

INTERJURISDICTIONAL COORDINATION ELEMENT

<p><b>Proposed Draft Policy:</b> <b>proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed <del>((removed text))</del></b></p>	<p><b>Findings</b></p>
<p>GOAL IC <u>1</u> Promote the coordination of planning, financing, and implementation programs between the county and local jurisdictions including tribal governments.</p>	<p>Housekeeping update, correcting typographic error.</p>
<p>IC Policy 1.A.2 “The county shall work with cities, transit agencies, utility providers and other <del>((stakeholders))</del> <b>parties</b>, including <del>((private citizens))</del> <b>residents</b> to develop more detailed plans where local conditions and interests demand it – particularly within designated centers and transit emphasis corridors.</p>	<p>Revised for clarification and removal of the term stakeholder and resident. Rewording to comply with standard policy formatting structure.</p>
<p>IC POLICY 1.B.6 The county should consider interlocal agreements with cities to coordinate county and municipal planning under GMA within UGAs. These planning processes should emphasize public participation and the role of elected officials in local decision-making. Such interlocal agreements may address the following interjurisdictional issues:</p> <p>Subsection (a) Transition processes for planning and development projects and capital facilities projects;</p> <p>Subsection (b) Provision of clear, adequate public participation processes;</p> <p>Subsection (c) Provision for fiscal equity between the county and the cities and identification of funding sources, fees, and revenue sharing;</p> <p>Subsection (d) Coordination between and delineation of tasks and schedules for staff, planning commissions and councils in the review, adoption and appeal process;</p> <p>Subsection (e) Development of application procedures and determination of applicable regulations and standards to be used;</p> <p>Subsection (f) Solid waste management and planning authority; <del>((and))</del></p> <p>Subsection (g) Other issues such as SEPA review, appeals, transportation concurrency, surface water, and public safety<del>((=));</del> <b>and</b></p>	<p>Proposed revision to include minimum residential density standards to the list of interjurisdictional issues that may be addressed in interlocal agreements. This is in line with Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) such as Joint Planning (JP)-1, JP-2, JP-3, JP-4, JP-5, and Land Use Policy LU 2.A.1.</p> <p>CPP JP-1: Coordination of county and municipal planning particularly for urban services, governance, and annexation is fundamental in implementing the Regional Growth Strategy and GMA directives related to urban growth areas in RCW 36.70A.110. Interlocal agreements for this purpose are encouraged pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperation Act (chapter 39.34 RCW). These agreements should emphasize the importance of early and continuous public participation, focus on decision-making by elected or other appropriate officials, and review the consistency of comprehensive plans with each other and the Growth Management Act, where applicable. Appendix F provides an illustrative list of issues that could be considered appropriate for Interlocal Agreements.</p> <p>CPP JP-2: In the event of a proposed annexation of unincorporated lands in Snohomish County by a city or special district with no incorporated or district territory currently located in Snohomish County, an interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and any jurisdiction determined necessary by the County shall be in place, consistent with CPP JP-1 and Appendix F. This agreement shall be in effect before the city or district submits a Notice of Intent to Annex to the State Boundary Review Board (BRB) of Snohomish County or, if not subject to BRB review, prior to approval of the annexation to the city or special district.</p>

<p><b>Proposed Draft Policy:</b>  <b>proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed <del>((removed text))</del></b></p>	<p><b>Findings</b></p>
<p><b><u>Subsection (h) Minimum residential density standards.</u></b></p>	<p>CPP JP-3: Encourage policies that allow accessible, effective, and frequent interjurisdictional coordination relating to the consistency of comprehensive plans in a particular Urban Growth Area (UGA) and to the expansion of a UGA.</p> <p>CPP JP-4: The County and cities shall develop comprehensive plan policies and development regulations that provide for the orderly transition of unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) to incorporated areas in UGAs. Mutual agreements may be utilized to address governance issues and expedite the transition.</p> <p>CPP JP-5: The County and affected cities should collaborate on the development of appropriate urban design measures in unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.</p> <p>GPP LU 1.E.2: The county shall not support any proposed annexation by a city unless and until an annexation agreement has been signed by the county and said city ensuring the continued implementation of Policy LU 1.E.1 for the area to be annexed. [LU 1.E.1 calls for a minimum residential density within UGAs in most cases.]</p>
<p>Objective IC 1.C <del>((Ensure that))</del> <b>The county <u>should collaborate with cities and towns on</u> <del>((and city))</del> development regulations <del>((are consistent))</del> within UGAs.</b></p>	<p>Proposed changes provide consistency with CPPs JP-3, JP-4, and JP-5.</p>
<p>IC POLICY 1.C.1 The county <del>((shall))</del> <b>may</b> seek interlocal agreements with the cities which identify development standards for each UGA.</p>	<p>Proposed changes provide consistency with CPPs JP-3, JP-4, and JP-5.</p>
<p>Objective IC 1.G Promote and support public health initiatives in collaboration with partner agencies and community <del>((stakeholders))</del> <b>parties.</b></p>	<p>Revised for clarification and removal of the term stakeholder. Rewording to comply with standard policy formatting structure.</p>
<p>IC POLICY 1.G.1 The county should work with community <del>((stakeholders))</del> <b>parties</b> to promote increased access to and consumption of healthy and locally grown foods.</p>	<p>Revised for clarification and removal of the term stakeholder. Rewording to comply with standard policy formatting structure.</p>
<p><del>((IC POLICY 1.G.2 The county should coordinate with the Snohomish Health District and other community stakeholders on initiatives which promote physical activity and a greater understanding of the relationships between the built environment, transportation, and human health in Snohomish County.))</del></p>	<p>Proposed for repeal as the Snohomish Health District now Snohomish County Health Department and is no longer a separate jurisdiction. Other aspects of coordination, particularly regarding the 'built environment' and land use planning have been moved to LU 4.A.3 (new policy).</p>

DRAFT