

1 Adopted: August 12, 2009
2 Vetoed: August 31, 2009
3 Veto Overridden: September 8, 2009
4 Effective: September 18, 2009
5

6 SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL
7 SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON
8

9 AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 09-044
10

11 AMENDING THE POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT AND LAND USE CHAPTERS OF THE
12 SNOHOMISH COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (GMACP)
13 AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS TO ELIMINATE PROVISIONS FOR FULLY CONTAINED
14 COMMUNITIES (FCCs) (GPP16 – FULLY CONTAINED COMMUNITIES)
15

16 WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.130 and .470 direct counties planning under the Growth
17 Management Act (GMA) to adopt procedures for interested persons to propose amendments and
18 revisions to the GMACP or development regulations; and
19

20 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council adopted chapter 30.74 Snohomish County
21 Code (SCC), "Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing," to comply
22 with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.130 and .470; and
23

24 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council has determined that the consideration of the
25 proposed amendments and revisions to the GMACP and development regulations would promote
26 a county purpose as established under RCW 36.70A.130, RCW 36.70A.470 and chapter 30.74
27 SCC; and
28

29 WHEREAS, in 2007, the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM)
30 released updated forecasts for Snohomish County's 2025 population projection that range from a
31 low of 769,525 to a high of 1,027,905, and lowered its medium ("most likely") 2025 population
32 projection for the county from 929,314 to 898,715; and
33

34 WHEREAS, in 2008 the Puget Sound Regional Council adopted an updated regional
35 growth strategy in Vision 2040, which includes updated population growth allocations
36 for Snohomish County; and
37

38 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council proposed GMACP amendments to eliminate
39 provisions for fully contained communities (FCCs), as proposal GPP 16, for consideration on
40 Final Docket XIII; and
41

42 WHEREAS, the Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) completed
43 the initial review and evaluation of docket proposal GPP 16 pursuant to SCC 30.74.030 and
44 transmitted those initial evaluations to the county council for its consideration in setting Final
45 Docket XIII; and

AMENDED ORDINANCE No. 09-044
AMENDING THE LAND USE AND POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT CHAPTERS OF THE SNOHOMISH COUNTY GROWTH
MANAGEMENT ACT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (GMACP) AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS TO ELIMINATE PROVISIONS
FOR FULLY CONTAINED COMMUNITIES (FCCs) (GPP16 – FULLY CONTAINED COMMUNITIES)

1
2 WHEREAS, on June 9 2008 and June 16, 2008, the Snohomish County Council held
3 public hearings to receive public testimony on proposed county and non-county initiated
4 amendments to the GMACP for consideration on Final Docket XIII including proposal GPP 16
5 Fully Contained Communities; and
6

7 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council, on June 16, 2008, approved, by Motion No.
8 08-238, a list of proposed GMACP amendments for inclusion on Final Docket XIII and
9 authorized the Snohomish County Executive, through the Department of Planning and
10 Development Services (PDS), to process Final Docket XIII, including GPP 16 consistent with
11 chapters 30.73 and 30.74 SCC; and
12

13 WHEREAS, GPP 16 requires corresponding amendments to the county population
14 growth targets in Appendix B, of the CPP's through an established process of consultation with
15 the Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT); and
16

17 WHEREAS, on August 20, 2008, the county council directed council staff to consult with
18 SCT on whether or not the proposed removal of the 15,000 FCC population reserve should be
19 reallocated to urban growth areas as part of proposal GPP 16; and
20

21 WHEREAS, on October 9, 2008, the SCT Planning Advisory Committee considered GPP
22 16 and recommended that if proposed GPP 16 is adopted by the county council, no reallocation
23 of population to urban areas should occur and the overall growth target should be reduced; and
24

25 WHEREAS, on October 14, 2008, the SCT Executive Committee considered GPP 16 and
26 recommended that if proposed GPP 16 is adopted by the county council, no reallocation of
27 population to urban areas should occur and the overall growth target should be reduced; and
28

29 WHEREAS, on October 22, 2008, the SCT Steering Committee considered GPP 16 and
30 recommended that if proposed GPP 16 is adopted by the county council, no reallocation of
31 population to urban areas should occur and the overall growth target should be reduced; and
32

33 WHEREAS, by Motion No. 08-682, the Snohomish County Council accepted the
34 recommendation of SCT that proposal GPP 16 should not include reallocation of population, and
35 instead should include reduction in the overall county population growth target as needed to
36 ensure consistency with the GMACP, the CPPs, and the GMA; and
37

38 WHEREAS, the concurrent amendments to Appendix B of the CPPs for GPP 16 were
39 completed through an established process of consultation with the cities through SCT on April
40 22, 2009; and
41

42 WHEREAS, pursuant to chapter 30.74 SCC, PDS completed final review and evaluation
43 of Final Docket XIII, including proposal GPP 16, and forwarded recommendations to the
44 Snohomish County Planning Commission; and

1
2 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Planning Commission held a public hearing and
3 received public testimony on Final Docket XIII on February 24, 2009; and
4

5 WHEREAS, on March 3, 2009, the Snohomish County Planning Commission deliberated
6 on Final Docket XIII at the conclusion of the public hearing on February 24, 2009, and voted on
7 the GPP 16 proposal but was unable to reach a majority to recommend approval or denial of the
8 proposed ordinance as enumerated in its recommendation letter of March 30, 2009; and
9

10 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council held a public hearing on July 8, 2009
11 continued to August 10, 2009, to consider the entire record, including the planning commission
12 recommendations on Final Docket XIII, and to hear public testimony on this Ordinance No. 09-
13 044.
14

15 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED:
16

17 **Section 1.** The county council makes the following findings:
18

- 19 A. The county council adopts and incorporates the foregoing recitals as findings as if set forth
20 fully herein.
- 21 B. The proposal by Snohomish County is to eliminate provisions for fully contained
22 communities from the GMACP – GPP and the county’s development regulations to preserve
23 rural character, reduce demand for urban services and infrastructure in areas that are
24 currently rural in character, and increase consistency between the county’s GMACP and the
25 multi-county planning policies.
- 26 C. The amendments to Appendix D, Table D-1 of the GPP of the GMACP as amended in
27 Exhibit F, pertaining to the reconciled growth going into urban areas where adequate public
28 facilities and infrastructure are in place to accommodate growth.
- 29 D. The proposal is generally consistent with the following goals, objectives and policy in the
30 GPP:
- 31 1. Goal LU 2, “Establish development patterns that use urban land more efficiently.”
 - 32 2. Goal LU 6, “Protect and enhance the character, quality, and identity of rural areas.”
 - 33 3. Goal TR 1, “Develop transportation systems that complement the land use element,
34 natural environment element and the economic development element of the county
35 comprehensive plan.”
 - 36 4. Objective HO 1.C, “Make adequate provisions for the existing and projected housing
37 needs of all economic segments of the population.”
 - 38 5. Objective NE 1.B, “Accommodate population growth in a manner that maintains and
39 protects elements of the natural environment.”

- 1 6. Policy CF 1.A.1, “The county shall extend facilities and services in a manner which
2 directs future growth to urban areas.”
- 3 E. The proposal is consistent with the following CPPs:
- 4 1. OD-1 “Promote development within urban growth areas in order to use land efficiently,
5 add certainty to capital facility planning and allow timely and coordinated extension of
6 urban services and utilities for new development”
- 7 2. RU-2, “Rural density and development standards will be based upon accommodating the
8 portion of the 20 year growth not accommodated within the urban growth areas. The
9 county will prohibit subdivision densities and patterns which preclude resubdivision to
10 urban densities.”
- 11 3. UG-3, “Ensure the final population allocation for UGAs reverses the pre-GMA trend of
12 an increasing share of the county’s new population locating in rural areas.”
- 13 4. UG-15, “Allow consideration of a Fully Contained Community so long as the population
14 allocation to cities, towns, and UGA’s plus the FCC does not exceed the high range of the
15 20 year urban allocated growth forecast.
- 16 a. The County may amend its comprehensive plan to incorporate criteria, not
17 inconsistent with RCW 36.70A.350 for considering and acting upon individual
18 FCC proposals. These criteria shall include as a minimum, but need not be
19 limited to:
- 20 1) New infrastructure is provided for and impact fees are established.
- 21 2) Transit-oriented site planning and traffic demand management
22 programs are implemented.
- 23 3) Buffers are provided between the new fully contained communities
24 and adjacent urban development.
- 25 4) A mix of uses is provided to offer jobs, housing, and services to
26 the residents of the new community.
- 27 5) Affordable housing is provided within the new community for a
28 broad range of income levels.
- 29 6) Environmental protection has been addressed and provided.
- 30 7) Development regulations are established to ensure urban growth
31 will not occur adjacent nonurban areas.
- 32 8) Provision is made to mitigate impacts on designated agricultural
33 lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands.
- 34 9) The plan for the new fully contained community is consistent with
35 the County’s development regulations established for the protection of
36 critical areas. (Added Dec. 10, 2003 – Amended Ord. 03-070)

1 b. The County will notify the appropriate city (cities) when an FCC will be
2 considered and consult with the city (cities) during the consideration of the FCC.
3 (Added Dec. 10, 2003 – Amended Ord. 03-070).”

4 F. The environmental impacts of the proposal are within the range of impacts analyzed by the
5 DEIS and FEIS during the Ten-Year Update to the GMACP in 2005. No new impacts have
6 been identified for the proposal, and SEPA requirements have been met through an
7 addendum issued on February 9, 2009, for Docket XIII prior to the public hearing before the
8 Snohomish County Planning Commission.

9 G. The proposal is consistent with OFM’s most recent population projection for Snohomish
10 County.

11 H. The county council includes in its findings and conclusions the final review and evaluation of
12 the proposal completed by PDS in accordance with chapter 30.74 SCC, which is hereby
13 made a part of this ordinance as if set forth herein.

14
15 **Section 2.** The county council makes the following conclusions:
16

17 A. The proposal by Snohomish County is to eliminate provisions for fully contained
18 communities from the GMACP and the county’s development regulations to preserve rural
19 character, to reduce demand for urban services and infrastructure in areas that are currently
20 rural in character, and to increase consistency between the county’s GMACP and the multi-
21 county planning policies so that it more closely meets the goals, objectives and policies of the
22 GPP.

23 B. The amendments to the GPP are consistent with the forecasted population and employment
24 growth for the succeeding 20-year period, consistent with the forecast promulgated by the
25 OFM.

26 C. The amendments are consistent with the GMA requirement that the GMACP of a county or
27 city be an internally consistent document (RCW 36.70A.070).

28 D. The amendments to the GMACP satisfy the procedural and substantive requirements of the
29 GMA.

30 E. The amendments maintain the GMACP’s consistency with the CPPs for Snohomish County.

31 F. The proposed amendments meet the goals, objectives and policies of the GMACP as
32 discussed in the specific findings.

33 G. SEPA requirements with respect to this non-project action have been satisfied through the
34 publication of an addendum to the Ten-Year Update.

35 H. The County complied with state and local public participation requirements under the GMA
36 and chapter 30.73 SCC.

1 **Section 3.** The county council bases its findings and conclusions on the entire record of the
2 county council, including all testimony and exhibits. Any finding, which should be deemed a
3 conclusion, and any conclusion which should be deemed a finding, is hereby adopted as such.
4

5 **Section 4.** Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Introduction section to the
6 Snohomish County GMACP – GPP, last amended by Ordinance No. 08-064, on June 3, 2008 is
7 amended as indicated in Exhibit A to this ordinance (“Amended Ordinance No. 09-044 Final
8 Docket XIII, Amendments to the Introduction to the GPP”).
9

10 **Section 5.** Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Population and Employment
11 chapter to the Snohomish County GMACP – GPP, last amended by Amended Ordinance No. 05-
12 069, on December 21, 2005, is amended as indicated in Exhibit B to this ordinance (“Amended
13 Ordinance No. 09-044 Final Docket XIII, GPP Population and Employment Chapter
14 Amendments”).
15

16 **Section 6.** Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the introductory text to the Land
17 Use chapter to the GMACP – GPP, last amended by Amended Ordinance No. 05-069 on
18 December 21, 2005, is amended as indicated in Exhibit C to this ordinance (“Amended
19 Ordinance No. 09-044 Final Docket XIII, GPP Amendments to the Introductory Text of the Land
20 Use Chapter”).
21

22 **Section 7.** Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Urban Growth Areas section to
23 the Land Use chapter to the Snohomish County GMACP – GPP, last amended by Amended
24 Ordinance No. 05-069 on December 21, 2005, is amended as indicated in Exhibit D to this
25 ordinance (“Amended Ordinance No. 09-044 Final Docket XIII, GPP Amendments to the Urban
26 Growth Areas Section of the Land Use Chapter”).
27

28 **Section 8.** Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Fully Contained Communities
29 section to the Land Use chapter to the Snohomish County GMACP – GPP, last amended by
30 Amended Ordinance No. 05-069 on December 21, 2005, is repealed as indicated in Exhibit E to
31 this ordinance (“Amended Ordinance No. 09-044 Final Docket XIII, GPP Repealing the Fully
32 Contained Communities Section to the Land Use Chapter”).
33

34 **Section 9.** Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, Appendix D, Table D-1 to the
35 Snohomish County GMACP – GPP, last amended by Amended Ordinance No. 06-117 on
36 December 20, 2006, is amended as indicated in Exhibit F to this ordinance (“Amended
37 Ordinance No. 09-044 Final Docket XIII, GPP – Appendix D, Table D-1 Amendments”).
38

39 **Section 10.** Snohomish County Code Section 30.21.025, last amended by Amended Ordinance
40 No. 07-029, on April 25, 2007, is amended to read:

41 **30.21.025 Intent of zones.**

1 This section describes the intent of each use zone. Snohomish County's use zones are
2 categorized and implemented consistent with the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan
3 establishes guidelines to determine compatibility and location of use zones. The intent of each
4 zone is established pursuant to SCC Table 30.21.020 and is set forth below in SCC 30.21.025(1)
5 - (4).

6 (1) Urban Zones. The urban zones category consists of residential, commercial, and
7 industrial zoning classifications in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) located outside of cities in
8 unincorporated Snohomish County. These areas are either already characterized by, or are
9 planned for, urban growth consistent with the comprehensive plan.

10 (a) Single Family Residential. The intent and function of single family residential zones
11 is to provide for predominantly single family residential development that achieves a minimum
12 net density of four dwelling units per net acre. These zones may be used as holding zones for
13 properties that are designated urban medium-density residential, urban high-density residential,
14 urban commercial, urban industrial, public/institutional use (P/IU), or other land uses in the
15 comprehensive plan. The official Snohomish County zoning maps prepared pursuant to SCC
16 30.21.030 shall use the suffix "P/IU" to indicate all areas in which these zones implement the
17 P/IU designation (e.g., R-7,200-P/IU). Single family residential zones consist of the following:

- 18 (i) Residential 7,200 sq. ft. (R-7,200);
- 19 (ii) Residential 8,400 sq. ft. (R-8,400); and
- 20 (iii) Residential 9,600 sq. ft. (R-9,600).

21 (b) Multiple Family Residential. Multiple family residential zones provide for
22 predominantly apartment and townhouse development in designated medium- and high-density
23 residential locations. Multiple family residential zones consist of the following:

- 24 (i) Townhouse (T). The intent and function of the townhouse zone is to:
 - 25 (A) provide for single family dwellings, both attached and detached, or different
 - 26 styles, sizes, and prices at urban densities greater than those for strictly single family detached
 - 27 development, but less than multifamily development;
 - 28 (B) provide a flexible tool for development of physically suitable, skipped-over or
 - 29 under-used lands in urban areas without adversely affecting adjacent development; and
 - 30 (C) provide design standards and review which recognize the special characteristics
 - 31 of townhouses, to ensure the development of well-planned communities, and to ensure the
 - 32 compatibility of such housing developments with adjacent, existing, and planned uses.
 - 33 Townhouses are intended to serve the housing needs of a variety of housing consumers and
 - 34 producers. Therefore, townhouses may be built for renter occupancy of units on a site under
 - 35 single ownership, owner agreements pursuant to chapters 64.32 or 64.34 RCW, or owner or
 - 36 renter occupancy of separately conveyed units on individual lots created through formal
 - 37 subdivision pursuant to chapter 58.17 RCW;
- 38 (ii) Low-Density Multiple Residential (LDMR). The intent and function of the low-
39 density multiple residential zone is to provide a variety of low-density, multifamily housing
40 including townhouses, multifamily structures, and attached or detached homes on small lots;
- 41 (iii) Multiple Residential (MR). The intent and function of the multiple residential
42 zone is to provide for high-density development, including townhouses and multifamily
43 structures generally near other high-intensity land uses; and

1 (iv) Mobile Home Park (MHP). The intent and function of the Mobile Home Park zone
2 is to provide and preserve high density, affordable residential development consisting of mobile
3 homes for existing mobile home parks.

4 (c) Commercial. The commercial zones provide for neighborhood, community and urban
5 center commercial, and mixed use developments that offer a range of retail, office, personal
6 service and wholesale uses. Commercial zones consist of the following:

7 (i) Neighborhood Business (NB). The intent and function of the neighborhood
8 business zone is to provide for local facilities that serve the everyday needs of the surrounding
9 neighborhood, rather than the larger surrounding community. Urban villages implemented under
10 chapter 30.34A SCC Urban Centers Demonstration Program are only permitted within the
11 Neighborhood Business (NB) zone;

12 (ii) Planned Community Business (PCB). The intent and function of the planned
13 community business zone is to provide for community business enterprises in areas desirable for
14 business but having highly sensitive elements of vehicular circulation, or natural site and
15 environmental conditions while minimizing impacts upon these elements through the
16 establishment of performance criteria. Performance criteria for this zone are intended to control
17 external as well as internal effects of commercial development. It is the goal of this zone to
18 discourage "piecemeal" and strip development by encouraging development under unified
19 control. Urban centers implemented under chapter 30.34A SCC Urban Centers Demonstration
20 Program are only permitted within the Planned Community Business (PCB) zone;

21 (iii) Community Business (CB). The intent and function of the community business
22 zone is to provide for businesses and services designed to serve the needs of several
23 neighborhoods;

24 (iv) General Commercial (GC). The intent and function of the general commercial
25 zone is to provide for a wide variety of retail and nonretail commercial and business uses.
26 General commercial sites are auto-oriented as opposed to pedestrian or neighborhood oriented.
27 Certain performance standards, subject to review and approval of an official site plan, are
28 contained in chapter 30.31B SCC;

29 (v) Freeway Service (FS). The intent and function of the freeway service zone is to
30 provide for needed freeway commercial facilities in the vicinity of on/off ramp frontages and
31 access roads of limited access highways with a minimum of traffic congestion in the vicinity of
32 the ramp. Allowed uses are limited to commercial establishments dependent upon highway
33 users. Certain performance standards, subject to review and approval of an official site plan, are
34 contained in chapter 30.31B SCC to protect freeway design;

35 (vi) Business Park (BP). The intent and function of the business park zone is to
36 provide for those business/industrial uses of a professional office, wholesale and manufacturing
37 nature which are capable of being constructed, maintained, and operated in a manner uniquely
38 designed to be compatible with adjoining residential, retail commercial, or other less intensive
39 land uses, existing or planned. Strict zoning controls must be applied in conjunction with private
40 covenants and unified control of land; many business/industrial uses otherwise provided for in
41 the zoning code will not be suited to the BP zone due to an inability to comply with its
42 provisions and achieve compatibility with surrounding uses. The BP zone, under limited
43 circumstances, may also provide for residential development where sites are large and where
44 compatibility can be assured for on-site mixed uses and for uses on adjacent properties;

1 (vii) Light Industrial (LI). The intent and function of the light industrial zone is to
2 promote, protect, and provide for light industrial uses while also maintaining compatibility with
3 adjacent nonindustrial areas;

4 (viii) Heavy Industrial (HI). The intent and function of the heavy industrial zone is to
5 promote, protect, and provide for heavy industrial uses while also maintaining compatibility with
6 adjacent nonindustrial areas; and

7 (ix) Industrial Park (IP/PIP). The intent and function of the industrial park and planned
8 industrial park zones is to provide for heavy and light industrial development under controls to
9 protect the higher uses of land and to stabilize property values primarily in those areas in close
10 proximity to residential or other less intensive development. The IP and remaining Planned
11 Industrial Park (PIP) zones are designed to ensure compatibility between industrial uses in
12 industrial centers and thereby maintain the attractiveness of such centers for both existing and
13 potential users and the surrounding community. Vacant/undeveloped land which is currently
14 zoned PIP shall be developed pursuant to industrial park zone regulations (chapter 30.31A
15 SCC).

16 (d) Industrial Zones. The industrial zones provide for a range of industrial and
17 manufacturing uses and limited commercial and other nonindustrial uses necessary for the
18 convenience of industrial activities. Industrial zones consist of the following:

- 19 (i) Business Park (BP). See description under SCC 30.21.025(1)(c)(vi);
- 20 (ii) Light Industrial (LI). See description under SCC 30.21.025(1)(c)(vii);
- 21 (iii) Heavy Industrial (HI). See description under SCC 30.21.025(1)(c)(viii); and
- 22 (iv) Industrial Park (IP). See description under SCC 30.21.025(1)(c)(ix).

23 ~~((e) Mixed-use zone. The mixed-use (MU) zone shall only be applied to properties~~
24 ~~approved for an fully contained communities (FCC) in accordance with Chapter 30.33A SCC.~~
25 ~~Allowed and/or prohibited uses for the MU zone shall be administered through the FCC permit~~
26 ~~Master Plan pursuant to SCC 30.33A.100(9).~~

27 ~~—————(i) Purposes. The MU zone is established to achieve the following purposes:~~

28 ~~—————(A) To enable FCC development, pursuant to this chapter, with imaginative site~~
29 ~~and building design in a compatible mixture of land uses that will encourage pedestrian rather~~
30 ~~than automotive access to employment opportunities and goods and services;~~

31 ~~—————(B) To ensure sensitivity in land use and design to adjacent land uses in the MU~~
32 ~~district, and avoid the creation of incompatible land uses;~~

33 ~~—————(C) To ensure that all development in the FCC gives adequate consideration to~~
34 ~~and provides mitigation for the impacts it creates with respect to transportation, public utilities,~~
35 ~~open space, recreation and public facilities, and that circulation, solid waste disposal and~~
36 ~~recycling, water, sewer and storm water systems are designed to adequately serve the FCC; and~~

37 ~~—————(D) To ensure that development protects and preserves the natural environment to~~
38 ~~the maximum extent possible, including but not limited to protection of the water quality of the~~
39 ~~county's rivers, contribution to the long-term solution of flooding problems, protection of~~
40 ~~wetlands and critical areas and protection of views of the county's foothills, mountains, open~~
41 ~~space areas, or other scenic resources within the county.~~

42 ~~—————(ii) Objectives. Each proposal for development within the MU zone shall be in~~
43 ~~conformity with the FCC permit master plan and advance the achievement of the foregoing~~
44 ~~purposes of the MU zone and the following objectives:~~

1 ~~_____ (A) The preservation or creation of open space for the enjoyment of the residents~~
2 ~~of the FCC, employees of business located within the FCC and the general public;~~

3 ~~_____ (B) The creation of attractive, pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods with a range of~~
4 ~~housing types, densities, costs and ownership patterns;~~

5 ~~_____ (C) The provision of employment opportunities and goods and services in close~~
6 ~~proximity to, interspersed with, or attached to residential uses;~~

7 ~~_____ (D) The provision of a balanced mix and range of land uses within and adjacent to~~
8 ~~the development that minimize the necessity for the use of automobiles on a daily basis;~~

9 ~~_____ (E) The use of highest quality architectural design and a harmonious use of~~
10 ~~materials;~~

11 ~~_____ (F) The provision of a range of street sizes and designs, including narrow streets~~
12 ~~designed principally for the convenience of pedestrians as well as streets of greater width~~
13 ~~designed primarily for vehicular traffic;~~

14 ~~_____ (G) The provision of commons, greens, parks or civic buildings or spaces as~~
15 ~~places for social activity and assembly for the community; and~~

16 ~~_____ (H) The provision of clustered development to preserve open space within the~~
17 ~~FCC while still achieving an overall desired density for the FCC.))~~

18 (2) Rural Zones. The rural zones category consists of zoning classifications applied to
19 lands located outside UGAs that are not designated as agricultural or forest lands of long-term
20 commercial significance. These lands have existing or planned rural services and facilities, and
21 rural fire and police protection services. Rural zones may be used as holding zones for
22 properties that are primarily a transition area within UGAs on steep slopes adjacent to non-UGA
23 lands designated rural or agriculture by the comprehensive plan. Rural zones consist of the
24 following:

25 (a) Rural Diversification (RD). The intent and function of the rural diversification zone is
26 to provide for the orderly use and development of the most isolated, outlying rural areas of the
27 county and at the same time allow sufficient flexibility so that traditional rural land uses and
28 activities can continue. These areas characteristically have only rudimentary public services and
29 facilities, steep slopes and other natural conditions, which discourage intense development, and a
30 resident population, which forms an extremely rural and undeveloped environment. The resident
31 population of these areas is small and highly dispersed. The zone is intended to protect,
32 maintain, and encourage traditional and appropriate rural land uses, particularly those which
33 allow residents to earn a satisfactory living on their own land. The following guidelines apply:

34 (i) a minimum of restrictions shall be placed on traditional and appropriate rural land
35 uses;

36 (ii) the rural character of these outlying areas will be protected by carefully regulating
37 the size, location, design, and timing of large-scale, intensive land use development; and

38 (iii) large residential lots shall be required with the intent of preserving a desirable
39 rural lifestyle as well as preventing intensive urban- and suburban-density development, while
40 also protecting the quality of ground and surface water supplies and other natural resources;

41 (b) Rural Resource Transition - 10 Acre (RRT-10). The intent and function of the rural
42 resource transition - 10 acre zone is to implement the rural residential-10 (resource transition)
43 designation and policies in the comprehensive plan, which identify and designate rural lands with
44 forestry resource values as a transition between designated forest lands and rural lands;

1 (c) Rural-5 Acre (R-5). The intent and function of the rural-5 acre zone is to maintain
2 rural character in areas that lack urban services. Land zoned R-5 and having an RA overlay,
3 depicted as R-5-RA on the official zoning map, is a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)
4 receiving area and, consistent with the comprehensive plan, will be retained in the R-5 RA zone
5 until regulatory controls are in place which ensure that TDR certificates issued pursuant to SCC
6 30.35A.050 will be required for development approvals within the receiving area;

7 (d) Rural Business (RB). The intent and function of the rural business zone is to permit
8 the location of small-scale commercial retail businesses and personal services which serve a
9 limited service area and rural population outside established UGAs. This zone is to be
10 implemented as a "floating zone" and will be located where consistent with specific locational
11 criteria. The rural business zone permits small-scale retail sales and services located along
12 county roads on small parcels that serve the immediate rural residential population, and for a new
13 rural business, are located two and one-half miles from an existing rural business, rural freeway
14 service zone, or commercial designation in the rural area. Rural businesses, which serve the
15 immediate rural population, may be located at crossroads of county roads, state routes, and major
16 arterials;

17 (e) Clearview Rural Commercial (CRC). The intent and function of the CRC zone is to
18 permit the location of commercial businesses and services that primarily serve the rural
19 population within the defined boundary established by the CRC land use designation. Uses and
20 development are limited to those compatible with existing rural uses that do not require urban
21 utilities and services.

22 (f) Rural Freeway Service (RFS). The intent and function of the rural freeway service
23 zone is to permit the location of small-scale, freeway-oriented commercial services in the
24 vicinity of on/off ramp frontages and access roads of interstate highways in areas outside a
25 designated UGA boundary and within rural areas of the county. Permitted uses are limited to
26 commercial establishments dependent upon highway users; and

27 (g) Rural Industrial (RI). The intent and function of the rural industrial zone is to provide
28 for small-scale light industrial, light manufacturing, recycling, mineral processing, and resource-
29 based goods production uses that are compatible with rural character and do not require an urban
30 level of utilities and services.

31 (3) Resource Zones. The resource zones category consists of zoning classifications that
32 conserve and protect lands useful for agriculture, forestry, or mineral extraction or lands which
33 have long-term commercial significance for these uses. Resource zones consist of the following:

34 (a) Forestry (F). The intent and function of the forestry zone is to conserve and protect
35 forest lands for long-term forestry and related uses. Forest lands are normally large tracts under
36 one ownership and located in areas outside UGAs and away from residential and intense
37 recreational use;

38 (b) Forestry and Recreation (F&R). The intent and function of the forestry and recreation
39 zone is to provide for the development and use of forest land for the production of forest
40 products as well as certain other compatible uses such as recreation, including recreation uses
41 where remote locations may be required, and to protect publicly-owned parks in UGAs;

42 (c) Agriculture-10 Acre (A-10). The intent and function of the agricultural-10 acre zone
43 is:

1 (i) To implement the goals and objectives of the County General Policy Plan, which
2 include the goals of protecting agricultural lands and promoting agriculture as a component of
3 the County economy;

4 (ii) To protect and promote the continuation of farming in areas where it is already
5 established and in locations where farming has traditionally been a viable component of the local
6 economy; and

7 (iii) To permit in agricultural lands, with limited exceptions, only agricultural land uses
8 and activities and farm-related uses that provide a support infrastructure for farming, or that
9 support, promote or sustain agricultural operations and production including compatible
10 accessory commercial or retail uses on designated agricultural lands.

11 (iv) Allowed uses include, but are not limited to:

12 (A) Storage and refrigeration of regional agricultural products;

13 (B) Production, sales and marketing of value-added agricultural products derived
14 from regional sources;

15 (C) Supplemental sources of on-farm income that support and sustain on-farm
16 agricultural operations and production;

17 (D) Support services that facilitate the production, marketing and distribution of
18 agricultural products;

19 (E) Off farm and on-farm sales and marketing of predominately regional
20 agricultural products from one or more producers, agriculturally related experiences, products
21 derived from regional agricultural production, products including locally made arts and crafts,
22 and ancillary sales or service activities.

23 (F) Accessory commercial or retail uses which shall be accessory to the growing
24 of crops or raising of animals and which shall sell products predominately produced on-site,
25 agricultural experiences, or products, including arts and crafts, produced on-site. Accessory
26 commercial or retail sales shall offer for sale a significant amount of products or services
27 produced on-site.

28 (v) Allowed uses shall comply with all of the following standards:

29 (A) The uses shall be compatible with resource land service standards.

30 (B) The allowed uses shall be located, designed and operated so as not to interfere
31 with normal agricultural practices.

32 (C) The uses may operate out of existing or new buildings with parking and other
33 supportive uses consistent with the size and scale of agricultural buildings but shall not otherwise
34 convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.

35 (d) Mineral Conservation (MC). The intent and function of the mineral conservation zone
36 is to comprehensively regulate excavations within Snohomish County. The zone is designed to
37 accomplish the following:

38 (i) preserve certain areas of the county which contain minerals of commercial
39 quality and quantity for mineral conservation purposes and to prevent incompatible land use
40 development prior to the extraction of such minerals and materials and to prevent loss forever of
41 such natural resources;

42 (ii) preserve the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan by setting certain
43 guidelines and standards for location of zones and under temporary, small-scale conditions to
44 permit other locations by conditional use permit;

1 (iii) permit the necessary processing and conversion of such material and minerals to
2 marketable products;

3 (iv) provide for protection of the surrounding neighborhood, ecological and aesthetic
4 values, by enforcing controls for buffering and for manner and method of operation; and

5 (v) preserve the ultimate suitability of the land from which natural deposits are
6 extracted for rezones and land usages consistent with the goals and objectives of the
7 comprehensive plan.

8 (4) Other Zones: The other zones category consists of existing zoning classifications that
9 are no longer primary implementing zones but may be used in special circumstances due to
10 topography, natural features, or the presence of extensive critical areas. Other zones consist of
11 the following:

12 (a) Suburban Agriculture-1 Acre (SA-1);

13 (b) Rural Conservation (RC);

14 (c) Rural Use (RU);

15 (d) Residential 20,000 sq. ft. (R-20,000);

16 (e) Residential 12, 500 sq. ft. (R-12,500); and

17 (f) Waterfront beach (WFB).

18 **Section 11.** Chapter 30.33A of the Snohomish County Code, last amended by Amended
19 Emergency Ordinance No. 09-036, on May 6, 2009, is repealed.

20 **Section 12.** Snohomish County Code Section 30.70.110, last amended by Emergency Ordinance
21 No. 04-019, on February 11, 2004, is amended to read:

22 **30.70.110 Processing timelines.**

23 (1) Notice of final decision on a project permit application shall issue within 120 days from
24 when the permit application is determined to be complete, unless otherwise provided by this
25 section or state law.

26 (2) In determining the number of days that have elapsed after an application is complete, the
27 following periods shall be excluded:

28 (a) Any period during which the county asks the applicant to correct plans, perform required
29 studies, or provide additional required information. The period shall be calculated from the date
30 the county mails notification to the applicant of the need for additional information until the date
31 the county determines whether the additional information satisfies the request for information, or
32 14 days after the applicant supplies the information to the county, whichever is earlier. If the
33 information submitted by the applicant under this subsection is insufficient, the county shall mail
34 notice to the applicant of the deficiencies and the provisions of this subsection shall apply as if a
35 new request for information had been made;

36 (b) Any period during which an environmental impact statement is being prepared;

37 (c) A period, not to exceed 30 calendar days, during which a code interpretation is processing
38 in conjunction with an underlying permit application pursuant to chapter 30.83 SCC.

39 (d) The period specified for administrative appeals of project permits;

40 (e) Any period during which processing of an application is suspended pursuant to SCC

- 1 30.70.045(1)(b); and
2 (f) Any period of time mutually agreed upon by the applicant and the county.
3 (3) The time periods established by this section shall not apply to a project permit application:
4 (a) That requires an amendment to the comprehensive plan or a development regulation in
5 order to obtain approval;
6 (b) ~~((That requires approval of a new fully contained community as provided in RCW~~
7 ~~36.70A.350, a master planned resort as provided in RCW 36.70A.360;~~
8 ~~—(e)))~~ That is substantially revised by the applicant, in which case a new 120-day time period
9 shall start from the date at which the revised project application is determined to be complete;
10 ~~((d))~~(c) That requires approval of a development agreement by the county council;
11 ~~((e))~~(d) When the applicant consents to an extension; or
12 ~~((f))~~(e) During any period necessary for reconsideration of a hearing examiner's decision.
13 (4) Subject to all other requirements of this section, notice of final decision on an application
14 for a boundary line adjustment shall be issued within 45 days after the application is determined
15 complete.
16 (5) The county shall notify the applicant in writing if a notice of final decision on the project
17 has not been made within the time limits specified in this section. The notice shall include a
18 statement of reasons why the time limits have not been met and an estimated date of issuance of
19 a notice of final decision.
20 (6) Failure of the county to make a final decision within the timelines specified by this chapter
21 shall not create liability for damages.

22 **Section 13.** Snohomish County Code Section 30.86.615, adopted by Amended Ordinance No.
23 05-101 on December 21, 2005, is repealed.

24
25 **Section 14.** Snohomish County Code Section 30.86.616, adopted by Amended Ordinance No.
26 05-101 on December 21, 2005, is repealed.

27
28 **Section 15.** Snohomish County Code Section 30.91F.525, adopted by Amended Ordinance No.
29 05-101 on December 21, 2005, is repealed.

30
31 **Section 16.** Snohomish County Code Section 30.91S.085, adopted by Amended Ordinance No.
32 05-101 on December 21, 2005, is repealed.

33
34 **Section 17.** The county council directs the Code Reviser to update SCC 30.10.060 pursuant to
35 SCC 1.02.020(3).

36
37 **Section 18.** Severability. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance shall be
38 held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the Growth Management Hearings Board, or a court of
39 competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or
40 constitutionality of any other section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance. Provided,
41 however, that if any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is held to be invalid by
42 the Board or court of competent jurisdiction, then the section, sentence, clause or phrase in effect
43 prior to the effective date of this ordinance shall be in full force and effect for that individual
44 section, sentence, clause or phrase as if this ordinance had never been adopted.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

PASSED this 12th day of August, 2009.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL
Snohomish County, Washington

Mike Cooper
Council Chair

ATTEST:

Barbara Sikorski
Asst. Clerk of the Council

- APPROVED
- EMERGENCY
- VETOED

DATE: August 31, 2009

Aaron Reardon
Snohomish County Executive

ATTEST:

Cora Palmer

Veto Overridden by a vote of 4 to 1 on
September 8, 2009

Approved as to form only:

Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Exhibit A
Amended Ordinance No. 09-044
Final Docket XIII, Amendments to the Introduction to the GPP
GPP 16 Fully Contained Communities

Introduction to the 10-Year Update of the Plan

This introduction provides a general overview of the Snohomish County General Policy Plan (GPP) at the time of the 10-year update of the plan. Introductory text is provided with each section and element of the GPP. Introductory text is intended to provide context and reference to relevant documents and not to provide policy or policy direction. It represents a “snapshot in time” of the county’s dynamic comprehensive plan, taken in the year 2005. The original introduction to the 1995 GPP, which provides extensive background on the GMA and represents another snapshot in time 10 years ago, has been preserved in Appendix G at the back of this document for historical reference purposes. A 10-year update of local comprehensive plans is required by the state Growth Management Act (GMA) to address new population and employment growth forecasts for a new 20-year planning period. The new “horizon” for this updated plan is now the year 2025.

The "snapshot in time" taken in 1995, the date of the adoption of the first comp plan and this 2005 snapshot shows significant differences. An analysis of the two snapshots has guided the evolution of the 1995 plan into the 2025 plan.

Resource Lands

Distinctive geomorphic forms have determined the county's overall character which is unlike other Puget Sound counties.

These landforms have been and are the basis for the settlement patterns, economic vitality and land use. The scenic backdrop of the Cascade Mountains with their forest cover is a visual reminder of both the aesthetic and the economic benefits of forestry. The vitality of historical forestry carried forward to the 1995 plan, and it remains economically important today. This plan continues the 1995 recognition and conservation of the forest boundaries, land uses and zoning that enables forestry to remain a viable industry, as long as the market requires it and the land is stewarded.

Secondly, the glacial, volcanic, and other geological forces left rich resources of gravel, sand and hard rock as well as some precious minerals scattered throughout the county. In the early 19th century, these resources drew settlers, fueled the economy and caused the establishment of small towns. The 1995 plan began the process of identifying and classifying these mineral rich areas in the county. This plan continues that process, with an updated inventory of the resources, goals and policies for enabling the extraction of resources in appropriate areas, the transfer of these products to markets, and the reclaiming of the areas. The inventory of the resources indicates that the county's sand, gravel and hardrock sources could meet market demands for 20 years. Like forestry, the

mineral resources of the county are economically important.

Thirdly, the rich soils, mild climate and general abundance of water provided the third resource of historical significance--the agricultural areas of the county. As with minerals and forestry, the agricultural resources drew settlers to the county, and present day citizens of Snohomish County are still deeply connected to farming and the farm lands. Importantly, these areas are as visually dominant throughout the county as are the forested lands discussed above. The 1995 plan identified upland agriculture and riverway agriculture, classified and conserved these areas. According to the U.S. Census of Agriculture, the acreage in farming has fallen over the last 60 years from 195,000 acres in 1945, to 69,000 acres actually in farm use in 2002. From 1945 to 1992, the average loss was about 2,600 acres a year. After 1992 it was 550 acres a year. Since adoption of GMA in 1995, the average loss is about 500 acres per year. Agricultural economists have noted that since the passage of the 1995 plan, the rate of conversion has slowed, thus helping to preserve the land base.

However, in the ten years that have passed, market shifts, increased cost of business, real estate forces and changing needs have impacted farmers, causing some to leave the industry and the area. Farming is at a crossroads. Clearly, it needs encouragement if it is to remain viable into the future. This plan continues the 1995 conservation measures for farming and has initiated some new goals and programs to encourage the industry.

Rural Areas

Snohomish County has an enviable rural land base, and many citizens enjoy and

prefer the rural lifestyles. The 1995 plan recognized this rural area as an important part of the quality of life of the county. Clearly the goals and policies of the 1995 plan helped to reverse the pre-GMA trend forecasts that showed 28% of the county's population growth occurring in rural areas. The 1995 Plan was based on a growth allocation that directed 15% of the county's population growth into the rural areas. Analysis of actual growth patterns experienced during the 1992-2004 period shows that only 13% of total population growth has occurred outside the UGAs. This dramatic shift in pre-GMA and post-GMA growth patterns strongly suggests that the county's plan has been a significant force for preservation of the county's rural lands.

Urban Areas

Snohomish County has 22 cities, all of which are classified as urban areas in the 1995 plan. Most of the cities have urban growth areas around them which allow for future expansion. In addition, the county has a large unincorporated urban area, also classified as the Southwest urban growth area. (SWUGA). The 1995 plan established goals and policies to continue the vitality of the cities through infill, growth and expansion for employment and population. Predicated upon the population and employment growth targets for the urban areas detailed in the Countywide Planning Policies, the plan envisioned that the unincorporated urban areas and the cities would together accommodate 85% of the county's total population growth. Growth Monitoring Reports prepared annually by the county following the plan's adoption, have shown that 87% of the population growth did occur in the urban areas from 1992-2004.

The updated plan continues to support the cities in accommodating new growth through infill of their present corporate boundaries and infill and modest expansion of their Urban Growth Areas. The unincorporated UGA's are also only modestly expanded in this updated plan primarily because analyses have shown that most of the projected population and employment growth can be accommodated within the current UGA boundaries, and through appropriate adjustments to the urban land use designations within them. Some

Some intermediate steps must be taken however, before that transfer will be completed. A coherent planning system must be established which addresses 13 earlier subarea plans.

A second important intermediate step for the county is the recognition that its urban zoning and building codes need revision to encourage higher standards of design and development. New goals and policies in the urban design, interjurisdictional cooperation, urban land use and centers sections of this update address this new initiative.

Newer forms of land use can also encourage higher urban design standards and make the areas more suitable for annexation. The 1995 plan goals and policies encouraged centers with identifiable public realms, design standards, neighborhood compatibility, a mixture of residential, commercial and office uses, and pedestrian friendly facilities. Very recently, the concept of a mixed-use center has reached some market maturity and several new urban centers have been built as envisioned by the plan. This update builds on this earlier success and adds goals and policies on centers development. New areas where

UGA expansions are needed, however, to accommodate individual city UGA growth targets, to provide housing opportunities, additional economic development options for employment growth, and to provide a reasonable safety factor for forecasting error.

In addition, this updated plan envisions that the unincorporated urban areas will annex to cities during the lifetime of the plan, 2005-2025. Goals and policies establish the intention of the county to transfer these lands to the cities.

mixed use should be encouraged are designated on the land use map. Many changes are found in the Centers section of the Land Use Chapter.

A third intermediate step is forging partnerships with the cities to evaluate how to transition the unincorporated urban areas into each city. The county and cities have begun early discussions, and this plan sets forth some goals and policies to enable a smooth transition of these areas. This is found in the Interjurisdictional Coordination section of the updated plan.

The GPP provides overall policy direction for all of the various components of the GMA Comprehensive Plan, and includes goals and policies for all of the plan elements, the future land use map, and other supporting maps. The other major components of the GMA Comprehensive Plan, which are contained in separate volumes, include:

- Transportation Element,
- Capital Facilities Plan,
- Capital Improvement Program, and
- Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Plan.

These plan elements work together to guide the public and private development which is necessary to support the projected population and employment growth for Snohomish County. Each plan element addresses specific GMA requirements for local comprehensive plans, and implements the general policy guidance of the Countywide Planning Policies.

The county's GMA comprehensive plan was originally adopted in 1995 and has been amended several times since to include more detailed land use plans for several UGAs. These UGA plans provide greater detail in specific geographical areas, particularly for land uses and densities in unincorporated urban areas. They were the product of the plan documents themselves are superceded by this plan but are referenced below as technical support documents.

In addition, this document is accompanied by a Final Environmental Impact Statement which gives greater analysis on the plan.

GPP - Purpose and Use

Snohomish County adopted the first GPP in June 1995. The GPP has been amended several times through the annual amendment process, the seven-year compliance review, and in response to Growth Management Hearings Board decisions. This document includes all GPP text, goal, policies, objectives and map changes and amendments including those that resulted from the 10-year plan update required by the GMA for the years 2005-2025. Future amendments will be added to the GPP in the form of loose-leaf supplements.

The Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan replaced the thirteen pre-GMA subarea plans that were adopted under the county's constitutional and charter authority and the authority of the Planning

intensive joint planning studies with the affected cities and maintained the policy direction established in the GPP. The following UGA plans were adopted after the original plan adoption in 1995:

- Gold Bar UGA Plan (1997)
- Snohomish UGA Plan (1998)
- Mill Creek "A" UGA Plan (1998)
- Lake Stevens UGA Plan (2001)
- Mill Creek East UGA Plan (2002)

As part of the 10-year update process, the primary policy components of these plans have been incorporated into the GPP, and

Enabling Act, Chapter 36.70 RCW. These plans were the products of county planning during the decades prior to the passage of the GMA in 1990. They represented a long history of plan development and together provided the foundation for the county's first GMA comprehensive plan in 1995.

The General Policy Plan serves as a guide to

Snohomish County's growth and

development from now through the year

2025. As required by the GMA, the GPP

delineates urban growth area boundaries that

provide for areas of present and future urban

development. It establishes goals to address

urban structure, character and design in

UGA's. Outside the UGAs, the GPP

designates rural and natural resource areas.

The GPP also provides direction for the county's development regulations which implement the citizens' vision of the county's future as expressed in the plan.

The GPP provides the direction and framework for ongoing and future county planning efforts. These efforts may include annual plan amendments, more detailed or geographically focused planning studies, monitoring of urban and rural land consumption and development patterns, and policy evaluation and refinement. In addition, the GPP provides direction for development regulations to implement the county's GMA comprehensive plan. The GMA requires that development regulations be consistent with the county's GMA comprehensive plan.

The organization of the GPP reflects the goals and requirements of the GMA. The plan chapters include a short narrative and goals, objectives and policies for:

- Population and employment.
- Land use for urban, rural and natural resource areas.
- Housing.
- Transportation.
- Capital facilities.
- Utilities.
- Economic development.
- Natural environment.
- Interjurisdictional coordination.

Each chapter is organized around several major goals, which build upon and augment the 13 goals of the GMA. Each GPP goal has one or more objectives and policies which, together, implement the 13 GMA (see Appendix C for these specific relationships).

The GPP contains appendices that provide supplemental information, background, and technical data related to the goals, objectives and policies of the GPP including a:

- County profile with land use and demographic data (Appendix A).
- Process for siting essential public facilities (Appendix B).
- Table showing the relationship of the GPP objectives and policies to GMA goals (Appendix C).
- Population and employment growth targets for cities and unincorporated areas (Appendix D).
- Glossary of acronyms and definitions (Appendix E).
- Review criteria for school district plans (Appendix F).
- Introduction to the 1995 GPP (Appendix G).
- Master Plans (Appendix H)
- List of Technical Reports (Appendix I)

Two appendices previously contained in the GPP have been dropped from this edition. The 1994 county motion that adopted the 1994 Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan (Appendix G) has been deleted because the county subsequently adopted a new park plan as an element of the GMA Comprehensive Plan, and that action is referenced at the beginning of the document together with all of the other plan amendment actions taken by county council since 1995. The list of proposed implementation measures (old Appendix H) has also been deleted (because they have been considered and rejected or are no longer applicable under the recommended policy revisions), and the measures have either been deleted, incorporated into the body of the GPP, or are identified in a separate document outlining a proposed implementation work plan. A new Appendix G has been added to preserve the

original 1995 introduction to this document, which provided extensive background information regarding the history of county planning, GMA planning requirements, as well as the development of the county's first plan under the 1990 GMA.

A new Appendix H has been added to serve as the repository of master plans that may be prepared for urban centers, special area studies or neighborhood issues.

The remainder of this introduction focuses on new or modified features of the plan that resulted from the 10-year update.

10-Year Update Background GMA Requirements

The GMA requires that the county review its urban growth areas (UGAs) at least once every ten years. This review includes a required evaluation of the adequacy of the UGAs to accommodate the succeeding 20 years of anticipated population and employment growth.

In 2003, the county and cities jointly developed new population and employment targets in preparation for the required 10-year update. The county council incorporated the Initial 2025 Population and Employment Growth Targets into Appendix B of the Countywide Planning Policies.

In 1998 the county and cities also began annually monitoring development activity within incorporated and unincorporated areas. In 2002, the Buildable Lands Report, prepared jointly by the county and cities, made the following findings:

- For the period from 1995 to 2000, the cities and the county achieved urban densities consistent with their adopted comprehensive plans.

- The county's UGAs, taken as a whole, had sufficient capacity to accommodate the 2012 growth targets.

At the ten-year mark of the 20-year planning period, the GMA requires that UGAs have sufficient capacity to accommodate growth, not only for the remaining 10-year planning period, but for a new 20-year planning horizon. Therefore, based on the buildable lands information – including an updated land capacity analysis performed for this plan update and adopted concurrently with the plan - and the 2025 growth targets, the county evaluated UGA capacities and/or the densities permitted within them to determine whether revisions would be needed to meet the state's update requirement.

10-Year Update Process

In 2002, Snohomish County launched a major planning process to undertake the 10-year plan update. Key components of this process were a public participation program, the development of land use alternatives, an environmental impact statement for the evaluation of three alternative growth and development scenarios, the development of a preferred land use alternative, and amendments to plan policies.

Public Participation:

Snohomish County's residents, business and community leaders, groups and organizations have long been active participants in the County's comprehensive planning process. The Growth Management Act encourages the early and continuous involvement of citizens and stakeholders in the planning process. Public participation was a key component in the development of the 1995 GMA comprehensive plan and

continued to play a fundamental role in the 10-year update.

Early and extensive public outreach efforts began late in 2002 with a series of “stakeholder” interviews. These interviews sought a cross-section of community perspectives. Business representatives, realtors, builders, farmers, citizen leaders, foresters, as well as newspaper editors and directors of non-profit organizations were identified. From December 2002 to March 2003, over 60 interviews were conducted with key community members. The process provided a unique opportunity for in-depth discussions about the future of Snohomish County. The stakeholder comments indicated that the vision expressed in the 1995 Comprehensive Plan provided a solid basis upon which to develop the 10-year update. Comments gathered during this process assisted staff in:

- Guiding the development of future public participation efforts.
- Providing an overview of local history and trends.
- Comparing 1995 public perceptions with those of 2002-2003.
- Developing overall plan process goals and ideas.
- Setting parameters for the planning and environmental review process.

The County sought further public involvement and participation through a series of 4 open houses conducted by the county in February 2003. Meetings were held in Everett, Lynnwood, Monroe and Arlington and provided the public with information on the existing comprehensive plan, the 10-year update process, and an opportunity for public question and comment. Summaries, tapes, or verbatim

transcripts are available for these public meetings and hearings.

The Snohomish County Council and Planning Commission continued outreach efforts with a joint public informational meeting in July 2003. Discussions were held relating to growth issues and alternative scenarios.

In addition, the department published a series of 10-year update newsletters with a mailing list of nearly 2,800 recipients. Information on the planning process, various reports and technical information, meeting and hearing notices, were all published and updated regularly on the project’s website. Two “Planners in the Library” events were conducted in various public libraries throughout the county to ensure that public education and input on the planning process continued.

In 2003 the County launched an environmental review process with an extended scoping period that also included community meetings, a joint county council / planning commission public meeting, and executive public hearings. These meetings were held at various locations and times throughout the county. Three public workshops were conducted in June, 2004 to assist in the development of a preferred land use alternative. An additional joint Council-Planning Commission public meeting was also held in late June, 2004. Members reviewed public input and discussed fundamental choices about the County’s future.

In October 2004, a Preferred Future Land Use Map was presented to the Snohomish County Planning Commission and public. The draft map was the result of over 20 months of extensive public review and input. Two more informational open houses

were held in October. During November four joint city and county planning commission workshops were held that focused on plan policies and measures to address impacts associated with plan implementation. These workshops provided guidance in the development of draft policy amendments to the comprehensive plan.

A questionnaire was developed and printed in The Herald in late February, as well as mailed to nearly 2,800 recipients on the project's mailing list. The results were tabulated into a report which was used to help inform county staff, the County Council and Planning Commission as they finalized the comprehensive plan. The results of the questionnaires also guided the planning department as they developed their 2005-2006 work program, which includes implementing the changes to the comprehensive plan.

In 2005, a complete package of comprehensive plan amendments were prepared by staff and presented to the planning commission and county council. Public open houses in April allowed the general public to see the various changes and ask questions of staff. Public hearings were jointly held by the planning commission and county council in May and early June to take formal testimony before the planning commission made its recommendation. County council held public hearing(s) on the planning commission's recommendation before taking final action.

Development of Plan Alternatives:

Snohomish County developed three alternative growth and land use scenarios in response to the 10-year update requirement of GMA. The alternatives were based on concepts organized around a range of

population growth targets and on responses from citizens and organizations during the public participation process. All alternatives had significant population increases within the range of projections issued by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). Similarly, employment growth was significant in all alternatives. The primary difference between the alternatives was in the amount of population growth, the geographical distribution of that growth, the degree of emphasis on residential infill within existing UGAs versus UGA expansions.

Alternative 1 represented the 2004 FLU Map as the "No Action Alternative." "No action" meant that no changes in the UGA boundaries or land use designations were made, although population and employment growth would continue since the current UGAs have infill potential. This alternative could accommodate about 862,000 residents by the year 2025. This alternative was based upon development densities and housing unit yields that had been increasing over the past five years and had effectively increased the 1995 plan's buildable land capacity. This alternative required an estimated \$600 million in arterial road improvements by 2025 and the development of nine new community parks.

Alternative 2 represented a mid-point alternative in terms of population growth and UGA expansions. This alternative expanded the Southwest, Marysville, Arlington, Sultan, Gold Bar, Granite Falls and Stanwood UGAs by a total of about 2.4 square miles and could accommodate approximately 895,000 residents by 2025. About 3.5 square miles of land within existing unincorporated UGAs were proposed for higher density residential plan designations in various infill locations.

Alternative 2 required about \$640 million in arterial road improvements and 11 new community parks over the next 20 years.

Alternative 3 represented the high growth alternative. This alternative included the UGA expansions of Alternative 2 and expanded the Monroe, Maltby, and Snohomish UGAs for total expansion of 11.5 square miles. Within the UGAs, approximately 6 square miles of infill areas were proposed for higher residential plan designations. This alternative could accommodate about 950,000 residents and a population reserve of 15,000 in future fully-contained communities in as of yet undefined locations. The required arterial road improvements for this alternative were estimated to cost about \$900 million. The projected population required 16 new community parks by 2025.

Environmental Impact Statement:

All three alternatives were evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the 10-Year plan update. The DEIS covered this possible range of plan choices and allowed a comparative analysis of different UGA expansion and infill scenarios. The key planning issues explored in the alternatives and illuminated by the environmental analysis included:

- Amount and distribution of growth.
- Accommodating infill and then expanding UGAs.
- Changes in allowable development types and intensities when compared to current plan, policies and zoning classifications.
- Level and cost of capital improvements needed to support the projected growth.
- Extent to which impacts could be expected and could be mitigated.

Preferred Alternative:

The Preferred Alternative was developed following the public DEIS review process and additional public workshops. It was based on elements of all three alternatives and followed principles that were based on public and agency comments. It was characterized by the following features:

- Maintained designated resource lands of long-term commercial significance (agricultural, forestry and mineral lands).
- Supported the projected population.
- Encouraged employment growth.
- Supported infill development in appropriate locations within UGAs.
- Included higher density development such as multi-family, condominium, and multi-story buildings in appropriate areas.
- Allowed modest expansion of UGAs adjacent to existing urban areas and where urban services can be efficiently extended.
- Provided policies and standards to evaluate potential proposals for a fully contained community.
- Included policies that promote livable communities in cities and in unincorporated areas.
- Provided for high quality development with people-oriented design standards.
- Built on infrastructure already in place or readily available for new development, including transportation, surface water, drainage, water supply, sanitary sewers and parks facilities.

The Preferred Alternative was the basis for the final EIS and the 2005 update of the plan

following some additional modifications by the planning commission and the county council.

In addition to incorporating numerous policy changes and other textual amendments to the plan documents, this plan includes some final refinements to the preferred alternative map of October 2004, including refinements to reflect technical corrections to better align zoning and land use and to better reflect parcel lines. Other refinements include: 1) additional UGA expansions to the northwest of Monroe; 2) adjustments to the infill designation changes in the Southwest UGA to better reflect existing conditions and new permits; and 3) additional refinements to reduce split parcels and in response to new information.

Key Changes between the 1995 and 2005 Plans

The 2005 plan represents a logical evolution of the existing plan and builds on and further develops the Diversified Centers concept of the 1995 GPP. Projected population and employment growth will be accommodated primarily within existing cities and unincorporated urban areas through various infill strategies, including changes in urban land use designations in appropriate locations.

Approximately five square miles of land area within the former UGAs are re-designated to more intense urban development. Included within that total are new areas designated as Village Centers that will encourage the development of neighborhood-scale focal points with a mix of retail, office, public use and some medium to high density residential development with increased design standards.

The UGAs have been expanded by approximately 3.5 square miles as a result of the update. Seven cities including Arlington, Granite Falls, Marysville, Monroe, Snohomish, Stanwood and Sultan experienced modest UGA expansions needed to accommodate their new 2025 population growth targets as determined after a land capacity analysis. The UGA expansion areas are about equally dedicated to new residential areas to accommodate population growth and new commercial or industrial areas to accommodate and encourage employment growth, consistent with the county's desire to retain and attract new job growth.

Additional opportunities for new economic development projects are provided through the designation of additional industrial land within expansion of the Marysville and Maltby UGAs and through a potential master-planned development at the county's Cathcart site, located northwest of the intersection of SR 9 and SR 96.

The 2005 GPP also provides the framework for the potential development of a new "fully contained community" (FCC). Such new communities are provided for in the GMA which envisions the development of new towns outside of existing urban growth areas that include significant business development as well as residential development. Residents can find employment and have their daily service needs met within the "fully-contained community." The plan includes FCC policies that require the establishment of high standards for urban infrastructure and urban design with appropriate mitigation of impacts on adjacent lands, the environment and public infrastructure systems.

Since the 2005 Ten-Year Update, the county revisited the FCC policies and implementing

development regulations in response to the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 plan. In 2009, the county eliminated provisions for FCCs in the comprehensive plan and implementing development regulations.

The 2005 GPP provides for continued vitality of resource lands. Goals and policies ensure commercial forestry may continue. Changes have been made to the mineral lands policies and maps to enable the industry to permit and operate more efficiently. New programs and policies have been initiated in the 2025 plan to encourage the agricultural industry in Snohomish County.

Finally, the 2025 GPP recognizes the need for more innovative land uses such as mixed use centers and the need for better design and development standards in unincorporated urban areas. The transition of these areas to cities is also the subject of the Interjurisdictional Coordination section of the plan.

Consistency with Other Plans

The 2005 GPP continues to implement and is consistent with the GMA and several other policy directives. The GPP addresses each of the GMA goals and applies them to unincorporated Snohomish County in a balanced manner:

- Encouragement of development and/or redevelopment in urban areas with existing or planned public facilities and services.

- Reduction of urban sprawl.
- Adequate provision of efficient multi-modal transportation systems.
- Availability of affordable housing for citizens of all income levels.
- Promotion of economic opportunity.
- Respect for private property rights.
- Predictability and timeliness of permit review processes.
- Conservation of natural resources.
- Retention of open space and provision of recreational opportunities.
- Protection and enhancement of the environment.
- Citizen participation in the planning process.
- Adequate provision of necessary public facilities and services.
- Preservation of historic and archaeological resources.
- Utilization, protection, restoration and preservation of shorelines of statewide significance.

The GPP also implements and is consistent with the regional vision as expressed in the multi-county policies that were adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). These policies call for population and employment growth to be focused in mixed-use centers that are served by a multi-modal transportation system. The GPP designates several locations as centers and provides policy guidance for their development, consistent with the PSRC Vision 2020 document.

The GPP is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) for Snohomish

County. The CPPs were originally adopted in 1993 and have been amended several times to meet changing GMA requirements. The CPPs consist of policy statements that establish a countywide framework from which county and city comprehensive plans are developed. They ensure that city and county comprehensive plans are consistent with each other. The initial 2025 population and employment growth targets and their distribution throughout Snohomish County are one of the most significant components of the CPPs. The updated GPP, which retains the overall policy direction of the original GMA Comprehensive Plan through the diversified centers concept, remains consistent with the planning framework and the updated growth targets of the CPPs.

The GPP also strives for consistency with the plans of adjacent jurisdictions. During the preparation of the 2005 plan update, the county sought to coordinate plan development with the cities, Native American tribes, and other affected public agencies. The county attempted to respond to the concerns of these jurisdictions and made appropriate changes to the plan. Since many cities had not completed their own 10-year updates at the time of county plan consideration and adoption, and since some city plans may not have been completely compatible with county goals and objectives, a plan reconciliation process may be appropriate. The countywide planning policies anticipate and provide for such a reconciliation process following plan adoption by all GMA planning jurisdictions in the county. The process is intended to allow the county and any affected cities to work out significant differences in their selected growth targets and any corresponding plan differences. The reconciliation process could produce plan amendments to one or several jurisdictions'

comprehensive plans during the annual cycles for such amendments.

Continuing Plan Development

An effective comprehensive plan cannot be a static document, but must be a dynamic guide to the future - one that is continually monitored and refined in response to changing circumstances and events. While the 10-year update represents a significant milestone in the development of the county plan, there will certainly be adjustments and refinements over the coming years.

In addition to changes in the GMA itself, which have occurred several times since its adoption in 1990, there are changing interpretations through new decisions from the three state hearings boards. The numerous courts of competent jurisdiction that review complaints based on comprehensive plans or implementing development regulations also render such decisions. These legal forces, as well as external economic and political forces at the local, state and federal levels all shape the environment in which the comprehensive plan must operate.

Among the many circumstances that could produce changes to this plan, the following must certainly be included: the growth target and plan reconciliation process with selected cities; a master planning process anticipated for the county's Cathcart site; further development and refinement of the Centers program; further development and refinement of the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program; and emerging county initiatives in the areas of agricultural practices and economic development. An update to the critical areas ordinance, and the county's shoreline master program now in process, and an update to the county's buildable lands report that is due in 2007, are also possible sources of future

comprehensive plan amendments. Finally, the annual docketing process ensures that the general public – as well as the county itself – has a regular opportunity to propose plan amendments for formal consideration. These and other considerations will help ensure that this plan remains an effective guide for the county in an ever-changing world.

Technical Reports

The 2005 update of the GPP was prepared using several plans and technical reports as a reference. Some of these reports are required by GMA. These documents are listed in Appendix I at the back of this document and are available from the Department of Planning and Development Services and the Department of Public Works.

Population and Employment

Growth Targets

The GMA requires that the county designate UGAs based upon the 20-year population projection made for the county by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). Specifically, Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) are required to include areas and densities sufficient to accommodate the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county for the succeeding 20-year period. OFM released the original growth management population forecasts for counties in January 1992. They showed a total population of 714,244 by the year 2012 for Snohomish County, representing a nearly 220,000 (44.5%) population increase over the 1992 total county population estimate of 494,300. This forecast was the basis for the growth assumptions underlying the first round of city and county GMA comprehensive plans adopted in the mid-1990s.

At least every ten years, the GMA requires counties to work with the cities to review and update the UGAs so that they are capable of accommodating the urban growth projected to occur in the county for the succeeding 20 year period. The ~~((most-recent))~~ OFM forecasts~~((:))~~ released in January 2002 and extending to the year 2025~~((:))~~ are currently being used by the county and the cities to satisfy the 10-year plan update requirement.

Unlike the 1992 OFM forecasts which included a single population forecast only, the 2002 forecasts included a low, ~~((intermediate))~~ medium, and high population projection for each county. For Snohomish County, the OFM 2025 population forecast ranged from a low of 795,725 to a high of 1,062,903, up from 628,000 in 2002. The ~~((intermediate))~~ medium 2025 population forecast was 929,314 (defined as the “most likely” OFM forecast as specified in GMA).

Under GMA, OFM is required to provide 20-year population forecasts at the county level only. Subcounty allocations of the OFM forecast, essential for detailed comprehensive planning analyses (i.e., UGA determination, land use, housing, capital facilities requirements, and transportation), are developed collaboratively between the cities and the counties. In Snohomish County, the countywide planning policies (CPPs) define a process for allocating the OFM forecast to UGAs, cities, and rural areas through a cooperative and iterative planning process known as Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT).

Snohomish County Tomorrow is an association of the 20 cities and towns in Snohomish County, Snohomish County government, and Tribal governments. It

serves as a forum to develop and recommend growth management policies to the county council. SCT fulfills the Growth Management Act requirement that each county, planning under GMA, work in cooperation and collaboration with its cities, towns and federally recognized Indian tribes. SCT is the countywide group that develops and recommends amendments to the countywide planning policies.

The CPPs state that initial subcounty allocations of both population and employment are based on the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) small area forecasts. The PSRC's forecasts are based on the Vision 2020 growth management, economic and transportation strategy, which directs new regional growth to urban centers and UGAs located throughout the central Puget Sound region. High population and employment densities are assumed within centers in order to help reduce sprawl and link growth centers to a multi-modal transportation system. Within Snohomish County, PSRC modeled three urban centers (Downtown Everett, Lynnwood/Alderwood Mall, and Bothell/Canyon Park). A manufacturing/industrial center at Paine Field/Boeing was also included in PSRC's forecast model.

Using the ~~((new))~~ OFM population forecast range and the ~~((latest))~~ PSRC small area forecasts (developed during fall 2002), the SCT Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), composed of Snohomish County city and county planners, released draft initial 2025 population and employment growth target ranges for jurisdictional review in January 2003. Jurisdictions reviewed the targets based on relevant land capacity and urban capital facilities and service capacity information. Feedback from local jurisdictions was evaluated by the PAC

through the end of summer 2003. The PAC's recommendation on the initial 2025 growth target allocation was reviewed and approved by the SCT Steering Committee and forwarded to the county council in the fall of 2003. The county council adopted initial 2025 population and employment growth targets into Appendix B of the countywide planning policies in February 2004 (Amended Ordinance 04-006). The adopted initial allocation amounted to a total 2025 countywide population of 914,239. A portion of the total 2025 population (15,000) was reserved for potential fully contained communities (FCCs).

As part of its current 10-year comprehensive plan update effort, the county evaluated the initial 2025 growth allocation contained in the countywide planning policies, as well as a lower and a higher growth alternative scenario for unincorporated areas. Growth targets for cities were held constant at their initial target preference levels in order to evaluate the impacts associated with changes to the county's future land use plan and growth target assumptions. As shown in Appendix D, the growth targets associated with the county's preferred plan, when combined with the city initial growth targets, resulted in a total 2025 countywide population target of 933,000, with a 15,000 portion of that total reserved for potential FCCs. As a result, the countywide 2025 population target associated with the county's preferred plan is nearly identical to the OFM 2025 ~~((intermediate))~~ medium ("most likely") population forecast of 929,314 for Snohomish County.

~~**((Target Reconciliation))**~~

~~((The selection of preferred plan alternatives by cities within Snohomish County is occurring simultaneously with the adoption of the county's updated plan. It is therefore~~

~~impossible to reconcile the preferences of each city, as expressed in their respective plans, prior to the GPP update. Important planning work is currently being conducted by the cities as part of their 10 year plan update efforts. The results of this work may affect county decisions on UGA capacity to accommodate population and employment growth thus necessitating possible adjustments to planned densities, land uses, or UGA boundaries. These decisions, if necessary, would occur after the initial 10-year county and city plan updates.~~

~~To achieve a balance between the preferred plan alternatives of cities and GMA goals, Snohomish County will participate with the cities through Snohomish County Tomorrow in a target reconciliation process once GMA plans have been updated. The purpose of the process will be to adjust the population and employment targets consistent with the CPPs and based upon adopted local comprehensive plan preferences. The SCT Steering Committee will recommend an updated 20-year allocation of population and employment to the county council to replace the initial 2025 targets in Appendix B of the CPPs. Target reconciliation may result in comprehensive plan amendments to adjust planned densities, land uses, or UGA boundaries using the process described in LU1.D.1.))~~

Following the 2005 comprehensive plan update, differences between city and county population growth targets were reconciled in consultation with Snohomish County Tomorrow. The countywide 2025 population growth target was increased to 938,434.

In 2007, OFM released updated forecasts that range from a low of 769,525 to a high of 1,027,905, with an medium (“most likely”) 2025 population forecast of 898,715. As a result, the countywide 2025 population target

was no longer nearly identical to the most recent OFM 2025 medium population forecast.

In 2008, the Puget Sound Regional Council adopted an updated regional growth strategy in Vision 2040 which was in alignment with the new OFM medium projection for Snohomish County. Elimination of the 15,000 FCC population reserve from the 2025 overall countywide growth target, lowers the total 2025 county population to 923,434, which is closer to the most recent medium OFM forecast.

Long-Term Monitoring

~~((Once target reconciliation has been accomplished, t) The county and the cities will monitor the extent to which the 2025 growth targets are being realized in cities, UGAs, and rural areas. This continues several years of interjurisdictional growth monitoring work which started in 1997 with the publication of the first annual SCT growth monitoring report. If the growth monitoring reports show that geographic distribution of actual residential and non-residential development is not in line with the targets, then the targets may not be accurate or the GMA plans may not be having the intended effects. The development trend data, relative to the targets, become the indicator for a reevaluation of either the targets and/or the plans.~~

Monitoring the remaining capacity of land within UGAs to accommodate future growth is as important as monitoring the growth targets. This requires monitoring the actual density of new development along with the amount in order to evaluate the adequacy of the remaining land supply within the UGA to accommodate future growth. If actual development densities are lower than

originally assumed in the land capacity analysis for the UGA, adjustments to the plan densities, development regulations, or the UGA boundary may be required to provide for adequate future land supply throughout the remainder of the GMA plan horizon.

Both the target monitoring and UGA land supply monitoring efforts described above are consistent with the GMA's requirements for periodic review and evaluation of development patterns within UGAs. In 1997, the GMA was amended to include a new requirement for Snohomish County and its cities to establish a buildable lands monitoring program that provides for the review and evaluation of residential, commercial and industrial lands every five years. Through this program, the county and the cities are required to ensure a sufficient inventory of buildable land throughout the remaining portion of the 20-year plan horizon.

The assessment of the adequacy of the remaining urban land supply is to be based on actual development densities observed within the UGA since GMA plan adoption or the previous buildable lands report. The first report was published in 2002. The next report is due in 2007.

Buildable lands monitoring may result in revisions to the population and employment targets in the CPPs. Adjustments to plan densities or UGA boundaries through the annual plan amendment process may also be necessary. Snohomish County will continue to work through Snohomish County Tomorrow to develop and refine specific criteria for monitoring and evaluating the need for target and UGA boundary adjustments.

The following pages list the goals, objectives, and policies for growth allocation, target reconciliation and long-term monitoring.

GOAL PE 1

Establish a subcounty allocation of projected growth to the year 2025 that is consistent with the goals of the Growth Management Act and the countywide planning policies.

Objective PE 1. A

Direct future growth in unincorporated Snohomish County primarily into urban areas.

PE Policies

1.A.1 Snohomish County's portion of the urban growth areas shall receive the majority of the unincorporated county's projected population and employment growth as shown in Appendix D.

1.A.2 New population and employment in unincorporated areas shall be located in urban areas best suited to accommodating the growth. Urban areas having adequate existing or planned public facility and service capacities to accommodate the growth should be the prime recipients of future growth.

1.A.3 The allocation of unincorporated population and employment growth to urban areas shall reflect the urban centers designated in the county's comprehensive plan.

1.A.4 The population and employment allocation for the unincorporated Southwest UGA shown in Appendix D shall include subtotals for the municipal urban growth areas (MUGAs) associated in the countywide planning policies with each of the nine cities in the Southwest UGA.

1.A.5 ~~((The population allocation shown in Appendix D shall reserve a portion of the 20-year OFM population forecast for potential fully contained communities (FCCs). The portion of the population reserve associated with an approved FCC shall become part of the urban growth allocation.~~

~~1.A.6))~~

The population allocation shown in Appendix D shall reserve a portion of the 20-year OFM population forecast for potential allocation to UGA expansions associated with TDR receiving areas designated pursuant to LU Policy 14.A.6.

Objective PE 1.B

Reduce future growth rates in rural areas of the county.

PE Policies

1.B.1 The rural (non-tribal) population and employment growth forecast shown in Appendix D and any future amendments to the forecast shall represent a reduction in the amount of rural growth compared with pre-GMA rural growth trends.

- 1.B.2 The rural (non-tribal) growth forecast and any future modifications to the forecast shall result in a reduction in the share of total county population and employment growth located within rural areas when compared with the pre-GMA rural growth trends of 28% for population and 8% for employment.

Objective PE 1.C Maximize use of the remaining land capacity within cities for allocating future urban growth to cities within Snohomish County.

- PE Policies**
- 1.C.1 Current information on the remaining land capacity of cities to accommodate additional growth shall be used to establish the allocation of future population and employment growth for cities shown in Appendix D.
 - 1.C.2 Each city’s GMA reasonable measures program for accommodating additional population and employment growth shall be evaluated and used to establish the capacity for and allocation of future population and employment growth for cities.

GOAL PE 2 Maintain and support a process for monitoring and adjusting, if necessary, the population and employment growth targets.

Objective PE 2.A Maintain and support a target reconciliation process using the Snohomish County Tomorrow process to review and, if necessary, adjust the population and employment targets once the GMA comprehensive plans of jurisdictions in Snohomish County are updated to accommodate the succeeding 20 years of growth.

- PE Policies**
- 2.A.1 The county and cities will jointly review the preferred growth targets in updated city comprehensive plans for discrepancies with the target allocation associated with the county's updated plan.
 - 2.A.2 The Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee will review and recommend to the county council an updated 2025 population and employment allocation for cities, UGAs, and rural areas. The updated allocation shall reconcile any differences revealed during the review of locally adopted targets. The allocation shall consider the plan of each jurisdiction and be

consistent with the Growth Management Act and the countywide planning policies.

- 2.A.3 The county council will consider the recommendation of the Steering Committee and will replace Appendix B of the countywide planning policies with an updated 2025 population and employment allocation for cities, UGAs, and rural areas.

Objective PE 2.B Maintain and support a long-term target monitoring process through Snohomish County Tomorrow to review annually and, if necessary, adjust the population and employment targets subsequent to target reconciliation.

- PE Policies**
- 2.B.1 Snohomish County and the cities will jointly monitor the following indicators within cities, UGAs, and rural areas:
 - (a) estimated population and employment growth,
 - (b) annexations and incorporations,
 - (c) residential and non-residential land consumption,
 - (d) land supply and land values relative to demographic changes,
 - (e) availability and affordability of all housing types, and
 - (f) any other relevant indicator which may affect the growth target allocation, i.e., capital facilities capacity, land price escalation, or comprehensive plan changes.
 - 2.B.2 Snohomish County will continue to participate with cities through Snohomish County Tomorrow to refine the monitoring criteria.
 - 2.B.3 Results of the target monitoring program will be published through Snohomish County Tomorrow in an annual growth monitoring report.
 - 2.B.4 The Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee will review, and may recommend to the county council, an adjustment to the 2025 population and employment allocation for cities, UGAs, and rural area. The allocation shall be based on the results of the target monitoring program and be consistent with the Growth Management Act and the countywide planning policies.
 - 2.B.5 The county council will consider the recommendation of the Steering Committee and may amend Appendix B of the countywide planning policies with adjusted 2025 population and employment targets for cities, UGAs, and rural areas.

Objective PE 2.C Review Snohomish County's comprehensive plan for internal consistency following adjustments to the

growth targets introduced during either initial target reconciliation or long-term target monitoring.

- PE Policies**
- 2.C.1 The county shall evaluate through a cooperative process with the cities whether adjustments to planned densities, land uses, or UGA boundaries are necessary as a result of amendments to the growth targets.
 - 2.C.2 Changes to the target allocation shall be fully incorporated, where necessary, into other Snohomish County comprehensive plan elements, specifically land use, housing, capital facilities, parks and recreation, and transportation.

Exhibit C
Amended Ordinance No. 09-044
Final Docket XIII, GPP Amendments to the
Introductory Text of the Land Use Chapter
GPP 16 Fully Contained Communities

Land Use

This land use element is comprised of interrelated land use goals which form the basis of the county's land use strategy and:

- provide for a supply and distribution of land use types to accommodate the majority of county population and employment growth within urban growth areas;
- reduce land consuming urban development patterns and provide structure for urban development within neighborhoods or urban centers;
- reduce development pressures and patterns of sprawl within rural areas;
- conserve agricultural, forest and mineral resource lands of long-term commercial significance; and
- preserve and protect open space, scenic and cultural resources.

The following sections provide more detailed explanations of the land use strategy. Each section includes various land use goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures to carry out the strategy.

Policy framework for this chapter comes from the Growth Management Act RCW 36.70A (GMA), the Puget Sound Regional Council's ~~((Vision 2020))~~ Vision 2040 and Destination 2030 Policy Documents and the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) ~~((, as well as the 1995 General Policy Plan (GPP))~~).

The sections are Urban Growth Areas ~~((with subsections of Fully Contained Communities (FCC),))~~ Urban Development Patterns, Urban Design, Centers, and Small Area and Neighborhood Structure); Rural Lands; and Resource Lands.

Exhibit D
Amended Ordinance No. 09-044
Final Docket XIII, GPP Amendments to the
Urban Growth Areas Section of the Land Use Chapter
GPP 16 Fully Contained Communities

Urban Growth Areas

The GMA requires that urban growth areas (UGAs) be designated through the county's plan. UGAs are to include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county over the next twenty years. Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas.

Planning for growth in this way accomplishes two GMA goals: 1) the efficient provision and utilization of public facilities and services, including public transportation; and 2) reduced conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.

Individual UGAs have been designated to include each city and town in the county with the nine cities in southwest county included in one large UGA. Each UGA contains both incorporated and unincorporated areas. The total additional population capacity within the Snohomish County composite UGA as documented by both City and County comprehensive plans does not exceed the total 20-year forecasted UGA population

growth by more than 15 percent. UGA boundaries will be re-evaluated at least once every five years to ensure they are adequate to accommodate 20-year growth projections. This assessment of UGA capacity is based upon developable lands, environmental constraints, city comprehensive plans, housing and economic development needs, public facility and service capacities and, lastly, the implementation of growth strategies aimed at developing and enhancing urban development patterns.

The county and the cities and towns within the county collaborated on a policy framework for designating UGAs and directing urban growth patterns. It is called the Countywide Planning Policies (CPP). This policy framework is informed by the multicounty planning policies (~~Vision 2020~~)Vision 2040 and Destination 2030) and the countywide planning policies.

In the southwest area of the county the UGA includes nine cities and unincorporated urban area, all contiguous to one another. The entire area is known as the Southwest Urban Growth Area (SWUGA). This unincorporated urban area has been further divided to show that the appropriate adjacent city will annex the area in the future. Hence, these subdivided areas are labeled Municipal Urban Areas (MUGA's) e.g. Lynnwood's MUGA; Mill Creek's MUGA.

This General Policy Plan provides additional direction, consistent with the multi-county and countywide planning policies, for urban growth within the unincorporated portions of all the UGAs.

The plan also provides for the designation of rural urban transition areas (RUTAs) outside of UGAs. Rural urban transition areas are intended to set aside a potential supply of land for employment and residential land uses for possible future inclusion in a UGA. The policies provide direction for the designation of rural urban transition areas.

This plan promotes the use of innovative techniques, such as transfer of development

rights receiving area designations, to encourage the preservation of rural and resource lands and the efficient use of urban land.

This chapter of the GPP addresses: 1) locating, sizing, maintaining and expanding UGA boundaries; 2) establishing potential future UGA areas; 3) ~~((a new UGA called FCC's;))~~ urban development patterns and design; ~~((5))~~ 4) urban centers; ~~((6))~~ 5) urban phasing; and ~~((7))~~ 6) neighborhood structures.

GOAL LU 1

Establish and maintain compact, clearly defined, well designed UGAs.

Objective LU 1.A

Establish UGAs with sufficient capacity to accommodate the majority of the county's projected population and employment growth over the next 20 years.

LU Policies 1.A.1

UGAs shall contain sufficient land capacity for a variety of land uses and densities, including green belts and open space, in suitable locations to accommodate the county's 20-year population projection allocated to the urban area. The total additional population capacity within the Snohomish County composite UGA as documented by both City and County comprehensive plans shall not exceed the total 20-year forecasted UGA population growth by more than 15 percent. A portion of the 20-year forecast UGA population may be reserved for allocation to Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) receiving areas (~~and Fully Contained Communities (FCCs)~~). Following the initial establishment of the UGAs in the General Policy Plan, subsequent recalculation of the percent by which additional population capacity exceeds the 20-year forecasted population growth shall occur at the time of the mandatory 10-year comprehensive review and updating of UGAs.

1.A.2 Snohomish County shall ensure no net loss of capacity to accommodate the amount and type of projected employment growth for 2025 while ensuring an adequate supply of both new and existing affordable housing.

1.A.3 Snohomish County shall ensure a no net loss of housing capacity that preserves the County's ability to accommodate the 2025 growth targets, while pursuing compliance with all relevant federal, state and local laws and regulations.

1.A.4 UGAs shall have existing or planned infrastructure capacity to adequately support urban growth over the 20-year period.

1.A.5 Determination of adequate land capacity shall be based on methodologies developed jointly with other jurisdictions and shall be consistent with Countywide Planning Policy UG-13.

1.A.6 All incorporated cities and towns shall be included within UGAs.

1.A.7 Designated forest and agricultural lands shall not be included within the UGA unless the designated lands are maintained as natural resource lands and a TDR/PDR program has been enacted by the city or the county.

~~((1.A.8) New, fully contained communities outside existing UGAs shall be considered when a portion of the population is placed in a reserve for Fully Contained Communities and the proposed communities are sited in accordance with the conditions in LU1.E.1 and the criteria in LU1.E.2. A FCC shall be sited only when an application is approved by Snohomish County.))~~

1.A.~~(9)~~8 UGA boundaries shall be re-evaluated at least every five years to determine whether or not they are capable of meeting the county's 20-year population and employment projections. This re-evaluation shall be consistent with Snohomish County's "buildable lands" review and evaluation program requirements established in Countywide Planning Policy UG-14 except that these conditions do not apply to the expansion of a UGA for churches or school instructional facilities when the affected land is dedicated solely for those uses.

1.A.~~10~~9 Ensure the efficient use of urban land by adopting reasonable measures to increase residential, commercial and industrial capacity within urban growth areas prior to expanding urban growth boundaries. The County Council will use the list of reasonable measures in accordance with the guidelines for review contained in Appendix C of the Countywide Planning Policies to evaluate all UGA boundary expansions proposed pursuant to LU 1.A.~~(10)~~10.1 through LU 1.A.~~(11)~~10.4.

1.A.~~11~~10 Expansion of the boundary of an individual UGA to include additional residential, commercial and industrial land shall not be permitted unless it is supported by a land capacity analysis adopted by the County Council pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110 and otherwise complies with the Growth Management Act, and includes consultation and coordination with appropriate jurisdictions in the UGA or MUGA. In addition, one of the following nine conditions must be met:

1. The expansion is a result of the review of UGAs at least every ten years to accommodate the succeeding twenty years of projected growth, as required by RCW 36.70A.130(3).
2. The expansion conforms with the findings of the most recent five-year buildable lands review and evaluation conducted required by RCW 36.70A.215 and described in Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) UG 14(a) through (d).
3. Both of the following conditions are met for expansion of the boundary of an individual UGA under an annual comprehensive plan amendment cycle to include additional residential land:

- (a) Population growth within the UGA (city plus unincorporated UGA combined) since the start of the twenty-year planning period, equals or exceeds fifty percent of the additional population capacity estimated for the UGA at the start of the planning period, as documented in the most recent Snohomish County Tomorrow Growth Monitoring Report or the buildable lands review and evaluation (Buildable Lands Report); and
 - (b) An updated residential land capacity analysis conducted by city and county staff for the UGA confirms the accuracy of the above finding using more recent residential capacity estimates and assumptions.
- 4. For expansion of the boundary of an individual UGA during the annual comprehensive plan amendment cycle to include additional commercial and industrial land, the county and the city or cities within that UGA document that commercial or industrial land consumption within the UGA (city plus unincorporated UGA combined) since the start of the twenty-year planning period, equals or exceeds fifty percent of the developable commercial or industrial land supply within the UGA at the start of the planning period. In UGAs where this threshold has not yet been reached, the boundary of an individual UGA may be expanded to include additional commercial or industrial land if the expansion is based on an assessment that concludes there is a deficiency of larger parcels within that UGA to accommodate the remaining commercial or industrial growth projected for that UGA. Other parcel characteristics determined to be relevant to the assessment of the adequacy of the remaining commercial or industrial land base, as documented in the Procedures Report required by CPP UG-14(a), may also be considered as a basis for expansion of the boundary of an individual UGA to include additional commercial or industrial land.
- 5. The expansion is necessary to make technical corrections to a UGA boundary to be more consistent with CPP UG-1, which requires a UGA to have identifiable physical boundaries such as natural features, roads, or special purpose districts, where feasible, provided that such expansions shall not increase total residential capacity by more than by the lesser of 0.5% or 20 acres, nor employment capacity by any significant amount, of an

individual UGA in any given year, as reported in the most recent Snohomish County Tomorrow Growth Monitoring Report.

6. The expansion will result in the realization of a significant public benefit as evidenced by Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) to the expansion area from Agriculture or Forest lands designated as TDR sending areas. The expansion area shall not be a designated forest or agricultural land of long-term significance. The expansion area shall be consistent with Objective LU 14.A and the TDR population reserve established in Appendix D pursuant to PE Policy 1.A.6.
7. The expansion will permanently preserve a substantial land area containing one or more significant natural or cultural feature(s) as open space adjacent to and outside of the revised UGA boundary and will provide separation between urban and rural areas. The presence of significant natural or cultural features shall be determined in consultation with the city or cities immediately adjacent to the proposed expansion. Significant natural or cultural feature(s) may include, but are not limited to, landforms, rivers, bodies of water, historic properties, archeological resources, unique wildlife habitat, and fish and wildlife conservation areas.
8. The expansion is a response to a declaration by the County Executive, or the County Council by resolution, of a critical shortage of affordable housing, which has the following characteristics:
 - (a) is incurable in a timely manner by the implementation of reasonable measures or other instrumentality reasonably available to the jurisdiction; and
 - (b) the expansion is reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing;

The expansion shall be directed toward accommodating households displaced by the closure of mobile home parks. The expansion shall be a demonstration area for mobile home parks or small-lot subdivisions only. Such declaration or resolution of a critical shortage of affordable housing must be supported by an updated housing needs analysis demonstrating that there is an insufficiency of land within the UGA to provide an adequate housing stock for all

economic segments of the population. The expansion must be supported by documentation that explains why reasonable measures cannot be implemented in time to prevent a critical shortage of affordable housing or that such reasonable measures do not exist.

9. The expansion will result in the economic development of lands that no longer satisfy the designation criteria for natural resource lands and the lands have been redesignated to an appropriate non-resource land use designation, provided that expansions are supported by the majority of the affected cities and towns whose UGA or designated MUGA is being expanded and shall not create a significant increase in total employment capacity (as represented by permanent jobs) of an individual UGA, as reported in the most recent Snohomish County Tomorrow Growth Monitoring Report in the year of expansion.

1.A.1211 Land use and capital facilities required for growth within the UGA shall be evaluated at least every five years to determine whether or not modifications to land use or facilities are required to more adequately meet the projected needs of the UGA.

1.A.1312 Urban growth areas which are located within the floodplain, as identified in 30.65 SCC (Special Flood Hazard Areas), shall comply with all provisions of that title, except that airports, and uses directly related to airports and sawmill storage yards, should be allowed in density fringe areas through a code amendment when located adjacent to existing airport or sawmill uses. Annexation agreements shall ensure the continued implementation of this policy.

1.A.1413 Technology corridors should be considered as a strategy to direct jobs to areas within the UGA.

Objective LU 1.B Designate rural urban transition areas outside of and adjacent to UGAs to reserve a potential supply of land for residential and employment land uses for the next plan cycle.

LU Policies 1.B.1 The designation of rural urban transition areas is an overlay that may be applied to rural lands adjacent to UGAs as a result of the review of UGAs at least every ten years, as required by RCW 36.70A.130(3), in order to allow for possible future expansion of employment and residential land uses.

1.B.2 Rural urban transition area boundaries shall not include designated farm or forest lands.

Objective LU 1.C

Establish and maintain a UGA boundary that provides a distinct edge between urban and rural land uses.

LU Policies 1.C.1

Unique topographical and physical features such as watershed boundaries, streams, rivers, ridge lines, steep slopes, roads, railroad lines and transmission lines (where they follow property lines) and special purpose district boundaries shall be used, if possible, to delineate and define the boundary.

1.C.2

The design of development and the location of structures along the UGA boundary should use guidelines such as the Residential Development Handbook for Snohomish County Communities (Snohomish County Tomorrow, 1992) which includes cluster development techniques.

1.C.3

The designation and siting of new industrial, commercial, and public facility land uses along the UGA boundary should include vegetative buffers.

1.C.4

Annexations and planned urban densities shall be prohibited outside of the UGA boundary, and the provision of sanitary sewers to development outside and adjacent to the UGA shall be allowed only for public health emergencies and for necessary public facilities that are required to be served by sanitary sewers and cannot be feasibly located within the UGA. Urban capital facilities, including sanitary sewer facilities, may be located outside a UGA only when there are compelling reasons for such locations related to engineering design requirements or significant limitations on site availability and when they are intended and designed solely to serve urban development with the UGA.

1.C.5

The county may consider the expansion of UGA boundaries as part of a 10-Year Update to the Comprehensive Plan or as part of a growth target and plan reconciliation process that follows a 10-Year Update, while deferring implementing zoning in situations where urban infrastructure or special regulatory controls are needed and anticipated but are not in place to serve the population and employment allocated to the UGA. Where such UGA expansions with deferred implementing zoning are approved, no rezoning of properties within the expansion area may occur until: (1) necessary capital facilities plan updates have been completed and adopted by the utility provider; or (2) the necessary development regulations have been adopted.

Objective LU 1.D

Continue to support the joint city/county planning process that may result in adjustments to UGA boundaries consistent with this plan and GMA.

- LU Policies** 1.D.1 Following the reconciliation of population and employment projections by Snohomish County Tomorrow and the county, make adjustments to UGA boundaries, if necessary. A UGA boundary adjustment shall be considered only when necessary to ensure adequate capacity for accommodating projected urban growth in the succeeding 20-year period, as required by Policy LU 1.A.11 and when it is consistent with GPP policies and the GMA.
- 1.D.2 UGA plans may be undertaken to provide greater detail as to the type and location of future land uses and shall address the following.
- (a) Analyze and designate locations for increased residential, commercial, and industrial densities.
 - (b) Preserve and enhance unique and identifiable characteristics such as urban centers, cultural and historic resources, critical areas, open space areas and trails, distinctive development patterns, and neighborhood areas.
 - (c) Provide for growth phasing areas within UGAs where appropriate.
 - (d) Provide for any needed amendments to the General Policy Plan following adoption of the UGA plan.
 - (e) Consider open space, parks, and recreational facilities needed for urban growth.

Exhibit E
Amended Ordinance No. 09-044
Final Docket XIII, GPP Repealing the Fully Contained
Communities Section from the Land Use Chapter
GPP 16 Fully Contained Communities

(Fully Contained Communities)

~~A fully contained community (FCC) is a new community, located in a rural area at least one mile outside current UGAs within reasonable distance to a state highway or arterial. No FCC will be sited until an application for an FCC is approved. The FCC provides a mix of uses supporting the residential, service, facility and employment needs of the residents of the FCC. The specific interrelation between an FCC and neighboring areas is described more fully in LU 1.E. Upon approval, an FCC is considered part of a UGA and is urban in nature.~~

~~The term “fully contained” does not mean totally self contained, but rather that criteria and regulations affecting FCCs shall avoid, minimize and mitigate the impacts of FCCs on nearby lands. Also, the FCC may not provide the origin and end point of all needed services and utilities and may provide services to property located outside the FCC. The FCC will pay its fair share of needed services and facilities within and outside the community as determined by governing laws and regulations.~~

~~RCW 36.70A.350 allows counties to establish a process for reviewing proposals to authorize new FCCs outside of existing UGAs. Approval depends on complying with criteria established in RCW 36.70A.350 (1) and LU 1.E.2. An FCC offers many opportunities to Snohomish County, including:~~

- ~~● Innovative land use planning to provide a portion of projected housing and employment needs;~~
- ~~● A mix of uses in a compact area designed to reduce off-site traffic impacts;~~

- ~~● Comprehensive land use planning for a large area at one time;~~
- ~~● A coordinated approach to land use, open space, infrastructure and critical area planning;~~
- ~~● Integration of natural features throughout urban neighborhoods;~~
- ~~● A diversity of housing types and ownership options;~~
- ~~● The establishment of a specific range and intensity of uses;~~
- ~~● A high degree of certainty about the nature of future development;~~
- ~~● Efficient review and approval of land use applications using comprehensive and consistently applied development standards and mitigation measures;~~
- ~~● Opportunities to create a system of public open spaces linked by recreational/fitness trails in proximity to natural amenities; and~~
- ~~● New economic development opportunities.~~

~~Since there are also challenges associated with developing FCCs, they shall also reduce or eliminate negative impacts by measures such as the following:~~

- ~~● Completing the master plan before development begins;~~
- ~~● Monitoring the implementation of permits and agreements to assure conformity with plans;~~
- ~~● Providing for the protection of rural or resource character of neighboring property; and~~
- ~~● Demonstrating the financial capacity of the development entity to assure completion of the development as planned.~~

~~Objective LU 1.E Establish preconditions, criteria and a process for considering an FCC.~~

~~LU Policies 1.E.1 All of the following preconditions shall be met prior to considering the designation of a site as an FCC:~~

- ~~(a) The site shall contain at least 2,000 acres, with an adequate amount of property to accommodate a compact and efficient urban community;~~
- ~~(b) The site shall be in single ownership or control by a legal entity with the financial capacity to facilitate site planning and to assure ultimate development consistent with an approved FCC master plan;~~
- ~~(c) The site shall be located on land that is not resource land or
 - ~~(i) on designated forest lands that no longer satisfy the criteria set forth in LU 8.A.2; or~~
 - ~~(ii) on designated mineral lands that no longer meet the criteria set forth in LU 9.A.~~~~
- ~~(d) The siting and development of the FCC shall assure that it can incorporate as a separate city in the future; and~~
- ~~(e) The site shall be at least one mile from any Snohomish County city and at least one mile from any urban growth area boundary associated with a Snohomish County city.~~

~~1.E.2 FCC development regulations shall address the following criteria, including those established in RCW.36.70A.350. Nothing in the following statements limits the applicability of existing Snohomish County Codes:~~

- ~~(a) New on and off site infrastructure is provided for and impact fees are established consistent with the requirements of RCW 82.02.050 prior to development.
 - ~~(1) The site shall either be capable of connecting to an existing public water supply system that has the capacity to serve the needs of the proposed project, or have identified water rights to establish a new system, as determined by the governing agency, without unmitigated negative impacts on existing water users and water resources;~~~~

- ~~(2) The site shall either be capable of connecting to an existing public wastewater treatment system that has the capacity to serve the needs of the proposed project, or the demonstrated capability to develop a new wastewater treatment facility to meet the needs of the proposed project that, after mitigation, will not adversely impact any watersheds; and~~
- ~~(3) The site shall be located where adequate road systems are in place or will be put in place to address transportation needs and impacts. Snohomish County shall confirm the evaluation of the transportation infrastructure impacts and improvement needs and their financial implications shall be evaluated. The evaluation will include a determination that a proposed FCC can be made consistent with requirements of chapter 30.66B SCC. The obligations arising from this analysis shall be included in the Development Agreement. (see LU1.E.4)~~
- ~~(4) Responsibility for the provision of any needed facilities shall be determined in the Development Agreement.~~
- ~~(b) Transit-oriented site planning and traffic demand management programs are implemented.~~
 - ~~Sites for pedestrian, bicycle and high occupancy vehicle facilities shall be designated and incorporated into the design and management of the FCC. (See also chapter 30.66B SCC and LU 1.E.4)~~
- ~~(c) Buffers are provided between the FCC and adjacent urban development.~~
 - ~~Perimeter buffers may be provided on or off site, consisting of either landscaped areas with native vegetation or natural areas, to reduce impacts on adjacent lands.~~
- ~~(d) The FCC shall provide a mix of uses to offer jobs, housing and services to the residents of the new community.~~
 - ~~(1) The FCC shall allocate a sufficient amount of land with appropriate infrastructure to accommodate an appropriate number of employment opportunities as determined by an analysis of the relevant factors affecting the proposed FCC.~~

~~(2) Service uses in the FCC may also serve residents outside the FCC, where appropriate.~~

~~(e) Affordable housing is provided within the new community for a broad range of age and income levels.~~

~~— The percentage of housing for low and moderate income households shall comply with Snohomish County's fair share housing allocation.~~

~~— At least 30% of the total housing within the FCC shall be divided into three classes:~~

~~(1) affordable to those with incomes at 80% of the median income;~~

~~(2) affordable to those with incomes at 100% of the median income; and~~

~~(3) affordable to those with incomes at 120% of the median income.~~

~~The exact mix between these three classes shall be determined by the director.~~

~~(f) Environmental protection has been addressed and provided for.~~

~~(g) Development regulations are established to ensure urban growth will not occur in adjacent non-urban areas.~~

~~— (1) Measures shall include, but are not limited to, rural zoning of adjacent rural areas, limits on size of FCC water and sewer systems.~~

~~— (2) FCC shall prohibit connection by property owners in the adjacent rural area to the FCC sewer and water mains or lines, except as allowed under GMA.~~

~~(h) Provision is made to mitigate impacts on designated agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands.~~

~~— The site shall be on land that minimally impacts any designated resource lands;~~

~~(i) The plan for the FCC is consistent with the development regulations established for the protection of critical areas and shorelines by the county pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170 and chapter RCW 90.58.~~

~~The site shall be located where environmental impacts to critical areas can be avoided, minimized, or mitigated.~~

- ~~(j) Low impact development and other techniques developed for resource conservation and reduction of environmental impacts, both during construction and over the life of the project, shall be incorporated into the planning, design, construction, and operation of the project.~~
- ~~(k) The FCC applicant will prepare a financial and fiscal analysis of the adequacy of existing capital facilities and general governmental services “necessary for urban development,” and a financial plan to address identified needs.~~
- ~~(l) The FCC applicant shall coordinate and cooperate with cities and nearby property owners that would be directly affected by the establishment of the FCC and shall document its efforts during the approval process.~~

~~1.E.3 Snohomish County shall adopt development regulations for FCCs~~

~~which establish the process for:~~

- ~~(a) Administrative and public review and approval of a FCC master plan;~~
- ~~(b) Any amendments to the FCC master plan; and~~
- ~~(c) Subsequent development review and approvals.~~

~~1.E.4 Snohomish County and the owner or owners of all land within a FCC shall enter into a Development Agreement, as authorized by RCW 36.70B.170-210, prior to any subdivision and construction of any development designated in the approved FCC master plan. This Development Agreement shall:~~

- ~~(a) Specify the term of the FCC permit;~~
- ~~(b) Incorporate from the FCC master plan detailed development standards for retention of natural vegetation, landscaping, parking, signage, trails, utility corridors, storm water management and groundwater protection pedestrian/vehicular traffic separation, and clearing and grading;~~
- ~~(c) Provide financial plans for infrastructure and services, amount and payment of impact fees, and eventual incorporation as a city/town;~~

- ~~(d) Specify roles and responsibilities in the provision of services and facilities in the FCC;~~
- ~~(e) Provide conditions for phasing and development, and mitigation measures that apply to the FCC;~~
- ~~(f) Provide a mechanism for assuring a mixture of uses and housing types in the development of the FCC in accordance with the applicable goals, objectives, policies and development standards;~~
- ~~(g) Provide a plan for the conversion of commercial to residential land use;~~
- ~~(h) Identify the permitted land uses, densities, and constraints for the development as a whole and for subareas;~~
- ~~(i) Provide a plan for zoning changes for the FCC;~~
- ~~(j) Provide provisions for the “Critical Areas Development Standards”;~~
- ~~(k) Specify the permit process and platting standard for the FCC;~~
- ~~(l) Provide any needed Quarry Development Standards;~~
- ~~(m) Define the urban road design standards for the FCC;~~
- ~~(n) Provide the agreement for implementing water and sewer service to FCC areas;~~
- ~~(o) Provide park and recreation improvements to the FCC, including plan for trails;~~
- ~~(p) Include a plan for schools, police and fire programs for the FCC;~~
- ~~(q) Address the adequacy and sufficiency of public facilities;~~
- ~~(r) Specify a plan for signs and landscaping for the FCC;~~
- ~~(s) Include Public Works agreement established for the FCC;~~
- ~~(t) Include county processing and review procedures;~~
- ~~(u) Provide for vesting of development standards for the FCC;~~
- ~~(v) Provide joint transportation improvements and preservation of open space for the FCC;~~
- ~~(w) Include general provisions agreed upon for the FCC;~~
- ~~(x) Provide for monitoring of measures to reduce impacts and address permitting conditions; and~~

~~(y) Include other terms and conditions the county deems necessary or appropriate to ensure that the development of the FCC is accomplished in compliance with the provisions and policies of Snohomish County and state and federal regulations that govern such development.)~~

Exhibit F
Amended Ordinance No. 09-044
Final Docket XIII, GPP – Appendix D, Table D-1 Amendments
GPP 16 Fully Contained Communities

APPENDIX D, Table D-1 - ((Reconciled)) 2025 Population Growth Targets for Cities, UGAs and the Rural/Resource Area Recommended by the SCT Planning Advisory Committee ((April 13, 2006)) and SCT Steering Committee ((May 24, 2006), as Modified), and Adopted by the Snohomish County Council ((on December 20, 2006)).					
Area	2002 Estimated Population	Reconciled 2025 Population Targets	2002 - 2025 Population Growth		
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth	
Non-S.W. County UGA	134,101	226,794	92,693	((29.9%))	31.4%
Arlington UGA	13,920	27,000	13,080	((4.2%))	4.4%
Arlington City	13,280	18,150	4,870		1.6%
Unincorporated	640	8,850	8,210	((2.6%))	2.8%
Darrington UGA	1,468	2,125	657		0.2%
Darrington Town	1,335	1,910	575		0.2%
Unincorporated	133	215	82		0.0%
Gold Bar UGA	2,817	3,500	683		0.2%
Gold Bar City	2,055	2,497	442		0.1%
Unincorporated	762	1,003	241		0.1%
Granite Falls UGA	2,909	6,970	4,061	((1.3%))	1.4%
Granite Falls City	2,760	4,770	2,010	((0.6%))	0.7%
Unincorporated	149	2,200	2,051		0.7%
Index UGA (incorporated)	160	190	30		0.0%
Lake Stevens UGA	26,828	46,125	19,297	((6.2%))	6.5%
Lake Stevens City	6,640	8,360	1,720		0.6%
Unincorporated	20,188	37,765	17,577	((5.7%))	5.9%
Maltby UGA (unincorporated)	NA	NA	NA		NA
Marysville UGA	50,828	79,800	28,972	((9.3%))	9.8%
Marysville City	27,580	36,737	9,157	((2.9%))	3.1%
Unincorporated	23,248	43,063	19,815	((6.4%))	6.7%
Monroe UGA	16,240	26,590	10,350	((3.3%))	3.5%
Monroe City	14,670	20,540	5,870	((1.9%))	2.0%
Unincorporated	1,570	6,050	4,480	((1.4%))	1.5%
Snohomish UGA	10,194	14,535	4,341	((1.4%))	1.5%
Snohomish City	8,575	9,981	1,406		0.5%
Unincorporated	1,619	4,554	2,935	((0.9%))	1.0%
Stanwood UGA	4,479	8,840	4,361	((1.4%))	1.5%
Stanwood City	4,085	5,650	1,565		0.5%
Unincorporated	394	3,190	2,796		0.9%
Sultan UGA	4,258	11,119	6,861	((2.2%))	2.3%
Sultan City	3,910	8,190	4,280		1.4%
Unincorporated	348	2,929	2,581	((0.8%))	0.9%
S.W. County UGA	380,579	533,125	152,546	((49.4%))	51.6%
Incorporated S.W.	242,490	303,227	60,737	((49.6%))	20.6%
Bothell City (part)	14,490	22,000	7,510	((2.4%))	2.5%
Brier City	6,445	7,790	1,345	((0.4%))	0.5%
Edmonds City	39,460	44,880	5,420	((1.7%))	1.8%
Everett City	96,070	123,060	26,990	((8.7%))	9.1%
Lynnwood City	33,990	43,782	9,792	((3.2%))	3.3%
Mill Creek City	12,055	16,089	4,034	((1.3%))	1.4%
Mtlake Terrace City	20,470	22,456	1,986	((0.6%))	0.7%
Mukilteo City	18,520	22,000	3,480	((1.4%))	1.2%
Woodway Town	990	1,170	180		0.1%
Unincorporated S.W.	138,089	229,898	91,809	((29.6%))	31.1%
UGA Total	514,680	759,919	245,239	((79.0%))	83.0%
City Total	327,540	420,202	92,662	((29.8%))	31.4%
Unincorporated UGA Total	187,140	339,717	152,577	((49.4%))	51.6%
((FCC Population Reserve*))	((NA))	((15,000))	((15,000))		((4.8%))
TDR Population Reserve	NA	4,900	4,900	((1.6%))	1.7%
Potential UGA total	514,680	((779,819))	((265,139))	((85.4%))	84.7%
Non-UGA Total (Rural Unincorporated)	113,320	158,615	45,295	((14.6%))	15.3%
County Total	628,000	((938,434))	((310,434))		100.0%

((FCC = Fully Contained Community;)) TDR = Transfer of Development Rights; NA = Not applicable.
((*) The portion of the 2025 countywide population projection reserved for potential FCCs. The portion of the population reserve associated with an approved FCC becomes part of the urban growth allocation [RCW 36.70A.350(2)].)