



Snohomish County Council

Committee: Planning & Community Development **Analyst:** Ryan Countryman
ECAF: 2022-0672
Proposal: Proposed Motion 22-286 **Date:** July 19, 2022

Consideration

Proposed Motion 22-286 states that the Snohomish County Council does not oppose the Lake Stevens Fagerlie annexation and will not invoke the jurisdiction of the Boundary Review Board (BRB).

The agenda package includes a substitute motion that adds direction the Council Clerk to file the motion together with a staff report from Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS) with the BRB.

Background and Analysis

The City of Lake Stevens seeks to annex approximately 13.93 acres of Urban Growth Area (UGA) adjacent to the southeast part of the current city boundary. This area includes three parcels, two with residences. Snohomish County and the Lake Stevens entered a Master Annexation Interlocal Agreement (MAILA) in 2005 that establishes the terms of future annexation processes.

Lake Stevens initiated the present annexation process for the area known as the “Fagerlie Annexation” by adopting Resolution 2022-07 and submitting notice of intention with the Boundary Review Board (BRB file 05-2022). PDS staff report dated July 1, 2022, describes how the annexation is consistent with the factors and objectives of the BRB, county code, the County’s Growth Management Act (GMA) Comprehensive Plan, the Countywide Planning Policies, and other applicable statutes.

This annexation uses the petition method (RCW 35A.14.120) which requires owners of 60% of the assessed property value in the annexation area to sign a petition of support. On April 12, 2022, the Snohomish County Assessor’s office issued a Certificate of Sufficiency stating that owners of 100% of the assessed value had signed the petition.

The motion originally transmitted to County Council omitted a recital that directs Council staff to send the approved motion and PDS staff report to the Boundary Review Board (BRB). Council staff inquired with PDS about the recital and PDS staff immediately supplied a motion with the recital. PDS and Council staff request that the County Council consider *Substitute Motion 22-286*.

An affirmative vote on the substitute motion would formalize the County Council's support for the annexation and would not invoke BRB jurisdiction. August 1, 2022 is the final day of the 45-day period during which the County may choose to invoke the jurisdiction of the BRB to hold a hearing on the annexation. If the County Council takes no action, then the annexation is valid. The proposed annexation is consistent with the MAILA and there is no known conflict with policy or other reason for the annexation to not proceed.

This motion was assigned to the Planning & Community Development Committee but, because of a need to meet the August 1 deadline, the request is to reassign it to Committee of the Whole for consideration and action on July 19.

Current Proposal

Summary: The motion states that the County Council does not oppose the annexation. The substitute motion adds direction to the Council Clerk to file the motion and PDS staff report with the BRB.

Effective Date: Date of passage.

Deadline: BRB 45-day review period ends August 1, 2022.

Fiscal Implications: Annual decrease of \$575.12 in Surface Water Management service charges at current rates.

Scope: Approval of the motion and direction to the Clerk to transmit to the BRB.

Handling: NORMAL

Risk Management: APPROVE

Executive Recommendation: APPROVE

Request: Consideration of *Substitute Motion 22-286* and action by Committee of the Whole on July 19, 2022.