictions and those that are of a countywide or regional nature. The 2012 CPP update is consistent with and implements the Multi-County Planning Policies included in VISION 2040. The 2012 CPP update represents the first comprehensive review and evaluation of the CPPs since initial adoption in 1992. The major themes of the 2012 CPP update include:

- Promoting coordination and collaboration among jurisdictions;
- Establishing environmental sustainability as a foundational principle;
- Promoting economic growth and job creation;
- Integrating public health with land use and transportation; and
- Fostering social equity and environmental justice

## **Chapter Analysis**

### **Chapter 1. Environment**

The Environment chapter emphasizes environmental sustainability to strengthen “the region’s economic, social, and environmental resiliency, while enhancing our ability to cope with adverse trends, including the challenges associated with climate change.”<sup>1</sup>

This is a full revision of the Environment chapter from the current CPPs. The existing CPPs were written prior to adoption of major environmental advances such as adoption of Critical Areas Ordinances by local jurisdictions, the formation of the Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs), and the creation of the Puget Sound Partnership, among others. Consequently, many of the existing policies are no longer relevant and do not adequately implement the new direction found in VISION 2040.

The focus of the Environment Chapter is on those issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries, have cross-jurisdictional impacts, or require a strong policy foundation for continued coordination across the County. The policies in the Environment chapter are supported by additional environmental policies in the Development Patterns, Transportation and Public Services chapters.

The Environment chapter includes policies that address:

---

<sup>1</sup> As defined by VISION 2040, [http://www.psrc.org/assets/1735/Part\\_I\\_Toward\\_a\\_Sustainable\\_Environment.pdf](http://www.psrc.org/assets/1735/Part_I_Toward_a_Sustainable_Environment.pdf).

- Environmental Sustainability
  - Collaborative approaches to integrate development with ecological, social, and economic concerns to maintain healthy ecosystems and environments. Sustainable development is grounded in the Environment chapter and echoed as a theme throughout the CPPs.
  - Recognition of the importance of environmental justice principles.
- Earth and Habitat
  - Multi-jurisdictional coordination in designating and protecting critical areas, developing common methodologies for assessing habitat needs, and planning for open space and greenbelts that cross jurisdictional boundaries.
- Flood Hazards
  - Recognition of the role of King County Flood Control District and calls for coordinated flood hazard management efforts throughout the District.
  - Encouragement of multi-jurisdictional approaches that balance regional levee maintenance standards with public safety and habitat protection objectives.
- Water Resources
  - Support for the protection of water resources by calling on jurisdictions to coordinate land use and transportation plans and actions for the benefit of Puget Sound and its watershed.
  - Call for the establishment of a multi-jurisdictional approach to water quality funding and monitoring.
  - Call for water conservation efforts to protect natural resources and support a sustainable water supply.
- Air Quality and Climate Change
  - Encouragement of land use patterns and transportation systems that minimize air pollution and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Relevant policies are found in the Environment, Development Patterns, and Transportation chapters.
  - Call for a countywide GHG reduction target and establishment of a countywide measurement framework to monitor progress toward that target.
  - Recognition of the role of energy efficiency in climate change reduction strategies.
  - Call for a climate change adaptation strategy.

## **Chapter 2. Development Patterns**

Policies on development patterns address the location; types; design and form; and intensity of land uses throughout King County and its cities. They describe and implement a vision for future growth within the County, including its relationship to other functional elements of the CPPs such as transportation, public services, the environment, affordable housing, and public health. Development patterns policies are at the core of growth management efforts in King County, in furtherance of the goals and objectives of VISION 2040, and with recognition of the variety of local communities within which those goals and objectives are realized.

The Development Patterns chapter consolidates elements of several chapters in the current CPPs, including Land Use Pattern, Community Character and Open Space, and Contiguous and Orderly Development, as well as provisions of several Framework Policies. This new chapter responds to the policy direction in VISION 2040 and updates the policies to reflect current conditions. Subsections of the new chapter include Urban Growth Area; Centers; Urban Design and Historic Preservation; and Rural Area and Resource Lands.

The Development Patterns chapter includes policies that address:

- Urban Growth Area
  - Call for the designation of all land within King County as either Urban Land within the Urban Growth Area (UGA), Rural Land, or Resource Land.
  - Promotion of a pattern of growth within the UGA that is consistent with the regional vision.
  - Establishment of housing and employment growth targets for the 2006 – 2031 planning period.
  - Identification of the review and amendment processes for monitoring the UGA.
  - Reaffirmation of the buildable lands program pursuant to the GMA.
  - Call for joint planning, especially with regard to the annexation of unincorporated Urban Lands.
- Centers
  - Promotion of centers (countywide designated Urban Centers and Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers as well as locally designated centers) and compact development. Policy DP-28 requires that a proposed Urban Center meet the criteria of designation by the PSRC as a Regional Growth Center as well as additional countywide-established criteria (beyond those required by the PSRC) regarding geographic size, zoning regulations, and infrastructure plans to accommodate certain densities of job activity and housing units.

- Urban Design and Historic Preservation
  - Inclusion of elements of urban design and form intended to integrate urban development into existing built and natural environments in ways that enhance both the urban and natural settings.
- Rural Area and Resource Lands
  - Minimization of negative environmental impacts to Rural Lands; call for appropriate character and location of development in Rural Areas; and identification of strategies to permanently protect such lands.
  - Limit nonresidential uses located in the Rural Area to those that are demonstrated to serve the Rural Area, unless the use is dependent upon a rural location.

### **Chapter 3. Housing**

The CPPs provide a framework for all jurisdictions to plan for and promote a range of affordable, accessible, and healthy housing choices for current and future residents. The Housing Chapter is consistent with the policies and goals of VISION 2040 by promoting a diversity of housing types and housing that is affordable to both owners and renters in every demographic and income group. The Housing Chapter:

- Clearly establishes upfront a countywide need for affordable housing;
- Eliminates assigned affordable housing targets;
- Focuses on implementation strategies to meet the countywide need; and
- Establishes four steps to accomplish this approach:
  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.

Categories of Countywide Need for Affordable Housing by percentage of Area Median Income (AMI) are:

50-80% of AMI (moderate)	16% of total housing supply
30-50% AMI (low)	12% of total housing supply
30% and below (very low)	12% of total housing supply

The need for households with less than 30% of AMI was identified as a necessary focus for all jurisdictions. The provision of housing affordable to very-low income households will only be fulfilled with inter-jurisdictional cooperation and public subsidies. All jurisdictions within the County will be expected to work to meet this obligation both at the jurisdictional level and cooperatively on a countywide or sub-county basis.

### **Chapter 4. Economy**

The policies within the Economy chapter are consistent with the VISION 2040 framework and Regional Economic Strategy (RES).<sup>2</sup> VISION 2040 integrates the RES with growth management, transportation, and environmental objectives to:

- Support fundamental economic foundations, such as education, technology, infrastructure, and quality of life; and
- Promote the region’s specific economic clusters: aerospace, clean technology, information technology, life sciences, logistics and international trade, military, and tourism.
- Overarching Economy policies call for aligning local economic policies and strategies with VISION 2040 and the Regional Economic Strategy, supporting the adopted 20-year employment targets, and identifying and supporting the region’s industry clusters within King County.

The Economy chapter includes policies that address:

- Business Development
  - Support for business retention and development, including local government actions, such as predictability of local regulations, and public-private partnerships.
  - Integration of the healthy communities concept into the Economy chapter, calling for support of the regional food economy, including production, processing, wholesaling and distribution of the region’s agricultural food and food products.
- People
  - Support for education and workforce training, celebrating the economic advantage of cultural diversity, and addressing disparity in income and employment for those that are economically disadvantaged.
- Places
  - Reinforcement of the centers-oriented approach of the region’s growth strategy and supports infrastructure investments that are aligned with the region’s economic strategy.
  - Economic activity in Rural Cities (new policy EC-21).

---

<sup>2</sup> The Regional Economic Strategy is the region’s federally required comprehensive economic development strategy as well as VISION 2040’s economic functional plan.

## **Chapter 5. Transportation**

Goals and policies in the Transportation chapter build on the existing CPPs and the Multicounty Planning Policies in VISION 2040. The policies also support Transportation 2040, the region's functional transportation plan that identifies priorities for the region's major investment decisions.

The Transportation chapter includes policies that address:

- **Supporting Growth**
  - Emphasis on transit and other modes that provide alternatives to driving alone within and between centers, supporting the Regional Growth Strategy as described in VISION 2040.
  - Reinforcement of the critical relationship between land use and transportation and are intended to guide the decisions made at the state, regional and local levels that affect that relationship.
- **Mobility**
  - Promotion of the mobility of people — including transit-dependent populations—through a multi-modal transportation system that supports access and connectivity for all users.
  - Recognition of the County's regional economic value by supporting the effective management of the freight-mobility transportation system.
- **System Operations**
  - Protection of public investments through maintenance, preservation, and safety improvements of the existing transportation system to avoid costly replacement projects.
  - Promotion of the identification of reliable financing methods and capabilities, coordination of transportation investment opportunities, and monitoring of transportation investment performance over time.
  - Promotion of public health and safety by minimizing human exposure to vehicle emissions; reducing greenhouse gas emissions; integrating the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists in the local and regional transportation plans; and developing coordinated prevention and disaster response plans.
  - Encouragement of technologies, programs, and other strategies to optimize the existing infrastructure and promote clean transportation opportunities.

## **Chapter 6. Public Facilities and Services**

The Public Facilities and Services chapter consolidates elements of several chapters in the current CPPs, including Contiguous and Orderly Development, Community Character, and Siting Public Capital Facilities, as well as provisions of several Framework Policies. These

policies ensure that utilities provide complete service within the UGA in ways that do not promote growth in the rural areas.

The Public Facilities and Services chapter includes policies that address:

- Collaboration among jurisdictions
  - Recognition of cities as appropriate providers of services to the UGA, either directly or by contract.
- Utilities
  - Cost-effective provision utility services including water supply; sewage treatment and disposal; solid waste; energy; and telecommunications.
  - Promotion of conservation and efficient use of resources to sustain those resources for use by future generations.
  - Promotion of alternative technologies as appropriate to improve service delivery and protect public health and safety.
  - Prohibit sewer service in the Rural Area and on Resource Lands except when needed to address health and safety, or as an extension through the Rural Area only when necessary, or to serve existing school sites as provided in the School Siting Task Force Report.
- Human and Community Services
  - Encouragement of location and provision of human, community, and educational services and facilities in a manner to support the Regional Growth Strategy and distinguish urban communities from rural communities.
- Siting Public Capital Facilities
  - Encouragement of all jurisdictions to work collaboratively and consider environmental justice principles when siting regional capital facilities to avoid disproportionate effects on the communities in which they are located.
  - Locate schools, institutions, and other community facilities and services that primarily serve urban populations within the UGA except as provided in the School Siting Task Force Report.

## **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the proposal does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts described in the existing environmental documents. No additional significant impacts beyond those identified in the VISION 2040 FEIS are expected to occur.

# APPENDIX A DISTRIBUTION LIST

## **Federal Agencies**

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
U.S. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

## **Tribal Entities**

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe  
Puyallup Indian Tribe  
Tulalip Indian Tribe  
Snoqualmie Indian Tribe  
Suquamish Indian Tribe

## **State of Washington**

Department of Commerce  
Department of Ecology  
Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Transportation

## **Regional Agencies**

Puget Sound Clean Air Agency  
Puget Sound Regional Council

## **King County**

Dow Constantine, King County Executive

Bob Ferguson, King County Councilmember  
Larry Gossett, Chair, King County Councilmember  
Kathy Lambert, King County Councilmember  
Larry Phillips, King County Councilmember  
Julia Patterson, King County Councilmember  
Jane Hague, King County Councilmember  
Peter Von Reichbauer, King County Councilmember  
Joe McDermott, King County Councilmember  
Reagan Dunn, King County Councilmember

Office of the Prosecuting Attorney  
Department of Housing and Community Development  
Department of Permitting and Environmental Review  
Department of Natural Resources and Parks  
Department of Transportation / Road Services Division

## **Organizations**

American Planning Association  
Association of Washington Cities  
East Lake Washington Audubon  
Futurewise  
King County Building Trades Council  
League of Women Voters of Washington  
League of Women Voters, King County South  
League of Women Voters, Lake Washington East  
League of Women Voters, Seattle

Master Builders of King & Snohomish Counties  
Property Rights Alliance  
Puget Sound Energy  
Puget Sound Transit Consultants  
Rainier Audubon Society  
Seattle-KC Association of Realtors  
Seattle Transportation Choices  
Sierra Club  
Snoqualmie River Valley Audubon  
Suburban Cities Association  
University of Washington - Department of Urban Design and Planning  
Washington Conservation Voters  
Washington Environmental Council  
Washington Wilderness Coalition  
WASHPIRG

**Community Councils**

Upper Bear Creek Community Council  
Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council  
Greater Maple Valley Area Council  
North Highline Unincorporated Area Council  
Vashon-Maury Island Community Council  
West Hill Community Council

**Newspapers**

Seattle Times

**Planning Directors**

Algona: Elizabeth Chamberlain  
Auburn: Kevin Snyder  
Beaux Arts Village: Mona Green  
Bellevue: Dan Stroh  
Black Diamond: Steve Pilcher  
Bothell: Bill Wiselogle  
Burien: David Johanson  
Carnation: Linda Scott  
Clyde Hill: Mitch Wasserman  
Covington: Richard Hart  
Des Moines: Grant Fredricks; Denise Lathrop  
Duvall: Lara Thomas  
Enumclaw: Erica Shook  
Federal Way: Isaac Conlen; Margaret Clark  
Hunts Point: Mona Green  
Issaquah: Mark Hinthorn  
Kenmore: Debbie Bent  
Kent: Charlene Anderson; Fred Satterstrom  
Kirkland: Erick Shields  
Lake Forest Park: Steve Bennett  
Maple Valley: Ty Peterson  
Medina: Robert Grumbach  
Mercer Island: Scott Greenberg; George Steirer  
Milton: Subir Mukerjee  
Newcastle: Steve Roberge  
Normandy Park: Chad Tibbits

North Bend: Gina Estep  
Pacific: Jay Bennett  
Redmond: Rob Odle; Lori Peckol  
Renton: Chip Vincent  
Sammamish: Kamuron Gurol  
SeaTac: Cindy Baker; Mike Scarey  
Seattle: Tom Hauger  
Shoreline: Rachael Markle  
Snoqualmie: Nancy Tucker  
Tukwila: Jack Pace  
Woodinville: Dave Kuhl  
Yarrow Point: Mona Green

**Individuals**

*Includes all individuals who submitted comments to the GMPC or testified at a GMPC meeting during the review of the 2012 King County Countywide Planning Policies*