

Index of Records							
Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) <a href="#">Ordinance 21-059</a> ( ECAF 21-0661) Executive recommended							
Hearing Date: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 @ 10:30 a.m.							
Council Staff: Ryan Countryman		DPA: Alethea Hart			PDS Staff: Mitchell Brouse		
EXHIBIT	RECORD TYPE	TO	FROM/BY	DATE	DATE IN	DESCRIPTION	# OF PAGES
<b>3.1 ECAF and Materials</b>							
<a href="#">3.1.1</a>	ECAF	Council	Executive/PDS		08/24/21	Transmitting Executive Recommended Ordinance	2
<a href="#">3.1.2</a>	Ordinance	Council	Executive/PDS		08/24/21	Introduced Ordinance	26
<a href="#">3.1.3</a>	Policies	Council	Executive/PDS		08/24/21	SCT recommended Countywided Planning Policies (Exhibit A to the ordinance)	101
<a href="#">3.1.4</a>	Introduction	Council	Nate Nehring		08/25/21	Introduction Slip	1
<b>3.2 Council Planning Committee Materials</b>							
<a href="#">3.2.1</a>	Staff Report	Council	Ryan Countryman, Council Staff		08/31/21	Council Staff Report	8
<a href="#">3.2.2</a>	PowerPoint	Council	Mitchell Brouse, PDS Staff		08/31/21	Presentation prepared for Planning Committee 08/31/21	10 slides

EXHIBIT	RECORD TYPE	TO	FROM/BY	DATE	DATE IN	DESCRIPTION	# OF PAGES
<b>3.3 Correspondence, Comments, Testimony</b>							
3.3.1	Letter	Council	Marshland Flood Control District	08/25/21	08/27/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.2	Letter	Council	Marv Thomas	08/27/21	08/27/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.3	Letter	Council	Master Builders	08/30/21	08/30/21	Public Testimony	9
3.3.4	E-mail	Council	Barbara Bailey	09/18/21	09/20/21	Public Testimony	6
3.3.5	Letter	Council	Barbara Bailey	09/18/21	09/28/21	Public Testimony	5
3.3.6	E-mail	Council	Karen Crowley	09/27/21	09/27/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.7	E-mail	Council	Marjie Fields	09/27/21	09/27/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.8	E-mail	Council	Nancy Johnson	09/27/21	09/27/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.9	E-mail	Council	Kate Lunceford	09/27/21	09/27/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.10	E-mail	Council	Carlo Voli	09/27/21	09/27/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.11	E-mail	Council	Nicholas Bratton, Forterra	09/28/21	09/28/21	Public Testimony	2
3.3.12	E-mail	Council	Greg Ferguson	09/28/21	09/28/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.13	E-mail	Council	Linda Gray	09/28/21	09/28/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.14	E-mail	Council	Mickie Gundersen	09/28/21	09/28/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.15	E-mail	Council	Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise	09/28/21	09/28/21	Public Testimony	12
3.3.16	E-mail	Council	Karen Guzak	09/29/21	09/29/21	Public Testimony	1

EXHIBIT	RECORD TYPE	TO	FROM/BY	DATE	DATE IN	DESCRIPTION	# OF PAGES
3.3.17	E-mail	Council	Jeanine SanClemente, PhD	09/29/21	09/29/21	Public Testimony	1
3.3.18	E-mail	Council	Randall Whalen	09/29/21	09/29/21	Public Testimony	1
<b>3.4 Staff Reports and Submissions</b>							
<b>3.5 Public Participation</b>							
3.5.1	Notice	Council	Council Staff	09/10/21		Notice of Introduction and Public Hearing	3
3.5.2	Affidavit	Council	Herald	09/15/21		Affidavit of Publication - Notice of Introduction and Public Hearing	3
3.5.3	Notice	Council	Council Staff	10/13/21		Notice of Enactment	1
3.5.4	Notice	Council	Council Staff	10/13/21		Notice of GMA Action	1
3.5.5	Transmittal	Council	Council Staff	10/13/21		Transmitting copy of adopted ordinance	130
3.5.6	Letter	Council	Dept. of Commerce	10/13/21		Acknowledging receipt of transmittal	1
3.5.7	Affidavit	Council	Herald	10/20/21		Affidavit of Publication - Notice of Enactment	2
3.5.8	Affidavit	Council	Herald	10/20/21		Affidavit of Publication - Notice of GMA Action	2
<b>3.6 Council Deliberations</b>							

EXHIBIT	RECORD TYPE	TO	FROM/BY	DATE	DATE IN	DESCRIPTION	# OF PAGES
3.6.1	Amendment	Council	PDS Staff		08/27/21	Amendment Sheet 1 - Housekeeping to Exhibit A	5
3.6.2	Amendment	Council	Council Staff		08/27/21	Amendment Sheet 2 - Updating GMA goals as stated in the CPPs	2
3.6.2A	Amendment	Council	Council Staff		09/29/21	Amendment Sheet 2A - Updating GMA goals as stated in the CPPs	2
3.6.3	Amendment	Council	Councilmember Nehring		09/29/21	Amendment Sheet 3 - Retaining Current Policy DP-2.e.10 as stated in the CPPs	1
3.6.3A	Amendment	Council	Council Staff		09/29/21	Amendment Sheet 3A - Retaining Current Policy DP-2.e.10 as stated in the CPPs	1
3.6.4	Amendment	Council	Councilmember Low		09/29/21	Amendment Sheet 4 - Revising Proposed Policy PS-21	1
3.6.4A	Amendment	Council	Council Staff		09/29/21	Amendment Sheet 4A - Revising Proposed Policy PS-21	1

## Executive/Council Action Form (ECAF)

**ITEM TITLE:**

*..Title*

Ordinance 21-059, relating to Growth Management; updating the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPS) for Snohomish County

*..body*

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Development Services

**ORIGINATOR:** Mitchell Brouse

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:** Approve-Ken Klein, 08/26/21

**PURPOSE:** To transmit the County Executive recommended ordinance updating the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County.

**BACKGROUND:** RCW 36.70A.210(2) requires the Snohomish County Council to adopt a countywide policy framework in cooperation with the cities and towns within Snohomish County, to guide the development and adoption of the County, cities, and towns' comprehensive plans.

On October 29, 2020, the Puget Sound Regional Council General Assembly adopted VISION 2050 A Plan for the Central Puget Sound Region, including updated Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) and Regional Growth Strategy (RGS). MPP-RC-13, within VISION 2050, requires the County to update its CPPs to address the updated MPPs prior to December 31, 2021.

The Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) set up a subcommittee, which included representation from cities, towns, tribes, Snohomish County, Community Transit, and PSRC, to draft a proposal for updating the CPPs, of which the final version was transmitted to the PAC on May 5, 2021. The PAC reviewed the subcommittee draft and transmitted a final recommendation on to the SCT Steering Committee on June 10, 2021 and the SCT Steering Committee reviewed the PAC recommendation and made a recommendation to the County Council on July 28, 2021.

The recommended updates to the CPPs include increased focus on topics such as social equity and inclusion, climate change, interjurisdictional coordination, and displacement of residents and businesses and include updates to the reasonable measures process and new criteria for the designation of countywide centers.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:**

<b>EXPEND:</b> FUND, AGY, ORG, ACTY, OBJ, AU	CURRENT YR	2ND YR	1ST 6 YRS
<b>TOTAL</b>			

<b>REVENUE:</b> FUND, AGY, ORG, REV, SOURCE	CURRENT YR	2ND YR	1ST 6 YRS
<b>TOTAL</b>			

**DEPARTMENT FISCAL IMPACT NOTES:** Click or tap here to enter text.

**CONTRACT INFORMATION:**

ORIGINAL \_\_\_\_\_ CONTRACT# \_\_\_\_\_ AMOUNT \_\_\_\_\_  
AMENDMENT \_\_\_\_\_ CONTRACT# \_\_\_\_\_ AMOUNT \_\_\_\_\_

**Contract Period**

ORIGINAL	START _____	END _____
AMENDMENT	START _____	END _____

**OTHER DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW/COMMENTS:** Approved as to form by PA (Alethea Hart)  
Approved/Reviewed by Finance & Risk

1 Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
2 Effective: \_\_\_\_\_

3  
4 SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
5 SNOHOMISH COUNTY WASHINGTON

6  
7 ORDINANCE NO. 21-059

8  
9 RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE  
10 PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

11  
12 WHEREAS, a provision of the Growth Management Act (GMA), Revised Code  
13 of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.210(2), requires the legislative authority of each county  
14 which is subject to the GMA's comprehensive planning requirements to adopt a  
15 countywide policy framework in cooperation with the cities and towns within that  
16 county, and from which the county's, cities' and towns' comprehensive plans are  
17 developed and adopted; and

18  
19 WHEREAS, a provision of the GMA, RCW 36.70A.210(7), requires the adoption  
20 of multicounty planning policies (MPPs) for contiguous counties, each with a population  
21 of four hundred fifty thousand or more, with contiguous urban areas; and

22  
23 WHEREAS, on July 17, 1991, the Snohomish County Council (County Council),  
24 approved, through Motion No. 91-210, an interlocal agreement (ILA) process that  
25 includes King, Pierce and Kitsap counties for the adoption of MPPs by the Puget Sound  
26 Regional Council (PSRC) as part of the duties performed by PSRC for regional planning  
27 in the Central Puget Sound area; and

28  
29 WHEREAS, in 1992, the PSRC and its member jurisdictions adopted an ILA that  
30 provides the PSRC with the authority to carry out functions required under state and  
31 federal law and calls for the PSRC to maintain an adopted regional growth strategy; and

32  
33 WHEREAS, on February 4, 1993, the county council, through Ordinance No. 93-  
34 004, adopted countywide planning policies (CPPs), which were later amended in  
35 Ordinance No. 94-002 on February 2, 1994; Amended Ordinance No. 95-005 on  
36 February 17, 1995; Ordinance No. 95-110 on December 20, 1995; Ordinance No. 98-054  
37 on July 15, 1998; Amended Ordinance No. 99-120 on January 19, 2000; Amended  
38 Ordinance No. 99-121 on February 16, 2000; Amended Ordinance Nos. 03-071, 03-072  
39 and 03-073 on July 9, 2003; Amended Ordinance No. 03-070 on December 10, 2003;  
40 Amended Ordinance No. 04-006 on February 11, 2004; Amended Ordinance No. 04-007  
41 on March 31, 2004; Amended Ordinance Nos. 06-098 and 06-116 on December 20,  
42 2006; Amended Ordinance No. 08-054 on June 3, 2008; Amended Ordinance No. 09-061  
43 on August 12, 2009 (with veto override vote on September 8, 2009 through Amended  
44 Ordinance No. 09-062); and Ordinance No. 10-037 on July 7, 2010; and

1 WHEREAS, on June 1, 2011, the County Council, through Amended Ordinance  
2 No. 11-011, repealed the CPPs and adopted new CPPs for Snohomish County, which  
3 were later amended in Amended Ordinance No. 11-021 on June 1, 2011; Amended  
4 Ordinance No. 11-015 on June 8, 2011; Ordinance No. 12-070 on October 17, 2012;  
5 Amended Ordinance No. 13-032 on June 12, 2013; Ordinance No. 14-006 on April 16,  
6 2014; and Amended Ordinance No. 16-078 on November 10, 2016; and  
7

8 WHEREAS, on October 29, 2020, the General Assembly of the PSRC adopted  
9 VISION 2050 A Plan for the Central Puget Sound Region, including new Multicounty  
10 Planning Policies (MPPs) and Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), which updated the  
11 previously adopted VISION 2040; and  
12

13 WHEREAS, policy MPP-RC-13 within VISION 2050 requires Snohomish  
14 County to update its countywide planning policies to address the new MPPs within  
15 VISION 2050 prior to December 31, 2021.  
16

17 WHEREAS, since the County Council's adoption of the CPPs in 1993, revisions  
18 have been made to the GMA that require changes to the CPPs in order to maintain  
19 consistency between the CPPs and the GMA; and  
20

21 WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.215 requires counties planning under the GMA, in  
22 consultation with their cities and towns, to adopt a review and evaluation program in the  
23 CPPs; and  
24

25 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) process for updating the  
26 CPPs typically begins with review of current CPPs by the Planning Advisory Committee  
27 (PAC) of SCT, followed by recommendations by the PAC to the Snohomish County  
28 Tomorrow Steering Committee (SCT SC) to revise current CPPs; and  
29

30 WHEREAS, the SCT process for updating the CPPs allows the SCT SC to discuss  
31 recommendations from the PAC, revise those recommendations, and make final  
32 recommendations from SCT to the County Council; and  
33

34 WHEREAS, the County Council receives the recommendations from SCT and  
35 then holds one or more public hearings on the recommendations before taking action to  
36 revise the CPPs; and  
37

38 WHEREAS, on February 13, 2020, the PAC set up a subcommittee to draft a  
39 proposal for updating the CPPs that the subcommittee would then submit back to the  
40 PAC for review and approval by consensus; and  
41

42 WHEREAS, the PAC subcommittee included representation from cities, towns,  
43 tribes, Snohomish County, PSRC, and Community Transit; and  
44

45 WHEREAS, the PAC subcommittee initiated in person meetings on February 20,  
46 2020, with scheduled meetings during the months of March and April 2020 canceled due



1 to the COVID-19 public health emergency, and subcommittee meetings continuing  
2 virtual between May 2020 and January 2021, working topic by topic reviewing and  
3 updating the CPPs; and

4  
5 WHEREAS, the PAC subcommittee submitted a proposed updated draft of the  
6 CPPs (dated February 12, 2021), including tables with a description of each  
7 subcommittee proposed policy amendment and associated MPPs, to the PAC to begin  
8 review at the February 11, 2021, PAC meeting; and

9  
10 WHEREAS, the PAC recommended draft of the CPPs was available for public  
11 comment between February 18, 2021, and March 16, 2021; and

12  
13 WHEREAS, the PAC referred all submitted comments back to the PAC  
14 subcommittee for review and consideration; and

15  
16 WHEREAS, the PAC subcommittee met on April 22 and April 29, 2021, to  
17 review the comments, update the subcommittee recommendation, and resubmit a  
18 proposed updated draft of the CPPs (dated May 5, 2021) to the PAC for their review and  
19 consideration; and

20  
21 WHEREAS, from February 11, 2021, to June 10, 2021, the SCT PAC convened  
22 to discuss and consider the 2021 update of the CPPs, including meetings on March 11,  
23 2021; April 8, 2021; and May 13, 2021; and

24  
25 WHEREAS, the minutes of the PAC meetings reflect the discussions and  
26 recommendations made by the PAC to the SCT SC; and

27  
28 WHEREAS, on May 26, 2021, June 23, 2021, and July 28, 2021, the SCT SC  
29 convened to discuss, review, and consider the PAC recommendation on the 2021 update  
30 of the CPPs; and

31  
32 WHEREAS, the SCT SC concluded its review of the PAC recommendations and  
33 made a recommendation to the County Council for updating the CPPs on July 28, 2021;  
34 and

35  
36 WHEREAS, except in the removal of the SCT SC recommended new policy JP-3,  
37 Exhibit A to this ordinance reflects the SCT SC recommendation to the County Council,  
38 as shown to strike through and underline, with minor formatting changes to conform with  
39 County standards on the form of ordinances; and

40  
41 WHEREAS, the minutes of the SCT SC meetings reflect the discussion and  
42 recommendations made by the SCT SC to the County Council; and

43  
44 WHEREAS, the County Council held a public hearing(s) on \_\_\_\_, 2021, to  
45 consider the entire record, including the July 28, 2021, SCT recommendation and to hear  
46 public testimony on this Ordinance No. 21-\_\_\_\_.

47  
48 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED:

1  
2 Section 1. The County Council adopts the following findings in support of this  
3 ordinance:

4  
5 A. The foregoing recitals are adopted as findings as if set forth in full herein.  
6

7 B. The updated CPPs, which include new policies and modified versions of current CPPs  
8 are consistent with VISION 2050 and state law.  
9

10 C. The County Council adopts and incorporates the following general findings of fact  
11 related to the updated CPPs:

- 12
- 13 1. The proposed updated CPPs consider the internal consistency of the current CPPs  
14 and reflect a careful balance between maintaining the historic nature of the  
15 policies and the functional advantages of improved consistency.  
16
  - 17 2. The formation of the updated CPPs reflect a careful balancing of the requirements  
18 found in: (a) the MPPs in VISION 2050; (b) the fourteen goals of the GMA  
19 (RCW 36.70A.020 and .480(1)); and (c) the requirements for CPPs for  
20 Snohomish County under RCW 36.70A.210 and RCW 36.70A.215. Of these  
21 requirements, the MPPs in VISION 2050 have undergone the greatest degree of  
22 recent change. Hence, the majority of policy-level changes in the new CPPs  
23 reflect local implementation of regional policies adopted in VISION 2050.  
24
- 25 a. The updated CPPs proposed by this ordinance make changes to address  
26 the updated MPPs in VISION 2050 to include the addition of new topics  
27 and concepts from the MPPs that are directive to counties and cities.  
28
  - 29 b. Consistent with the changes to the MPPs between VISION 2040 and  
30 VISION 2050, the proposed amendments to the CPPs include increased  
31 emphasis on the topics of equity and inclusion. This emphasis can be seen  
32 through revised central principles, updated chapter goals, and new and  
33 updated policies throughout all chapters of the CPPs. The updated and  
34 enhanced focus directs jurisdictions, through local and countywide  
35 planning processes, to more readily consider and include the impacts of  
36 governmental decision making on historically marginalized populations;  
37 work to reduce the discrepancies in access to opportunity, health  
38 outcomes, and services; and include equity considerations in decision  
39 making and jurisdictional investments.  
40
  - 41 c. The proposed policy updates include additional direction on coordination  
42 between jurisdictions and governmental agencies. This direction also  
43 incorporates additional guidance for jurisdictional coordination with tribes  
44 and military installations that is consistent with regional direction from  
45 VISION 2050.  
46

- 1 d. The proposed amendments include additional emphasis on slowing and  
2 mitigating the impacts of climate change, including the addition of a new  
3 subchapter in the Natural Environment chapter (proposed to be renamed to  
4 The Natural Environment and Climate Change), dedicated to policies  
5 addressing climate change and greenhouse gas emissions reductions.  
6  
7 e. The proposed amendments include new and amended policies intended to  
8 address and mitigate potential displacement of residents and businesses as  
9 a result of pressure from population and employment growth and  
10 development and redevelopment.  
11  
12 f. The proposed amendments include additional focus on transit-oriented  
13 development and directing population and employment growth to centers.  
14 This includes the addition of a new appendix, Appendix 1 – Centers, which  
15 includes new and additional direction on the centers hierarchy, consistent  
16 with VISION 2050 and the Regional Centers Framework. Within the  
17 proposed appendix is newly proposed criteria for the identification of  
18 Countywide Growth Centers and Countywide Industrial Centers.  
19  
20 g. The proposed amendments include updates to the reasonable measures  
21 process, consistent with new guidance adopted by the Washington State  
22 Legislature in 2017 through E2SSB 5254.

23  
24 3. This ordinance is consistent with the record.

25  
26 4. Except in the removal of the SCT SC recommended new policy JP-3, the updated  
27 CPPs in Exhibit A to this ordinance reflect the recommendation from the SCT SC,  
28 with minor formatting changes to Exhibit A as necessary to conform with County  
29 standards on the form of ordinances.

30  
31 5. The SCT SC recommended new policy JP-3 is removed because: (a) The SCT SC  
32 policy JP-3 assigns obligations to only the County in facilitating annexation of  
33 Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs),  
34 which is an action that inherently requires collaboration between jurisdictions; (b)  
35 The SCT SC recommended policy JP-3 does not address disagreement related to  
36 annexations and will not likely result in consistency between County and city  
37 comprehensive plans; (c) Portions of the SCT SC recommended policy JP-3 are  
38 redundant to existing policy language within the CPPs, with, for example, JP-1  
39 emphasizing the importance of coordinating annexation between jurisdictions and  
40 JP-4 (formerly JP-6) directing the County and cities to develop policies in their  
41 comprehensive plans that provide for the orderly transition of unincorporated  
42 UGAs into cities; and (d) The SCT SC recommended policy JP-3 includes  
43 unnecessary restatements of basic legal principles about city/town land use  
44 authority, which are already found in existing policies DP-5 and DP-7 (formally  
45 DP-8).  
46

1 D. The County Council adopts and incorporates the following additional specific findings  
2 of fact related to the updated CPPs:

- 3  
4 1. The updated CPPs include amended narrative in the introductory chapter titled  
5 “Introduction to the Countywide Planning Policies.” In addition to the changes  
6 described below, amendments to the existing narrative are intended to improve  
7 readability, update references as needed, and make minor corrections.  
8  
9 a. The “Regional Context” section is updated to incorporate the regional  
10 vision as found in VISION 2050, including updates to reflect the  
11 description of the plan, the updated “vision for 2050”, the updated  
12 regional overarching goals, and the updated Regional Growth Strategy.  
13  
14 b. The Countywide Context section is updated to acknowledge the unknown  
15 aspects of the COVID-19 public health emergency, which occurred during  
16 the updated CPP development process.  
17  
18 2. The second chapter in the CPPs is titled “Central Principles and Framework  
19 Policies” and sets the stage for cooperative action between jurisdictions. The  
20 chapter includes three parts: (1) Central Principles, which guide all policies within  
21 the CPPs; (2) General Framework Policies, which includes one unchanged policy  
22 and six amended policies; and (3) Joint Planning Policies, which includes four  
23 unchanged policies, one amended policy, two new policies, and two deleted  
24 policies. In addition to the changes described below, amendments are made to  
25 improve readability, update references as needed, and make minor corrections.  
26

27 *Central Principles*

- 28  
29 a. The first Central Principle is amended to provide improved readability and  
30 include reference to the MPPs and regional vision within VISION 2050.  
31  
32 b. A proposed new third Central Principle calls for jurisdictions to  
33 incorporate equity and inclusion into all aspects of planning. This  
34 principle is consistent with new focus on social equity throughout the  
35 MPPs and is reflected in updated and new policies throughout the  
36 amended CPPs.  
37

38 *General Framework Policies*

- 39  
40 c. Policy GF-2 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
41 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
42  
43 d. Policy GF-3 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
44 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
45

- 1 e. Policy GF-4 is amended to update the reference to the current regional  
2 plan, VISION 2050. The policy direction remains unchanged.  
3  
4 f. Policy GF-5 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
5 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
6  
7 g. Policy GF-6 is amended to simplify the language for easier policy  
8 maintenance and updates over time and to directly reflect the language in  
9 MPP-RGS-4, which prioritizes the accommodation of growth within the  
10 UGA.  
11  
12 h. Policy GF-7 is amended to incorporate the revised deadline for the  
13 Buildable Lands Report as described in RCW 36.70A.215(2)(b), which  
14 was enacted in 2017 through E2SSB 5254.  
15

16 *Joint Planning Policies*  
17

- 18 i. Policy JP-1 is amended to include reference to the portions of the GMA  
19 that provide directives about urban growth and to stress the importance of  
20 coordination between jurisdictions in local planning, governance,  
21 provision of services, and annexation, consistent with MPP-RGS-16.  
22  
23 j. Existing policy JP-2 is deleted because jurisdictions did not express  
24 interest in utilizing this dispute resolution process. Alternate methods of  
25 dispute resolution have been utilized by jurisdictions. Subsequently listed  
26 policies are renumbered as appropriate.  
27  
28 k. Existing policy JP-5 is deleted because the described interjurisdictional  
29 group and process was never implemented by Snohomish County  
30 Tomorrow. Alternate methods have been used to resolve disputes between  
31 jurisdictional comprehensive plans. Other policies are renumbered as  
32 appropriate.  
33  
34 l. New proposed policy JP-6 provides direction for jurisdictions to  
35 collaborate in planning efforts with military installations. The proposed  
36 policy is consistent with MPP-RC-5.  
37  
38 m. New proposed policy JP-7 provides direction for jurisdictions to  
39 collaborate with tribes in local and countywide planning efforts. The  
40 proposed policy is consistent with MPP-RC-4.  
41  
42 3. The third chapter within the CPPs is titled “Development Patterns” and includes  
43 an overall goal and three subchapters: (1) Urban Growth Areas and Land Use,  
44 which includes nine unchanged policies, twelve amended policies, three new  
45 policies, and one deleted policy; (2) Rural Land Use and Resource Lands, which  
46 includes three unchanged policies and six amended policies; and (3) Orderly

1 Development, which includes five unchanged policies, four amended policies, and  
2 three new policies.  
3

- 4 a. The narrative sections of the Development Patterns chapter are updated to  
5 improve clarity of the section, update references as needed, reflect new  
6 regional and state level context, and make corrections as needed to reflect  
7 the updated policies.  
8
- 9 b. The overall Development Patterns Goal is amended to specifically identify  
10 the desired form for Snohomish County’s urban places (walkable,  
11 compact, transit oriented, access to open space, with protection of rural  
12 and resource lands). Additionally, the amended language includes greater  
13 focus on creating communities that provide a high quality of life for all  
14 Snohomish County residents.  
15

16 *Urban Growth Areas and Land Use*  
17

- 18 c. Policy DP-2 provides standards for UGA expansion and is amended to  
19 replace the term “churches” with the term “places of worship” to ensure  
20 the policy is inclusive. Further changes specify that proposed UGA  
21 expansion that is in response to a declaration by the County Executive or  
22 County Council that there is a critical shortage of affordable housing  
23 should be reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing to low and  
24 moderate income households.  
25
- 26 d. Policy DP-3 is amended to clarify that areas that are removed from the  
27 UGA should be “consistent” with existing rural and resource designations.  
28
- 29 e. Policy DP-4 is amended to include specific reference to the Procedures  
30 Report that is referenced in Appendix E – Procedures for Buildable Lands  
31 Reporting in Response to GF-7 to the CPPs, leaving the existing policy  
32 direction unchanged.  
33
- 34 f. Existing policy DP-6 is deleted from the Development Patterns chapter  
35 and relocated to the Public Services and Facilities chapter as policy PS-22,  
36 while renumbering all other DP policies as applicable. The policy provides  
37 direction on the extension of sanitary sewer mains outside of the UGA and  
38 is most appropriately located in the General Public Services subchapter.  
39
- 40 g. Renumbered Policy DP-6 (formerly DP-7) is amended to state that  
41 locating employment and living areas in close proximity should improve  
42 the jobs-housing balance. The policy is consistent with MPP-RGS-Action-  
43 8 and MPP-H-1.  
44
- 45 h. New proposed policy DP-8 directs the designation and development of  
46 local, countywide, and regional centers to be consistent with the Regional

1 Growth Strategy in VISION 2050, the Regional Centers Framework, and  
2 the Countywide Center Criteria contained in new Appendix I to the CPPs.  
3 The proposed policy is consistent with MPP-DP-21 and MPP-DP-25.  
4

- 5 i. Policy DP-9 is amended to update language to provide direction to those  
6 jurisdictions with a regional growth center and/or a regional  
7 Manufacturing/Industrial center to ensure that those areas develop  
8 consistent with the regional vision. The policy is consistent with and  
9 implements MPP-RGS-8, MPP-RGS-9, MPP-RGS-10, and the Regional  
10 Centers Framework.  
11
- 12 j. Policy DP-10 is amended to update terminology to be consistent with new  
13 language within VISION 2050 regarding types of centers, to ensure that  
14 planning efforts for centers provides economic opportunities for all  
15 residents, and that development results in a reduction of greenhouse gas  
16 emissions from transportation. The amendments are consistent with the  
17 Development Patterns VISION 2050 goal, and policies MPP-DP-21,  
18 MPP-DP-22, MPP-DP-24, MPP-DP-25, and MPP-CC-Action-3.  
19
- 20 k. Policy DP-11 is amended to emphasize that higher densities and greater  
21 employment concentrations should be consistent with the Regional  
22 Growth Strategy and the Snohomish County growth targets. The  
23 amendments are consistent with MPP-RGS-1, MPP-RGS-4, and MPP-  
24 RGS-Action-7.  
25
- 26 l. Policy DP-12 is amended to clarify that UGAs should provide sufficient  
27 levels of land and public facilities to support population and employment  
28 growth consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.  
29
- 30 m. Policy DP-13 is amended to encourage jurisdictions to include design  
31 guidelines and other standards in urban centers to achieve compact urban  
32 areas with multimodal transportation facilities. The updated policy  
33 language is meant to implement policy direction from MPP-DP-1.  
34
- 35 n. Policy DP-14 is amended to replace the term “urban centers” with the term  
36 “local centers, countywide centers, regional centers” to promote greater  
37 clarity and consistency with the terminology in VISION 2050.  
38
- 39 o. Policy DP-15 is amended to specifically include underutilized lands  
40 among those areas that should be considered for infill and redevelopment.  
41 The updated language is consistent with policy direction from MPP-DP-4.  
42
- 43 p. New policy DP-17 is policy language relocated from the Transportation  
44 chapter (formerly TR-24) to the Development Patterns chapter because the  
45 policy is land use in nature. The policy direction is proposed to remain  
46 unchanged. Other policies are renumbered as applicable.

- q. New policy DP-18 is added to relocate the portions of the existing TR-12 that provide direction on land use issues. The policy direction remains unchanged. Other policies are renumbered as applicable.
- r. Policy DP-19 (formerly DP-17) is amended with minor language changes for policy clarification. The policy direction remains unchanged.

*Rural Land Use and Resource Lands*

- s. Policy DP-26 (formerly DP-24) is amended to clarify that standards in the rural areas should result in reduced rural growth rates over time. This is consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and MPP-RGS-13.
- t. Policy DP-27 (formerly DP-25) is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.
- u. Policy DP-28 (formerly DP-26) is amended to add reference to the county's coordinated water system plan, while maintaining the existing policy direction.
- v. Policy DP-30 (formerly DP-28) is amended to direct communities to plan to locate commercial and community services that serve rural residents within nearby UGAs, consistent with MPP-RGS-12.
- w. Policy DP-31 (formerly DP-29) is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.
- x. Policy DP-32 (formerly DP-30) is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.

*Orderly Development*

- y. Policy DP-33 (formerly DP-31) is amended to include minor changes to incorporate regional direction from MPP-DP-32 to reduce impacts on resource lands and critical areas.
- z. New policy DP-35 is added to provide direction for the creation of parks and other civic and public places within centers and urban areas. The proposed policy is consistent with MPP-DP-11. All other policies are renumbered as appropriate.
- aa. Policy DP-37 (formerly DP-34) is amended to add additional direction for jurisdictions to work with tribes to protect Tribal Reservation lands and other culturally significant sites. The amended language is consistent with MPP-RC-1, MPP-RC-4, MPP-DP-7, and MPP-DP-51.

Amended at public hearing 09/29/21



1  
2 bb. New policy DP-38 is added to direct jurisdictions to utilize inclusive  
3 community planning and to consider needs of current and future residents  
4 and businesses when making investment decisions. The proposed policy is  
5 consistent with MPP-DP-2 and MPP-DP-8 in VISION 2050 which  
6 promote access to opportunity and reduction of disparities.  
7

8 cc. New policy DP-39 is added to encourage jurisdictions to consider and  
9 mitigate the displacement impacts that planning, development, and  
10 redevelopment have on marginalized residents and businesses. The  
11 proposed policy is consistent with MPP-DP-23.  
12

13 dd. Policy DP-40 (formerly DP-35) is amended with minor language updates  
14 to improve policy clarity. In addition, new language is proposed which  
15 directs jurisdictions to incorporate consideration of reducing disparities in  
16 health and well-being into local and countywide planning efforts. The  
17 amended language is meant to implement MPP-DC-3, MPP-DP-16, MPP-  
18 DP-18, and MPP-DP-19.  
19

20 ee. Policy DP-42 (formerly DP-37) is amended with minor language updates  
21 to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
22

23 4. The fourth chapter in the CPPs is titled "Housing" and includes an amended  
24 overall goal and four unchanged policies, nine amended policies, two new  
25 policies, and one deleted policy.  
26

27 a. The narrative section of the Housing chapter is updated to improve clarity  
28 of the section, update references as needed, reflect new regional guidance,  
29 and make corrections as needed to reflect the updated policies.  
30

31 b. The overall Housing chapter Goal is amended to incorporate the concept  
32 of fair housing into the overall housing goal and highlight equity and  
33 inclusion as a key part of housing policies within the CPPs. The  
34 amendments are consistent with the Housing Goal from VISION 2050.  
35

36 c. Existing policy HO-1 is deleted because the topic of fair housing, which it  
37 currently addresses, has been incorporated into the overall Housing  
38 chapter Goal. All other Housing policies have been renumbered as  
39 appropriate.  
40

41 d. Policy HO-1 (formerly HO-2) is amended with minor language changes  
42 for clarification and the addition of section HO-1.f to promote diverse  
43 housing types in single-family neighborhoods to meet the various needs of  
44 residents. These amendments increase consistency with MPP-H-1 and  
45 MPP-H-2.  
46

Amended at public hearing 09/29/21

- 1 e. Policy HO-2 (formerly HO-3) is amended to provide reference to VISION  
2 2050, the Regional Growth Strategy, and Snohomish County Growth  
3 Targets for affordable housing goals. The amendment includes that  
4 regional fair share of affordable housing should address housing for all  
5 income levels, which is consistent with MPP-H-3.  
6  
7 f. Policy HO-3 (formerly HO-4) is amended to update language  
8 promoting interjurisdictional efforts to provide an adequate supply  
9 of “affordable, special needs, and diverse” housing throughout the  
10 county. These modifications improve consistency with MPP-H-11.  
11  
12 g. New proposed policy HO-4 promotes the development of moderate  
13 density housing, also referred to as “missing middle housing” through  
14 amendments to County and city codes and removal of other  
15 restrictions. This new policy is consistent with MPP-H-9.  
16  
17 h. Policy HO-5 is amended to replace the term “redevelopable residential  
18 land” with the phrase “land that is undeveloped, partially used and/or has  
19 the potential to be developed or redeveloped for residential purposes” for  
20 greater clarity. The amended language also includes the addition of a new  
21 section HO-5.d that adds the evaluation of physical and economic  
22 displacement risk as part of the Housing Characteristics and Needs Report  
23 for Snohomish County. The changes are consistent with the intent and  
24 language in MPP-H-12 and MPP-H-Action-2.  
25  
26 i. Policy HO-6 is amended to emphasize affordable housing for all by  
27 adding “for residents of all income levels” to the policy. The phrase  
28 “upgrading of neighborhoods,” which is ambiguous language, is  
29 deleted. These modifications promote alignment with MPP H-3.  
30  
31 j. Policy HO-7 is amended to strike the term “growth monitoring report” and  
32 replace it with an updated reference to the “Housing Characteristics and  
33 Needs Report prescribed in HO-5” which is the report that provides  
34 housing definitions.  
35  
36 k. Policy HO-9 is amended with minor language changes for clarity. The  
37 policy direction is unchanged.  
38  
39 l. Policy HO-10 is amended to include reference to “environmentally  
40 sensitive building techniques and materials” to minimize impacts on  
41 natural resource systems. Language is added for jurisdictions  
42 to seek balance between the costs and benefits of housing affordability and  
43 environmental sustainability. This amended language increases  
44 consistency with several of the MPPs in VISION 2050, including MPP-  
45 En-5, MPP-CC-2, and MPP-DP-19.  
46

- 1 m. Policy HO-14 is proposed to be amended to add emphasis and possible  
2 strategies for jurisdictions to develop and preserve long-term affordable  
3 housing. These modifications promote alignment with MPP-H-8.  
4  
5 n. New proposed policy HO-15 requires certain jurisdictions to develop and  
6 implement strategies to address displacement of at-risk populations and  
7 those identified by the report proscribed by policy HO-5. This policy is  
8 consistent with MPP-H-Action-6 which focuses upon the risk of  
9 displacement in urban areas and MPP-H-12 which addresses displacement  
10 risk due to development and redevelopment.  
11  
12 5. The fifth chapter in the CPPs is titled “Economic Development and Employment”  
13 and includes an amended overall goal and four unchanged policies, nine amended  
14 policies, five new policies, and three deleted policies.  
15  
16 a. The narrative section of the Economic Development and Employment  
17 chapter is updated to improve clarity of the section, update references as  
18 needed, reflect new regional guidance, and make minor corrections as  
19 needed to reflect the updated policies.  
20  
21 b. The overall Economic Development and Employment Goal is updated to  
22 emphasize that economic growth that is encouraged by governments  
23 should be sustainable.  
24  
25 c. Policy ED-1 is amended to update the reference to regional planning  
26 documents, including VISION 2050 and the Regional Economic Strategy.  
27 The amendments also remove reference to specific industry clusters, and  
28 instead direct that jurisdictions should support existing and emerging  
29 industry clusters as identified in local and regional economic development  
30 plans, which is consistent with MPP-EC-3.  
31  
32 d. Policy ED-2 is amended to direct jurisdictions to promote equity and  
33 inclusion in the local economy by fostering a business and regulatory  
34 environment that is supportive of local, small, and startup businesses,  
35 particularly those that are minority- and woman-owned. The amended  
36 policy is consistent with MPP-EC-7.  
37  
38 e. Policy ED-3 is amended to direct jurisdictions to prioritize multi-modal  
39 transportation linkages between centers that improve access to  
40 opportunities and support economic development. This amendment is in  
41 alignment with MPP-EC-18.  
42  
43 f. Policy ED-4 is amended with minor language updates that reference the  
44 hierarchy of centers, consistent with MPP-RC-7, MPP-RC-8, and the  
45 Regional Centers Framework.  
46

- 1 g. Existing policy ED-5 is deleted from the Economic Development and  
2 Employment chapter and all applicable information is relocated to the new  
3 proposed Appendix I – Centers. The new Appendix I includes steps for the  
4 countywide designation of new regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers,  
5 which was previously included as CPP-ED-5.  
6  
7 h. New proposed policy ED-5 provides direction for jurisdictions to  
8 incorporate equity and inclusion principles into the local economy by  
9 promoting economic growth that provides a diverse range of living wage  
10 jobs. The new policy is consistent with MPP-EC-9.  
11  
12 i. Existing policy ED-6 is deleted and all applicable information is relocated  
13 to the new proposed Appendix I – Centers. The new Appendix I replaces  
14 the existing ED-6 by referencing the Regional Centers Framework for  
15 regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center designation criteria.  
16  
17 j. New proposed policy ED-6 provides direction for jurisdictions to  
18 incorporate equity and inclusion into economic development strategies to  
19 improve access to economic opportunity for those populations that have  
20 historically low access. The policy is consistent with MPP-EC-14.  
21  
22 k. Policy ED-7 is amended with an updated reference to regional planning  
23 documents and with minor language updates. The amendments do not  
24 alter policy direction.  
25  
26 l. Policy ED-8 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
27 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
28  
29 m. Policy ED-11 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
30 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
31  
32 n. Policy ED-12 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
33 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
34  
35 o. New proposed policy ED-15 addresses the connection between economic  
36 development and the natural environment and climate change. The policy  
37 is consistent with MPP-EC-16. Other policies are renumbered as  
38 applicable.  
39  
40 p. Policy ED-16 (formerly ED-15) is amended with minor language updates  
41 to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
42  
43 q. Existing policy ED-16 is deleted because the Arlington/ and Marysville  
44 Manufacturing/Industrial Center (Cascade Industrial Center) has been  
45 identified as a regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC) under the  
46 Regional Centers Framework.

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  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

- r. New proposed policy ED-17 directs the County and cities to support the Cascade Industrial Center as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center and identifies it as a key employment area for the county and region. Policy ED-7 identifies the Paine Field-Boeing Manufacturing/Industrial Center as a key area for employment. Policy ED-17 adds consistency to the CPPs by providing a similar policy for the Cascade Industrial Center.
  - s. New proposed policy ED-18 directs jurisdictions to identify and, where appropriate, mitigate the impacts of displacement on locally owned and small businesses. The policy is consistent with MPP-EC-12.
6. The sixth chapter in the CPPs is titled “Transportation” and includes an amended overall goal and ten unchanged policies, thirteen amended policies, two new policies, and one deleted policy.
- a. The narrative section of the Transportation chapter is amended to update references as needed and make corrections to reflect the updated policies.
  - b. The overall Transportation Goal is amended to direct jurisdictions to emphasize affordability, equity, inclusion, and safety to plan a transportation system that promotes economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and human health. The amendments are consistent with the VISION 2050 Transportation goal and the transportation MPPs.
  - c. Policy TR-3 is amended to maintain consistency with updated language in VISION 2050 on transportation funding priorities and to update the names of regional and state-wide plans. The amendments are consistent with MPP-T-12 and MPP-T-15.
  - d. Policy TR-4 is amended to maintain consistency with updated policy language from VISION 2050 to address changing transportation technologies, street connectivity, and multimodal level of service (LOS). The amended language is consistent with MPP-T-7, MPP-T-16, MPP-T-17, and MPP-T-33.
  - e. Policy TR-5 is amended to direct jurisdictions to consider the transportation system’s compatibility with the natural environment, consistent with MPP-T-21.
  - f. Policy TR-6 is amended to differentiate between TR-6, which addresses the natural environment, and TR-16, which addresses climate change. The amendments also incorporate regional direction on stormwater (MPP-En-9), fish passages (MPP-T-32), and human health (MPP-T-5).

Amended at public hearing 09/29/21

- 1 g. Policy TR-8 is amended to add expectations for concurrency  
2 determinations within regional, countywide, and local centers and near  
3 high-capacity transit facilities. Additionally, the amended language deletes  
4 portions of the existing policy that serve as narrative rather than providing  
5 policy direction. The amendments are consistent with MPP-DP-52, MPP-  
6 DP-53, and MPP-DP-54.  
7  
8 h. Policy TR-12 is amended to focus this policy on transportation, including  
9 transit and transit-supportive infrastructure. The deleted language provided  
10 direction on land use issues and is relocated to the Development Patterns  
11 chapter as policy DP-18.  
12  
13 i. Policy TR-13 is amended to reflect the passage of Sound Transit 3 System  
14 Expansion Plan (ST3). The existing policy references potential locations  
15 for Sound Transit 2 System Expansion Plan (ST2) stations within  
16 Snohomish County. The revisions add specific reference to ST3 including  
17 the proposed station locations.  
18  
19 j. Policy TR-14 is amended to clarify that the process to evaluate possible  
20 transit service area expansion is the responsibility of transit agencies rather  
21 than that of the County and/or cities and towns. The new language directs  
22 jurisdictions to work with and support efforts by transit agencies to  
23 evaluate possible expansion.  
24  
25 k. Policy TR-15 is amended to add language directing jurisdictions to  
26 improve the resilience of the transportation system to better plan for  
27 disasters and other impacts. The amendments are consistent with MPP-T-  
28 31 and MPP-CC 8.  
29  
30 l. Policy TR-16 is amended to mirror the increased emphasis on the role of  
31 transportation on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions outlined in  
32 VISION 2050. The amendments also seek to differentiate between TR-6,  
33 addressing the natural environment, and TR-16, addressing climate  
34 change. The amendments are consistent with MPP-En-3, MPP-CC-3,  
35 MPP-T-13, MPP-T-29, and MPP-T-30.  
36  
37 m. Policy TR-18 is amended with minor language changes that emphasize the  
38 need for the local transportation network to support global trade and the  
39 local, regional, and statewide economic needs related to distribution of  
40 goods and services. The amendments are consistent with MPP-T-14,  
41 MPP-T-23, MPP-T-24, MPP-T-25, and MPP-T-26.  
42  
43 n. Policy TR-19 is amended to incorporate equity and inclusion  
44 considerations into transportation system planning. The policy is  
45 consistent with major changes between VISION 2040 and VISION 2050  
46 and the overall proposed updates to the CPPs that emphasize social equity

1 within regional, countywide, and local planning. Specifically, the  
2 amendments are consistent with MPP-T-9 and MPP-T-Action-9.

- 3
- 4 o. Policy TR-21 is amended with minor changes to further emphasize  
5 planning for pedestrian connections between activity centers throughout  
6 Snohomish County. The amendments are consistent with MPP-T-17.  
7
- 8 p. Existing policy TR-24 is deleted from the Transportation chapter and  
9 relocated to the Development Patterns chapter as DP-17 because it  
10 provides direction on land use issues. The policy direction remains  
11 unchanged.  
12
- 13 q. New policy TR-24 is added to provide direction to jurisdictions on the  
14 improvement of arterial roads outside of urban growth areas. The  
15 proposed new policy is consistent with the existing CPP-D-25  
16 (renumbered to be CPP-DP-27) and MPP-T-22.  
17
- 18 r. New policy TR-25 is added to direct jurisdictions to coordinate with  
19 airports on local and regional aviation needs, consistent with state and  
20 regional aviation system plans. The proposed policy is consistent with  
21 MPP-T-28.  
22

23 7. The seventh chapter in the CPPs is titled “The Natural Environment” and includes  
24 policies that address protection of the natural environment and slowing and  
25 mitigating the impacts of climate change. Within the existing CPPs, the chapter  
26 has an overall chapter goal and a series of policies related to the natural  
27 environment and climate change. Through adoption of this ordinance, the chapter  
28 is renamed to “The Natural Environment and Climate Change” and includes two  
29 new subchapters: (1) The Natural Environment, including policies related to  
30 topics such as air and water resources, the natural environment, habitat, and open  
31 space, with one unchanged policy, four amended policies, and six new policies;  
32 and (2) Climate Change, including policies that provide direction on slowing and  
33 mitigating the impacts of climate change, with one unchanged policy, four  
34 amended policies, and two new policies.  
35

- 36 a. The narrative section of the Natural Environment and Climate Change  
37 chapter is updated to improve clarity of the section, update references as  
38 needed, reflect new regional guidance, and make corrections as needed to  
39 reflect the updated policies.  
40
- 41 b. The overall Natural Environment and Climate Change goal is amended to  
42 highlight climate change as a key focus of the overall chapter and  
43 incorporate equity and inclusion considerations into the chapter. The  
44 amendments are consistent with the Environment Goal and the Climate  
45 Change Goal from VISION 2050.  
46

*The Natural Environment*

- c. Env-1 is amended with updated language to emphasize interjurisdictional and interdisciplinary planning for the protection of natural ecosystems and natural environment. This amendment increases alignment of this policy with MPP-En-1 and MPP-En-2.
- d. Policy Env-2 is amended with minor language updates that highlight the importance of working across jurisdictional boundaries to accomplish environmental goals. Specific language is added to emphasize equitable access to parks and open space. These modifications promote alignment with MPP-En-12, MPP-En-14 and MPP-En-Action-4 and the overall emphasis on interjurisdictional cooperation and social equity in VISION 2050.
- e. New proposed policy Env-3 provides direction for interjurisdictional commitment to implementing the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan within Snohomish County. This new policy is consistent with MPP-En-12 and MPP-En-Action-4. Other policies are referenced as applicable.
- f. Policy Env-4 (formerly Env-3) addresses protection of wildlife corridors and habitat for endangered or threatened species and is amended with specific reference to protection of habitat for orca and salmon, highlighting them as a key indicator species for the region. These changes better align this policy with the language in MPP-En-16.
- g. Policy Env-5 (formerly Env-4) is amended to include tribes in interjurisdictional efforts to protect open space. The changes are closely aligned with the overall emphasis on inclusion and regional cooperation in VISION 2050. The addition of “other best practices” for protection of open space and natural resources expands the strategies that jurisdictions can consider.
- h. New proposed policy Env-7 provides new direction for reduction and mitigation of stormwater impacts, including through collaborative watershed planning. This connection between stormwater management and development is not specifically addressed in the existing CPPs. This new policy is well aligned with MPP-En-18, which advocates reduction of stormwater impacts.
- i. New proposed policy Env-8 provides direction for protecting and improving air and water quality for all residents, which is a topic not specifically addressed in other policies. This new policy is consistent with MPP-En-3 and MPP-En-4.



- 1 j. New proposed policy Env-9 provides direction for the reduction of light  
2 and noise pollution from a variety of sources, with a specific emphasis on  
3 reducing impacts upon vulnerable populations. The proposed policy  
4 is consistent with MPP-En-7 and MPP-En-8. This new policy addresses  
5 a topic not specifically addressed in other CPPs.  
6  
7 k. New proposed policy Env-10 provides direction for the reduction of  
8 pesticide use and promotion of programs to protect human and  
9 environmental health. The proposed policy is aligned with MPP-En-13  
10 and addresses a topic not specifically addressed in other CPPs.  
11  
12 l. New proposed policy Env-11 provides direction for the prevention and  
13 reduction of the spread of invasive species. This policy is consistent with  
14 MPP-En-13 to help protect overall ecological function.  
15

16 *Climate Change*  
17

- 18 m. Policy CC-1 (formerly Env-6) is amended to include specific reference to  
19 the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, by stating that jurisdictions shall  
20 adopt actions and initiatives to comply with that agency's emission  
21 reduction goals. This policy is consistent with reduction goals outlined in  
22 the Climate Change goal for VISION 2050 and MPP-CC-1.  
23  
24 n. Policy CC-2 (formerly Env-7) is relocated to the Climate Change  
25 subsection and be renumbered as CC-2. Policy language remains  
26 unchanged.  
27  
28 o. Policy CC-3 (formerly Env-8) is relocated to the Climate Change  
29 subchapter and amended to add specific examples that jurisdictions can  
30 use to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These modifications increase this  
31 policy's alignment with MPP-CC-2 and MPP-CC-3.  
32  
33 p. Policy CC-4 (formerly Env-9) is relocated to the Climate Change  
34 subchapter and amended by adding a specific reference to maintain and  
35 increase natural resources that sequester and store carbon. This  
36 amendment is aligned with the direction provided in MPP-CC-4.  
37  
38 q. Policy CC-5 (formerly Env-10) is relocated to the Climate Change  
39 subchapter and amended to reflect environmental justice priorities outlined  
40 in VISION 2050. The proposed policy specifically includes "adaptation  
41 and resilience" as a priority for local planning regarding climate change.  
42 These amendments increase the alignment of this policy with MPP-CC-8  
43 and MPP-CC-Acion-4.  
44  
45 r. New proposed policy CC-6 provides direction to jurisdictions by  
46 identifying high level measures to meet greenhouse gas reduction

1 targets. This policy is consistent with emission reduction goals outlined in  
2 VISION 2050 and MPP-CC-1, MPP-CC-11, and MPP-CC-Action-3.  
3

- 4 s. New policy CC-7 provides direction to jurisdictions to consider sea level  
5 rise when siting or relocating essential public facilities and hazardous  
6 industries. This CPP is consistent with MPP-CC-8, MPP-CC-10, and  
7 MPP-CC-Action 4.  
8

- 9 8. The eighth chapter in the CPPs is titled “Public Services and Facilities”, and  
10 includes an amended overall Public Services and Facilities Goal and two  
11 subchapters: (1) General Public Services, including eleven unchanged policies,  
12 four amended policies, and seven new policies; and (2) Essential Public Services  
13 including three unchanged policies and two amended policies.  
14

- 15 a. The narrative section of the Public Services and Facilities chapter is  
16 updated to improve clarity of the section, update references as needed,  
17 reflect new regional guidance, and make minor corrections as needed.  
18  
19 b. The overall Public Services and Facilities goal is updated with minor  
20 changes to direct jurisdictions to consider residents when planning for  
21 the provision of public services and facilities.  
22

23 *General Public Services*  
24

- 25 c. Policy PS-7 is amended to include a focus on long-term availability of  
26 water for human use and environmental needs, including reference  
27 to possible strategies. This change increases this policy’s alignment with  
28 MPP-PS-9, MPP-PS-22, MPP-PS-23 and MPP-PS-24. The amendment  
29 also incorporates reference to interjurisdictional collaboration which is a  
30 major theme in VISION 2050 and included in MPP-PS-23.  
31  
32 d. New policy PS-8 provides direction for jurisdictions and tribal  
33 governments to engage in collaborative planning of water and wastewater  
34 utilities which is closely aligned with the policy language of MPP-PS-23.  
35 All other policies are renumbered as applicable.  
36  
37 e. New policy PS-9 provides direction for jurisdictions to include  
38 consideration of the potential impacts of climate change in planning for  
39 the county’s long-term water supply. This amendment is consistent with  
40 MPP-PS-20, MPP-PS-21, and MPP-PS-23. Other policies are renumbered  
41 as applicable.  
42  
43 f. Policy PS-10 (formerly PS-8) is amended to add the phrase “and, if  
44 desired exceed” in reference to reduction targets of solid waste set by the  
45 state, which promotes exceeding the minimum requirement. This  
46 amendment is aligned with MPP-PS-8.

- g. Policy PS-12 (formerly PS-10) is amended to replace the term “encourage” with “promote” to urge jurisdictions to move towards renewable and alternative energy sources. This modification contributes to greater alignment with this major theme from VISION 2050 and policies MPP-PS-13, MPP-PS-15 and MPP-CC-3.
- h. Policy PS-13 (formerly PS-11) is amended with a reference to new facilities in addition to existing facilities for promotion of energy conservation and efficiency. This policy amendment is aligned with MPP-PS-4, MPP-PS-14 and MPP-PS-15.
- i. New policy PS-18 provides direction to jurisdictions to work collaboratively to promote equitable access to public services. This proposed policy is consistent with MPP-PS-2, which has a particular focus on populations that are historically underserved.
- j. New policy PS-19 provides direction to jurisdictions to identify connection to sanitary sewers as the preferred alternative to address failing septic systems. The new policy is consistent with MPP-PS-11.
- k. New policy PS-20 provides direction to jurisdictions to plan for the provision of telecommunication infrastructure, including a focus on underserved areas. The new policy is consistent with MPP-PS-16.
- l. New policy PS-21 provides direction to jurisdictions to work collaboratively to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities and ensure that school siting is consistent with comprehensive plans and the Regional Growth Strategy. The new policy is consistent with MPP-PS-26.
- m. New proposed PS-22 (formerly DP-6) is the relocation of the existing DP-6 to the Public Service and Facilities chapter because it is directly related to the provision of public services. New language is added “and as allowed in RCW 36.70A.213” to be consistent with HB 2243 passed in 2017 which created RCW 36.70A.213 and allows utilities to be extended under certain circumstances.

*Essential Public Facilities*

- n. Policy EPF-2 is amended to add consideration of future impacts from climate change in planning the siting of local essential public services, including risk of sea level rise. The updated language is consistent with MPP-CC-8 and MPP-CC-10.

Amended at public hearing 09/29/21

1 o. Policy EPF-3 is amended to add equity considerations in the siting of local  
2 essential public services. The updated language is consistent with MPP-  
3 PS-28.

4  
5 9. The CPPs also include appendices that supplement the policies. The nine  
6 appendices include: a) UGA and MUGA Boundary Maps; b) Growth Targets; c)  
7 Growth Targets Procedure Steps for GF-5; d) Reasonable Measures; e)  
8 Procedures for Buildable Lands Reporting in Response to GF-7; f) List of Issues  
9 for Interlocal Agreements; g) Definitions of Key Terms; h) Fiscal Impact  
10 Analysis; and i) Centers (a proposed new appendix). The proposed amendments  
11 include several revisions to the appendices of the CPPs and the adoption of a new  
12 appendix, which are described below.

13  
14 *Appendix C – Growth Target Procedure Steps for GF-5*

15  
16 a. Appendix C is amended to emphasize the role of the Regional Growth  
17 Strategy in the growth targeting process for Snohomish County. These  
18 amendments include highlighting key features of the RGS, including their  
19 associated countywide planning policies, that should be emphasized in  
20 initial subcounty population and employment distributions. The features  
21 include growth near centers and high-capacity transit (HCT), improving  
22 the jobs/housing balance, managing and reducing rural growth over time,  
23 and supporting UGA infill.

24  
25 *Appendix D – Reasonable Measures*

26  
27 b. Appendix D is amended in response to 2017 Senate Bill E2SSB 5254,  
28 which required local evaluation and review of the reasonable measures  
29 process. On June 24, 2020, the SCT Steering Committee approved the  
30 Reasonable Measures Technical Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254,  
31 containing recommended updates to the reasonable measures tables. To  
32 complement the recommendation, on October 12, 2020, ECONorthwest  
33 provided additional documentation that identified a recommended scale of  
34 impact, measure applicability, and issue category for each potential  
35 measure to add that was identified in the Reasonable Measures Technical  
36 Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254. The revisions to Appendix D  
37 reflect the recommendations included in the Reasonable Measures  
38 Technical Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254, the October 12, 2020  
39 additional documentation, the SCT PAC subcommittee recommendations,  
40 or are intended to improve clarity.

41  
42 c. First, the Reasonable Measures List is amended to add a description of  
43 measure field, which includes a brief description of each measure to  
44 provide clarity. These descriptions were added at the recommendation of  
45 the SCT PAC subcommittee. Descriptions of existing measures were  
46 taken from the Phase II Report: Recommended Method for Evaluating

1 local Reasonable Measures Programs, from June 2003, while descriptions  
2 of new measures were developed based on information in the Buildable  
3 Lands Guidelines, published by the Department of Commerce in 2018,  
4 and the Reasonable Measures Technical Supplement: Response to E2SSB-  
5 5254.

- 6  
7 d. Second, the Reasonable Measures List is amended by adding an Issue  
8 Category field, stating which issue or issues each measure is intended to  
9 address. The issue categories included were identified in the Reasonable  
10 Measures Technical Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254, and are: 1)  
11 planned densities not achieved; 2) insufficient capacity; and 3)  
12 inconsistent development patterns. Based on recommendations from the  
13 SCT PAC subcommittee, certain measures have different issue categories  
14 checked than set forth in the Reasonable Measures Technical Supplement:  
15 Response to E2SSB-5254.
- 16  
17 e. Third, the Reasonable Measures List is amended to add a scale of impact  
18 field, identifying the anticipated impact each measure is expected to have.  
19 The scale ranges from small to moderate to high.
- 20  
21 f. Finally, the amendments add eight new measures to the Reasonable  
22 Measures List, derived from the list of thirty-one potential measures  
23 identified in the supplement to the Reasonable Measures Technical  
24 Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254, approved by the SCT Steering  
25 Committee June 24, 2020. The eight new measures are: 1) allow garden  
26 and larger scale apartments and other moderate and higher density  
27 housing; 2) administrative and procedural reforms; 3) streamline  
28 development regulations and/or standards; 4) phasing/tiering urban  
29 growth; 5) promote vertical growth; 6) SEPA categorical exemptions for  
30 mixed use and infill development and increased threshold for SEPA  
31 categorical exemptions; 7) provide for regional stormwater facilities; and  
32 8) public land disposition.

33  
34 *Appendix F – List of Issues for Interlocal Agreements*

- 35  
36 g. Appendix F is amended to expand the list of example issues that are  
37 appropriate to coordinate between jurisdictions using interlocal  
38 agreements to include “response to climate crisis through restoration and  
39 protection of the environment’s natural functions and wildlife habitats.”  
40 This addition is consistent with the increased focus on slowing and  
41 mitigating the impacts of climate change throughout the proposed CPP  
42 amendments and VISION 2050.

43  
44 *Appendix G – Definitions of Key Terms*

- 1 h. Appendix G is amended to expand the list of defined terms to assist in the  
2 interpretation and implementation of the policies contained within the  
3 CPPs. The added terms are: 1) Activity Unit; 2) Built Environment; 3)  
4 Centers; 4) Clean Energy; 5) Countywide Center; 6) Displacement; 7)  
5 Environmentally Sensitive Development Practice; 8) Environmentally  
6 Sensitive Housing Development; 9) Equity; 10) Greenhouse Gas; 11)  
7 Growth Target; 12) Historically Marginalized Communities; 13) Jobs-  
8 Housing Balance; 14) Living Wage Jobs; and 15) Moderate Density  
9 Housing. Terms that are also defined within VISION 2050 include a  
10 definition consistent with that definition.

11  
12 *Appendix I - Centers*

- 13  
14 i. New Appendix I – Centers is added to the CPPs. The new appendix is  
15 intended to help implement the Regional Centers Framework, VISION  
16 2050 policies MPP-RC-8, MPP-RGS-8, MPP-RGS-9, MPP-RGS-10,  
17 MPP-RGS-11, MPP-DP-25, and MPP-DP-26, and Countywide Planning  
18 Policies DP-8, DP-9, DP-10, DP-14, and ED-4.  
19  
20 j. Included in Appendix I is the new Countywide Growth Center and  
21 Countywide Industrial designation criteria and process, consistent with  
22 regional guidance provided in the Regional Centers Framework and an  
23 identified list of candidate centers, which jurisdictions can choose to plan  
24 for formal identification.

25  
26 E. Procedural requirements.

- 27  
28 1. State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requirements with  
29 respect to this non-project action have been satisfied through the issuance of  
30 Addendum No. [REDACTED] to the VISION 2050 Final Environmental Impact Statement  
31 on [REDACTED], 2021.  
32  
33 2. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106(1), a notice of intent to adopt this ordinance was  
34 transmitted to the Washington State Department of Commerce for distribution to  
35 state agencies on August 2, 2021.  
36  
37 3. The public participation process used in the adoption of this ordinance complies  
38 with all applicable requirements of the GMA and the SCC.  
39  
40 4. The Washington State Attorney General last issued an advisory memorandum, as  
41 required by RCW 36.70A.370, in September of 2018 entitled “Advisory  
42 Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property” to help  
43 local governments avoid the unconstitutional taking of private property. The  
44 process outlined in the State Attorney General’s 2018 advisory memorandum was  
45 used by the County in objectively evaluating the regulatory changes proposed by  
46 this ordinance.

1  
2 Section 2. The County Council makes the following conclusions:  
3

- 4 1. The proposed updated CPPs increase consistency between the CPPs and VISION  
5 2050.  
6  
7 2. The proposed updated CPPs increase consistency between the CPPs and the  
8 GMA.  
9  
10 3. The proposed updated CPPs satisfy the requirements of RCW 36.70A.210 and  
11 RCW 36.70A.215 and are consistent with the GMA.  
12  
13 4. The County has complied with all SEPA requirements with respect to this non-  
14 project action.  
15  
16 5. The public participation process used in the adoption of this ordinance complies  
17 with all applicable requirements of the GMA and title 36 SCC.  
18  
19 6. The updated CPPs proposed by this ordinance do not result in an unconstitutional  
20 taking of private property for a public purpose.  
21

22 Section 3. The County Council bases its findings and conclusions on the entire  
23 legislative record, including all testimony and exhibits. Any finding which should be  
24 deemed a conclusion, and any conclusion that should be a finding, is hereby adopted  
25 as such.  
26

27 Section 4. Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Snohomish  
28 County Countywide Planning Policies, last amended by Amended Ordinance No. 16-  
29 078 on October 16, 2017, are amended as set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto.  
30

31 Section 5. Severability and Savings. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of  
32 this ordinance shall be held to be invalid by the Growth Management Hearings Board  
33 (Board), or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or  
34 unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section,  
35 sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance. Provided, however, that if any section,  
36 sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is held to be invalid by the Board or court of  
37 competent jurisdiction, then the section, sentence, clause or phrase in effect prior to the  
38 effective date of this ordinance shall be in full force and effect for that individual section,  
39 sentence, clause or phrase as if this ordinance had never been adopted.  
40

41 Section 6. The County Council directs the Code Reviser to update SCC  
42 30.10.050 pursuant to SCC 1.02.020(3).  
43

44  
45 PASSED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2021.  
46  
47

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Washington

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Council Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Council

( ) APPROVED

( ) EMERGENCY

( ) VETOED

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
County Executive

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_

Approved as to form only.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

August 20, 2021

Amended at public hearing 09/29/21



**EXHIBIT A:**

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY EXECUTIVE AUGUST 18,  
2021, RECOMMENDED**

**COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES**

**FOR**

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

1 **Table of Contents**

2

3 Introduction to the Countywide Planning Policies ..... 3

4 Purpose..... 3

5 Organization of the Document..... 5

6 State Context and Goals..... 8

7 Regional Context ..... 9

8 Countywide Context ..... 15

9 Central Principles and Framework Policies ..... 17

10 General Framework Policies..... 18

11 Joint Planning Policies..... 20

12 Development Patterns ..... 22

13 Urban Growth Areas and Land Use..... 22

14 Rural Land Use and Resource Lands..... 31

15 Orderly Development ..... 34

16 Housing ..... 36

17 Economic Development and Employment ..... 42

18 Transportation ..... 49

19 The Natural Environment and Climate Change..... 61

20 The Natural Environment Policies..... 62

21 Climate Change Policies ..... 63

22 Public Services and Facilities ..... 65

23 General Public Services ..... 66

24 Essential Public Facilities ..... 66

25 Appendices..... 70

26 Appendix A – UGA & MUGA Boundary Maps ..... 71

27 Appendix B – Growth Targets..... 73

28 Appendix C – Growth Target Procedure Steps for GF-5 ..... 79

29 Appendix D – Reasonable Measures ..... 81

30 Appendix E – Procedures for Buildable Lands Reporting in Response to GF-7 ..... 90

31 Appendix F – List of Issues for Interlocal Agreements..... 91

32 Appendix G – Definitions of Key Terms..... 92

33 Appendix H – Fiscal Impact Analysis ..... 95

34 Appendix I – Centers ..... 96

35

1                                   **INTRODUCTION TO THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES**

2   Snohomish County is home to over ~~((700,000))~~ 800,000 residents, hundreds of businesses, 20  
3   cities and towns, two tribal governments, one county government, and a number of special  
4   purpose districts and agencies. Each has separate aspirations for the future and priorities for  
5   projects and programs, ~~((though))~~ however ties of geography, history, and day-to-day  
6   governance unite all. At every level, there is recognition that local governments better serve  
7   residents and businesses ~~((better))~~ by planning and working together.

8   **Purpose**

9   Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) establish a countywide framework for developing and  
10   adopting county ~~((and)),~~ city, and town comprehensive plans. These comprehensive plans are the  
11   long-term policy documents used by each jurisdiction to plan for its future. They include  
12   strategies for land use, housing, capital facilities, utilities, transportation, economic development,  
13   and parks and recreation (as well as a rural element for counties only) (RCW 36.70A.070). The  
14   role of the CPPs is to coordinate comprehensive plans of jurisdictions in the same county ~~((for))~~  
15   in regard to regional issues ~~((or))~~ and issues affecting common borders (RCW 36.70A.100).  
16   Under state law, RCW 36.70A.210(1) describes the relationship between comprehensive plans  
17   and CPPs. It says that a countywide planning policy is:

18                   *~~((a 'countywide planning policy' is))~~ a written policy statement or statements used solely*  
19                   *for establishing a countywide framework from which county and city comprehensive*  
20                   *plans are developed and adopted pursuant to this chapter. This framework shall ensure*  
21                   *that city and county comprehensive plans are consistent as required in RCW 36.70A.100.*  
22                   *Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the land use powers of ~~((the))~~ cities.*

23   ~~((Guidance comes from the))~~ Washington Administrative Code~~((:))~~ (WAC 365-196-510) ~~((says~~  
24   ~~that))~~ also provides guidance, stating that:

25                   *interjurisdictional consistency should be met by the adoption of comprehensive plans,*  
26                   *and subsequent amendments, which are consistent with and carry out the relevant*  
27                   *county-wide planning policies and, where ~~((required))~~applicable, the relevant*  
28                   *multicounty planning policies. Adopted county-wide planning policies are designed to*  
29                   *ensure that county and city comprehensive plans are consistent.*

30   ~~((From the perspective of))~~ Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT), the body that recommends the  
31   CPPs to the County Council, outlines that the goal of the CPPs is:

32                   *[To] more clearly distinguish between the roles and responsibilities of the county, cities,*  
33                   *Tribes, state and other governmental agencies in managing Snohomish County's future*  
34                   *growth, and to ensure greater interjurisdictional cooperation and coordination in the*  
35                   *provision of services.<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> Snohomish County Tomorrow Long-Term Goals, 1990, Government Roles and Responsibilities, pg 17.

1 To meet this ~~((stated))~~ SCT goal, some of the CPPs do more than meet the Growth Management  
2 Act (GMA) mandate of ensuring consistency of comprehensive plans. The CPPs also provide  
3 ~~((to Snohomish County jurisdictions))~~ direction to Snohomish County jurisdictions that is  
4 necessary for the coordinated implementation of GMA goals and the ~~((VISION 2040))~~  
5 Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) within VISION 2050. Thus, in the context of state law,  
6 administrative guidance, and the goals of Snohomish County Tomorrow, the CPPs have been  
7 developed to accomplish the following functions:


- 8 • ~~((Meet a specific requirement to ensure))~~ Ensure consistency between County and city  
9 comprehensive plans as required by ~~((RCW 36.70A.100))~~;
- 10 • Satisfy other GMA mandates~~((;))~~;
- 11 • ~~((Maintain ongoing efforts))~~ Continue cooperative countywide planning, through ~~((SCT))~~  
12 Snohomish County Tomorrow ~~((SCT))~~ ~~((to plan cooperatively))~~ for countywide  
13 initiatives~~((, and))~~;
- 14 • Provide direction to Snohomish County jurisdictions for the coordinated implementation  
15 of the Multicounty Planning Policies in VISION 2050; and
- 16 • Support local implementation of the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) in VISION  
17 ~~((2040))~~ 2050 that seeks to promote compact urban development ~~((in a sustainable~~  
18 manner)), protect rural and resource lands, maximize use of existing and planned  
19 infrastructure, and provide open space.

20  
21 The CPPs encourage flexibility in local interpretations to support diverse interests throughout the  
22 county. Through the process of updates to their comprehensive plans, each individual  
23 jurisdiction will update General Policy Plans (GPPs) and corresponding regulations that are  
24 tailored to local needs while still maintaining consistency with these Countywide Planning  
25 Policies.

1 **Organization of the Document**

2 ((The GMA specifies certain topic areas that must be included in CPPs. It does not speak to the  
3 topic areas that must be included in MPPs)). The Washington Administrative Code (WAC)  
4 specific topic areas that, at the minimum, must be addressed by the MPPs and the CPPs. Under  
5 state law, the CPPs must be consistent with the MPPs. VISION ((2040)) 2050 is not organized  
6 around the topics that GMA requires CPPs to cover. ((To facilitate review and development of  
7 the CPPs for consistency with VISION 2040, the chapter headings in the CPPs follow the  
8 categories in VISION 2040.)) Historically, the chapter layout of the CPPs directly follows the  
9 chapters in the MPPs. Under VISION 2050, three new chapters, Regional Collaboration,  
10 Regional Growth Strategy, and Climate Change, were added to the MPPs. No new chapters were  
11 added to the CPPs, so the chapter layout does not directly parallel VISION 2050 as it has in the  
12 past. Where several GMA topics for CPPs fall into the same chapter, each individual topic uses a  
13 subheading. By doing this, the CPPs can readily demonstrate how they cover topics required  
14 under GMA.

15 The design of the CPPs is in response to the authorities that give policy direction to the CPPs and  
16 the need for the CPPs to guide local plan development. Unless otherwise specified, ((the)) all  
17 actions ((that the CPPs call for)) identified by the CPPs apply to ((the cities and the County)) all  
18 jurisdictions. Figure 1 shows this relationship.



19

**Figure 1 – Policy Relationships Diagram**





Figure 2 – Internal Flow of the Countywide Planning Policies

1 The CPPs are organized around a set of principles, goals and policies arranged generally as a  
2 hierarchy moving from the general to the more specific (refer to the Policy Hierarchy diagram in  
3 Figure 3). At the policy apex are the central principles and, just below them, the framework  
4 policies. Together, the principles and framework policies help define the general purpose and  
5 approach of the CPPs. The succeeding sections of the CPPs deal with specific topic areas, with  
6 each topic containing an overall goal statement followed by a number of supporting policies.  
7 Taken as a whole, the central principles, framework policies, and topical goals and policies form  
8 the basic policy direction of the CPPs.

9 In addition to the basic policy direction, the CPPs also contain a number of appendices. Some of  
10 the appendices provide procedures for accomplishing specific policy direction. (~~A second~~  
11 ~~category of appendices are those that~~) Others provide more detail or elaborate on particular  
12 policy direction; the reason for their inclusion in an appendix is that they contain lists or tables  
13 that would be unwieldy if included as part of the pertinent policy statement. Maps and definitions  
14 are also contained in the appendices.

15 Note that some policies have footnotes for illustration purposes. Although these footnotes are not  
16 a part of the policy statements, they are intended to be explanatory or provide examples.  
17 Likewise, the narrative sections provide context but are not policy.



**Figure 3 – Policy Hierarchy in the Countywide Planning Policies**

1 **State Context and Goals**

2 The GMA contains a set of statewide planning goals in RCW 36.70A.020. These goals are  
3 intended to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans for those counties and  
4 cities planning under chapter 36.70A RCW. The numbering of the goals does not indicate  
5 priority(~~(, and the list comes from RCW 36.70A.020:)~~).

6 *(1) **Urban growth.** Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public  
7 facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.*

8 *(2) **Reduce sprawl.** Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into  
9 sprawling, low-density development.*

10 *(3) **Transportation.** Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are  
11 based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.*

12 *(4) **Housing.** Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments  
13 of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing  
14 types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.*

15 *(5) **Economic development.** Encourage economic development throughout the state that  
16 is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all  
17 citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, promote  
18 the retention and expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new businesses,  
19 recognize regional differences impacting economic development opportunities, and  
20 encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the  
21 capacities of the state's natural resources, public services, and public facilities.*

22 *(6) **Property rights.** Private property shall not be taken for public use without just  
23 compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners shall be protected  
24 from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.*

25 *(7) **Permits.** Applications for both state and local government permits should be  
26 processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.*

27 *(8) **Natural resource industries.** Maintain and enhance natural resource-based  
28 industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage  
29 the conservation of productive forestlands and productive agricultural lands, and  
30 discourage incompatible uses.*

31 *(9) **Open space and recreation.** Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities,  
32 conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water,  
33 and develop parks and recreation facilities.*

34 *(10) **Environment.** Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life,  
35 including air and water quality, and the availability of water.*



1 *(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the*  
2 *planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to*  
3 *reconcile conflicts.*

4 *(12) Public facilities and services. Ensure that those public facilities and services*  
5 *necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time*  
6 *the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service*  
7 *levels below locally established minimum standards.<sup>2</sup>*

8 *(13) Historic preservation. Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and*  
9 *structures that have historical or archaeological significance.*

## 10 **Regional Context**

### 11 **Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)**

12 The PSRC is a Regional Transportation Planning Organization under chapter 47.80 RCW. (~~In~~  
13 its) Its major planning document, VISION ((2040)) 2050((, the PSRC describes itself as)) states:

14 ~~((an association of cities, towns, counties, ports, and state agencies that serves as a~~  
15 ~~forum for developing policies and making decisions about regional growth management,~~  
16 ~~environmental, economic, and transportation issues in the four-county central Puget~~  
17 ~~Sound region of Washington state.~~

18 ~~The Regional Council is designated under federal law as the Metropolitan Planning~~  
19 ~~Organization (required for receiving federal transportation funds), and under state law~~  
20 ~~as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization for King, Kitsap, Pierce, and~~  
21 ~~Snohomish counties. The Regional Council's members include 71 of the region's 82 cities~~  
22 ~~and towns. Other statutory members include the four port authorities of Bremerton,~~  
23 ~~Everett, Seattle, and Tacoma, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and~~  
24 ~~the Washington Transportation Commission. Both the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe and the~~  
25 ~~Suquamish Tribe are members. In addition, a memorandum of understanding with the~~  
26 ~~region's six transit agencies outlines their participation in the Regional Council.)) The~~  
27 ~~region's local governments come together at the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)~~  
28 ~~to make decisions about transportation, growth management, and economic development.~~

29 PSRC serves King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap counties, along with cities and towns,  
30 tribal governments, ports, and state and local transportation agencies within the region.

---

<sup>2</sup> RCW 36.70A.070(3)(d) requires that the capital facilities plan element of the county's comprehensive plan include "at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes." RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) requires transportation improvements or strategies to be provided concurrent with the development, where "concurrent with the development" means that "improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years."

1 PSRC is a federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the region.<sup>3</sup>

## 2 **VISION ((2040)) 2050**

3 VISION ((2040)) 2050 is the result of a process undertaken by the region’s elected officials,  
4 public agencies, interest groups, and individuals. It was adopted in ((2008)) 2020 and establishes  
5 the regional vision, sets the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), and provides guidance to the CPPs  
6 as shown in Figure 1. VISION ((2040)) 2050 describes itself with the following ((paragraphs))  
7 excerpt:

8 ~~((VISION 2040 is a shared strategy for moving the central Puget Sound region toward a  
9 sustainable future. The combined efforts of individuals, governments, organizations and  
10 the private sector are needed to realize this vision. As the region has continued to grow  
11 and change, its residents have stepped up to ensure that what is most valued about this  
12 place remains timeless. Positive centers oriented development trends in recent years are  
13 a cause for optimism. Yet VISION 2040 recognizes that "business as usual" will not be  
14 enough. As a result, VISION 2040 is a call for personal and institutional change.~~

15 ~~VISION 2040 recognizes that local, state, and federal governments are all challenged to  
16 keep up with the needs of a growing and changing population. VISION 2040 is designed  
17 to guide decisions that help to make wise use of existing resources—and ensure that  
18 future generations will have the resources they need))~~

19 VISION 2050 is the shared regional plan for moving toward a sustainable and more  
20 equitable future. It encourages decision-makers to make wise use of existing resources  
21 and planned transit investments while achieving the region’s shared vision. VISION 2050  
22 sets forth a pathway that strengthens economic, social, and environmental resiliency,  
23 while enhancing the region’s ability to cope with adverse trends such as climate change  
24 and unmet housing needs. As the region experiences more growth, VISION 2050 seeks to  
25 provide housing, mobility options, and services in more sustainable ways. Most  
26 importantly, VISION 2050 is a call to action to meet the needs of a growing population  
27 while considering the current needs of residents. VISION 2050 recognizes that clean air,  
28 health, life expectancy, and access to jobs and good education can vary dramatically by  
29 neighborhood. VISION 2050 works to rectify the inequities of the past, especially for  
30 communities of color and people with low incomes.<sup>4</sup>

31 The concept of sustainability ((~~behind~~)) is integrated into VISION ((2040)) 2050 and has long  
32 been ((around for a while)) a key feature of the regional vision. ((In 1987, the United Nations  
33 issued the Bruntland Report, which defines sustainable development))The United Nations  
34 defined the term sustainable development in the Bruntland Report, issued in 1987, as  
35 “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future

---

<sup>3</sup> ((Vision 2040, page ii [http://psrc.org/projects/vision/pubs/vision2040/vision2040\\_021408.pdf](http://psrc.org/projects/vision/pubs/vision2040/vision2040_021408.pdf))) VISION 2050,  
page vi. Available at: <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> ((VISION 2040, page 1. Available at: <http://www.psrc.org/assets/366/FullReport.pdf>)) VISION 2050, page 2.  
Available at: <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 generations to meet their own needs.”<sup>5</sup> This concept is present throughout the goals, policies, and  
2 actions within VISION 2050.

3 ((Sustainability in VISION 2040 is described as meaning that:

4 *[Our region] ensures the well-being of all living things, carefully meshing human*  
5 *activities with larger patterns and systems of the natural world. This translates into*  
6 *avoiding the depletion of energy, water, and raw natural resources. A sustainable*  
7 *approach also prevents degradation of land, air, and climate, while creating built*  
8 *environments that are livable, comfortable, safe and healthy, as well as promote*  
9 *productivity.))*

10 VISION 2050 sets a vision for the central Puget Sound region, which reads as follows:

11 ***A Vision for 2050***

12 *The central Puget Sound region provides an exceptional quality of life and opportunity*  
13 *for all, connected communities, a spectacular natural environment, and an innovative,*  
14 *thriving economy.*

15 ***In 2050...***

- 16 ● ***Climate.*** *The region’s contribution to climate change has been substantially reduced.*
- 17 ● ***Community.*** *Distinct, unique communities are supported throughout the region.*
- 18 ● ***Diversity.*** *The region’s diversity continues to be a strength. People from all backgrounds*  
19 *are welcome, and displacement due to development pressure is lessened.*
- 20 ● ***Economy.*** *Economic opportunities are open to everyone, the region competes globally,*  
21 *and has sustained a high quality of life. Industrial, maritime, and manufacturing*  
22 *opportunities are maintained.*
- 23 ● ***Environment.*** *The natural environment is restored, protected, and sustained, preserving*  
24 *and enhancing natural functions and wildlife habitats.*
- 25 ● ***Equity.*** *All people can attain the resources and opportunities to improve their quality of*  
26 *life and enable them to reach their full potential.*
- 27 ● ***Health.*** *Communities promote physical, social, and mental well-being so that all people*  
28 *can live healthier and more active lives.*
- 29 ● ***Housing.*** *A range of housing types ensures that healthy, safe, and affordable housing*  
30 *choices are available and accessible for all people throughout the region.*
- 31 ● ***Innovation.*** *The region has a culture of innovation that embraces and responds to*  
32 *change.*

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm>

- 1           • **Mobility and Connectivity.** A safe, affordable, and efficient transportation system  
2           connects people and goods to where they need to go, promotes economic and  
3           environmental vitality, and supports the Regional Growth Strategy.
- 4           • **Natural Resources.** Natural resources are sustainably managed, supporting the  
5           continued viability of resource-based industries, such as forestry, agriculture, and  
6           aquaculture.
- 7           • **Public Facilities and Services.** Public facilities and services support the region’s  
8           communities and plans for growth in a coordinated, fair, efficient, and cost-effective  
9           manner.
- 10          • **Resilience.** The region’s communities plan for and are prepared to respond to potential  
11          impacts from natural and human hazards.
- 12          • **Rural Areas.** Rural communities and character are strengthened, enhanced, and  
13          sustained.<sup>6</sup>

14           **VISION 2050 Overarching Goals**

15   VISION ((2040)) 2050 contains the following topic specific Overarching Goals:

16           **Regional Collaboration.** The region plans collaboratively for a healthy environment,  
17           thriving communities, and opportunities for all.

18           **Regional Growth Strategy.** The region accommodates growth in urban areas, focused in  
19           designated centers and near transit stations, to create healthy, equitable, vibrant  
20           communities well-served by infrastructure and services. Rural and resource lands  
21           continue to be vital parts of the region that retain important cultural, economic, and  
22           rural lifestyle opportunities over the long term.

23           **Environment.** The region ((will care)) cares for the natural environment by protecting  
24           and restoring natural systems, conserving habitat, improving water quality, and reducing  
25           ((greenhouse gas emissions and)) air pollutants((, and addressing potential climate  
26           change impacts)). The ((region acknowledges that the)) health of all residents and the  
27           economy is connected to the health of the environment. Planning at all levels ((should  
28           consider)) considers the impacts of land use, development ((patterns)), and  
29           transportation on the ecosystem.

30           **Climate Change.** The region substantially reduces emissions of greenhouse gases that  
31           contribute to climate change in accordance with the goals of the Puget Sound Clean Air  
32           Agency (50% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050) and  
33           prepares for climate change impacts.

---

6 ((VISION 2040, page 7.)) VISION 2050, page 1. Available at: <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/2050-plan.pdf>

1 **Development Patterns.** ~~The region ((will focus growth within already urbanized areas to~~  
2 ~~create walkable, compact, and transit-oriented communities that maintain unique local~~  
3 ~~character. Centers will continue to be a focus of development. Rural and natural~~  
4 ~~resource lands will continue to be permanent and vital parts of the region)) creates~~  
5 ~~healthy, walkable, compact, and equitable transit-oriented communities that maintain~~  
6 ~~unique character and local culture, while conserving rural areas and creating and~~  
7 ~~preserving open space and natural areas.~~

8 **Housing.** ~~The region ((will preserve, improve, and expand)) preserves, improves, and~~  
9 ~~expands its housing stock to provide a range of affordable, accessible, healthy, and safe~~  
10 ~~housing choices to every resident. The region ((will continue)) continues to promote fair~~  
11 ~~and equal access to housing for all people.~~

12 **Economy.** ~~The region ((will have)) has a prospering and sustainable regional economy~~  
13 ~~by supporting businesses and job creation, investing in all people and their health,~~  
14 ~~sustaining environmental quality, and creating great central places, diverse communities,~~  
15 ~~and high quality of life.~~

16 **Transportation.** ~~The region ((will have)) has a sustainable, equitable, affordable, safe,~~  
17 ~~((cleaner, integrated, sustainable,)) and ((highly)) efficient multimodal transportation~~  
18 ~~system, with specific emphasis on an integrated regional transit network that supports the~~  
19 ~~regional growth strategy, promotes ((economic and environmental)) vitality of the~~  
20 ~~economy, environment, and ((contributes to better public)) health.~~

21 **Public Services.** ~~The region ((will support)) supports development with adequate public~~  
22 ~~facilities and services in a timely, coordinated, efficient, and cost-effective manner that~~  
23 ~~supports local and regional growth planning objectives.~~

## 24 **Regional Growth Strategy**

25 ~~((To achieve the goals in VISION 2040, there is a new Regional Growth Strategy.)) The~~  
26 ~~Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) is a major component of VISION 2050. Implementation of the~~  
27 ~~RGS is a key in achieving the regional vision and goals. The central Puget Sound region is~~  
28 ~~forecasted to grow to 5.8 million people and 3.4 million jobs by 2050. The RGS considers how~~  
29 ~~the region can distribute growth. VISION 2050 describes the Regional Growth Strategy as:~~

30 ~~a description of a preferred pattern of urban growth that has been designed to minimize~~  
31 ~~environmental impacts, support economic prosperity, advance social equity, promote~~  
32 ~~affordable housing choices, improve mobility, and make efficient use of new and existing~~  
33 ~~infrastructure.<sup>7</sup>~~

34 The major parts of the growth strategy include:

- 35 a. Designation of ~~((geographic areas for))~~ regional growth centers, regional manufacturing  
36 and industrial centers, ~~((as well as other centers such as town))~~ countywide centers and

---

<sup>7</sup> VISION 2050, page 26. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

- 1 local centers and activity hubs in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and cities to concentrate  
 2 population and employment growth and other services and activities;  
 3 b. Planning for multi-modal connections and supportive land uses between centers and  
 4 activity hubs and building transit-oriented development along existing and planned  
 5 infrastructure investments;  
 6 c. ~~((Promotion of sustainability in all decision-making))~~ Maintaining stable and sustainable  
 7 urban growth areas into the future; and  
 8 d. Achieving a better balance of jobs and housing throughout the region;  
 9 e. Allocation of population and employment growth to regional geographies in Snohomish  
 10 County.

11 Under the RGS, Snohomish County is expected to grow by 424,000 people and 225,000 jobs  
 12 between 2017 and 2050.

### 13 **Multicounty Planning Policies**

14 VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 contains MPPs that are intended to provide an integrated framework for  
 15 addressing land use, economic development, transportation, other infrastructure, ~~((and))~~  
 16 environmental, and climate change planning. These policies play three key roles: (1) give  
 17 direction for implementing the Regional Growth Strategy, (2) create a common framework for  
 18 planning at various levels in the four-county region, including countywide planning, local plans,  
 19 transit agency plans, and others, and (3) provide the policy structure for ~~((the Regional~~  
 20 ~~Council's))~~ PSRCs functional plans (the ~~((Metropolitan))~~ Regional Transportation Plan and the  
 21 Regional Economic Strategy). The MPPs are presented as a part of VISION 2050 through a three  
 22 part framework:

- 23 • Goals. Overview the desired outcome for each of the subject areas covered in VISION  
 24 2050.
- 25 • Policies. Provide overall guidance for planning and decision-making at the local,  
 26 countywide, and regional level.
- 27 • Actions. Implement the policies and identify specific tasks for local governments, PSRC,  
 28 and other partners.<sup>8</sup>

29 The MPPs address the following subject areas:

- 30 • ~~((General Multicounty Planning Policies))~~ Regional Collaboration
- 31 • Regional Growth Strategy
- 32 • Environment
- 33 • Climate Change
- 34 • Development Patterns
  - 35 ○ ~~((Land Use (including urban lands, rural lands, and resource lands)~~
  - 36 ~~○ Elements of Orderly Development and Design))~~
- 37 • Housing

---

<sup>8</sup> VISION 2050, Page 13. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

- 1 • Economy
- 2 • Transportation
- 3 • Public Services

## 4 **Countywide Context**

### 5 **History**

6 SCT began in 1989 as a voluntary association of cities, towns, the County, and the Tulalip  
7 Tribes. Its genesis was the recognition that growth presents “a challenge of great dimension that  
8 will ultimately shape our future quality of life” and that “it is imperative that this challenge be  
9 faced resolutely, and with a county-wide perspective”.<sup>9</sup> In 1990, the SCT Steering Committee  
10 had reached consensus on a number of goals that formed a “regional vision and framework for  
11 growth management for the county”.<sup>10</sup> These became official through the adoption of  
12 “Snohomish County Tomorrow’s Long-Term Goals”.<sup>11</sup>

13 The GMA went into effect in 1990 and the addition of a requirement for CPPs took place in  
14 1991. The SCT Steering Committee decided to use the SCT Long-Term Goals as a basis for  
15 establishing their recommendations for CPPs under GMA to the County Council.

### 16 **Process Overview**

17 The continuing cooperative and collaborative efforts of all jurisdictions in Snohomish County are  
18 essential to fulfilling the promise of the GMA. At stake is the delicate balance between our  
19 environment and our economy. This balance determines our quality of life. The *Snohomish*  
20 *County Tomorrow Goals* (1990) and the CPPs (1993) set out the countywide vision for managing  
21 future growth in the County and cities. Similarly, the County and cities have developed their own  
22 GMA comprehensive plans. These plans are consistent with this countywide vision, and  
23 coordinate the intricate relationships between land use, the environment, transportation,  
24 infrastructure investment, public services and the economy. The CPPs and each of the plans have  
25 undergone periodic revisions. Following adoption of these CPPs, the County’s and cities’  
26 Comprehensive Plans will be made consistent with the vision and policies in this document.

27 During the 2021 CPP update process, the world was hit with the COVID-19 pandemic. The  
28 pandemic had a significant impact on the lives of all Snohomish County residents and  
29 businesses. At this time, it is impossible to know the full impacts of the pandemic, however those  
30 impacts may be long lasting. Future evaluation will be needed to understand the full impact of  
31 the pandemic.

---

<sup>9</sup> Snohomish County Council Motion 89-159, creating SCT


<sup>10</sup> History of Snohomish County Tomorrow, undated.

[http://www.co.snohomish.wa.us/documents/County\\_Services/SCT/HistoryofSnohomishCountyTomorrow Draft.pdf](http://www.co.snohomish.wa.us/documents/County_Services/SCT/HistoryofSnohomishCountyTomorrow Draft.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.co.snohomish.wa.us/documents/County\\_Services/sct/sctgoals.pdf](http://www.co.snohomish.wa.us/documents/County_Services/sct/sctgoals.pdf)

## 1       **Current and Future Policy Refinements**

2       This document recognizes that some of the planning and development issues have been well  
3       researched and discussed so that strategies are generally accepted; for other issues, the situation  
4       is still emerging. Refinements and future amendments to these policies will use the process  
5       agreed to by the SCT Steering Committee. This process generally calls for one of the standing  
6       committees of SCT – usually, but not always, the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) – to take  
7       the lead in formulating draft policy amendments to the Steering Committee. The Steering  
8       Committee then takes input and forwards its recommendation(s) to the County Council. Finally,  
9       the Council holds a public hearing and takes final action.



11       **Figure 4 – General Process for Updating the CPPs**

## 12       **How to read these Goals and Policies**

13       Most CPPs apply to all cities and the County. ~~((For these the))~~ These policies use ~~((the))~~ “County  
14       and cities” interchangeably with “jurisdictions” and “municipalities”. Some CPPs apply only to  
15       the County or to cities (and sometimes to a subset of cities). For clarity, policies normally state  
16       who implements the policy. Policies without a subject apply to all jurisdictions.

17       Unless otherwise stated, all policies have equal priority and each one should be understood in the  
18       context of the entire document. A number of policies include examples of actions, programs, or  
19       concepts. The intent of these lists is that they are illustrative unless otherwise noted or unless the  
20       list refers to specific documents.

21       The CPPs specify how directive a policy should be. They make use of three different words to do  
22       this: shall, should, and may. Usage of these verbs in the CPPs is more precise than their use in  
23       common expression. Even though in common usage “will” is synonymous with “shall”, in the  
24       CPPs the use of “will” does not specify how directive a policy is. Instead, it is used to express a  
25       future situation (i.e. after this happens then that will happen). It is an expression of intention.

- 26       • **“Shall”** means implementation of the policy is mandatory and imparts a higher degree of  
27       substantive direction than “should”. “Shall” is used for polices that repeat State of  
28       Washington requirements or where the intent is to mandate action. However, “shall” can



1 not be used when it is largely a subjective determination whether a policy’s objective has  
2 been met.

- 3
- 4 • **“Should”** means implementation of the policy is expected but its completion is not  
5 mandatory. The policy is directive with substantive meaning, although to a lesser degree  
6 than “shall” for two reasons. (1) “Should” policies recognize the policy might not be  
7 applicable or appropriate for all municipalities due to special circumstances. The decision  
8 to not implement a “should” policy is appropriate only if implementation of the policy is  
9 either inappropriate or not feasible. (2) Some “should” policies are subjective; hence, it is  
10 not possible to demonstrate that a jurisdiction has implemented it.
- 11
- 12 • **“May”** means the actions described in the policy are either advisable or are allowed.  
13 “May” gives permission and implies a preference. Because “may” does not have a  
14 directive meaning, there is no expectation the described action will be implemented.

### 15 **Common Acronyms**

16 **BLR** = Buildable Lands Report  
17 **CPP** = Countywide Planning Policy  
18 **GMA** = Growth Management Act  
19 **GMR** = Growth Monitoring Report  
20 **HCT** = High-Capacity Transit  
21 **MPP** = Multicounty Planning Policy  
22 **MUGA** = Municipal Urban Growth Area  
23 **PAC** = Snohomish County Tomorrow Planning Advisory Committee (~~((of SCT))~~)  
24 **PSRC** = Puget Sound Regional Council  
25 **SCT** = Snohomish County Tomorrow  
26 **RCW** = Revised Code of Washington (state law)  
27 **RGS** = Regional Growth Strategy  
28 **UGA** = Urban Growth Area  
29 **WAC** = Washington Administrative Code  
30 **WSDOT** = Washington State Department of Transportation

### 31 **CENTRAL PRINCIPLES AND FRAMEWORK POLICIES**

32 These CPPs represent a significant contribution to a process designed to define and direct the  
33 collective vision of our community. The policies are significant both in substance and in the  
34 commitment they represent by local governments of Snohomish County. Guiding these policies  
35 are the central principles that the CPPs shall:

- 36 • Be consistent with the ~~((GMA))~~ Growth Management Act (GMA), other state laws,  
37 ~~((and))~~ ~~((MPPs in VISION 2040))~~ Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs), and the  
38 overall regional Vision 2050 described in VISION 2050;

- 1 • Establish a framework for continuing coordination and collaboration between all
- 2 jurisdictions of Snohomish County;
- 3 • Incorporate equity and inclusion into all aspects of countywide and local planning;
- 4 • Allow for flexibility in local implementation;
- 5 • Support attaining an environmentally, socially, and economically/fiscally sustainable
- 6 county within Snohomish and within the regional context;
- 7 • Establish a framework for mitigating and adapting to climate change;
- 8 • Address and maintain quality of life; and
- 9 • Enhance the built environment and human health.

10 The purpose of the CPPs is to guide development of local comprehensive plans. The mandate for  
 11 CPPs comes from the GMA. Policy direction in the CPPs reflects a local interpretation of how to  
 12 blend the direction in GMA with the regional values expressed in VISION (~~(2040)~~) 2050 and  
 13 local priorities.

14 The CPPs include General Framework policies that define and broaden the objectives in the  
 15 Central Principles while setting the stage for cooperative action. The CPPs also include Joint  
 16 Planning policies that address procedures for cooperation between (~~(multiple)~~) jurisdictions and  
 17 agencies. Under Joint Planning, such cooperation does not necessarily involve all jurisdictions  
 18 and agencies at one time. Other chapters of the CPPs are more (~~(directed toward)~~) focused on  
 19 promoting consistency among local plans. CPPs are prepared under the authorities of RCW  
 20 36.70A.210 and RCW 36.70A.215(~~(-Their)~~) and their implementation, to the extent necessary at  
 21 the countywide and local levels, meets the intent of (~~(the General MPPs in)~~) VISION (~~(2040)~~)  
 22 2050.

23 **General Framework Policies**

24 The following policies expand on the Central Principles (previous page) and provide a  
 25 framework and a foundation for the topic-specific policies in the rest of this document. (~~(They)~~)  
 26 The General Framework Policies acknowledge the role of the GMA and VISION (~~(2040)~~) 2050  
 27 in setting the goals and direction (~~((particularly regarding sustainability))~~) for the CPPs. They  
 28 also (~~(achieve)~~) address the need to plan for projected population and employment growth  
 29 (~~((population and employment))~~) and the prerogative of each jurisdiction in the County to  
 30 conduct its local planning in a manner that responds to local situations and issues.

**GF-1** The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) guide development of policies in local plans per RCW 36.70A.210. This guidance allows for flexibility in local interpretation; however, local policies shall be free of contradictions or conflicts with the CPPs.

**GF-2** Through Snohomish County Tomorrow and adoption by the County Council, the process for updating the Countywide Planning Policies shall be collaborative and participatory. This process should include regional service providers, state agencies, (~~(other)~~) tribal governments, and (~~(citizen)~~) public input.

- GF-3** Decisions on land use, transportation, and economic and social infrastructure should consider ~~((and include ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions))~~ impacts on climate change and provide ~~((for “soft”))~~ solutions to ~~((address both traditional needs as well as emerging challenges))~~ reduce greenhouse gas emissions. ~~((Soft solutions))~~ Solutions should emphasize:
- Integrated planning;
  - Adaptive management;
  - Efficiency and resiliency;
  - Minimize single use ~~((;))~~ products and maximize re-use; and
  - Minimize the need for air quality treatment by minimizing ~~((the level of pollution))~~ emissions.
- GF-4** The Countywide Planning Policies shall be consistent with VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategy. To be consistent means that they shall be absent of conflicts or contradictions with the regional planning or transportation objectives. The policy response to the growth strategy focuses on issues of interest to Snohomish County jurisdictions and some flexibility in detail is possible while retaining overall consistency per RCW 36.70A.100 and WAC 365-196-510.
- GF-5** Subcounty allocation of projected growth shall be established for purposes of conducting the eight-year UGA review and plan update required by the Growth Management Act at RCW 36.70A.130(3). This allocation shall occur through a cooperative planning process of Snohomish County Tomorrow and be consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies. The allocation shall include cities (within current city boundaries), unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), unincorporated Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs), and the rural/resource area of Snohomish County. The subcounty allocation shall use the most recent Office of Financial Management population projections for Snohomish County and the Puget Sound Regional Council’s Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) as the starting point for this process. The process shall consider each community’s vision and its regional role as described in the RGS. The process shall ensure flexibility for jurisdictions in implementing the RGS. Such implementation shall seek compatibility with the RGS, considering levels of infrastructure investment, market conditions, and other factors that will require flexibility in achieving growth allocations. The subcounty allocation of projected growth shall be depicted as a set of “growth targets,” and shall be shown in Appendix B of the countywide planning policies. The growth targets shall indicate the amount of growth each jurisdiction is ~~((capable of accommodating over the 20-year planning period, as described))~~ expected to plan for in its comprehensive plan. The growth target development process in Snohomish County shall use the procedures in Appendix C, which call for the following steps:
- Initial Growth Targets;
  - Target Reconciliation; and
  - Long Term Monitoring.

- GF-6** Ensure that the final population (~~(allocation)~~) and employment allocations for Urban Growth Areas supports the Regional Growth Strategy as provided for in VISION (~~(2040. This shall include assigning at least ninety percent (90%) of the county's future population growth after 2008)~~) 2050 by assigning Snohomish County's growth first and foremost to urban areas.
- GF-7** Maintain the review and evaluation program, which includes an annual data collection component, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.215 ("Buildable Lands Program"). Complete the evaluation component required by the Buildable Lands Program at least once every eight years, and no later than three years prior to the deadline for review and update of comprehensive plans and development regulations as required by RCW 36.70A.130. (~~(This evaluation may be combined with the review and evaluation of County and city comprehensive land use plans and development regulations required by RCW 36.70A.130(1), and the review of Urban Growth Areas required by RCW 36.70A.130(3).)~~)
- a. Use the procedures report in Appendix E for the Buildable Lands Program.
  - b. A list of reasonable measures that may be used to increase residential, commercial and industrial capacity in UGAs, without adjusting UGA boundaries, is contained in Appendix D. The County Council shall use the list of reasonable measures and guidelines for review contained in Appendix D to evaluate all UGA boundary expansions proposed pursuant to DP-2.

## 1 **Joint Planning Policies**

- 2 RCW 36.70A.210(3) requires that, at a minimum, Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) address
- 3 joint County and city planning in urban growth areas. The CPPs also recognize that it is
- 4 important to encourage joint planning outside the Urban Growth Area and that it may involve
- 5 public agencies in addition to the County and cities.

**JP-1** Coordination of county and municipal planning particularly for urban services, governance, and annexation is (~~(important)~~) fundamental in implementing the Regional Growth Strategy and GMA directives related to urban growth areas in RCW 20.70A.110. Interlocal agreements for this purpose are encouraged pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperation Act (chapter 39.34 RCW). These agreements should emphasize the importance of early and continuous public participation, focus on decision-making by elected or other appropriate officials, and review the consistency of comprehensive plans with each other and the Growth Management Act, where applicable. Appendix F provides an illustrative list of issues that could be considered appropriate for Interlocal Agreements.

~~(**JP-2**) ((Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) shall develop a process for mediation and/or alternative dispute resolution. In developing this process, SCT shall convene a task force to make recommendations that outline procedures, timelines, and responsibilities associated with the mediation and/or dispute resolution processes.))~~

**JP-((3))**  
2 In the event of a proposed annexation of unincorporated lands in Snohomish County by a city or special district with no incorporated or district territory currently located in Snohomish County, an interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and any jurisdiction determined necessary by the County shall be in place, consistent with CPP JP-1 and Appendix F. This agreement shall be in effect before the city or district submits a Notice of Intent to Annex to the State Boundary Review Board (BRB) of Snohomish County or, if not subject to BRB review, prior to approval of the annexation to the city or special district.

**JP-((4))**  
3 Encourage policies that allow accessible, effective and frequent interjurisdictional coordination relating to the consistency of comprehensive plans in a particular Urban Growth Area (UGA) and to the expansion of a UGA.

~~**JP-5)** ((Through Snohomish County Tomorrow, establish an interjurisdictional group of elected officials, appointed officials, citizens and staff to review disputes regarding the consistency of comprehensive plans with each other.))~~

**JP-((6))**  
4 The County and cities shall develop comprehensive plan policies and development regulations that provide for the orderly transition of unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) to incorporated areas in UGAs. Mutual agreements may be utilized to address governance issues and expedite the transition.

**JP-((7))**  
5 The County and affected cities should collaborate on the development of appropriate urban design measures in unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.

**JP-6** Snohomish County Tomorrow, the County, and cities should coordinate countywide and local planning efforts with military installations, recognizing the shared benefits and impacts of growth occurring within and outside installation boundaries.

**JP-7** Snohomish County Tomorrow, the County, and cities should coordinate countywide and local planning efforts with tribes, recognizing the shared benefits and impacts of growth occurring within and outside Tribal Reservation lands.

1

2

## DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

The physical form ~~(,)~~ and location ~~(, and servicing)~~ of development ~~((throughout Snohomish County are vitally important if we are to achieve))~~ as well as the provision of services play a significant role in the development of livable places that are environmentally sustainable, economically viable, ~~((and))~~ socially responsible, and equitable for the long-term ~~((future))~~. The following countywide planning policies (CPPs) provide guidance for concentrating growth into existing Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), centers, and along high-capacity transit, and ensuring that ~~((such))~~ growth occurs in a variety of healthy, accessible and well-designed communities that are connected with an efficient transportation network.

### Development Patterns Goal

The cities, towns, and Snohomish County will ~~((promote and guide well-designed))~~ provide livable communities for all residents by directing growth into designated urban areas to create ~~((more vibrant))~~ urban places ~~((while preserving our valued))~~ that are equitable, walkable, compact, and transit oriented, preserve and create open space, and protect rural and resource lands.

## Urban Growth Areas and Land Use

### State Context

The Growth Management Act (GMA) establishes a framework for coordinated and comprehensive planning to help local communities manage their growth. The GMA calls for UGAs where growth will be encouraged and supported with adequate facilities and urban services (RCW 36.70A.110). Areas outside the UGAs are reserved for non-urban uses such as rural and resource lands (RCW 36.70A.070(5)).

### Regional Context

VISION ~~((2040 is))~~ 2050 outlines a strategy for using the region's land more efficiently and sustainably. It identifies existing urban lands as central to accommodating population and employment growth. In particular, VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 directs development into regional growth centers ~~((and))~~, ~~((to a lesser extent, other))~~ countywide centers ~~((and compact urban communities))~~ local centers, and high capacity transit station areas. It seeks to ~~((limit growth on rural lands))~~ manage and reduce rural growth rates over time by accommodating the region's growth first and foremost in the urban growth area. ~~((VISION 2040 recognizes that unincorporated urban lands are often similar in character to cities they are adjacent to, calling for them to be affiliated with adjacent cities for joint planning purposes and future annexation.))~~

VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 recognizes that compact, transit oriented development creates vibrant, livable, and healthy urban communities. Such communities offer economic opportunities, ~~((for all. They also provide))~~ housing choices, and multiple transportation ~~((choices))~~ options for all. This reduces demand for inefficient forms of transportation that contribute to air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Further, VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 supports brownfield and

1 contaminated site clean-up as well as the identification and redevelopment of underutilized lands  
2 (~~compact communities and centers with high levels of amenities~~).

### 3 **Local Context**

4 The County designates UGAs (~~per~~) in accordance with RCW 36.70A.110. (~~The~~) According  
5 to RCW 36.70A.100, the designation of UGAs must be coordinated between the county and  
6 cities(~~per RCW 36.70A.100~~). This document provides the process and criteria for considering  
7 expansion or adjustment of UGAs to accommodate the projected growth. (~~While a change to an~~  
8 ~~established UGA is most often expected to result in an expansion, in some instances a change to~~  
9 ~~a UGA may instead be an adjustment, correction, or even a constriction.~~)

- DP-1** The County shall maintain Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), as shown on the map in Appendix A, that:
- a. Include all cities in Snohomish County;
  - b. Can be supported by an urban level of service consistent with capital facilities plans for public facilities and utilities;
  - c. Are based on the best available data and plans regarding future urban growth including new development, redevelopment, and infill;
  - d. Have identifiable physical boundaries such as natural features, roads, or special purpose district boundaries when feasible;
  - e. Do not include designated agricultural or forest land unless the city or County has enacted a program authorizing transfer or purchase of development rights;
  - f. Have been evaluated for the presence of critical areas;
  - g. Where possible, include designated greenbelts or open space within their boundaries and on the periphery of the UGA to provide separation from adjacent urban areas, rural areas, and resource lands;
  - h. Should consider the vision of each jurisdiction regarding the future of their community during the next 20 years;
  - i. Are large enough to ensure an adequate supply of land for an appropriate range of urban land uses to accommodate the planned growth; and
  - j. Support pedestrian, bicycle and transit compatible design.

- DP-2** An expansion of the boundary of an individual Urban Growth Area (UGA) that results in a net increase of residential, commercial or industrial land capacity shall not be permitted unless:
- a. The expansion is supported by a land capacity analysis adopted by the County Council pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110;
  - b. The resulting 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;
  - c. The expansion otherwise complies with the Growth Management Act;
  - d. Any UGA expansion should have the support of affected cities. Prior to issuing a decision on a UGA boundary change, the County shall consult with affected cities and give substantial weight to a city's position on the matter. If the County Council approves an expansion or contraction of a UGA boundary that is not

supported by an affected city, it shall include in its findings how the public interest is served by the UGA expansion or contraction despite the objection of an affected city; and

- e. One of the following conditions is met:
  1. The expansion is a result of the most recent buildable lands review and evaluation required by RCW 36.70A.215 and performed per policy GF-7 following the procedures in Appendix E.
  2. The expansion is a result of the review of UGAs at least every eight years to accommodate the succeeding twenty years of projected growth, as projected by the State Office of Financial Management, and adopted by the County as the 20-year urban allocated population projection as required by RCW 36.70A.130(3).
  3. Both of the following conditions are met for expansion of the boundary of an individual UGA to include additional residential land:
    - a. Population growth in the UGA (city plus unincorporated UGA) 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. Acceptable sources of documentation are the most recent Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) Growth Monitoring Report (GMR) or the buildable lands review and evaluation (Buildable Lands Report [BLR]), 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, and any new information presented at public hearings that confirms or revises the conclusions is considered.
  4. Both of the following conditions are met for expansion of the boundary of an individual UGA to include additional employment land:
    - a. Employment growth in the UGA (city plus unincorporated UGA) since the start of the twenty-year planning period, equals or exceeds fifty percent of the additional employment capacity in the UGA at the start of the planning period. Acceptable sources of documentation are the most recent SCT GMR or the buildable lands review and evaluation (BLR), and
    - b. An updated employment land capacity analysis conducted by city and County staff for the UGA confirms the accuracy of the above finding using more recent employment capacity estimates and assumptions.
  5. The expansion will correct a demonstrated mapping error.
  6. Schools (including public, private and parochial), ~~((churches))~~ places of worship, institutions and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plans should be located in an urban growth area. In the event that it is demonstrated that no site within the UGA can reasonably or logically accommodate the proposed facilities, urban growth area expansions may take place to allow the development of these facilities provided that the expansion area is adjacent to an existing UGA.
  7. In UGAs where the threshold in Condition 4 has not been reached, the



boundary of an individual UGA may be expanded to include additional industrial land if the expansion is based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.365 for the establishment of a major industrial development. This assessment shall be based on a collaborative County and city analysis of large developable industrial site needs in relation to land supply. "Large developable industrial sites" may include land considered vacant, redevelopable, and/or partially-used by the Buildable Lands Program (per GF-7 and Appendix E of these CPPs) and may include one or more large parcels or several small parcels where consolidation is feasible.

8. 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.
9. The expansion will permanently preserve a substantial land area containing one or more significant natural or cultural feature(s) as open space adjacent to the revised UGA boundary and will provide separation between urban and rural areas. The presence of significant natural or cultural features shall be determined by the respective legislative bodies of the county and the city or cities immediately adjacent to the proposed expansion, and 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.
10. 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 is uncurable in a timely manner by the implementation of reasonable measures or other instrumentality reasonably available to the jurisdiction, and the expansion is reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing for low and moderate income households, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
11. 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.

- DP-3** Following consultation with the affected city or cities, the County may adjust urban growth areas – defined in this policy as concurrent actions to expand an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in one location while contracting the same UGA in another location – without resulting in a net increase of population or employment land capacity. Such action may be permitted when consistent with adopted policies and the following conditions:
- a. The area being removed from the UGA is not already characterized by urban development, and without active permits that would change it to being urban in character; and
  - b. The land use designation(s) assigned in the area removed from the UGA shall be ~~((among))~~ consistent with the existing rural or resource designations in the comprehensive plan for Snohomish County.

**DP-4** The County and cities shall use consistent land capacity analysis methods as ~~((approved by the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee))~~ established in the Procedures Report called for in Appendix E.

- DP-5** The County and cities shall adopt comprehensive plans and development regulations (RCW 36.70A.040). In Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), such plans and regulations shall:
- a. Achieve urban uses and densities;
  - b. Provide for urban governmental services and capital facilities sufficient to accommodate the broad range of needs and uses that will accompany the projected urban growth; and
  - c. Permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the succeeding twenty-year period (RCW 36.70A.110(2)).

The County shall adopt such plans and regulations for its unincorporated territory. Each city shall adopt such plans and regulations for territory within its city limits. Additionally, cities may adopt such plans and proposed development regulations for adjacent unincorporated territory within its UGA or Municipal UGA (MUGA) to which the city has determined it is capable of providing urban services at some point in the future, via annexation.

When amending its comprehensive plan, the County shall give substantial consideration to the city’s adopted plan for its UGA or MUGA. Likewise, the affected city shall give substantial consideration to the County’s adopted plan for the same area.

However, nothing in this policy shall limit the authority of the County to plan for and regulate development in unincorporated territory for as long as it remains unincorporated, in accordance with all applicable county, state and federal laws. Similarly, nothing in this policy shall limit the authority of cities to plan for territory in and adjacent to their current corporate limits and to regulate development in their current corporate limits, in accordance with all applicable city, county, state and federal laws.

~~((DP-6)) ((Sanitary sewer mains shall not be extended beyond Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) into rural areas except when necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment, and when such sewers are financially supportable at rural densities and do not result in the inducement of future urban development outside of UGAs. Sewer transmission lines may be developed through rural and resource areas to meet the needs of UGAs as long as any extension through resource areas does not adversely impact the resource lands. Sanitary sewer connections in rural areas are not allowed except in instances where necessary to protect public health and safety and the environment. Sanitary sewer mains are prohibited in resource areas.))~~

**DP-((7))** City and County comprehensive plans should locate employment areas and living areas in close proximity in order to maximize transportation choices, ~~((and))~~ minimize vehicle miles traveled, ~~((and to))~~ optimize the use of existing and planned transportation systems and capital facilities, and improve the jobs-housing balance.

**DP-((8))** The County and cities shall coordinate their comprehensive plans (RCW 36.70A.100). Coordination in unincorporated territory planned by both the County and a city means that each plan should provide for the orderly transition of unincorporated to incorporated areas, including appropriate urban design provisions, by:

- a. Creating a safe and attractive urban environment that enhances livability; and
- b. Balancing actions necessary to meet the requirement of achieving urban uses and densities with the goal of respecting already established neighborhoods.

When amending its comprehensive plan, the County shall give substantial consideration to the city's adopted plan for its UGA or MUGA. Likewise, the affected city shall give substantial consideration to the County's adopted plan for the same area.

However, nothing in this policy shall limit the authority of the County to plan for and regulate development in unincorporated territory for as long as it remains unincorporated, in accordance with all applicable county, state and federal laws. Similarly, nothing in this policy shall limit the authority of cities to plan for territory in and adjacent to their current corporate limits and to regulate development in their current corporate limits, in accordance with all applicable city, county, state and federal laws.

## 1 **Centers and Compact Urban Communities**

**DP-8** If applicable, the County and cities shall designate and provide for the development of local, countywide, and regional centers consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, the Regional Centers Framework, and the Countywide Center Criteria contained in Appendix I.

- DP-9** (~~Local plans should identify centers as designated by the Regional Growth Strategy presented in VISION 2040.~~) Jurisdictions (~~in which~~) that have designated regional growth centers and manufacturing and industrial centers (~~are located~~) shall (~~provide~~) direct a significant share of population and employment growth to those areas through the provision of land use policies and infrastructure investments that support growth levels and densities consistent with the regional vision (~~for these centers~~).
- DP-10** The County and cities shall coordinate the designation and planning of (~~urban~~) regional, countywide, and local centers with transit service and other service providers to promote well-designed and transit oriented developments that enhance economic development opportunities for all residents, address environmental goals, and reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.
- DP-11** (~~The~~) Consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and growth targets in Appendix B, the County and cities should (~~revise development regulations and incentives, as appropriate, to~~) encourage higher residential densities and greater employment concentrations in Urban Growth Areas by revising development regulations and incentive programs as appropriate.
- DP-12** Urban Growth Areas should provide for sufficient levels of development and developable or redevelopable land so that adequate sources of public revenue and public facilities are available to support the projected population and employment growth in Snohomish County consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, GF-5, and the growth targets in Appendix B. In addition, the allowed density should support transit services and the efficient utilization of infrastructure.
- DP-13** The County and cities should integrate the desirable qualities of existing residential neighborhoods when planning for urban centers and mixed-use developments. Jurisdictions should adopt design guidelines and standards for urban centers to provide for compact, efficient site design that integrates building design(~~(;)~~) with multimodal transportation facilities(~~(;)~~) and publicly accessible open spaces.
- DP-14** The County and cities should promote and focus new compact urban growth in (~~urban centers~~)local centers, countywide centers, regional centers, and transit emphasis corridors.
- DP-15** The County and cities should adopt policies, development regulations, and design guidelines that allow for infill and redevelopment of underutilized lands and other appropriate areas(~~( as identified in their comprehensive plans)~~).
- DP-16** Jurisdictions should encourage the use of innovative development standards, design guidelines, regulatory incentives, and applicable low impact development measures to provide compact, high quality communities.

**DP-17** The County and cities should encourage transit supportive land uses in non-contiguous Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) in order to help preserve transit service between non-contiguous UGAs.

**DP-18** In coordination with transit agencies, jurisdictions that are served by transit should, where appropriate, enact transit oriented development policies and development standards. Transit oriented development should include the following common elements:

- a. Located to support the development of designated local growth centers, countywide growth centers, regional growth centers, and existing and planned transit emphasis corridors;
- b. Include pedestrian scale neighborhoods and activity centers to stimulate use of transit and ride sharing;
- c. Plan for an appropriate intensity and mix of development, including both employment and housing options, that support transit service; and
- d. Plan for growth near high-capacity transit.

## 1 **Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas**

**DP-((17)) 19** City comprehensive plans should have policies on ~~((annexing the))~~ the annexation of areas ((in))within their unincorporated Urban Growth Area ((/))and/or Municipal Urban Growth Area.

**DP-((18)) 20** In the Southwest Urban Growth Area (SWUGA), Municipal Urban Growth Areas shall be maintained as a part of these Countywide Planning Policies for the purposes of allocating growth as required by the Growth Management Act and CPP GF-5 and shall be portrayed on the map in Appendix A and documented in County and city comprehensive plans.

**DP-((19)) 21** Where the Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA) map in Appendix A portrays agreement – meaning in places that do not include areas of gap, overlap, or other special notation – the MUGAs shall be used to designate future annexation areas for each of the nine cities in the Southwest Urban Growth Area. An interlocal agreement should be executed by the County and city addressing transition of services.

**DP-**  
**~~((20))~~ 22** Where Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA) gaps and overlaps occur, the affected cities are encouraged to negotiate a solution and, if needed, to use a mediation process to fill gaps and resolve overlaps before proceeding with a proposed action to annex. The following guidance is provided for reconciling overlapping MUGAs and MUGA gaps:

- a. Overlapping MUGAs and MUGA gaps may be reconciled between the affected cities and in consultation with the County. As used in this policy, the term “affected cities” means cities that are adjacent to MUGAs located in Snohomish County. For cities located in Snohomish County, “affected cities” include cities identified on the map in Appendix A that have MUGAs in common, as “overlaps” and cities that have incorporated boundaries or designated MUGAs adjacent to “gap” areas on the map. Cities having no territory in Snohomish County only qualify as “affected cities” after adoption of interlocal agreement(s) pursuant to Countywide Planning Policy JP-3 and Appendix F.
- b. Amendments to MUGA boundaries that occur in conjunction with changes to the outer Southwest UGA boundary may take place through agreement and action by the County and affected cities following consultation with the cities.
- c. Amendments to MUGA boundaries that are internal to the Southwest UGA boundary may take place through agreement and action by the affected cities following consultation with the County.
- d. When an agreement is reached under (a), (b), or (c), the County Council shall consider the recommendation of the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee on the proposed changes to the MUGA boundary and may amend the MUGA map in Appendix A.

**DP-**  
**~~((21))~~ 23** Where jurisdictions are unable to reach agreement under DP-20, it is not necessary for affected cities to resolve overlapping Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs) or MUGA gaps as a precondition to proposing annexation of property in the MUGA gap or overlap. In such cases, the established annexation processes under state law will guide city boundary decisions.

**DP-**  
**~~((22))~~ 24** Paine Field represents a unique situation in the Southwest Urban Growth Area, as it is a County-administered regional essential public facility. Any proposal to annex Paine Field is not subject to DP-20 and requires an approved agreement with the County prior to proceeding with any action to annex.

1

2

1

## 2 **Rural Land Use and Resource Lands**

3 This sub-section of the Development Patterns ~~((section meets))~~ chapter is intended to meet three  
4 purposes. First, it includes the countywide response to GMA requirements. Second, it includes  
5 policies to support parts of ~~((the regional plan,))~~ VISION ((2040,)) 2050 that ~~((go))~~ extend  
6 beyond state mandates. Third, it provides policies for issues that are specific to Snohomish  
7 County and its cities.

### 8 **State Context**

9 GMA distinguishes between Rural Lands and Resource Lands. In rural areas, there is a mix of  
10 low intensity uses including; housing, agriculture, forested areas, recreation, and appropriately  
11 scaled business and services, often following historic development patterns. Resource Lands are  
12 primarily for agriculture, forestry, or mineral extraction. Other activities on resource lands are to  
13 be of a subordinate nature.

### 14 **Regional Context**

15 VISION ~~((2040 identifies))~~ 2050 states that rural lands ((as permanent and vital parts of the  
16 region.)) “are expected to retain important cultural, economic, and rural lifestyle opportunities in  
17 the region.”<sup>12</sup> ~~((It recognizes that rural lands accommodate many activities associated with~~  
18 ~~natural resources, as well as small scale farming and cottage industries.))~~ VISION ((2040)) 2050  
19 emphasizes the preservation of these lands ((and acknowledges that managing rural growth)) by  
20 calling for reduced rural growth rates by directing urban development into designated urban  
21 lands ((helps to preserve vital ecosystems and economically productive lands)). It further  
22 encourages counties, where ever possible, to plan for rural growth rates that are lower than the  
23 levels that are contained in the regional growth strategy.

24 VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 also identifies that permanent protection of natural resource lands—  
25 forest, agricultural, and mineral lands—~~((are crucial))~~ is critical to the region’s sustainability. It  
26 recognizes that the loss or fragmentation of these lands ~~((—along with their productivity—has~~  
27 impacts on the environment, including air and water quality and quantity, our economy, and  
28 ultimately the health of the region’s people)) is particularly concerning for the long-term  
29 sustainability of the region.

### 30 **Local Context**

31 Beyond the guidance in GMA and VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050, ~~((these))~~ the rural land use and  
32 resource lands CPPs ~~((give))~~ provide direction ~~((for))~~ in the coordination of local issues outside  
33 of the UGA ~~((that may arise between jurisdictions)).~~

---

<sup>12</sup> VISION 2050, page 40. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 The objective of these policies is to (~~ensure a future that maintains~~) manage and reduce rural  
2 growth over time and maintain the non-urban character of rural areas, an active resource  
3 economy, and prosperous rural cities.

**DP-** The County shall establish low intensities of development and uses in areas outside of  
~~((23))~~ **25** Urban Growth Areas to preserve resource lands and protect rural areas from  
sprawling development.

**DP-** Density and development standards in rural and resource areas shall (~~be based on~~  
~~((24))~~ **26** ~~accommodating the projected population and employment growth not allocated to the~~  
~~urban growth areas, consistent with~~) work to manage and reduce rural growth rates  
over time, consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, GF-5, and the growth  
targets in Appendix B.

**DP-** The County shall establish(~~, in rural and resource areas,~~) infrastructure and road  
~~((25))~~ **27** standards in rural and resource areas that are consistent with appropriate development  
patterns and densities (~~in rural and resource areas~~) to maintain rural character.

**DP-** Domestic water supply systems may be developed in rural and resource areas to meet  
~~((26))~~ **28** the needs of rural areas as provided in the county's coordinated water system plan.  
Water sources and transmission lines may be developed in rural and resource areas to  
meet the needs of urban growth areas.

**DP-** The county may permit rural clustering in accordance with the Growth Management  
~~((27))~~ **29** Act.

**DP-** The County and cities should meet the demand for new commercial activity and  
~~((28))~~ **30** services as well as new industrial job base in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) with  
limited exceptions as identified below. Outside of UGAs, the County should limit  
commercial and industrial development consistent with GMA and the Regional  
Growth Strategy (~~, by allowing~~) and should plan for commercial and community  
services that serve rural residents to locate within nearby UGAs, but can otherwise  
allow for:

- a. Resource-based and resource supportive commercial and industrial uses;
- b. Limited convenience commercial development serving the daily needs of rural  
area residents;
- c. Home-based businesses;
- d. Low traffic and employment enterprises that benefit from a non-urban location  
due to large lots, vegetative buffers, etc.; and,
- e. Maintenance of the historical locations, scale, and character of existing  
commercial services and industrial activities.
- f. Resource-dependent tourism and recreation oriented uses provided they do not  
adversely impact adjoining rural and resource uses.



**DP-**  
**((29)) 31** The County shall develop strategies and programs to support agricultural and forest activities.

- a. Strategies should reduce ~~((conversion pressures on all))~~ pressure to convert resource ((lands)) and ((on)) rural lands with resource-based activities ((and)) to non-resource uses. Strategies may include redesignation of rural land to resource land.
- b. Programs may include transfer of development rights, purchase of development rights, and other conservation incentives that encourage ~~((the))~~ and focus ~~((of))~~ growth in the Urban Growth Areas.

**DP-**  
**((30)) 32** Jurisdictions should encourage the use of transfer of development rights (TDR), purchase of development rights, and conservation incentives. The objective is to focus growth in the Urban Growth Areas while lessening development pressure on rural and resource areas. Specific steps regarding TDR include:

- a. Designating additional TDR sending and receiving areas;
- b. Developing zoning incentives to use TDR in urban areas not already designated as receiving areas;
- c. Coordinating ~~((with))~~ efforts to establish a regional TDR program; and
- d. Ensuring that an area designated as a TDR receiving area by the County remains a receiving area after annexation or that the city provides an equivalent capacity for receiving TDR certificates elsewhere in the city when the County and the affected cities have adopted an interlocal agreement addressing the TDR program.

1

2



1       **The Built Environment and Health**

2 Urban design has a profound effect on ~~((how well we live))~~ quality of life. This subsection of the  
3 Development Patterns chapter ties together how we build the urban environment and ~~((the values~~  
4 ~~of))~~ livability, health, and safety. It responds to the legislative findings in the GMA where the  
5 state connects land use planning to health and public safety.<sup>13</sup> The GMA considers provisions for  
6 health and safety to be a part of the goal of Public Services.<sup>14</sup> VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 articulates  
7 the regional response to this state requirement and sets the stage for the CPPs to guide local  
8 plans. The policies here are the local response to state and regional initiatives that seek to  
9 connect land use planning with public health and safety.

**DP-**       The County and cities should address the safety, health, and well-being of residents  
~~((35))~~ **40**    and employees ~~((by))~~ in countywide and local planning through:  
a. ~~((Adopting))~~ Adoption of development standards ~~((encouraging))~~ that encourage  
   design and construction of healthy buildings and facilities; ~~((and))~~  
b. ~~((Providing))~~ Provision of infrastructure that promotes physical activity~~((:));~~ and  
c. Incorporating a focus on health and well-being, including the reduction of  
   existing disparities between population groups, into countywide and local  
   decision-making processes.

**DP-**       The County and cities should adopt policies that create opportunities for:  
~~((36))~~ **41**    a. Supporting urban food production practices, distribution, and marketing such as  
   community gardens and farmers markets; and  
   b. Increasing the local agricultural economy’s capacity to produce, market, and  
   distribute fresh and minimally processed foods.

10       **Incompatible Land Uses**

**DP-**       The County and cities should conserve designated industrial land for future industries  
~~((37))~~ **42**    and related jobs by:  
a. Protecting ~~((#))~~ industrial land from encroachment by incompatible uses and  
   development on adjacent land;  
b. Discouraging non-industrial uses on ~~((#))~~ industrial land unless such uses support  
   and enhance existing industrial land uses; and  
c. Discouraging conversion of ~~((#))~~ industrial land to other land use designations  
   unless it can be demonstrated that a specific site is not suitable for industrial  
   uses.

**DP-**       Adjacent to military lands, the County and cities should encourage land uses that are  
~~((38))~~ **43**    compatible with military uses and discourage land uses that are incompatible.

**DP-**       The County and cities shall protect the continued operation of general aviation  
~~((39))~~ **44**    airports from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.

---

<sup>13</sup> RCW 36.70A.010

<sup>14</sup> RCW 36.70A.020(12) and 36.70A.030(13)

1  
2 **HOUSING**

3 **State Context**

4 ~~((Washington's))~~ The Growth Management Act (GMA) ~~((establishes a))~~ housing goal  
5 ~~((pertaining to housing, to))~~ states that comprehensive plans and development regulations should  
6 encourage a full range of affordable housing types to meet the needs of all segments of the  
7 population, and to encourage the preservation of the existing housing stock.<sup>15</sup>

8 Pursuant to the GMA, the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) ~~((must))~~ specifically address  
9 how local comprehensive plans will consider the need for affordable housing ~~((, such as))~~. That  
10 consideration includes the creation of housing for all economic segments of the population and  
11 parameters for ((its)) the distribution of affordable housing among counties and cities.<sup>16</sup> In turn,  
12 each county and city is obligated to plan for affordable housing consistent with the regional  
13 context determined by CPPs.<sup>17</sup> Counties and cities planning under GMA must ensure that, taken  
14 collectively, their comprehensive plans provide sufficient land capacity for projected housing  
15 ~~((growth))~~ needs, consistent with the county's 20-year population growth allocation.<sup>18</sup>

16 CPPs may not, however, alter the land-use powers of cities.<sup>19</sup>

17 **Regional Context**

18 ~~((The regional plan, Vision 2040 contains an "overarching goal" for housing that calls for the~~  
19 ~~region to))~~ VISION 2050 includes a regional housing goal, stating that the region:

20 *~~((preserve, improve, and expand))~~ preserves, improves, and expands its housing stock to*  
21 *provide a range of affordable, accessible, ~~((health))~~ healthy, and safe housing choices for*  
22 *every resident. The region ~~((will continue))~~ continues to promote fair and equal access to*  
23 *housing for all people.*"

24 ~~((Vision 2040's Multi-county))~~ The Multicounty Planning Policies MPPs ~~((also require~~  
25 ~~jurisdictions to establish local housing targets based on population projections, and local housing~~  
26 ~~and employment targets for each designated regional growth center))~~ provide a regional policy  
27 framework for housing, which includes consideration of affordability, home ownership, housing  
28 location, and housing choice. In particular, the Housing chapter of VISION 2050 identifies the  
29 need for local action as a critical component in the provision of affordable housing.<sup>20</sup> It includes  
30 policies related to affordability, displacement, and jobs-housing balance. In addition, the housing

---

<sup>15</sup> RCW 36.70A.020(4).

<sup>16</sup> RCW 36.70A.210(3)(e) and WAC 365-196-410(2)(e)(ii).

<sup>17</sup> WAC 365-196-410(2)(e)(ii).

<sup>18</sup> RCW 36.70A.115.

<sup>19</sup> RCW 36.70A.210(1).

<sup>20</sup> ~~((MPP D-3.))~~ VISION 2050, page 103. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 policies ((of Vision 2040)) place significant emphasis on ((the location of)) locating housing in  
2 close proximity to growth and employment centers and ((to)) transportation and transit corridors.

### 3 **Snohomish County Housing**

4 Snohomish County continues to face the following housing challenges:

- 5 1. Adequate supply of affordable housing for all economic segments in each community.
- 6 2. Adequate supply of quality housing options in proximity or satisfactory access to places  
7 of employment.
- 8 3. Infill housing development and community concerns about density and design.
- 9 4. Adequate resources for, and equitable distribution of low-income and special needs  
10 housing across the county.
- 11 5. Housing types suitable for changing household demographics and an aging population.
- 12 6. Maintenance of existing affordable housing stock, including mobile home and  
13 manufactured housing.
- 14 7. Overall increase in housing cost.

15 It is important to remember that housing is created, priced, and demolished as the result of  
16 complicated interactions of market forces and government policies that reach across regions and  
17 even nations. Snohomish County is part of a regional market where housing is a commodity  
18 largely produced by the private sector, with a small but significant portion provided by  
19 government housing authorities and non-profit agencies. Sufficient housing, concurrent with  
20 employment and population growth and adequate transportation access, is a regional challenge  
21 that needs attention at all levels of government.

22 It is beyond the financial capacity of local governments and nonprofits to satisfy unmet housing  
23 needs through their own expenditures. Historically, the federal government has taken the lead in  
24 the financial strategies, but federal funding does not meet the need. The housing affordability  
25 issue will get worse if federal funding trends continue.

26 Snohomish County jurisdictions recognize that their actions alone will not eliminate unmet  
27 housing needs. Financial constraints, however, are not a valid reason for jurisdictions not to  
28 address countywide unmet housing needs in their comprehensive plans' land use and housing  
29 strategies.

30 Despite the limited control that local governments have over housing markets, Snohomish  
31 County jurisdictions have made progress in meeting these housing challenges. Snohomish  
32 County Tomorrow regularly monitors and analyzes these housing challenges to better understand  
33 them and to suggest steps toward their diminishment. The *2007 Housing Evaluation Report*  
34 illustrates that, alone and in cooperation, the county and cities have adopted policies, strategies  
35 and regulations that help preserve affordable housing or remove barriers or reduce the costs of  
36 producing new housing units.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> The report can be found online at [www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/Departments/PDS/Divisions/LR\\_Planning/Information/Plans/SCT+Reports/HER07.htm](http://www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/Departments/PDS/Divisions/LR_Planning/Information/Plans/SCT+Reports/HER07.htm)

1 Beyond that, the Snohomish County Housing Affordability Regional Taskforce was established  
2 in 2019 and issued the HART Report and Five-Year Action Plan in January 2020. The report  
3 identifies housing challenges and provides an action plan for addressing housing affordability.<sup>22</sup>

4 The CPPs on housing are required and intended to support both GMA and Vision 2040.  
5 Generally speaking, they follow the organization of the (~~Vision 2040 Multi-county Planning~~  
6 ~~Housing Policies~~) VISION 2050 Multicounty Planning on housing.

7 **Housing Goal**

8 Snohomish County and its cities (~~will promote an affordable lifestyle where residents~~  
9 ~~have access to safe, affordable, and~~) shall promote fair and equitable access to safe, affordable,  
10 and accessible housing options for every resident through the expansion of a diverse  
11 housing (~~options near their jobs~~) stock that is in close proximity to employment, services, and  
12 transportation options.

~~(HO-1)~~ (~~The county and cities shall support the principle that fair and equal access to housing is available to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, national origin, familial status, source of income, or disability.~~)

**HO-  
(2) 1** The county and cities shall make provisions in their comprehensive plans to accommodate existing and projected housing needs, (~~including~~) consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and Snohomish County Growth Targets. Plans must include a specific assessment of housing needs by economic segment (~~within the community~~), as (~~indicated~~) described in the housing report prescribed in CPP HO-5. Those provisions should consider the following (~~factors~~) strategies:

- a. (~~Avoiding~~) Avoid further concentrations of low-income and special needs housing.
- b. (~~Increasing~~) Increase opportunities and capacity for affordable housing in (~~urban~~) Regional, Countywide, and local growth centers.
- c. (~~Increasing~~) Increase opportunities and capacity for affordable housing close to employment, education, shopping, public services, and public transit.
- d. (~~Increasing~~) Increase opportunities and capacity for affordable and special needs housing in areas where affordable housing is currently lacking.
- e. (~~Supporting~~) Support affordable housing opportunities in other Snohomish County jurisdictions, as described below in CPP HO-4.
- f. Support the creation of additional housing options in single-family neighborhoods to provide for more diverse housing types and choices to meet the various needs of all economic segments of the population.

---

<sup>22</sup> HART Report and Five-Year Action Plan. Available at <https://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/71290/HART-Report-and-5-Year-Action-Plan?bidId=>

**HO-~~(3)~~ 2** County and city comprehensive plans shall include policies ~~((for accommodating))~~ to meet affordable housing goals ~~((throughout the County))~~ consistent with ~~((Vision 2040))~~ VISION 2050. ~~((The land use and housing elements should demonstrate they))~~ Jurisdictions should demonstrate within their land use and housing elements that they can accommodate needed housing ~~((availability and facilitate))~~ consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and Snohomish County Growth Targets. These efforts should include facilitating the regional fair share of affordable housing for very low, low, moderate, and middle-income households and special needs individuals. Housing elements of comprehensive plans shall be periodically evaluated for success in facilitating needed housing.

**HO-~~(4)~~ 3** The county and cities should participate in ~~((a))~~ multi-jurisdictional affordable housing ~~((program or))~~ programs and engage in other cooperative ~~((effort))~~ efforts to promote and contribute to an adequate ~~((and diversified))~~ supply of affordable, special needs, and diverse housing countywide.

**HO-4** The county and cities should implement policies that allow for the development of moderate density housing to help meet future housing needs, diversify the housing stock, and provide more affordable home ownership and rental opportunities. This approach should include code updates to ensure that zoning designations and allowed densities, housing capacity, and other restrictions do not preclude development of moderate density housing.

**HO-5** The cities and the county shall collaborate to report housing characteristics and needs in a timely manner for jurisdictions to conduct major comprehensive plan updates and to assess progress toward achieving CPPs on housing. The report shall be sufficiently easy to understand and use for planning and evaluation. To the extent made possible by the availability of valid data, this report shall, for the entire county and each jurisdiction:

- a. Describe the measures that jurisdictions have taken (individually or collectively) to implement or support CPPs on housing, especially measures taken to support housing affordability.
- b. Quantify and map existing characteristics that are relevant to the results prescribed in the CPPs on housing, including (but not limited to):
  - i. The supply of housing units, including subsidized housing, by type, tenure, affordability, and special needs populations served.
  - ii. The availability and general location of existing affordable housing units and the distribution and location of vouchers and similar assistance methods.
  - iii. The supply of land that is undeveloped, partially used ~~((and redevelopable residential land))~~ and/or has the potential to be developed or redeveloped for residential purposes.
- c. Identify the number of housing units necessary to meet the various housing needs ~~((of the))~~ for the projected population ~~((, by income ranges,))~~ of households of all incomes and special needs populations. The number of units identified for each jurisdiction will be utilized for planning purposes and to acknowledge the responsibility of all jurisdictions to plan for affordable housing within the regional context.

d. Evaluate the risk of physical and economic displacement of residents, especially low-income households and marginalized populations.

**HO-6** The county and cities should implement policies and programs that encourage ~~((the upgrading of neighborhoods and))~~ the rehabilitation and preservation of existing legally established, affordable housing for residents of all income levels, including but not limited to mobile/manufactured housing and single - room occupancy (SRO) housing.

**HO-7** Jurisdictions shall use housing definitions consistent with those of the Snohomish County Tomorrow ~~((growth monitoring report))~~ Housing Characteristics and Needs Report prescribed in HO-5. Definitions may be periodically revised based on consideration of local demographic data and the definitions used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

**HO-8** Each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan should reconcile the need to encourage and respect the vitality of established residential neighborhoods with the need to identify and site essential public residential facilities for special needs populations, including those mandated under RCW 36.70A.200.

**HO-9** In order to improve the jobs-to-housing balance in Snohomish County, jurisdictions shall adopt comprehensive plans that provide for the development of:

- a. A variety of housing choices, including affordable housing, so that workers at all income levels may choose to live in proximity to existing and planned employment concentrations and transit service; and
- b. ~~((Provide for employment))~~ Employment opportunities in proximity to existing and planned residential communities.

**HO-10** Jurisdictions should encourage the use of environmentally sensitive housing development practices and environmentally sustainable building techniques and materials in order to minimize the impacts of growth and development on the county's natural resource systems. This approach should also consider the potential costs and benefits to site development, construction, and building maintenance to balance housing affordability and environmental sustainability.

**HO-11** The county and cities should consider the economic implications of proposed building and land use regulations so that the broader public benefit they serve is achieved with the least additional cost to housing.

**HO-12** The county and cities should minimize housing production costs by considering the use of a variety of infrastructure funding methods, such as existing revenue sources, impact fees, local improvement districts, and general obligation bonds.



- HO-13** Jurisdictions should ensure that their impact fee programs add no more to the cost of each housing unit produced than a fairly-derived proportionate share of the cost of new public facilities necessary to accommodate the housing unit as determined by the impact fee provisions of the Growth Management Act cited in chapter 82.02 RCW.
- HO-14** The county and cities should ~~((provide incentives for))~~ incentivize and promote the development and preservation of long-term affordable housing ~~((such as))~~ through the use of zoning, taxation, and other tools, including height or density bonuses, property tax incentives and parking requirement reductions. The incentives should apply where feasible to encourage affordable housing.
- HO-15** Metropolitan cities, Core cities, and High Capacity Transit Communities, as defined by the Regional Growth Strategy in VISION 2050, shall develop and implement strategies to address displacement of historically marginalized populations, including residents identified in the report prescribed in HO-5, and neighborhood-based small business owners.

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

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT

A solid economic foundation is fundamental to our quality of life. Economic growth and activity provides jobs and income for our citizens, the goods and services that we use daily, and revenues that fund local government services and programs. Strengthening our ~~((businesses))~~ business climate keeps our region competitive with other regions, and expands opportunities for new and better jobs as our population grows. Diversifying and expanding Snohomish County’s economic base will provide important long-term benefits to our ~~((citizens))~~ residents and communities.

~~((Local))~~ In partnership with the private sector, local government should promote economic development by creating opportunities for a wide range of businesses, jobs ~~((and))~~, careers, ~~((in partnership with the private sector))~~ and educational opportunities for all residents. Through education and training programs, land use planning, construction permitting, and building infrastructure, local government “sets the table” for private investment and continued economic growth.

### State Context

The Growth Management Act requires that Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) include policies to promote economic development and employment (RCW 36.70A.210(3)(g)). It also requires local plans—which the CPPs guide—to include an economic development element (RCW 36.70A.070(7)).

### Regional Context

VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 sets the following ~~((“))~~overarching goal~~((”))~~ for ~~((economic development))~~ the regional economy:

*The region ~~((will have))~~ has a prospering and sustainable regional economy by supporting businesses and job creation, investing in all people and their health, sustaining environmental quality, and creating great central places, diverse communities, and high quality of life.*

It goes on to state:

~~*(VISION 2040’s economic goals and policies promote a sustainable economy that creates and maintains a high standard of living and quality of life for all. The create stable and lasting prosperity, VISION 2040 focuses on businesses, people, and places, recognizing that growth management, transportation, economic, and environmental policies must be integrated and must take social, economic, and environmental issues into account while preserving key regional assets.)*~~

*To create stable and lasting prosperity, VISION 2050 focuses on businesses, people, and places. Strong regional growth necessitates continuous coordination to ensure that the region’s quality of life remains an economic asset in the future. Success of the region’s*

1 economy is built on quality of life policies across VISION 2050 that manage the region's  
2 growth, invest in transportation, protect the environment, enhance community assets, and  
3 provide housing options for the region's residents. Economy policies in VISION 2050  
4 build on these policies.

5 In ~~((2008, the Prosperity Partnership for the Puget Sound adopted a))~~ 2017 Amazing Place was  
6 adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council, updating the Regional ~~((Growth))~~ Economic  
7 Strategy ~~((RGS))~~ for ~~((the area that identifies 14 industrial clusters in the region's economy. It~~  
8 ~~also identifies the following seven clusters for strategic development))~~ the Central Puget Sound  
9 Region. In the Regional Economic Strategy, three economic goals were identified for the region.  
10 Those goals are as follows:

11 Goal: Open economic opportunities to everyone.

12 Goal: Compete globally.

13 Goal: Sustain a high quality of life.<sup>23</sup>

14 In addition to setting goals and providing strategies to achieve those goals, Amazing Place  
15 identifies the following nine key export industries that the economic strategy is designed to  
16 support:

- 17 • Aerospace
- 18 • Business Services
- 19 • Clean Technology
- 20 • Information and Communication Technology
- 21 • Life Sciences and Global Health
- 22 • Logistics and International Trade
- 23 • Maritime
- 24 • Military and Defense
- 25 • Tourism~~((/Visitors))~~.<sup>24</sup>

## 26 **Snohomish County Economy**

27 The CPPs in this chapter are intended to promote economic development in Snohomish County  
28 consistent with the goals and policies of VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050. Snohomish County is an  
29 important international center for the aerospace industry, and the home of Boeing Company's  
30 largest aircraft manufacturing complex. This county also accounts for about one-fourth of the  
31 biotech industry in the State of Washington. Looking into the future, economic development  
32 organizations have identified three industry clusters as the ultimate focus of Snohomish County.  
33 These three industry clusters are Aerospace, Life Sciences (Biotech and Medical Devices), and  
34 Technology Manufacturing.

---

<sup>23</sup> Amazing Place, Page 11. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/amazingplacestrategy.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> Amazing Place, Page 3. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/amazingplacestrategy.pdf>

1 To achieve sustainable economic vitality for all the communities of Snohomish County,  
2 jurisdictions are required to incorporate an economic development element in their  
3 comprehensive plans. Coordination of economic development planning with the other required  
4 elements of comprehensive plans is vital to attracting new business, promoting economic  
5 diversity and encouraging expansion and retention of existing businesses.

6 Snohomish County residents provide a skilled workforce for many businesses in both King and  
7 Snohomish counties. An important part of creating sustainable communities and improving the  
8 quality of life will be realized by creating more opportunities for residents of Snohomish County  
9 to work closer to home. The CPPs, as the framework for local comprehensive plans, support the  
10 integration of economic opportunities, transportation improvements, investments in education,  
11 protection of environmental quality, and focusing of growth in designated centers, consistent  
12 with the RGS in VISION ((2040)) 2050.

### 13 **Economic Development and Employment Goal**

14 Cities, towns, and Snohomish County government will encourage coordinated,  
15 sustainable economic growth by building on the strengths of the county’s economic base and  
16 diversifying it through strategic investments in infrastructure, education and training, and sound  
17 management of land and natural resources.

**ED-1** The County and cities, through Snohomish County Tomorrow, should support the  
Regional Growth Strategy of VISION ((2040)) 2050 and the ((economic priorities of  
~~the Prosperity Partnership~~)) Regional Economic Strategy. ((While recognizing the  
need to accommodate other businesses and industries and to diversify our economy,  
jurisdictions)) Jurisdictions should utilize comprehensive plan policies, infrastructure  
investments, and regulations to support the ((following)) existing and emerging  
industry clusters that play an important role in ((the health of)) growing and  
sustaining Snohomish County’s economy. ((, through our comprehensive plan  
policies, infrastructure investments and land use regulations:  
a. ~~Aerospace;~~  
b. ~~Technology;~~  
c. ~~Life sciences and healthcare;~~  
d. ~~International trade;~~  
e. ~~Military;~~  
f. ~~Tourism;~~  
g. ~~Agriculture; and~~  
h. ~~Education~~))

**ED-2** The County and cities should ((encourage)) foster an equitable business and  
regulatory environment that supports and encourages the establishment and growth  
of ((locally owned,)) small and startup businesses ((through comprehensive plan  
policies, infrastructure investments, and fair and appropriate land use regulations in  
all communities)), especially those that are woman- and minority-owned .

- ED-3** Jurisdictions should prioritize multi-modal transportation system linkages between growth centers, manufacturing and industrial centers, and ~~((supporting))~~ residential areas ~~((containing an adequate supply of affordable housing (as appropriate)))~~ to support economic development and improve access to a wide variety of job opportunities and employment.
- ED-4** State and federal economic development and transportation funding should be prioritized to regionally designated centers~~((and sub-centers))~~, countywide centers, high-capacity station areas with a station area plan, and other local centers, as well as transportation system linkages between regional growth centers, manufacturing industrial centers, and supporting residential areas containing an adequate supply of affordable housing.
- ED-5** ~~((The process for designating Manufacturing/Industrial Centers (MICs) shall be as follows:~~
- ~~a. A local jurisdiction may nominate an MIC;~~
  - ~~b. An economic development subcommittee of Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) reviews the proposal for conformity with the criteria in ED-6;~~
  - ~~c. If the MIC proposal is found to be appropriate, the SCT Steering Committee recommends the MIC for designation; and~~
  - ~~d. The County Council holds a public hearing and makes the decision to seek designation of the MIC as a candidate center to be forwarded to the Puget Sound Regional Council for consideration.))~~
- Jurisdictions should promote economic and employment growth that creates a countywide economy that consists of a diverse range of living wage jobs for all of the county's residents.

**ED-6** (~~Manufacturing/Industrial Centers (MICs) designated through the process in ED-5 shall be located in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs). MICs should have clearly defined geographic boundaries and develop in accordance with the general guidelines established in the VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy. Specifically, an MIC should meet the following criteria, it:~~  
a. ~~Consists of major, existing regional employment areas of intensive, concentrated manufacturing, industrial and high technology land uses, including— but not limited to— aviation facilities and services;~~  
b. ~~Provides capacity and planning for a minimum of 20,000 jobs;~~  
c. ~~Is located outside other designated centers but in a UGA;~~  
d. ~~Includes land uses that cannot easily be mixed at higher densities with other uses;~~  
e. ~~Is supported by adequate public facilities and service, including good access to the regional transportation system; and~~  
f. ~~Discourages retail and office uses unless they are supportive of the preferred uses in (a.-))~~  
As a part of the overall countywide economic development strategy, jurisdictions should target economic development activities that improve access to economic opportunity for residents that historically have low and very low access to opportunity.

**ED-7** The County and adjacent cities shall protect the Paine Field-Boeing area as a Manufacturing Industrial Center (MIC), recognizing that it is a major, existing regional employment area of intensive, concentrated manufacturing and industrial land uses, including aerospace, aircraft manufacturing and high-technology uses. Notwithstanding the VISION ((2040)) 2050 guidelines for MIC designation, land uses and zoning of Paine Field continue to be governed by the Snohomish County Airport Paine Field Master Plan and Snohomish County Zoning Code consistent with federal aviation policies and grant obligations. This MIC should:  
a. Accommodate aerospace related employment and associated activities;  
b. Accommodate employment which requires a high floor area to employee ratio but ((~~strive to~~)) increase the overall employment density in the manufacturing and industrial center;  
c. Encourage a mix of uses which support and enhance manufacturing, aerospace and industrial centers; and  
d. Be supported by adequate public facilities and services, including good access to the region's transportation system, which are essential to the success of the MIC.

**ED-8** Jurisdictions ((~~are encouraged to work~~)) should collaborate with businesses and organizations to develop economic development plan elements and analyze the land use designations, infrastructure and services needed ((~~by business uses~~)) to support businesses.

**ED-9** As appropriate, the County and cities should adopt plans, policies, and regulations that preserve designated industrial, commercial, agricultural, and resource land base for long-term regional economic benefit.

- ED-10** In their local comprehensive plans, jurisdictions shall include economic development policies consistent with existing or planned capital and utility facilities. These plans should identify and implement strategies to ensure timely development of needed facilities.
- ED-11** In cooperation with school districts, other education providers, and each other, jurisdictions should ensure the availability of sufficient land and services for future K-20 school needs, and support ~~((improved))~~ high-quality education and job training resources for all ~~((citizens))~~ residents, such as a 4-year university or technical college in Snohomish County.
- ED-12** The County and cities should coordinate economic development plans and economic elements within comprehensive plans with transportation, housing, and land use policies~~((that))~~, and the Regional Growth Strategy to support economic development ~~((and predictability for future growth))~~ that is compatible with each community.
- ED-13** Jurisdictions should recognize, where appropriate, the growth and development needs of businesses of local, regional, or statewide significance and ensure that local plans and regulations provide opportunity for the growth and continued success of such businesses.
- ED-14** The County and cities should promote an appropriate balance of jobs-to-housing to:
- a. Support economic activity;
  - b. Encourage local economic opportunities and housing choice;
  - c. Improve mobility; and
  - d. Respond to the challenge of climate change.
- ED-15** Jurisdictions should ensure that economic development sustains and respects the county’s natural environment and encourages the development of existing and emerging industries, technologies, and services that promote environmental sustainability, especially those addressing climate change and resilience.
- ED-~~((15))~~ 16** The expeditious processing of development applications ~~((by the County and the cities))~~ shall not result in the ~~((lowering))~~ reduction of environmental and land use standards.

**ED-** ((In their comprehensive plans, the cities of Arlington and Marysville identify an industrial center spanning those two cities as a candidate for regional designation as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC). The proposed MIC is entirely within the urban growth area and predominantly within the city limits of Arlington and Marysville. Based on the recommendation of Snohomish County Tomorrow, developed through a collaborative and participatory process, the County identifies the proposed Arlington Marysville Manufacturing Industrial Center as a candidate for regional designation as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center.)) **((16)) 17** The County and cities shall support the Cascade Industrial Center as a Manufacturing Industrial Center (MIC), recognizing that it is a major, existing regional employment area of intensive, concentrated manufacturing and industrial land uses.

**ED-18** Jurisdictions should identify the potential for physical, economic, and cultural displacement of existing locally owned, small businesses as a result of development or redevelopment and market pressure. Jurisdictions should consider a range of mitigation strategies to mitigate the impacts of displacement to the extent feasible.

1

2



# TRANSPORTATION

## State Context

These transportation policies have been prepared under the authority of RCW 36.70A.210 (3) which states that "A countywide planning policy [CPP] shall as a minimum, address the following... (d) Policies for countywide transportation facilities and strategies". They apply to designated, countywide transportation facilities and services, which are those that serve travel needs and have impacts beyond the particular jurisdiction(s) in which they are located.

## Regional Context

VISION ((2040)) 2050 provides a framework for long-range transportation planning in the region by integrating planning for freight, ferries, roads, transit, bicycling, and walking. VISION ((2040)) 2050 recognizes the importance of continued mobility for people, goods, and services. It also recognizes that transportation in our region is the source for approximately half of the greenhouse gas emissions, as well as a primary source of pollution in Puget Sound. As a result, VISION ((2040)) 2050 commits to a sustainable, clean and safe transportation system that increases transportation choices while improving the natural environment.

The multicounty planning policies for transportation are organized around the maintenance, management, and safety of the transportation systems. The policies call for better integrated land use and transportation planning, with a priority placed on transportation investments that serve centers and compact urban communities. An emphasis is also placed on cleaner operations, dependable financing mechanisms transportation, alternatives to driving alone (and reduced vehicle miles traveled), and lower transportation-related energy consumption—which, in turn, lowers particulate pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

## Local Context

Transportation and land use are profoundly interrelated. The type, intensity, and timing of land development will influence the mode of transportation provided, its effectiveness in moving people and goods and the travel behavior of people using the land. Distinctions need to be made between the types and levels of transportation services provided to urban areas and rural areas. People living in low-density areas traveling to employment dispersed throughout the county tend to use the automobile over other modes of transportation.

~~((It is very difficult to serve these types of trips with traditional, fixed route, public transportation (i.e., bus or rail).))~~ Public transportation is most effective in moving people where population and employment are concentrated in denser neighborhoods and activity centers. Site design features need to accommodate public transportation allowing efficient access and circulation of transit vehicles.

In order to achieve the long-term growth management goals that are established by Snohomish County Tomorrow, the following overarching principles should guide implementation of the CPPs for multimodal transportation.

- 1 • Provide a wide range of choices in transportation services to ensure that all citizens have  
2 the ability to travel regardless of age, sex, race, income, disability, or place of residence.
- 3 • Pursue sustainable funding and informed decision-making that recognizes the economic,  
4 environmental, and social context of transportation.
- 5 • Balance the various modes of travel in order to enhance person-carrying capacity, as  
6 opposed to vehicle-moving capacity.
- 7 • Implement efficient levels of service for the various surface transportation modes (i.e.,  
8 roadways, bikeways, transit, and freight) that are applied effectively to serve different  
9 intensities of land development.

10 Policies related to level of service, transportation location, and design need to be coordinated  
11 across state, regional, and local agencies to ensure effective and efficient transportation. We need  
12 to ensure that our countywide transportation systems are designed to support the level of land  
13 development we allow and forecast while at the same time recognizing and responding to the  
14 context in which those systems are located.

15 The CPPs presented here are intended to guide transportation planning by the County and cities  
16 in Snohomish County and to provide the basis for regional coordination with the Washington  
17 State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), and  
18 transportation operating agencies.

## 19 **Transportation Goal**

20 The County and cities will work proactively with transportation planning agencies and service  
21 providers to plan, finance, and implement an efficient, affordable, equitable, inclusive, and safe  
22 multi-modal transportation system that supports state-level planning, the Regional Growth  
23 Strategy, and local comprehensive plans and promotes economic vitality, environment  
24 sustainability, and human health.

- TR-1** Jurisdictions should establish agreements and procedures for jointly mitigating traffic impacts, including provisions for development and design review and sharing of developer impact mitigation.
- a. Interlocal agreements among the cities and County should be used in Urban Growth Areas and areas proposed for annexation, to define procedures and standards for mitigating traffic impacts, sharing improvement and debt costs for transportation facilities, and addressing maintenance and funding for future transportation facilities and services. These interlocal agreements may also include transit agencies or the Washington State Department of Transportation where mitigation includes transportation demand management strategies or transit related improvements, such as park and ride facilities, bus rapid transit stations, or high-occupancy lanes.
  - b. Joint development and plan review teams should be formed for major projects having impacts that extend across jurisdictional boundaries.
  - c. Development impact mitigation should be shared where a project's impacts extend across jurisdictional boundaries.
  - d. Local comprehensive plans and long-range transit agency plans should provide

policies that encourage private sector investment in transportation services and facilities.

- e. Local land use regulations should provide for integrated design of transportation facilities in designated urban growth centers to encourage transit-oriented land uses and nonmotorized modes of travel.

**TR-2** Jurisdictions may designate transportation service areas that provide the geographic basis for joint projects, maintenance, level of service methods, coordinated capital and mitigation programs and finance methods for transportation facilities and services. In these transportation service areas, the Washington State Department of Transportation, the County, cities and transit agencies may coordinate future land use, transportation, and capital facilities planning efforts to ensure consistency between jurisdictional comprehensive plans and long-range transit agency plans.

**TR-3** ~~((In support of VISION 2040, the))~~ The County and cities should establish ~~((agreements))~~ processes and procedures for setting priorities, programming, and financing for countywide, regional and state transportation facilities and services consistent with VISION 2050, the Growth Management Act, and federal transportation legislation.

a. The County and cities, in coordination with public transit agencies and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), should develop consistent methodologies to determine transportation needs and their estimated costs in terms of capital, operations, preservation, and maintenance.

b. Transportation needs should be prioritized based on the extent to which they fulfill the objectives of the adopted Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), local comprehensive plans, long range transit agency plans, and transportation policies.

c. Within cities and unincorporated county in urban growth areas, transportation facility and service investments should be prioritized that support compact, pedestrian- and transit- oriented development, especially within designated regional, countywide, and local centers, near HCT facilities, and along corridors connecting centers.

d. Transportation investments should be prioritized that support the achievement of regional greenhouse gas emission reduction goals.

~~((e.))~~ e. The Puget Sound Regional Council, WSDOT, County, and cities should maintain an ongoing and coordinated six-year program that specifies the financing of immediate transportation improvements consistent with the RGS, ~~((Transportation 2040, and the WSDOT Highway System Plan))~~ The Regional Transportation Plan, and WSDOT's Washington Transportation Plan.

~~((f.))~~ f. The financing of transportation systems and improvements should reflect the true costs of providing service, reflecting the costs and benefits attributable to those who use the system as well as those who benefit from it. Revenues to finance transportation should come from traditional measures (e.g., fuel taxes, property taxes, and impact mitigation fees), but also from other innovative measures (e.g., user fees, high occupancy tolls, Vehicle Miles Travelled assessments, and private-sector contributions). Importantly, impacts of transportation system choices and funding decisions on climate change should be considered as part of this process.

**TR-4**

The County and cities, together with WSDOT and transit agencies, shall provide transportation facilities and services ~~((that))~~ necessary to support and implement the RGS and the land use elements of ((their)) local comprehensive plans, including roadway capacities((-and nonmotorized)), active transportation options((-together with)), and public transportation services appropriate to the designated land use types and intensities by:

- a. Maintaining and improving existing arterials, neighborhood streets, and associated pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure in order to promote safe and efficient use for all modes;
- b. Providing a network of multimodal arterials based on a consistent classification system and appropriate design standards that will improve connectivity, circulation, and reduce vehicle miles of travel;
- c. Using land use projections based on the Regional Growth Strategy and implemented through local comprehensive plans to identify and plan for adequate roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit services to meet travel needs;
- d. Reviewing land use designations where ~~((roadway capacity and/or transit service capacity))~~ transportation levels of service cannot adequately serve or expect to achieve concurrency for development allowed under the designation;
- e. Providing adequate access to and circulation for public service and priority for public transportation vehicles will be part of the planning for comprehensive plan land use designations and subsequent development as appropriate; ~~((and))~~
- f. Consulting with transit agencies, as appropriate, when planning future land use in designated transit emphasis corridors and in the area of high capacity transit stations for consistency with long-range transit agency plans and to ensure that the land use and transit services are mutually supported;
- g. Preparing for changes in technology and travel patterns for moving people and goods; and
- h. Improving street connectivity to encourage walking, bicycling, transit use, and physical activity.

**TR-5** The County and cities together with the Washington State Department of Transportation should develop consistent transportation design standards for urban and rural areas throughout the County that address public transportation, roadways, ferries, walkways, bikeways, and access for people with disabilities, low-income and special needs populations, and that recognize differences among communities by:

- a. Identifying major travel routes needing additional public transportation, pedestrian, or bicycle-related improvements to increase people-carrying capacity;
- b. Coordinating local comprehensive plans to develop or complete a system of interconnected walkways and bikeways;
- c. Establishing multimodal transportation facility design, level of service standards and site plan design standards that will address the movement of goods and services to enhance the wellbeing of the economy and public health; and
- d. Implementing context-sensitive solutions that recognize the variety of functions of transportation facilities and that promote compatibility with the natural environment, adjoining land uses, and activities and that create high quality public spaces.

**TR-6** The County and cities should prepare consistent rules and procedures among affected jurisdictions and transit agencies for locating, ~~((and))~~ designing, and constructing transportation facilities and services to minimize and mitigate their adverse impacts on the natural environment, ~~((or))~~ resource lands, or human health. Depending on the jurisdiction, these may include:

- a. Design standards and consistent methods to reduce stormwater pollution, improve fish passages, and minimize other adverse impacts on shorelines, water resources, drainage patterns, and soils;
- b. Location criteria that minimize the disruption to natural habitat, flood plains, wetlands, geologically and other environmentally sensitive areas;
- c. Cooperation with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, PSRC, and local jurisdictions to ensure consistency with the transportation control measure requirements of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments; and
- d. ~~((Measures to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change.))~~ Development of a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to and promotes human health.

**TR-7** The County and cities shall employ professionally accepted methodologies for determining transportation levels of service that consider different development intensities for urban centers, other urban areas and rural areas, high-occupancy vehicle use and community values as reflected by the city and County comprehensive plans, and transit agency long range plans.

The County and cities should use – in coordination with transit agencies – a consistent technique in calculating transportation level of service on a systems basis that:

- a. Incorporates different levels of service depending on development form, mix of uses and intensity/density of land use, availability and adequacy of transit service, and the availability and adequacy of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in accordance with local comprehensive plans and long-range transit agency plans;

- b. Employs consistent data collection and processing in determining travel demand and system operations along with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), adjacent local jurisdictions and transit agencies; and
- c. Monitors level of service and concurrency on a routine basis on those critical transportation facilities and services that serve as indicators of system operation.

**TR-8** The County and cities shall establish concurrency requirements for land development by considering transportation levels of service and available financial resources to make needed transportation improvements.

- a. The goals, policies, and objectives of local comprehensive plans shall be the basis for making interpretations of development concurrency with transportation.
- b. Level of service shall be used as a growth management tool to limit development in rural areas and offer incentives for more intense development in existing urban areas. ~~((Implementation of this policy will require higher levels of service in rural areas than in urban areas.))~~
- c. The impact of alternate modes of travel (e.g., pedestrian, bicycle, carpools, vanpools, buses, rail, etc.), as well as single-occupant vehicles, shall be considered in ~~((making))~~ local concurrency ~~((determinations))~~ programs, both in assessment and mitigation.
- d. Recognize there are transportation services and facilities that are at their ultimate capacity.
- e. The County and cities will reconsider land use designations where it is evident transportation facilities and services cannot be financed or provided in sufficient time to maintain concurrency with land development. ~~((Implementation of this policy will likely require increased density in centers, additional restrictions on rural development, shifting of transportation dollars to projects supporting centers, and lower levels of service and/or inability to maintain concurrency in some areas.))~~
- f. Concurrency programs in designated regional, countywide, and local centers, and near HCT facilities should be designed to encourage transit supportive development.

**TR-9** The County and cities should establish common policies and technical procedures for transportation system management and transportation demand management programs that reduce trip making, total miles traveled, and the climate change and air quality impacts associated with development, and improve the efficiency of the transportation system.

- a. The Washington State Department of Transportation, Puget Sound Regional Council, County and cities should establish consistent commute trip reduction, vehicle-miles-of-travel and single-occupant vehicles goals and consistent methods of measuring progress to ensure consistency and equity.
- b. The County and cities should coordinate with transit agencies and with each other for the implementation of employer and residential trip reduction programs.

- TR-10** The County and cities should collaborate with federal, state, and regional agencies, and adjacent counties, cities, and transit agencies to prepare uniform criteria for locating and mitigating the impacts of major countywide and regional transportation facilities and services. These agencies should:
- a. Designate transportation facilities of countywide and regional significance;
  - b. Prepare criteria for locating park-and-ride lots, transit stations, and similar components of a regional transportation system; and
  - c. Coordinate studies that look at alternative sites with affected public agencies and impacted neighborhoods.
- TR-11** The County and cities should establish an education program utilizing state, County, transit agency, city transportation resources, and local school districts that encourages use of public transportation. The County and cities, in cooperation with transit agencies, should also establish an ongoing public awareness program for ridesharing and public transportation.
- TR-12** Each local jurisdiction served by transit should, in cooperation with transit agencies, map the general locations of planned major transit facilities in their comprehensive plans and ~~((shall enact appropriate transit-oriented policies and development standards for such locations. Where appropriate, transit-oriented development should encompass the following common elements))~~ provide for transit-supportive infrastructure and programs, including:
- ~~((a. Be located to support the development of designated growth centers and existing or planned transit emphasis corridors;~~
  - ~~b. Include pedestrian-scale neighborhoods and activity centers to stimulate use of transit and ridesharing;~~
  - ~~e. Plan for appropriate intensity and mix of development—including both employment and housing options—that support transit service;))~~
  - ~~((d. Provide safe))~~a. Safe, pleasant, and convenient access for pedestrians and bicyclists;
  - ~~((e. Provide safe))~~b. Safe and convenient access to and transfer between all forms of transit and other modes of travel; and
  - ~~((f. Promote pricing))~~c. Pricing or regulatory mechanisms<sup>25</sup> to encourage transit use and reduce reliance on the automobile.

---

<sup>25</sup> Such as metered parking and tolling.

- TR-13** The County, cities, and transit agencies in the Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA) should collaborate with Sound Transit to ensure planning and right-of-way preservation for ~~((a))~~ future ~~((phase))~~ phases of light-rail corridor development that will extend to the Everett Regional Growth Center as soon as possible. Planning for light-rail transit should:
- a. Be compatible with the Sound Transit 2 ((plans for Snohomish County)) System Expansion Plan, which ~~((include))~~ includes commitments for stations in Lynnwood and Mountlake Terrace;
  - b. Be compatible with the Sound Transit 3 System Expansion Plan, which includes commitments for stations near Alderwood Mall, in the vicinity of 164<sup>th</sup> St SW near I-5, in the vicinity of 128<sup>th</sup> St SW near I-5, at the Southwest Everett Industrial Center, in the vicinity of SR526 near Evergreen Way, and near Everett Station, with provisions for a possible station at Airport Rd near SR 99;
  - ~~((b-))~~c. Recognize and be compatible with local land use planning and urban design objectives in the Southwest UGA; and
  - ~~((e-))~~d. Include consideration and evaluation of additional transit services to major employment centers in the Southwest UGA.

- TR-14** In order to improve countywide and regional transit service ~~((throughout the county, cities, the County and))~~, the County and cities should provide assistance and support to transit agencies ((should evaluate))in evaluating the potential to expand the Public Transportation Benefit Area (PTBA) and/or the Regional Transit District (RTD) to Urban Growth Areas beyond the current boundaries in Snohomish County. ~~((This effort should consider the following:-~~
- ~~a. Revenues to be generated from the expanded areas;-~~
  - ~~b. Potential transit service improvements in the expanded PTBA and RTD;~~
  - ~~c. Benefits to communities to be added to the PTBA and RTD from improved transit services;~~
  - ~~e. Overall countywide benefit to implementing the Regional Growth Strategy and the objectives of city and County comprehensive plans by improving countywide and regional transit services;-~~
  - ~~d. Roles countywide and regional agencies will assume in providing transit services; and~~
  - ~~e. Other relevant factors pertaining to the countywide and regional transportation system.))~~



- TR-15** The County and cities shall maintain, preserve and operate the existing transportation systems in a safe and usable state. The County and cities should collaborate on maintenance, management, predictable funding and safety practices that:
- a. Maintain and operate transportation systems to provide safe, efficient, and reliable movement of people, goods, and services;
  - b. Protect the investment in the existing system and lower overall life-cycle costs through effective maintenance and preservation programs;
  - c. Reduce the need for some capital improvements through investments in operations; pricing programs; demand management strategies, and system management activities that improve the efficiency of the current system;
  - d. Improve the safety of the transportation system and, in the long term, pursue the goal of zero deaths and ~~((disabling))~~serious injuries;
  - e. ~~((Protect the transportation system against disaster by developing prevention and recovery strategies and coordinating emergency responses))~~ Advance the resilience of the transportation system by incorporating redundancies, preparing for disasters and other impacts, and coordinated planning for system recovery; and
  - f. Assess and plan for adaptive transportation responses to potential threats and hazards arising from climate change.

- TR-16** The County and cities, in cooperation with transit operating agencies and the Washington State Department of Transportation, should plan strategically to integrate ~~((concepts related to sustainability and climate change))~~ measures to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change in transportation planning, by:
- a. Developing and coordinating transportation plans that support land use and other plan elements and contribute to a flexible, holistic and long-term approach to promote sustainability and mitigate impacts contributing to climate change;
  - b. Maximizing efficiency of existing transportation investments and pursuing measures to reduce vehicle miles of travel and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation;
  - c. ~~((Fostering a less polluting system that reduces the negative effects of transportation infrastructure and operation on climate and natural environment))~~ Supporting the transition to a cleaner transportation system by planning for and encouraging investment in clean energy options such as zero emission vehicles, low carbon fuels and the necessary infrastructure to support clean energy options;
  - d. Developing and implementing transportation modes, fuels and technologies that are energy-efficient and reduce negative impacts on the environment;
  - e. Investing in nonmotorized transportation improvements in and between urban centers; and
  - f. ~~((Promoting convenient and low impact alternatives to single occupancy vehicles; and))~~ Increasing the proportion of trips made by transportation modes that are alternatives to driving alone by ensuring availability of reliable and competitive mobility options, especially to and within centers and along corridors connecting centers.
- ~~((g. Developing a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to human~~

health.))

- TR-17** The County and cities should collaborate with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and transit operating agencies in order to designate transit emphasis corridors that allow effective and integrated planning of land use and transportation. Transit emphasis corridors – as delineated by local comprehensive plans – should:
- a. Be served, or planned to be served, by public transportation;
  - b. Provide for transit-compatible and transit-oriented land uses and densities in transit emphasis corridors that recognize and reflect appropriate activity zones and walking distances, generally within ¼ to ½ mile of the corridor;
  - c. Connect all designated mixed-use urban centers;
  - d. Conform to urban design and infrastructure standards that accommodate and enhance the operations of transit services;
  - e. Be planned for compact, mixed-use commercial and residential development that is designed to be transit-oriented;
  - f. Include programs to implement vehicle access management measures that preserve capacity, maintain level of service standards and promote traffic safety;
  - g. Include transportation control measures, transportation demand management programs, and transportation system management programs to reduce travel delay and vehicle-miles of travel; and
  - h. Promote consistency between County, city, WSDOT, and transit agency long-range transportation plans.
- TR-18** The County and cities, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation and port authorities, should plan and implement projects and programs ~~((to promote freight mobility and access needs being addressed))~~that support global trade and the needs of state, regional, and local distribution of goods and services and attract and retain industries and skilled workers through:
- a. Coordinated design and construction of regional and local transportation facilities that support manufacturing and international trade;
  - b. Traffic operations measures and capital improvements that minimize the impacts of freight movement on other modes of travel;
  - c. Maintenance, preservation, and expansion of freight rail capacity;
  - d. Establishment of interjurisdictional programs aimed at preserving rail rights-of-way; and
  - e. Special efforts to ensure any ongoing conflicts and other needs are planned for and resolved to the greatest extent possible.

- TR-19** The County (~~and cities~~), cities, and transit agencies should prepare compatible rules and procedures (~~((among affected jurisdictions and transit agencies for locating transportation facilities and services to minimize and mitigate potential adverse impacts on low income, minority, and special need populations.))~~to implement transportation programs and projects that provide access to opportunities while preventing and mitigating potential adverse impacts to people of color, people with low incomes, and people with special transportation needs.
- TR-20** The County and cities, in cooperation with transit agencies, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and port authorities, should plan and design transportation facilities and services to efficiently interface with waterborne and air transportation terminals and facilities. It is intended that these efforts would:
- a. Promote a seamless transportation system for all modes of travel;
  - b. Emphasize multi-modal intersection points at efficiently designed terminals;
  - c. Lead to coordinated fare and ticketing systems;
  - d. Benefit local transportation systems by reducing traffic volumes or improving traffic flows; and
  - e. Accommodate and complement existing and planned local land use patterns.
- TR-21** The County and cities, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation (as appropriate), shall coordinate in planning, designing programming, and constructing nonmotorized transportation facilities in Snohomish County. The County and affected cities recognize a need for:
- a. Bikeway and walkway standards that are compatible among affected jurisdictions;
  - b. Joint planning to achieve continuous and/or direct bicycle routes and pedestrian connections between cities and major centers in Snohomish County and the region;
  - c. Joint planning for a safe system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities that link residential areas, schools, recreational areas, business districts, and transit centers and facilities; and
  - d. New development to accommodate nonmotorized transportation facilities in its site planning.
- TR-22** The County and cities, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation and transit operating agencies, should preserve existing freight and passenger railroad rights-of-way for continued rail transportation use.

- TR-23** The County, along with affected cities, should cooperate in efforts to acquire and/or purchase abandoned railroad right-of-way in order to preserve options for alternative transit corridors, such as commuter rail, between growth centers in or adjacent to Snohomish County.<sup>26</sup> The County and affected cities recognize that:
- a. Interim or co-existing uses, such as freight rail, nonmotorized transportation, and recreational activities need to be considered and planned in conjunction with commuter rail service;
  - b. Compatible land use types and densities need to be strategically planned at key locations to support the rail corridors; and
  - c. Impacts on resource lands, the natural environment, and the community shall be considered with regard to preservation and use of abandoned railroad rights-of-way.

- TR-24** ~~((The County and cities should encourage transit supportive land uses in noncontiguous Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) in order to help preserve transit service between non-contiguous UGAs-))~~ Consistent with the RGS, arterial capacity improvements that encourage rural growth should be avoided. Where increased arterial capacity is warranted to provide safe and efficient travel between UGAs:
- a. Road standards shall be consistent with appropriate development patterns and densities; and
  - b. Appropriate rural land development and access management regulations should be in place prior to authorizing improvements.

- TR-25** The County and cities should coordinate with the county’s airports to meet local and regional aviation system needs while minimizing impacts to the community consistent with state and regional aviation system plans.

1  
2

---

<sup>26</sup> One example is a potential link between the cities of Woodinville and Snohomish.

# 1 THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

## 2 State Context

3 The goal for the environment in the Growth Management Act (GMA) (~~(says to)~~) states “Protect  
4 the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and  
5 the availability of water” (RCW 36.70A.020(10)). There is no specific requirement in GMA for  
6 environmental policies; however, achievement of other requirements in GMA contributes to  
7 accomplishment of this goal.

## 8 Regional Context

9 VISION (~~(2040)~~)2050 includes two chapters, Environment and Climate Change that include  
10 goals and polices that are relevant to this chapter. The Environment chapter acknowledges that  
11 certain development patterns and practices have damaged and threaten further disruption of the  
12 region’s ecosystems. (~~(It)~~) While this chapter recognizes that (~~(while)~~) some impacts are  
13 irreversible, it provides guidance on how the region can curb pollution, change land use and  
14 transportation patterns, and better manage waste to protect and restore key ecological functions  
15 (~~(and help restore the environment)~~). VISION (~~(2040)~~) 2050 stresses the ecological, economic,  
16 and health benefits of preserving and restoring our natural environment and open space.  
17 Additionally, the environment chapter identifies recovery of Puget Sound as a key part of this  
18 environmental strategy. According to VISION 2050:

19 *“Local governments play a critical role in Puget Sound recovery through actions such as*  
20 *protecting and restoring critical habitat, converting hardened shorelines back to more*  
21 *natural conditions, protecting aquifers, promoting and installing stormwater*  
22 *infrastructure, and upgrading sewage treatment facilities.”<sup>27</sup>*

23 The Climate Change chapter provides polices identifying regional methods to slow and mitigate  
24 the impacts of climate change. The Climate Change goal includes a regional benchmark for  
25 greenhouse gas emissions reduction, stating:

26 *The region substantially reduces emissions of greenhouse gases that contribute to climate*  
27 *change in accordance with the goals of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (50% below*  
28 *1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050) and prepares for climate*  
29 *change impacts.*

## 30 Local Context

31 These regional policies form the basis (~~(of)~~) to develop and update countywide planning policies  
32 to facilitate coordinated countywide (~~(environmental)~~) strategies for environmental stewardship  
33 (~~(earth and)~~) and justice, addressing climate change, habitat, and water (~~(quality,)~~) and air  
34 quality(~~(, and climate change)~~). The CPPs for the environment and climate change are addressed  
35 in this chapter, with two subchapters, natural environment and climate change. (~~(Related policies~~

---

<sup>27</sup> VISION 2050, page 60. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 ~~in the~~) Other chapters, including Development Patterns and Transportation (~~sections address~~  
2 ~~some of the major sources of~~), also include policies on air and water quality and (~~climate~~  
3 ~~change pollutants~~) greenhouse gas emissions. Protecting and enhancing the quality of the  
4 natural environment (~~is~~) and combating and mitigating the impacts of climate change are  
5 central to providing (~~for the~~) high quality of life for residents of Snohomish County.

## 6 **The Natural Environment and Climate Change Goal**

7 Snohomish County and local jurisdictions will act as a steward of the natural environment (~~by~~  
8 ~~protecting and restoring natural systems, conserving~~) in an effort to protect and restore natural  
9 systems and public health and mitigate climate change. This will be achieved through natural  
10 resource and habitat conservation, (~~improving air and~~) water quality improvement, and  
11 (~~reducing~~) air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions reduction (~~and air pollutants,~~  
12 and addressing potential climate change impacts). Planning for the future will include  
13 addressing climate change and resilience at local and regional levels of government to (~~will~~  
14 embrace sustainable ways to integrate care of) protect the natural environment (~~with~~) and meet  
15 the economic and social needs of all residents.

## 16 **The Natural Environment Policies**

**Env-1** All jurisdictions shall protect and enhance natural ecosystems through their comprehensive plans, development regulations, capital facilities programs, and management practices. Jurisdictions should work collaboratively, employing integrated and interdisciplinary approaches, to consider regional and countywide strategies and assessments, as well as best available qualitative and quantitative information, in formulating plans and regulations that are specific to their community.

**Env-2** The County and cities should work collaboratively to identify, designate, and protect regional open space (~~networks/wildlife~~) networks and wildlife corridors both inside and outside the Urban Growth Area and across the jurisdictional boundaries. Jurisdictions should establish policies and coordinated approaches to preserve and enhance these (~~networks/corridors across jurisdictional boundaries~~) open space networks and corridors and ensure that all residents have access to parks and open space.

**Env-3** The County and cities shall work collaboratively to create goals and policies intended to implement and address the needs identified in the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan.

**Env-  
(3) 4** The County and cities should identify and protect, enhance, or restore wildlife corridors and important habitat areas that support designated species of local or state significance, such as orca and salmon, and those areas that are critical for survival of endangered or threatened species.

**Env-  
(4) 5** The County and cities should work with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes to identify and protect significant open space areas, natural resources, and critical areas through appropriate local policies, regulations or other mechanisms such as public acquisition, easements, voluntary agreements, ~~((or by-))~~ supporting the efforts of conservation organizations, and other best practices.

**Env-  
(5) 6** In recognition of the broad range of benefits from ecological systems, the County and cities should establish policies and strategies to restore – where appropriate and possible – the region’s freshwater and marine shorelines, watersheds, and estuaries to a natural condition for ecological function and value.

**Env-7** The County and cities should reduce and mitigate the stormwater impacts of land development and redevelopment through collaboration in watershed planning, implementation of low impact development, and other best practices.

**Env-8** The County and cities shall work to maintain and improve air and water quality and ensure that all residents have equitable access to clean air and water.

**Env-9** The County and cities should reduce the impacts of light and noise pollution upon residents, including an emphasis on reducing these impacts on vulnerable populations, through land use, development, and transportation decisions.

**Env-10** The County and cities should support the use of integrated pest management and other programs that work to reduce the use of toxic pesticides and other products that present a risk to the health of the environment and humans.

**Env-11** The County and cities should establish and/or support programs that manage and work to reduce the spread of invasive species that are harmful to natural ecological function and habitat throughout the county.

1

## 2 **Climate Change Policies**

**(~~Env-6~~) CC-1** The County and cities shall incorporate emissions reduction actions into local plans and collaborate with regional and state agencies on initiatives to ensure that air quality meets or ~~((is better than)) exceeds~~ established state and federal standards and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced in accordance with the goals of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Any initiatives which exceed established state and federal standards shall be voluntary between jurisdictions and are not required by ~~((Env-6))~~ CC-1.

**(~~Env-7~~) CC-2** The County and cities should support the implementation of the state’s climate change initiatives and work toward developing a common framework to analyze climate change impacts when conducting environmental review under SEPA.

~~((Env-8))~~ **CC-3** The County and cities should establish and/or support programs ~~((to))~~ that work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and ~~((to))~~ increase energy conservation~~((and alternative/clean energy among both public and private entities.))~~, including the retrofit of existing buildings, expansion of alternative/clean energy within the public and private sector, and the use of environmentally sustainable building techniques and materials.

~~((Env-9))~~ **CC-4** The County and cities should use natural systems to reduce carbon in the atmosphere by establishing programs and policies that maintain and increase natural resources that sequester and store carbon, such as forests, ~~((and-))~~vegetative cover, wetlands, farmland, and estuaries.

~~((Env-10))~~ **CC-5** The County and cities should ~~((establish))~~ plan for climate adaptation and resilience by establishing a planning framework in local plans and ~~((coordinate))~~ coordinating regionally to identify, anticipate, prepare for, and adapt ~~((as necessary))~~ to likely impacts of climate change on natural systems, infrastructure, public health, and the economy. These efforts should identify measures to mitigate climate impacts and include a focus on minimizing these impacts upon highly impacted and vulnerable populations.

**CC-6** The County and cities should support the achievement of regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets through adoption of policies and implementation of actions including identification of emissions reduction goals in local plans and providing support for land use, transportation, and development policies that reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.

**CC-7** Jurisdictions should consider rising sea level by planning for the siting of new and relocation of existing essential public facilities and hazardous industries to areas that are outside the 500-year floodplain.

1

2



1 **PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES**

2 **State Context**

3 ~~((The)) Planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) requires jurisdictions to determine~~  
4 ~~which facilities and services are necessary to serve the desired growth pattern. Jurisdiction are~~  
5 ~~also required to identify current and future capital facility needs necessary to serve anticipated~~  
6 ~~growth and how to fund those needs (RCW 36.70A.070). The state’s intent is to ensure that~~  
7 ~~public facilities and services adequately support development and are provided in a timely~~  
8 ~~manner while maintaining locally established minimum standards. Further, the GMA~~  
9 ~~differentiates between urban and rural public services and facilities (RCW 36.70A.110)((-~~  
10 ~~Certain)) allowing certain public services and facilities, such as sanitary sewers, are ((allowed))~~  
11 ~~only in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), with ((very)) few exceptions. ((The GMA requires local~~  
12 ~~jurisdictions to determine which facilities and services are necessary to serve the desired growth~~  
13 ~~pattern and how they will be financed (RCW 36.70A.070). The state’s intent is to ensure that~~  
14 ~~those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate and~~  
15 ~~provided in a timely manner without decreasing the current service levels below locally~~  
16 ~~established minimum standards.))~~

17 ~~((The GMA ((requires countywide planning policies (CPPs) to contain policies related to~~  
18 ~~essential public facilities (EPFs) (RCW 36.70A.210(3)(C)). The GMA provides that no~~  
19 ~~comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public~~  
20 ~~facilities (RCW 36.70A.200(5)). The GMA)) The GMA framework also maintains specific~~  
21 ~~policy requirements regarding essential public facilities (EPFs) for countywide planning policies~~  
22 ~~(CPPs) (RCW 23.70A.210(3)(C). That framework allows counties to adopt comprehensive plan~~  
23 ~~policies and development regulations related to the siting of EPFs ((of a local nature as long as))~~  
24 ~~however, it states that those policies and regulations ((do not)) may not preclude the siting of any~~  
25 ~~such facility.~~

26 ~~((Essential)) Under state law, essential public facilities include those facilities that are typically~~  
27 ~~difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, state and regional transportation~~  
28 ~~facilities as defined in RCW 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste~~  
29 ~~handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health~~  
30 ~~facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities as defined in RCW 71.09.020.~~

31 Since the enactment of the GMA, ~~((government’s)) the ability of jurisdictions to fund the~~  
32 ~~expanding demand for critical public facilities and services and ((ability to)) achieve GMA goals~~  
33 ~~has been reduced. As a result, government agencies have been forced to re-evaluate service~~  
34 ~~levels and delivery while looking to other sources of funds for critical public facilities and~~  
35 ~~services.~~

36 **Regional Context**

37 The Public Services and Facilities chapter responds to the overarching Public Services goal and  
38 supporting Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) in VISION ((2040 that)) 2050. The VISION

1 2050 goal reads, in part, “support development with adequate public facilities and services in a  
2 coordinated, and cost-effective manner”. Some of the services addressed in VISION ((2040))  
3 2050 are included in the Joint Planning subsection of the General Framework and Coordination  
4 chapter, and others appear in the Transportation chapter. The following policies are for those  
5 public services and facilities that are appropriate for discussion in this chapter and that are not  
6 covered elsewhere in the CPPs.

7 Conservation is a major theme throughout VISION ((2040)) 2050. It calls for jurisdictions to  
8 invest in facilities and amenities that serve centers and to restrict urban facilities in rural and  
9 resource areas. The ((~~multicounty planning policies~~)) MPPs also discourage schools and other  
10 institutions serving urban residents from locating outside the urban growth area.

### 11 **Local Context**

12 The designation of UGAs or Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs) establishes the public  
13 facilities and service area for cities in Snohomish County. The detailed planning and timing of  
14 such facilities and services and the installation of infrastructure improvements is determined  
15 through shorter-term 6-year capital improvement plans.

16 Public services and facilities in UGAs and MUGAs are expected to be provided at service levels  
17 to support urban densities and development intensity while reflecting the realities of limited  
18 funding resources and prioritization between those services and facilities.

19 Public services and facilities in rural areas of Snohomish County are expected be provided at  
20 service levels reflecting lower densities and more dispersed patterns of development.

### 21 **Public Services and Facilities Goal**

22 Snohomish County and its cities will coordinate and ((~~strive to~~)) develop and provide adequate  
23 and efficient public facilities and services to ensure the health, safety, conservation of resources,  
24 and economic vitality of our communities and all residents.

### 25 **General Public Services**

**PS-1** Jurisdictions should support cities as the preferred urban service providers.

**PS-2** Cities shall determine the appropriate methods for providing urban services in their incorporated areas including any annexations thereto. Cities that currently have no territory in Snohomish County shall have an interlocal agreement in place with the County prior to annexations into the county, to address the provision of public services.

**PS-3** Jurisdictions should support the County as the preferred provider for regional services, rural services, agricultural services, and services for natural resource areas.

- PS-4** The County and cities should support the planned development of jobs and housing through strategic investment decisions and coordination of public services and facilities.
- PS-5** Public services and infrastructure provided by jurisdictions in rural and resource areas should be at a level, scale, and in locations that do not induce urban development pressures.
- PS-6** The County and cities should design infrastructure and public services to promote conservation of natural resources.
- PS-7** ~~((Jurisdictions))~~ To ensure long-term water availability for both human use and environmental needs, jurisdictions should ~~((promote improved-))~~ work collaboratively to reduce per capita water consumption through conservation ~~((and efficient use of water to ensure long-term water availability))~~, improvements in efficiency, and if applicable, reclamation and reuse.
- PS-8** The County and cities shall work collaboratively, in coordination with tribal governments, for the planning of water and wastewater utilities to meet the area’s long-term needs and support the regional growth strategy.
- PS-9** The County and cities, in collaboration with water providers and utilities, should consider the potential impacts of climate change, including impacts exacerbated by seasonal or cyclical conditions, when engaged in planning efforts to ensure the county’s long-term water supply.
- PS-((8)) 10** Jurisdictions should coordinate with solid waste service providers in order to meet and, if desired, exceed state mandates for the reduction of solid waste and promotion of recycling.
- PS-((9)) 11** The County and cities shall permit new development in urban areas only when sanitary sewers are available with the exception of where sewer service is not likely to be feasible for the duration of the jurisdiction’s adopted plan.<sup>28</sup>
- PS-((10)) 12** Jurisdictions should ~~((encourage))~~ promote the use ~~((of low impact development techniques, and))~~ and investment in renewable and alternative energy sources to meet the local and countywide energy needs.
- PS-((11)) 13** The County and cities should ~~((maximize the use of ))~~ support energy conservation and efficiency in new and existing public facilities ~~((to promote financial and energy conservation benefits and))~~ in order to achieve fiscal savings and reduce environmental impacts associated with energy generation and use.

---

<sup>28</sup> Currently identified exceptions include unsewerable enclaves, as well as the Darrington, Gold Bar, and Index Urban Growth Areas.

- PS-  
(~~12~~) 14** Jurisdictions in Urban Growth Areas shall coordinate on the data, analysis and methodologies relating to the Levels of Service (LOS) standards for all public facilities and services that are required by the Growth Management Act. Each jurisdiction may implement and monitor its own LOS standards in accordance with each jurisdiction's adopted comprehensive plan.
- PS-  
(~~13~~) 15** Jurisdictions should adopt capital facilities plans, and coordinate with other service providers, to provide the appropriate level of service to support planned growth and development in Urban Growth Areas.
- PS-  
(~~15~~) 16** The County and cities should develop and coordinate compatible capital facility construction standards for all service providers in individual Urban Growth Areas.
- PS-  
(~~16~~) 17** The County and cities should encourage the location of new human services facilities near access to transit.
- PS-18** The County and cities should work collaboratively at a local and countywide level to promote equitable access of public services and facilities for all residents, especially those that are historically underserved.
- PS-19** The County and cities should promote connection to sanitary sewers for residents and businesses within urban growth areas as the preferred alternative to resolving failing septic systems.
- PS-20** The County and cities should support planning for the provision of telecommunication infrastructure in order to improve and facilitate access to telecommunication for all residents and businesses, especially those in underserved areas.
- PS-21** The County and cities should work collaboratively with school districts to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities to meet the current and future community needs, consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, the regional growth strategy, and the growth targets in Appendix B.
- PS-22** Sanitary sewer mains shall not be extended beyond Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) into rural areas except when necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment, and when such sewers are financially supportable at rural densities and do not result in the inducement of future urban development outside of UGAs. Sewer transmission lines may be developed through rural and resource areas to meet the needs of UGAs as long as any extension through resource areas does not adversely impact the resource lands. Sanitary sewer connections in rural areas are not allowed except in instances where necessary to protect public health and safety and the environment and as allowed in RCW 36.70A.213. Sanitary sewer mains are prohibited in resource areas.

# 1 Essential Public Facilities

- EPF-1** The County and each city may impose reasonable conditions and/or mitigation of adverse environmental impacts on approval of a development agreement or other land use approvals as a result of the siting of local, regional, statewide, or federal essential public facilities.
- EPF-2** The County and each city may establish a process through their respective comprehensive plans and implementing development regulations to identify and site local essential public facilities(;) that are consistent with the provisions of the GMA and ensure long-term resilience of these facilities. This process should include:
- a. A definition of these facilities;
  - b. An inventory of existing and future facilities;
  - c. Economic and other incentives to jurisdictions receiving facilities;
  - d. A public involvement strategy;
  - e. Assurance that the environment and public health and safety are protected; (~~and~~)
  - f. Consideration of impacts from climate change when selecting locations for facilities, including, but not limited to, potential flood risk and sea-level rise; and
  - g. A consideration of alternatives to the facility.
- EPF-3** Local essential public facilities should be sited or expanded to support the countywide land use pattern, (~~support economic activities, reduce environmental impacts, provide amenities or incentives, and minimize public costs~~) minimize public costs, and protect the environment and public health, including reducing adverse impacts upon historically marginalized populations and disproportionately burdened communities.
- EPF-4** Local essential public facilities shall first be considered for location inside Urban Growth Areas unless it is demonstrated that a non-urban site is the most appropriate location for such a facility. Local essential public facilities located outside of an Urban Growth Area shall be self-contained or be served by urban governmental services in a manner that shall not promote sprawl.
- EPF-5** The County and each city should collaborate with public agencies and special districts to identify opportunities for the co-location of local essential public facilities.

2


3

1


**APPENDICES**

2

# 1 Appendix A – UGA & MUGA Boundary Maps



2



## MUNICIPAL URBAN GROWTH AREA (MUGA) BOUNDARIES

Appendix A – CPP Southwest Snohomish County Effective Date: November 10, 2016





## Appendix B – Growth Targets

APPENDIX B, Table 1 - 2035 Reconciled Population Growth Targets for Cities, UGAs and the Rural/Resource Area				
Area	2011 Population Estimates	2035 Population Targets	2011-2035 Population Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>Non-S.W. County UGA</b>	161,288	233,097	71,809	30.1%
Arlington UGA	18,489	26,002	7,512	3.2%
Arlington City	17,966	24,937	6,971	2.9%
Unincorporated	523	1,065	541	0.2%
Darrington UGA	1,420	2,161	741	0.3%
Darrington Town	1,345	1,764	419	0.2%
Unincorporated	75	397	322	0.1%
Gold Bar UGA	2,909	3,319	411	0.2%
Gold Bar City	2,060	2,406	346	0.1%
Unincorporated	849	913	65	0.0%
Granite Falls UGA	3,517	8,517	5,000	2.1%
Granite Falls City	3,370	7,624	4,254	1.8%
Unincorporated	147	893	746	0.3%
Index UGA (incorporated)	180	220	40	0.0%
Lake Stevens UGA	33,218	46,380	13,162	5.5%
Lake Stevens City	28,210	39,340	11,130	4.7%
Unincorporated	5,008	7,040	2,032	0.9%
Maltby UGA (unincorporated)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Marysville UGA	60,869	87,798	26,929	11.3%
Marysville City	60,660	87,589	26,929	11.3%
Unincorporated	209	209	-	0.0%
Monroe UGA	18,806	24,754	5,948	2.5%
Monroe City	17,351	22,102	4,751	2.0%
Unincorporated	1,455	2,652	1,197	0.5%
Snohomish UGA	10,559	14,494	3,935	1.7%
Snohomish City	9,200	12,139	2,939	1.2%
Unincorporated	1,359	2,354	996	0.4%
Stanwood UGA	6,353	11,085	4,732	2.0%
Stanwood City	6,220	10,116	3,896	1.6%
Unincorporated	133	969	836	0.4%
Sultan UGA	4,969	8,369	3,399	1.4%
Sultan City	4,655	7,345	2,690	1.1%
Unincorporated	314	1,024	709	0.3%
<b>S.W. County UGA</b>	434,425	582,035	147,610	62.0%
Incorporated S.W.	261,506	363,413	101,907	42.8%
Bothell City (part)	16,570	23,510	6,940	2.9%
Brier City	6,201	6,972	771	0.3%
Edmonds City	39,800	45,550	5,750	2.4%
Everett City	103,100	164,812	61,712	25.9%
Lynnwood City	35,860	54,404	18,544	7.8%
Mill Creek City	18,370	20,196	1,826	0.8%
Mountlake Terrace City	19,990	24,767	4,777	2.0%
Mukilteo City	20,310	21,812	1,502	0.6%
Woodway Town	1,305	1,389	84	0.0%
Unincorporated S.W.	172,919	218,623	45,704	19.2%
<b>UGA Total</b>	595,713	815,132	219,419	92.1%
City Total	412,723	578,994	166,271	69.8%
Unincorporated UGA Total	182,990	236,138	53,148	22.3%
<b>Non-UGA Total</b> (Uninc Rural/Resource Area)	121,287	140,125	18,838	7.9%
<b>County Total</b>	717,000	955,257	238,257	100.0%

NOTES: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; NA = not applicable.

APPENDIX B, Table 2 - 2035 Reconciled Population Growth Targets for Cities and MUGAs within the SW County UGA				
Area	2011 Population Estimates	2035 Population Targets	2011-2035 Population Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>SW County UGA Total</b>	434,425	582,035	147,610	62.0%
Incorporated SW County UGA Total	261,506	363,413	101,907	42.8%
Unincorporated SW County UGA Total	172,919	218,623	45,704	19.2%
<b>Bothell Area</b>	39,760	53,117	13,357	5.6%
Bothell City (part)	16,570	23,510	6,940	2.9%
Unincorporated MUGA	23,190	29,607	6,418	2.7%
<b>Brier Area</b>	8,199	9,327	1,128	0.5%
Brier City	6,201	6,972	771	0.3%
Unincorporated MUGA	1,998	2,354	356	0.1%
<b>Edmonds Area</b>	43,420	49,574	6,155	2.6%
Edmonds City	39,800	45,550	5,750	2.4%
Unincorporated MUGA	3,620	4,024	405	0.2%
<b>Everett Area</b>	145,184	211,968	66,784	28.0%
Everett City	103,100	164,812	61,712	25.9%
Unincorporated MUGA	42,084	47,156	5,072	2.1%
<b>Lynnwood Area</b>	63,327	92,022	28,695	12.0%
Lynnwood City	35,860	54,404	18,544	7.8%
Unincorporated MUGA	27,467	37,617	10,150	4.3%
<b>Mill Creek Area</b>	54,747	67,940	13,193	5.5%
Mill Creek City	18,370	20,196	1,826	0.8%
Unincorporated MUGA	36,377	47,744	11,367	4.8%
<b>Mountlake Terrace Area</b>	20,010	24,797	4,787	2.0%
Mountlake Terrace City	19,990	24,767	4,777	2.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	20	30	10	0.0%
<b>Mukilteo Area</b>	32,545	36,453	3,909	1.6%
Mukilteo City	20,310	21,812	1,502	0.6%
Unincorporated MUGA	12,235	14,641	2,407	1.0%
<b>Woodway Area</b>	1,305	4,361	3,056	1.3%
Woodway Town	1,305	1,389	84	0.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	-	2,972	2,972	1.2%
Paine Field Area (Unincorporated)	-	-	-	0.0%
Larch Way Overlap (Unincorporated)	3,370	5,007	1,637	0.7%
Lake Stickney Gap (Unincorporated)	7,161	9,786	2,625	1.1%
Silver Firs Gap (Unincorporated)	15,398	17,683	2,285	1.0%
<b>County Total</b>	<b>717,000</b>	<b>955,257</b>	<b>238,257</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

NOTE: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; MUGA = Municipal Urban Growth Area.

APPENDIX B, Table 3 - 2035 Reconciled Housing Growth Targets for Cities, UGAs and the Rural/Resource Area

Area	2011 Housing Unit Estimates	2035 Housing Unit Targets	2011-2035 Housing Unit Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>Non-S.W. County UGA</b>	60,509	87,340	26,831	27.4%
Arlington UGA	7,128	10,018	2,890	3.0%
Arlington City	6,931	9,654	2,723	2.8%
Unincorporated	197	364	167	0.2%
Darrington UGA	682	948	266	0.3%
Darrington Town	644	764	120	0.1%
Unincorporated	38	184	146	0.1%
Gold Bar UGA	1,205	1,304	99	0.1%
Gold Bar City	831	917	86	0.1%
Unincorporated	374	387	13	0.0%
Granite Falls UGA	1,412	3,516	2,104	2.1%
Granite Falls City	1,348	3,090	1,742	1.8%
Unincorporated	64	425	361	0.4%
Index UGA (incorporated)	117	127	10	0.0%
Lake Stevens UGA	12,281	17,311	5,030	5.1%
Lake Stevens City	10,470	14,883	4,413	4.5%
Unincorporated	1,811	2,428	617	0.6%
Maltby UGA (unincorporated)	71	71	NA	NA
Marysville UGA	22,709	32,936	10,227	10.4%
Marysville City	22,649	32,876	10,227	10.4%
Unincorporated	60	60	-	0.0%
Monroe UGA	5,838	7,443	1,605	1.6%
Monroe City	5,326	6,526	1,200	1.2%
Unincorporated	512	917	405	0.4%
Snohomish UGA	4,545	6,115	1,570	1.6%
Snohomish City	4,013	5,204	1,191	1.2%
Unincorporated	532	911	379	0.4%
Stanwood UGA	2,634	4,578	1,944	2.0%
Stanwood City	2,586	4,179	1,593	1.6%
Unincorporated	48	398	350	0.4%
Sultan UGA	1,887	2,972	1,085	1.1%
Sultan City	1,752	2,581	829	0.8%
Unincorporated	135	391	256	0.3%
<b>S.W. County UGA</b>	178,958	243,179	64,221	65.6%
Incorporated S.W.	112,679	155,760	43,081	44.0%
Bothell City (part)	6,780	9,782	3,002	3.1%
Brier City	2,226	2,536	310	0.3%
Edmonds City	18,396	21,168	2,772	2.8%
Everett City	44,656	70,067	25,411	26.0%
Lynnwood City	14,947	22,840	7,893	8.1%
Mill Creek City	7,991	8,756	765	0.8%
Mountlake Terrace City	8,643	10,928	2,285	2.3%
Mukilteo City	8,574	9,211	637	0.7%
Woodway Town	466	472	6	0.0%
Unincorporated S.W.	66,279	87,419	21,141	21.6%
<b>UGA Total</b>	239,466	330,519	91,052	93.0%
City Total	169,346	236,563	67,217	68.7%
Unincorporated UGA Total	70,120	93,955	23,835	24.3%
<b>Non-UGA Total (Uninc Rural/Resource Area)</b>	48,973	55,816	6,844	7.0%
<b>County Total</b>	288,439	386,334	97,895	100.0%

NOTES: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; NA = not applicable.

APPENDIX B, Table 4 - 2035 Reconciled Housing Growth Targets for Cities and MUGAs within the SW County UGA

Area	2011 Housing Unit Estimates	2035 Housing Unit Targets	2011-2035 Housing Unit Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>SW County UGA Total</b>	178,958	243,179	64,221	65.6%
Incorporated SW County UGA Total	112,679	155,760	43,081	44.0%
Unincorporated SW County UGA Total	66,279	87,418	21,140	21.6%
<b>Bothell Area</b>	15,738	21,249	5,511	5.6%
Bothell City (part)	6,780	9,782	3,002	3.1%
Unincorporated MUGA	8,958	11,467	2,509	2.6%
<b>Brier Area</b>	3,045	3,431	387	0.4%
Brier City	2,226	2,536	310	0.3%
Unincorporated MUGA	819	896	77	0.1%
<b>Edmonds Area</b>	19,896	22,809	2,913	3.0%
Edmonds City	18,396	21,168	2,772	2.8%
Unincorporated MUGA	1,500	1,641	141	0.1%
<b>Everett Area</b>	61,276	88,848	27,572	28.2%
Everett City	44,656	70,067	25,411	26.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	16,620	18,781	2,161	2.2%
<b>Lynnwood Area</b>	26,205	39,716	13,511	13.8%
Lynnwood City	14,947	22,840	7,893	8.1%
Unincorporated MUGA	11,258	16,876	5,618	5.7%
<b>Mill Creek Area</b>	21,411	26,575	5,165	5.3%
Mill Creek City	7,991	8,756	765	0.8%
Unincorporated MUGA	13,420	17,819	4,400	4.5%
<b>Mountlake Terrace Area</b>	8,652	10,941	2,289	2.3%
Mountlake Terrace City	8,643	10,928	2,285	2.3%
Unincorporated MUGA	9	13	4	0.0%
<b>Mukilteo Area</b>	13,148	15,100	1,952	2.0%
Mukilteo City	8,574	9,211	637	0.7%
Unincorporated MUGA	4,574	5,889	1,315	1.3%
<b>Woodway Area</b>	466	2,004	1,538	1.6%
Woodway Town	466	472	6	0.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	-	1,532	1,532	1.6%
Paine Field Area (Unincorporated)	-	-	-	0.0%
Larch Way Overlap (Unincorporated)	1,155	2,187	1,033	1.1%
Lake Stickney Gap (Unincorporated)	2,850	4,249	1,399	1.4%
Silver Firs Gap (Unincorporated)	5,117	6,067	950	1.0%
<b>County Total</b>	<b>288,439</b>	<b>386,334</b>	<b>97,895</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

NOTE: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; MUGA = Municipal Urban Growth Area.

APPENDIX B, Table 5 - 2035 Reconciled Employment Growth Targets for Cities, UGAs and the Rural/Resource Area				
Area	2011 Employment Estimates	2035 Employment Targets	2011-2035 Employment Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>Non-S.W. County UGA</b>	46,644	93,571	46,927	31.8%
Arlington UGA	8,660	20,884	12,224	8.3%
Arlington City	8,659	20,829	12,170	8.3%
Unincorporated	1	55	54	0.0%
Darrington UGA	500	886	386	0.3%
Darrington Town	498	800	302	0.2%
Unincorporated	2	86	84	0.1%
Gold Bar UGA	223	666	443	0.3%
Gold Bar City	218	661	443	0.3%
Unincorporated	5	5	-	0.0%
Granite Falls UGA	760	2,276	1,516	1.0%
Granite Falls City	759	2,275	1,516	1.0%
Unincorporated	1	1	-	0.0%
Index UGA (incorporated)	20	25	5	0.0%
Lake Stevens UGA	4,003	7,821	3,818	2.6%
Lake Stevens City	3,932	7,412	3,480	2.4%
Unincorporated	71	409	338	0.2%
Maltby UGA (unincorporated)	3,190	6,374	3,184	2.2%
Marysville UGA	12,316	28,113	15,797	10.7%
Marysville City	11,664	27,419	15,755	10.7%
Unincorporated	652	694	42	0.0%
Monroe UGA	7,779	11,781	4,002	2.7%
Monroe City	7,662	11,456	3,794	2.6%
Unincorporated	117	325	208	0.1%
Snohomish UGA	4,871	6,941	2,070	1.4%
Snohomish City	4,415	6,291	1,876	1.3%
Unincorporated	456	650	194	0.1%
Stanwood UGA	3,456	5,723	2,267	1.5%
Stanwood City	3,258	4,688	1,430	1.0%
Unincorporated	198	1,035	837	0.6%
Sultan UGA	866	2,081	1,215	0.8%
Sultan City	862	2,077	1,215	0.8%
Unincorporated	4	4	-	0.0%
<b>S.W. County UGA</b>	187,653	279,479	91,826	62.3%
Incorporated S.W.	163,409	241,271	77,862	52.8%
Bothell City (part)	13,616	18,576	4,960	3.4%
Brier City	319	405	86	0.1%
Edmonds City	11,679	13,948	2,269	1.5%
Everett City	93,739	140,000	46,261	31.4%
Lynnwood City	24,266	42,229	17,963	12.2%
Mill Creek City	4,625	6,310	1,685	1.1%
Mountlake Terrace City	6,740	9,486	2,746	1.9%
Mukilteo City	8,369	10,250	1,881	1.3%
Woodway Town	56	68	12	0.0%
Unincorporated S.W.	24,244	38,209	13,965	9.5%
<b>UGA Total</b>	234,297	373,050	138,753	94.1%
City Total	205,356	325,204	119,848	81.3%
Unincorporated UGA Total	28,941	47,846	18,905	12.8%
<b>Non-UGA Total *</b> (Uninc Rural/Resource Area)	14,693	23,323	8,630	5.9%
<b>County Total</b>	248,990	396,373	147,383	100.0%

NOTES: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries.

Employment includes all full- and part-time wage and salary workers and self-employed persons, excluding jobs within the resource (agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining) and construction sectors.

\* - Non-UGA Total includes projected employment on the Tulalip Reservation which is anticipated to reach 13,890 by 2030 according to the Tulalip Tribes' 2009 adopted plan, representing a 7,003 increase over the 2008 jobs estimate of 6,887.

APPENDIX B, Table 6 - 2035 Reconciled Employment Growth Targets for Cities and MUGAs within the SW County UGA				
Area	2011 Employment Estimates	2035 Employment Targets	2011-2035 Employment Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>SW County UGA Total</b>	187,653	279,479	91,826	62.3%
Incorporated SW County UGA Total	163,409	241,271	77,862	52.8%
Unincorporated SW County UGA Total	24,244	38,209	13,965	9.5%
Bothell Area	14,996	20,271	5,275	3.6%
Bothell City (part)	13,616	18,576	4,960	3.4%
Unincorporated MUGA	1,380	1,696	316	0.2%
Brier Area	388	476	88	0.1%
Brier City	319	405	86	0.1%
Unincorporated MUGA	69	71	2	0.0%
Edmonds Area	11,835	14,148	2,313	1.6%
Edmonds City	11,679	13,948	2,269	1.5%
Unincorporated MUGA	156	200	44	0.0%
Everett Area	98,989	148,324	49,335	33.5%
Everett City	93,739	140,000	46,261	31.4%
Unincorporated MUGA	5,250	8,324	3,074	2.1%
Lynnwood Area	27,840	48,225	20,385	13.8%
Lynnwood City	24,266	42,229	17,963	12.2%
Unincorporated MUGA	3,574	5,996	2,422	1.6%
Mill Creek Area	7,372	10,279	2,907	2.0%
Mill Creek City	4,625	6,310	1,685	1.1%
Unincorporated MUGA	2,747	3,969	1,222	0.8%
Mountlake Terrace Area	6,740	9,486	2,746	1.9%
Mountlake Terrace City	6,740	9,486	2,746	1.9%
Unincorporated MUGA	-	-	-	0.0%
Mukilteo Area	11,166	15,278	4,112	2.8%
Mukilteo City	8,369	10,250	1,881	1.3%
Unincorporated MUGA	2,797	5,029	2,232	1.5%
Woodway Area	70	246	176	0.1%
Woodway Town	56	68	12	0.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	14	178	164	0.1%
Paine Field Area (Unincorporated)	4,622	8,010	3,388	2.3%
Larch Way Overlap (Unincorporated)	1,630	2,051	421	0.3%
Lake Stickney Gap (Unincorporated)	694	794	100	0.1%
Silver Firs Gap (Unincorporated)	1,311	1,891	580	0.4%
<b>County Total</b>	<b>248,990</b>	<b>396,373</b>	<b>147,383</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

NOTES: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; MUGA = Municipal Urban Growth Area. Employment includes all full- and part-time wage and salary workers and self-employed persons, excluding jobs within the resource (agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining) and construction sectors.

1 **Appendix C – Growth Target Procedure Steps for GF-5**

- 2 **1. Initial Growth Targets:** Initial population, housing, and employment projections shall be  
3 based on the following sources:
- 4 a. The most recently published official 20-year population projections for Snohomish  
5 County from the Office of Financial Management (OFM);
  - 6 b. The Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) most recent population and employment  
7 distribution as represented in the VISION ((2040)) 2050 Regional Growth Strategy  
8 (RGS); and
  - 9 c. A further distribution of the population and employment RGS allocations to jurisdictions  
10 in each of the PSRC regional geographies in Snohomish County to arrive at initial  
11 subcounty population, housing, and employment ((projections)) target distribution that  
12 emphasizes growth in and near centers and high-capacity transit (DP-8 and DP-18),  
13 addresses jobs/housing balance (CPP-DP-7), manages and reduces the rate of rural  
14 growth over time (CPP-DP-24), and supports infill within the urban growth area (CPP-  
15 DP-15).

16 Results of the initial growth target allocation process shall be shown in Appendix B of the  
17 CPPs. These initial allocations shall be used for at least one of the plan alternatives evaluated  
18 by jurisdictions for their GMA plan updates.

- 19 **2. Target Reconciliation:** Once the GMA comprehensive plan updates of jurisdictions in  
20 Snohomish County are adopted, the Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) process shall be  
21 used to review and, if necessary, adjust the population, housing, and employment growth  
22 targets contained in Appendix B of the CPPs.
- 23 a. The County and cities shall jointly review the preferred growth alternatives in adopted  
24 local comprehensive plans for discrepancies with the target allocation associated with the  
25 County's preferred plan alternative.
  - 26 b. Based on the land supply, permitted densities, capital facilities, urban service capacities  
27 and other information associated with the preferred growth alternatives of adopted local  
28 comprehensive plans, the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) of SCT shall recommend  
29 to the SCT Steering Committee a reconciled 20-year population, housing, and  
30 employment allocation.
  - 31 c. The SCT Steering Committee shall review and recommend to the County Council a  
32 reconciled 20-year population, housing, and employment allocation. Substantial  
33 consideration shall be given to the plan of each jurisdiction, and the recommendation  
34 shall be consistent with the GMA, the Regional Growth Strategy, and the CPPs.
  - 35 d. The County Council shall consider the recommendation of the Steering Committee and  
36 shall replace Appendix B of the CPPs with a reconciled 20-year population, housing, and  
37 employment allocation.

- 38
- 39 **3. Long Term Monitoring:** Subsequent to target reconciliation, SCT shall maintain a long  
40 term monitoring process to review annually the population, housing, and employment growth  
41 targets contained in Appendix B of the CPPs.

- 1 a. Snohomish County and the cities shall jointly monitor the following:  
2 i. Estimated population and employment growth;  
3 ii. Annexations and incorporations;  
4 iii. Residential and non-residential development trends;  
5 iv. Availability and affordability of housing.  
6 b. Results of the target monitoring program shall be published in a growth monitoring report  
7 developed by the PAC.  
8
- 9 **4. Target Adjustments:** The SCT process may be used to consider adjustments to the  
10 population, housing, and employment growth targets contained in Appendix B of the CPPs.  
11 a. Based on the results of the long term monitoring process, the PAC may review and  
12 recommend to the SCT Steering Committee an adjustment to the population, housing,  
13 and employment targets.  
14 b. The SCT Steering Committee shall review a PAC recommendation to adjust growth  
15 targets and may recommend to the County Council, an adjustment to the population,  
16 housing, and employment targets. Adjustments to the growth targets shall be based on the  
17 results of the target monitoring program and shall be consistent with the GMA and the  
18 CPPs.  
19 c. The County Council shall consider the recommendation of the Steering Committee and  
20 may amend Appendix B of the CPPs with adjusted population, housing, and employment  
21 targets for cities, UGAs, and rural areas.

22



1 **Appendix D – Reasonable Measures**

2 **Guidelines for Review**

3 The County Council has adopted the attached list of Reasonable Measures and the following  
4 guidance, pursuant to Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) GF-7.

5 **A. Applicable Policies.**

6 As a component of the on-going monitoring of growth and development undertaken through a  
7 county-wide collaborative process, the Growth Monitoring Report and Buildable Lands Report  
8 required under statute, starting with the first report ~~((issued))~~ adopted by the County Council in  
9 January 2003, the second in October 2007, ~~((and))~~ the third in June 2013, contain information on  
10 the buildable land capacity of Snohomish County cities and urban areas to accommodate future  
11 growth.

12 Several consistency problems were found in the second and third ~~((report))~~ reports. Therefore,  
13 the affected jurisdictions ~~((need))~~ needed to adopt and implement reasonable measures  
14 implementation programs. In UGAs where a consistency problem has been found (e.g. not  
15 achieving urban densities or a lack of sufficient capacity), GMA (RCW 36.70A.215) and  
16 Countywide Planning Policy GF-7 direct cities and the county to consider “reasonable  
17 measures,” other than expanding Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), to resolve the inconsistency.  
18 RCW 36.70A.215 define reasonable measures as “those actions necessary to reduce the  
19 differences between growth and development assumptions and targets contained in the  
20 countywide planning policies and the county and city comprehensive plans with actual  
21 development patterns.”

22 The County Council shall use the guidance in this Appendix and its list of reasonable measures  
23 to evaluate proposed expansions of UGAs. CPP GF-7 provides that, once this Appendix and the  
24 list are adopted, “the County Council shall use the list of reasonable measures and guidelines for  
25 review contained in Appendix D to evaluate all UGA boundary ~~((expansion proposals consistent~~  
26 ~~with CPPs GF-7 and))~~ expansions proposed pursuant to DP-2.”

27 **B. Mechanism for Local Review and Adoption of Reasonable Measures.**

28 The appropriate forum for consideration and adoption of reasonable measures is the adoption of  
29 individual County and city comprehensive plans and implementing regulations. Through these  
30 public processes, measures appropriate for each jurisdiction are evaluated and incorporated into  
31 plan policies, and implementing regulations.

32 Beginning with the updates to be completed in 2004 and 2005, each jurisdiction (the relevant city  
33 and the county) will demonstrate its consideration of reasonable measures in its comprehensive  
34 plan or, at its discretion, in a separate report. Each plan’s environmental review or adoption  
35 documents will report on the sufficiency of the reasonable measures specified in its plan or  
36 report. ECONorthwest has provided optional useful steps in its final report: *Document*

1 *development trends; Identify and analyze current and proposed reasonable measures; and,*  
2 *Determine sufficiency.*

3 **C. Evaluation.**

4 The County Executive and Council’s evaluation of UGA expansion proposals under CPP DP-2  
5 shall include findings that the jurisdiction has made a determination of consideration of UGA  
6 expansion requests.

7 **D. Consultation with Snohomish County Tomorrow.**

8 The County Council adopted this list of Reasonable Measures and guidance after considering the  
9 recommendation of the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee, as provided in CPP  
10 GF-7.

11 **E. Review and Evaluation Program.**

12 Annual monitoring of growth and development information, including any reasonable measures  
13 programs, occurs through Snohomish County Tomorrow’s (SCT) annual Growth Monitoring  
14 Report, and/or the SCT Housing (~~(Evaluation)~~) Characteristics and Needs Report, regular  
15 updates of buildable lands reports, and other updates of those reports produced for review  
16 processes undertaken by a city or the county.

17 Jurisdictions should review and update their reasonable measures programs and finding of  
18 sufficiency at least every eight years in conjunction with the buildable lands review or their  
19 comprehensive plan update.

20 Detailed descriptions of the reasonable measures and the optional evaluation methodology are  
21 contained in the final (~~(report)~~) reports by ECONorthwest titled “Phase II Report: Recommended  
22 Method for Evaluating Local Reasonable Measures Programs,” approved by the SCT Steering  
23 Committee in June 2003 (~~((Final Report))~~) and the “Reasonable Measures Program Technical  
24 Supplement,” approved by the SCT Steering Committed in June 2020.

25 The attached list of reasonable measures are a part of this Appendix D. The identified “issue  
26 category” is intended to help readers understand the predominant applicability of each measure,  
27 it is not intended to limit which measures can be used to resolve specific findings of differences  
28 between growth and development assumptions and targets, or as an alternative to UGA  
29 expansions.

Reasonable Measures List

- Directly applicable
- ◐ Partially applicable

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
<b>Measures that Increase Residential Capacity</b>															
Permit Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in single family zones.	Communities use a variety of terms to refer to the concept of accessory dwellings: secondary residences; “granny” flats; and single-family conversions, among others. Regardless of the title, all of these terms refer to an independent dwelling unit that shares, at least, a tax lot in a single-family zone. Some accessory dwelling units share parking and entrances. Some may be incorporated into the primary structure; others may be in accessory structures. Accessory dwellings can be distinguished from “shared” housing in that the unit has separate kitchen and bathroom facilities. ADUs are typically regulated as a conditional uses. Some ordinances only allow ADUs where the primary dwelling is owner-occupied.	◐		•	◐	•		•					✓		Small
Provide Multifamily Housing Tax ((Credits)) exemptions to Developers	Local governments can provide tax credits to developers for new or rehabilitated multi-family housing. Tax credits provide an incentive to developers by reducing future tax burden. In some markets, this can make projects financially feasible. This policy is intended to encourage development of multifamily housing, primarily in urban centers. This policy is primarily applicable in larger cities and is typically offered for projects that meet specific criteria.	•		•	•	◐		◐	•			✓	✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Provide Density Bonuses to Developers	The local government allows developers to build housing at densities higher than are usually allowed by the underlying zoning. Density bonuses are commonly used as a tool to encourage greater housing density in desired areas, provided certain requirements are met. This policy is generally implemented through provisions of the local zoning code and is allowed in appropriate residential zones.	•	◐	◐	◐	◐		•	•			✓	✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Transfer/Purchase of Development Rights	This policy is intended to move development from sensitive areas to more appropriate areas. Development rights are transferred to “receiving zones” and can be traded. This policy can increase overall densities. This policy is usually implemented through a subsection of the zoning code and identifies both sending zones (zones where decreased densities are desirable) and receiving zones (zones where increased densities are allowed).	•	◐	◐	◐			◐				✓	✓	✓	Small-Moderate

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Allow Clustered Residential Development	Clustering allows developers to increase density on portions of a site, while preserving other areas of the site. Clustering is a tool most commonly used to preserve natural areas or avoid natural hazards during development. It uses characteristics of the site as a primary consideration in determining building footprints, access, etc. Clustering is typically processed during the site review phase of development review.	●			●			●	●		●	✓	✓	✓	Moderate
Allow Co-housing	Co-housing communities balance the traditional advantages of home ownership with the benefits of shared common facilities and connections with neighbors. This approach would be implemented through the local zoning or development code and would list these housing types as outright allowable uses in appropriate residential zones.	●	●	●	●	●							✓		Small
Allow Duplexes, Townhomes, and Condominiums	Allowing these housing types can increase overall density of residential development and may encourage a higher percentage of multi-family housing types. This approach would be implemented through the local zoning or development code and would list these housing types as outright allowable uses in appropriate residential zones.	●		●		●		●				✓	✓		Moderate
Increase Allowable Residential Densities	This approach seeks to increase holding capacity by increasing allowable density in residential zones. It gives developers the option of building to higher densities. This approach would be implemented through the local zoning or development code.	●				●						✓	✓		High
Mandate Maximum Lot Sizes	This policy places an upper bound on lot size and a lower bound on density in single-family zones. For example, a residential zone with a 6,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size might have an 8,000 sq. ft. maximum lot size yielding an effective net density range between 5.4 and 7.3 dwelling units per net acre.	●						●	●			✓	✓	✓	High
Mandate Minimum Residential Densities	This policy is typically applied in single-family residential zones and is places a lower bound on density. Minimum residential densities in single-family zones are typically implemented through maximum lot sizes. In multiple-family zones they are usually expressed as a minimum number of dwelling units per net acre. Such standards are typically implemented through zoning code provisions in applicable residential zones.	●						●	●			✓	✓	✓	High

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Reduce Street Width Standards	This policy is intended to reduce land used for streets and slow down traffic. Street standards are typically described in development and/or subdivision ordinances. Reduced street width standards are most commonly applied on local streets in residential zones. Implementation of this policy should ensure that streets are wide enough to allow access for emergency, transit, other service providers.	•						●	•			✓	✓		Small
Allow Small Residential Lots	Small residential lots are generally less than 5,000sq. ft. This policy allows individual small lots within a subdivision or short plat. Small lots can be allowed outright in the minimum lot size and dimensions of a zone, or they could be implemented through the subdivision or planned unit development ordinances.	•				•	●	•				✓	✓		Small
Encourage Infill and Redevelopment	This policy seeks to maximize use of lands that are fully-developed or underdeveloped. Make use existing infrastructure by identifying and implementing policies that (1) improve market opportunities, and (2) reduce impediments to development in areas suitable for infill or redevelopment.	•	•	•			●	•					✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Enact an inclusionary zoning ordinance for new housing developments	Inclusionary zoning requires developers to provide a certain amount of affordable housing in developments over a certain size. Inclusionary zoning is applied during the development review process.	●			●	•							✓		Small-Moderate
Plan and zone for affordable and manufactured housing development	This policy would add manufactured housing as an outright use in specified residential zones. This policy ensures that land is available for this housing type.	●			•	•							✓		Small-Moderate
Allow Garden and Larger Scale Apartments and other moderate and higher density housing	Allowing higher and moderate density housing types, such as medium (garden) and high-density (larger scale) apartments, can result in increased development capacity and encourage a higher percentage of multi-family development. This approach can be implemented by amending the zoning code to allow them as an outright allowed use in appropriate zones.	•	●	●	●	●	●	●	•	●		✓	✓		Small-Large
<b>Measures that Increase Employment Capacity</b>															
Develop an Economic Development Strategy	An economic development strategy is intended to (1) identify desired types of businesses, and (2) identify the land needs of those businesses. Economic development strategies can be incorporated into the economic element of local comprehensive plans, or can be stand-alone policy documents.						•				●		✓		Small-Moderate
Create Industrial Zones	Industrial zoning is intended to limit uses on specific sites to appropriate industrial uses. Some cities have ordinances that specify what types of industries can locate on specific sites. This measure is implemented through the local zoning ordinance.		●				•						✓	✓	Small-Moderate

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Zone areas by building type, not by use	A local jurisdiction can alter its zoning code so that zones define the physical aspects of allowed buildings, not the uses within those buildings. This zoning approach recognizes that many land uses are compatible and locate in similar building types. For example, a manufacturing firm may have similar space requirements as a print shop.	•					•						✓	✓	Moderate
Develop or strengthen local brownfields programs	Local jurisdictions provide policies or incentives to encourage the redevelopment of underused industrial sites, known as brownfields. This policy can be implemented through provisions in local zoning ordinances that provide incentives for redevelopment of brownfields such as expedited permitting or reduced fees, or through targeted public investments.		•	•									✓	✓	Small-Moderate
<b>Measures that Support Increased Densities</b>															
Encourage the Development of Urban Centers and Urban Villages	An urban center or urban village provides mixed uses with a development. Residences are near retail establishments, parks, schools, and other urban amenities. The goal of urban centers and villages is to create integrated, more complete, and inter-related neighborhoods. Such concepts are often implemented through specific area or downtown plans and may require public investment. This measure should include encouraging development in Regional and Countywide Centers.	•	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐						✓	✓	Moderate-High
Allow Mixed Uses	The zoning code would specifically allow multiple uses in a zone, instead of all residential, or all commercial. Mixed uses can be vertical (i.e., multiple uses within a single building) or horizontal (i.e., multiple uses in a given geographic area).	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐			•	•			✓	✓	Low
Encourage Transit-Oriented Design	The goal of transit-oriented development is to create development patterns that complement transit. Transit-oriented development allows people to more easily use transit systems and helps businesses near transit stations be more accessible. When done well, the result will be desirable urban neighborhoods.	◐			◐	◐	◐	•	•				✓	✓	Moderate-High
Downtown Revitalization	Downtown revitalization includes redevelopment of blighted areas, developing a viable business district, and improving retail opportunities.	◐	•	•	◐	◐	•	◐					✓	✓	High
Require Adequate Public Facilities	Local jurisdictions require developers to provide adequate levels of public services, such as roads, sewer, water, drainage, and parks, as a condition of development.	◐						•					✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Specific Development Plans	Work with landowners, developers, and neighbors to develop a detailed site plan for development of an area. Allow streamlined approval for projects consistent with the plan. This policy results in a plan for a specific geographic area that is adopted as a supplement or amendment to the jurisdictions comprehensive land use plan.	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐			◐		✓	✓	Moderate-High

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Encourage Transportation-Efficient Land Use	Review and amend comprehensive plans to encourage patterns of land development that encourage pedestrian, bike, and transit travel. This policy is typically implemented at the development review level. It can also be implemented through plan designation and zoning maps through consideration of the geographic distribution of planned land uses and densities.	●			●	●	●	●				✓		✓	Small-Moderate
Urban Growth Management Agreements	Identify a lead jurisdiction for growth management inside urban growth areas. The urban growth area can include city and county land. The agreements define lead responsibility for planning, zoning, and urban service extension within these areas. The agreements exist between various government jurisdictions and specify jurisdiction over land use decisions, infrastructure provision, and other elements of urban growth.	●						●	●		●	✓		✓	Small
Create Annexation Plans	In an Annexation Plan, cities identify outlying areas that are likely to be eligible for annexation. The Plan identifies probable timing of annexation, needed urban services, effects of annexation on current service providers, and other likely impacts of annexation.	●						●	●		●	✓		✓	Small-Moderate
Encourage developers to reduce off-street surface parking	This policy provides incentives to developers to reduce the amount of off-street surface parking through shared parking arrangements, multi-level parking, or use of alternative transportation modes.	●						●	●			✓			Small-Moderate
Implement a program to identify and redevelop vacant and abandoned buildings	Many buildings sit vacant for years before the market facilitates redevelopment. This policy encourages demolition and would clear sites, making them more attractive to developers and would facilitate redevelopment.	●					●	●				✓		✓	Small-Moderate
Concentrate critical services near homes, jobs, and transit	This policy would require critical facilities and services be located in areas that are accessible by all people. For example, a hospital could not be located at the urban fringe in a business park. This policy would be implemented through provisions in the local zoning ordinance pertaining to siting specific critical services.										●	✓		✓	Small
Locate civic buildings in existing communities rather than in Greenfield areas	Local governments, like private builders, are tempted to build on greenfield sites because it is less expensive and easier. However, local governments can "lead by example" by making public investments in desired areas, or redeveloping target sites.									●	●	✓		✓	Small
Implement a process to expedite plan and permit approval for smart growth projects	Streamlined permitting processes provide incentives to developers. This policy would be implemented at the development review phase.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	✓		✓	Small
Administrative and Procedural Reforms	Permit and development project process can be streamlined to reduce barriers to development while still achieving the intended objectives of development policies.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	✓	✓	✓	Small

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Streamline Development Regulations and/or Standards	Regulatory reforms that simplify development regulations and standards while still maintaining appropriate restrictions on development can reduce barriers on development.	•			●	●			•			✓			Small-Moderate
Phasing/tiering Urban Growth	Strategies can be incorporated into comprehensive plans and capital facilities plans to phase urban growth as a method to provide for orderly development and encourage infill ahead of "urban fringe" development.	●	●	●	●			•	•				✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Promote Vertical Growth	Modifications to building height restrictions to allow taller structures can result in increases development capacity and assist in achieving planned densities.	•	●	●	●			●	●	•		✓	✓		Small-Moderate
SEPA Categorical Exemptions for mixed use and infill development & increased thresholds for SEPA Categorical Exemptions	Modifications to SEPA exemptions for mixed use and infill development can streamline the development review process and encourage more efficient development.		●	●	●				●					✓	Small-Large
<b>Measures to Mitigate the Impact of Density</b>															
Design standards	Design standards seek to preserve and enhance the character of a community or district. They are most typically applied in the design phase of projects or during site review. Design standards are typically implemented as another section of the development code. Some cities have design review boards in addition to the planning commission.									•				✓	Small
Urban Amenities for Increased Densities	Amenities include parks, trails, waterfront access, and cultural centers. Such amenities are typically implemented through the parks plan, the downtown plan, specific area plans or other public investments. Some cities require amenities to be included with larger projects.									•		✓		✓	Small
Conduct community visioning exercises to determine how and where the community will grow	Community visioning processes attempt to build consensus around the type, amount, and location of future development. Visioning exercises are typically included at the beginning of a comprehensive planning process and are used to update plan goals and objectives.									•				✓	Small
Provide for Regional Stormwater Facilities	The provision of regional stormwater facilities can provide stormwater treatment that supports development in areas where on-site treatment facilities are not financially feasible.	●		●	●				●					✓	Moderate-Large
<b>Other Measures</b>															
Mandate Low Densities in Rural and Resource Lands	This policy is intended to limit development in rural areas by mandating large lot sizes. It can also be used to preserve lands targeted for future urban area expansion. Low density urban development in fringe areas can have negative impacts of future densities and can increase the need for and cost of roads and other infrastructure.								•					✓	Small



Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Urban Holding Zones	<u>This policy identifies sites for future expansion and limits development to preserve options in those sites. This policy would be implemented through a specific zone or overlay. Urban holding areas would be identified on a map.</u>								•				✓	✓	Moderate-High
Capital Facilities Investments	<u>Investment in public facilities can be effectively used to guide the location of growth. This policy is implemented through capital improvement plans and the local capital budgeting process.</u>							•	•				✓	✓	High
Environmental Review and Mitigation Built into the Subarea Planning Process	<u>Building environmental review and mitigation into the subarea planning process can address key land use concerns at a broader geographic scale, streamlining review and approval of individual developments.</u>	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			✓	Small
Partner with nongovernmental organizations to preserve natural resource lands	<u>Local governments can partner with land trusts and other nongovernmental organizations to leverage limited public resources in preserving natural resource lands. The two work together to acquire natural resource lands or to place conservation easements on them. Land trusts are natural partners in this process and have more flexibility than local governments in facilitating land transactions. This policy is implemented through the development of long-term partnerships.</u>										•			✓	Small
Public Land Disposition	<u>Land owned or acquired by public agencies can be sold or leased at below market rates for various projects to help achieve development or redevelopment objectives.</u>		•			●	●						✓	✓	Small-Moderate

1 **Appendix E – Procedures for Buildable Lands Reporting in Response to GF-7**

2 **Procedures Report**

3 Use the procedures report that has been accepted and recommended by the Snohomish County  
4 Tomorrow (SCT) Steering Committee and adopted by the County Council. The procedures  
5 report used by local jurisdictions shall address the following issues:

- 6 1. Multi-year work program and schedule;
- 7 2. Jurisdictional responsibilities for data collection, analysis, and reporting;
- 8 3. Eight-year buildable lands review and evaluation methodology, including a methodology  
9 for establishing an accurate countywide baseline inventory of commercial and industrial  
10 lands;
- 11 4. Annual data collection requirements;
- 12 5. Coordinated interjurisdictional data collection strategy;
- 13 6. Definitions and relationships of key urban land supply terms and concepts, including  
14 market availability factor and the UGA safety factor;
- 15 7. Content of the eight-year buildable lands review and evaluation report;
- 16 8. Criteria and timelines for consistency and inconsistency determinations based on the  
17 review and evaluation results; and
- 18 9. Process for public involvement during preparation and finalization of the eight-year  
19 buildable lands reports.

20 **Resolving Inconsistencies in Collection and Analysis of Data**

21 In the event of a dispute among jurisdictions relating to inconsistencies in collection and analysis  
22 of data, the affected jurisdictions shall meet and discuss methods of resolving the dispute. In the  
23 event a successful resolution cannot be achieved, the SCT Steering Committee shall be asked to  
24 meet and resolve the matter. In such instances, the Steering Committee co-chairs will make every  
25 effort to ensure that all Steering Committee jurisdictions are present and in attendance, and that  
26 the affected jurisdictions are provided with proper notice of such discussion. Nothing in this  
27 policy shall be construed to alter the land use power of any Snohomish County jurisdiction under  
28 established law.

29

1 **Appendix F – List of Issues for Interlocal Agreements**

2 *(To Illustrate Policy JP-1 and to Implement ((~~JP-3~~)) JP-2)*

3 Interlocal agreements may coordinate any number of issues, such as, but not limited to:

- 4 1. Facilitation of annexations;
- 5 2. Principles for annexation;
- 6 3. Public service delivery;
- 7 4. Clarification of roles;
- 8 5. Coordination between long term and current planning at both the city and the County
- 9 level;
- 10 6. Land Use Designations;
- 11 7. Population and employment growth targets;
- 12 8. Delineation of tasks of city/County staff;
- 13 9. Development of schedule for completion of tasks;
- 14 10. Delineation of roles of the various planning commissions;
- 15 11. Delineation of roles of city/County council in adoption process;
- 16 12. Provision of consistent processes for design and development;
- 17 13. Permit processing;
- 18 14. Ensuring non-duplicative process for the development community;
- 19 15. Development of application procedures;
- 20 16. Determination of applicable regulations and standards to be used;
- 21 17. Determination of SEPA process and lead agency roles;
- 22 18. Development of appeal processes;
- 23 19. Provision for realistic capital facilities planning;
- 24 20. Provision for fiscal equity between the County and the cities;
- 25 21. Bonded debt;
- 26 22. Identification of funding sources, fees, and revenue sharing;
- 27 23. Provision of clear, adequate public participation processes;
- 28 24. Provision for viable, quality communities;
- 29 25. Transportation mitigation, concurrency, or other issues including those detailed in TR-
- 30 1(a);
- 31 26. Interjurisdictional affordable housing agreements or programs; and/or
- 32 27. Other issues such as surface water, solid waste, and public safety.
- 33 28. Response to climate crisis through restoration and protection of the environment’s natural
- 34 functions and wildlife habitats.

35

1 **Appendix G – Definitions of Key Terms**

2 **Activity Unit:** A measure of total activity that combines the number of jobs and population.

3 **Affordable Housing:** The generally accepted definition of housing affordability is for a  
4 household to pay no more than 30 percent of its annual income on housing (HUD).

5 **Buildable Lands Report:** A Buildable Lands Report (BLR) analyzes the urban development  
6 that has occurred since the adoption of the previous Growth Management Act comprehensive  
7 plans. Using this information, the report evaluates the adequacy of the land supply in the Urban  
8 Growth Area to accommodate the remaining portions of the projected growth. In this sense, a  
9 BLR ‘looks back’ to compare planned vs. actual urban densities to determine whether the  
10 original plan assumptions were accurate. (See GF-7 and RCW 36.70A.215.)

11 **Built Environment:** Refers to the human-created surroundings that provide the setting for  
12 human activity, ranging from large-scale civic districts, commercial and industrial buildings, to  
13 neighborhoods and individual homes.

14 **Centers:** A defined focal area within a city or community that is a priority for local planning and  
15 infrastructure. VISION 2050 and the CPPs identify mixed-use centers, which have a mix of  
16 housing, employment, retail and entertainment uses and are served by multiple transportation  
17 options. Industrial centers concentrate and preserve manufacturing and industrial lands. Regional  
18 centers are formally designated by PSRC, countywide centers are formally identified by the  
19 CPPs, and local centers are designated by local comprehensive plans.

20 **City:** Any city or town, including a code city. [RCW 36.70A.030(3)]

21 **Clean Energy:** Energy derived through renewable, zero emission sources.

22 **Consistency:** The definitions and descriptions of the term "consistency" contained in the Growth  
23 Management Act procedural criteria Chapter 365-196-210(9) Washington Administrative Code,  
24 and as further refined in statute, Growth Management Hearings Board decisions and court  
25 decisions should be used to determine consistency between jurisdictions' comprehensive plans.

26 **Countywide Center:** Countywide growth centers serve important roles as places for  
27 concentrating jobs, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. Countywide industrial  
28 centers serve as important local industrial areas. Countywide centers are designated in Appendix  
29 I of this document.

30 **Displacement:** The involuntary relocation of current residents or businesses from their current  
31 residence. This is a different phenomenon than when property owners voluntarily sell their  
32 interests to capture an increase in value. Physical displacement is the result of eviction,  
33 acquisition, rehabilitation, or demolition of property, or the expiration of covenants on rent- or  
34 income-restricted housing. Economic displacement occurs when residents and businesses can no  
35 longer afford escalating housing costs. Cultural displacement occurs when people choose to  
36 move because their neighbors and culturally related businesses have left the area.

1 **Economic Infrastructure:** The combination of economic activity, institutions (e.g. banks,  
2 investment firms, research and development organizations, and education providers) and  
3 physical infrastructure – such as transportation systems – that support economic activity.

4 **Environmentally Sensitive Development Practice:** Practices intended to limit the  
5 environmental impacts and energy use associated with development, such as low-impact  
6 development.

7 **Environmentally Sensitive Housing Development:** The development of housing that is  
8 designed such that it yields environmental benefits, such as savings in energy, building materials,  
9 and water consumption, or reduced waste generation.

10 **Equity:** All people can attain the resources and opportunities that improve their quality of life  
11 and enable them to reach full potential. Those affected by poverty, communities of color, and  
12 historically marginalized communities are engaged in decision-making processes, planning, and  
13 policy making. Also referred to as “social equity”.

14 **Essential public facilities:** Those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports,  
15 state education facilities and state or regional transportation facilities as defined in RCW  
16 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient  
17 facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure  
18 community transition facilities as defined in RCW 71.09.020. [RCW 36.70A.200(1)]

19 **Greenhouse Gas:** Components of the atmosphere which contribute to global warming, including  
20 carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases. Human activities have added to  
21 the levels of most of these naturally occurring gases.

22 **Growth Target:** The number of residents, housing, or jobs that a jurisdiction is expected to plan  
23 for in its comprehensive plan. Growth targets are set by countywide planning groups for counties  
24 and cities to meet the Growth Management Act requirement to allocate urban growth that is  
25 projected for the succeeding twenty-year period (RCW 36.70A.110).

26 **Historically Marginalized Communities:** Include, but are not limited to, native and Indigenous  
27 peoples, people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with low incomes, those with  
28 disabilities and health conditions, and people with limited English proficiency.

29 **Jobs-Housing Balance:** A planning concept which advocates that housing and employment be  
30 located closer together, with an emphasis on matching housing options with nearby jobs, so  
31 workers have shorter commutes or can eliminate vehicle trips altogether.

32 **Jurisdictions:** County and city governments (when used in a policy).

33 **Land Capacity Analysis:** A land capacity analysis focuses on the reestablishment of a new 20-  
34 year urban land supply for accommodating the urban growth targets. As such, it fulfills the  
35 Growth Management Act “show your work” requirement for the sizing of Urban Growth Areas  
36 for future growth. (See DP-1 and RCW 36.70.A.110(2))

1 **Living Wage Jobs:** Jobs that pay enough to meet the basic needs and costs of supporting a  
2 family or individual independently. Factors for determining living-wage jobs include housing,  
3 food, transportation, utilities, health care, child care, and recreation.

4 **May:** The actions described in the policy are either advisable or are allowed. “May” gives  
5 permission and implies a preference. Because “may” does not have a directive meaning, there is  
6 no expectation the described action will be implemented.

7 **Moderate Density Housing:** A classification of housing type that has densities greater than  
8 what would ordinarily be seen in single-family neighborhoods, but less than in more intensive  
9 high density multifamily development. Moderate density housing includes, but is not limited to,  
10 duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, walkup apartments, and accessory dwelling units. Moderate  
11 density housing is often referred to as “missing middle housing”.

12 **Municipality:** In the context of these Countywide Planning Policies, municipalities include  
13 cities, towns, and counties.

14 **Public facilities:** Streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic  
15 signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreational  
16 facilities, and schools. [36.70A.030(12)]

17 **Shall:** Implementation of the policy is mandatory and imparts a higher degree of substantive  
18 direction than “should”. “Shall” is used for policies that repeat State of Washington requirements  
19 or where the intent is to mandate action. However, “shall” cannot be used when it is largely a  
20 subjective determination whether a policy’s objective has been met.

21 **Should:** Implementation of the policy is expected but its completion is not mandatory. The  
22 policy is directive with substantive meaning, although to a lesser degree than “shall” for two  
23 reasons. (1) “Should” policies recognize the policy might not be applicable or appropriate for all  
24 municipalities due to special circumstances. The decision to not implement a “should” policy is  
25 appropriate only if implementation of the policy is either inappropriate or not feasible. (2) Some  
26 should policies are subjective; hence, it is not possible to demonstrate that a jurisdiction has  
27 implemented it.

28 **Social Infrastructure:** The underlying institutions, community organizations, and safety  
29 networks that support society in general and local service standards and delivery in particular.

30 **Special Needs Housing:** Affordable housing for persons that require special assistance or  
31 supportive care to subsist or achieve independent living, including but not limited to persons that  
32 are frail, elderly, developmentally disabled, chronically mentally ill, physically handicapped,  
33 homeless, persons participating in substance abuse programs, persons with AIDS, and youth at  
34 risk.

35

36

1 **Appendix H – Fiscal Impact Analysis**

2 RCW 36.70A.210 requires that each county mandated to plan under the GMA develop and adopt  
3 CPPs in cooperation with the cities in the county. These policies establish a framework for the  
4 preparation of local comprehensive plans and development regulations. These policies are not  
5 the equivalent of a regional comprehensive plan. The legislative direction is to develop policy  
6 statements to be used solely for attaining consistency among plans of the county and the  
7 cities/towns.

8 These CPPs have no direct fiscal impact. They are an agreed upon method of guiding the  
9 planning activities required by the GMA. Actions requiring further analysis could include (but  
10 are not limited) those listed in Appendix F.

11

1 **Appendix I – Centers**

2 Centers are a key feature of VISION 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategy. Centers are mixed  
3 use and industrial locations that attract robust employment and population growth. The Regional  
4 Centers Framework sets up a hierarchy of centers, starting at the regional level and moving  
5 though the countywide level to local centers.

6 **Regional Context**

7 VISION 2050 includes narrative and Multicounty Planning Policies that describe the role of  
8 centers in the Regional Growth Strategy and provide guidance for the implementation of the  
9 centers framework locally. VISION 2050 states:

10 *Mixed-use centers of different sizes and scales—including large designated regional*  
11 *growth centers, countywide centers, local downtowns, and other local centers—are*  
12 *envisioned for all of the region's cities. Concentrating growth in mixed-use centers of*  
13 *different scales allows cities and other urban service providers to maximize the use of*  
14 *existing infrastructure, make more efficient and less costly investments in new*  
15 *infrastructure, and minimize the environmental impacts of urban growth.*<sup>29</sup>

16 Additional policies provide guidance for implementing the regional centers framework  
17 throughout the region including providing guidance on subregional funding allocation,  
18 countywide center designation, and guiding development and growth. The following policies and  
19 actions provide an overview of this guidance:

20 *MPP-RC-8: Direct subregional funding, especially county-level and local funds, to*  
21 *countywide centers, high-capacity transit areas with a station area plan, and other local*  
22 *centers. County-level and local funding are also appropriate to prioritize to regional*  
23 *centers.*

24 *MPP-DP-25: Support the development of centers within all jurisdictions, including high-*  
25 *capacity transit station areas and countywide and local centers.*

26 *DP-Action-1: Implement the Regional Centers Framework: PSRC will study and*  
27 *evaluate existing regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers to assess*  
28 *their designation, distribution, interrelationships, characteristics, transportation*  
29 *efficiency, performance, and social equity. PSRC, together with its member jurisdictions*  
30 *and countywide planning bodies, will work to establish a common network of countywide*  
31 *centers.*

32 **Regional Centers**

33 Regional Centers are identified by PSRC at the regional level. The Regional Centers Framework  
34 outlines the process for identifying new regional centers and provides detailed criteria for the

---

<sup>29</sup> VISION 2050, page 28. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>



1 designation of such areas. There are three Regional Growth Centers and two Regional  
2 Manufacturing Industrial Centers within Snohomish County:

3 Regional Growth Centers

- 4 • Bothell Canyon Park RGC
- 5 • Everett RGC
- 6 • Lynnwood RGC

7 Regional Manufacturing and Industrial Centers

- 8 • Cascade MIC
- 9 • Paine Field/Boeing Everett MIC

10 Snohomish County Tomorrow has identified the following process for designation of a new  
11 Regional Center within Snohomish County:

- 12 1. A local jurisdiction nominates a center;
- 13 2. A working group of Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) reviews the proposal for  
14 conformity with the criteria in the Regional Centers Framework;
- 15 3. If the prospective center is found to be appropriate, the SCT Steering Committee  
16 recommends the center for designation; and
- 17 4. The County Council holds a public hearing and makes the decision whether or not to seek  
18 designation of the prospective center and forward the proposal to the Puget Sound  
19 Regional Council for consideration.

20 **Countywide Centers**

21 Countywide center are the middle level of center under the centers hierarchy. There are two  
22 types of countywide center, growth centers and industrial centers. VISION 2050 requires  
23 countywide planning policies to include criteria and processes for the identification of  
24 countywide centers. The Regional Framework provides baseline designation criteria and  
25 descriptions of the two types of countywide center. However, “depending on county  
26 circumstance and priorities, countywide planning policies may include additional criteria (such  
27 as planning requirements or mix of uses) or other additional standards within this overall  
28 framework.”<sup>30</sup>

29 Countywide Growth Centers are areas that “serve important roles as places for concentrating  
30 jobs, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. These are often smaller downtowns,  
31 high-capacity transit station areas, or neighborhood centers that are linked by transit, provide a  
32 mix of housing and services, and serve as focal points for local and county investment.”<sup>31</sup>

33 Countywide Industrial Centers are areas that “serve as important local industrial areas. These

---

<sup>30</sup> Regional Centers Framework, page 11. Available at [https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final\\_regional\\_centers\\_framework\\_march\\_22\\_version.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf)

<sup>31</sup> Regional Centers Framework, page 11. Available at [https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final\\_regional\\_centers\\_framework\\_march\\_22\\_version.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf)

1 areas support living wage jobs and serve a key role in the county’s manufacturing/industrial  
 2 economy.”<sup>32</sup>

3 **Countywide Center Criteria**

4 The following criteria must be met for designation of a Countywide Growth Center:

<b><u>Countywide Growth Center</u></b>	
<u>Identification</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Shall be identified as a Countywide Growth Center in the Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies.</u></li> <li>● <u>Shall be identified as a Countywide Growth Center in the local comprehensive plan.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Prioritization</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>It is recommended that the locality has developed a subarea plan for the center; and</u></li> <li>● <u>Clear evidence that the area is a priority for investment, such as planning efforts or infrastructure.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<p><u>At the time of identification, the center shall have:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>An existing activity unit (AU) density of 10 AU/acre;</u></li> <li>● <u>An existing planning and zoning designation for a mix of uses of 20% residential and 20% employment;</u></li> <li>● <u>An existing capacity and planning for additional growth; and</u></li> <li>● <u>Goals and policies that encourage mixed use development and increased densities in the local comprehensive or subarea plan.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Other Requirements</u>	<p><u>The center is served by a Community Transit Core Transit Emphasis Corridor or High-Capacity Transit (HCT). The center shall encompass areas that fall within the following radii:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>¼ mile from a planned or existing Community Transit Core Transit Emphasis Corridor or local transit service that is equivalent in level of service;</u></li> <li>● <u>¼ mile from an existing or planned bus rapid transit stop; or</u></li> <li>● <u>½ mile of an existing or planned light rail station or commuter rail station.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>The center has a compact, walkable, shape and size:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Size of ¼ square mile (160 acres), up to ½ mile transit walkshed (500 acres).</u></li> <li>● <u>It is recommended that centers are nodal with a generally round or square shape.</u></li> <li>● <u>Centers should generally avoid linear or gerrymandered shapes that are not walkable or connected by transit.</u></li> <li>● <u>The local comprehensive or subarea plan shall have goals and policies for the center that support the development of infrastructure and/or street patterns that encourage nonmotorized forms of transportation, such as walking and bicycling.</u></li> </ul>

5

<sup>32</sup> Regional Centers Framework, page 11. Available at [https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final\\_regional\\_centers\\_framework\\_march\\_22\\_version.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf)

1 The following criteria must be met for the designation of a Countywide Industrial Center:

<b>Countywide Industrial Centers</b>	
<u>Identification</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Shall be identified as a Countywide Industrial Center in the Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies.</u></li> <li>• <u>Shall be identified as a Countywide Industrial Center in the local comprehensive plan.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Prioritization</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>It is recommended that the locality has developed a subarea plan for the center; and</u></li> <li>• <u>Clear evidence that the area is a priority for investment, such as planning efforts or infrastructure.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<p><u>At the time of identification, the center shall have:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>A minimum 1,000 existing jobs;</u></li> <li>• <u>A minimum of 500 acres of industrial zoning;</u></li> <li>• <u>At least 75% of the center zoned for core industrial uses; and</u></li> <li>• <u>Existing capacity and planning for additional employment growth.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Other Requirements</u>	<p><u>The center shall:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Through local or countywide planning have industrial retention strategies in place; and</u></li> <li>• <u>Play an important county role and concentration of industrial land or jobs with evidence of long-term demand.</u></li> </ul>

2 **Identification Process**

3 Initial identification of Countywide Centers shall occur through the process outlined below:

- 4 1. Candidate Countywide Centers are identified in the 2021 update of the Countywide
- 5 Planning Policies for Snohomish County (below).
- 6 2. Jurisdictions determine whether or not to pursue formal identification of Candidate
- 7 Countywide Centers within their jurisdictional boundaries.
- 8 3. Localities choosing to pursue formal identification complete local planning for each
- 9 Candidate Countywide Center as a part of the 2024 GMA Comprehensive Plan Update.
- 10 Local planning shall:
  - 11 a. Formalize boundaries;
  - 12 b. Identify Center location as a Countywide Center in the local comprehensive plan;
  - 13 c. Adopt policies required by the Countywide Center criteria; and
  - 14 d. If applicable, complete subarea planning.
- 15 4. Countywide Planning Policies are amended to finalize designation of Countywide
- 16 Growth and Industrial centers that meet the criteria in this Appendix.

17 After initial countywide center designation, new countywide canters can be designated through

18 the following process:

- 19 1. Prospective center is nominated by a local jurisdiction;
- 20 2. A working group of Snohomish County Tomorrow reviews the prospective center for
- 21 consistency with the Countywide Center Criteria;

- 1        3. If the center proposal is found to be appropriate, the SCT Steering Committee  
2        recommends the countywide center for designation; and  
3        4. The County Council holds a public hearing and makes the decision whether or not to  
4        designate the prospective center as a Countywide Center.

5  
6        **Candidate Countywide Centers**

7        The following candidate centers were identified during the 2021 Countywide Planning Policies  
8        update. As outlined in the identification process above, these locations will not formally be  
9        designated as countywide centers until local planning has occurred, candidate centers have been  
10       evaluated to ensure they meet the criteria, and the CPPs have been amended to designate the  
11       locations. Jurisdictions will need to complete local planning for each area to ensure it is an  
12       appropriate location for a countywide center in accordance with local plans and complete all  
13       necessary planning to ensure the area meets the countywide center criteria identified above.

14       Candidate County Growth Centers:

- 15       • 196<sup>th</sup> Street Mixed Use Node – Lynnwood  
16       • Airport Road and Highway 99 Provisional Light Rail Station – Everett and Snohomish  
17       County  
18       • Ash Way Light Rail Station Area– Snohomish County  
19       • Edmonds Downtown – Edmonds  
20       • Everett Mall – Everett  
21       • Evergreen Way and SR 526 – Everett  
22       • Lakewood – Marysville  
23       • Mariner Light Rail Station Area – Snohomish County  
24       • Marshall/Kruse Area – Marysville  
25       • Marysville Downtown – Marysville  
26       • Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center – Edmonds, Lynnwood, and Mountlake Terrace  
27       • Mill Creek Town Center – Mill Creek  
28       • Mountlake Terrace Town Center/Light Rail Station Area – Mountlake Terrace  
29       • Mukilteo Old Town – Mukilteo  
30       • North Everett – Everett  
31       • Red Barn Village – Bothell  
32       • Smokey Point – Arlington  
33       • Thrasher’s Corner – Snohomish County

34       Candidate Countywide Industrial Centers

- 35       • Harbour Reach – Mukilteo  
36       • Maltby – Snohomish County  
37       • Port of Everett/Navy Mill – Everett  
38       • Snohomish River Delta – Everett

1        **Local Centers**

2        Local centers are designated through local planning processes by each local jurisdiction. There is  
3        no countywide or regional designation process for local centers, but according to the Regional  
4        Centers Framework, local centers should “play an important role in the region and help define  
5        our community character, provide local gathering places, serve as community hubs, and are often  
6        appropriate places for additional growth and focal points for services.”<sup>33</sup> As local centers grow,  
7        they may become eligible for designation as a countywide or regional center if they meet the  
8        designation criteria identified in this document and the Regional Centers Framework.

---

<sup>33</sup> Regional Centers Framework, page 12. Available at  
[https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final\\_regional\\_centers\\_framework\\_march\\_22\\_version.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf)

**ORDINANCE  
INTRODUCTION SLIP**

TO: Clerk of the Council

TITLE OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE:

N. Nehring  
Councilmember Date

Clerk's Action: Proposed Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_

Assigned to: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FORM**

On \_\_\_\_\_, the Committee considered the item and by \_\_\_\_ Consensus /  
\_\_\_\_ Yeas and \_\_\_\_ Nays, made the following recommendation:

\_\_\_\_ Move to Council to schedule public hearing \_\_\_\_\_

**Public Hearing Date** \_\_\_\_\_ **at** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ Move to Council as amended to schedule public hearing

\_\_\_\_ Move to Council with no recommendation

**This item \_\_\_\_ should/ \_\_\_\_ should not be placed on the Consent Agenda.**

(Consent agenda may be used for routine items that do not require public hearing and do not need discussion at General Legislative Session)

**This item \_\_\_\_ should/ \_\_\_\_ should not be placed on the Administrative Matters Agenda**

(Administrative Matters agenda may be used for routine action to set time and date for public hearings)

N. Nehring  
Committee Chair



## Snohomish County Council

**Committee:** Planning & Community Development      **Analyst:** Ryan Countryman  
**ECAFs:** 2021-0647 and 2021-0661  
**Proposal:** Ordinances 21-057 and 21-059      **Date:** August 31, 2021

### **Consideration**

Two proposed ordinances that would, with one exception, make the same amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs). The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires counties to adopt CPPs to ensure consistency in the comprehensive plans adopted by local jurisdictions in that county. The Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee (SCT SC) is the body that typically recommends CPPs to the County Council. In this instance, the County Executive branch is making a separate recommendation that would omit one of the proposed new policies in the SCT SC recommendation. Council is thus considering two proposed ordinances. These are:

- Ordinance 21-057: Snohomish County Tomorrow July 28, 2021, Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County; and
- Ordinance 21-059: Snohomish County Executive August 18, 2021, Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County

Planning and Development Services (PDS) staff have prepared Amendment Sheet 1 which would make a variety of housekeeping changes throughout the document. Council staff have prepared Amendment Sheet 2 to update references to GMA goals that are now out of date. While, the content of the amendment sheets applies equally to both versions of the proposed CPPs, there are four total amendment sheets under consideration because each ordinance has two amendment sheets.


### **Background**

Countywide Planning Policies guide the development of local plans by establishing a framework for coordination and consistency on issues that span jurisdictions. The proposed ordinance would update the CPPs largely in response to new Multicounty Planning Policies

(MPPs) adopted by Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) on October 29, 2020 as part of Vision 2050. Other proposed CPP updates are in response to changes in state law and local initiatives. Figure 1, below, is from the CPPs and illustrates the relationship between the CPPs and these other sources of policy direction. On July 28, 2021, SCT SC voted to recommend the proposed CPP changes in Ord. 21-057 to the County Council. On August 18, 2021, the County Executive made a separate recommendation to the County Council in the form of Ord. 21-059. Snohomish County has a deadline to adopt CPP updates addressing Vision 2050 and changes in state law by December 31, 2021.

Vision 2050 introduced new policies or greater emphasis on the following themes:

- Equity and inclusion
- Climate change
- Transit supportive and oriented development
- Identifying risk and mitigating the effects of residential and business displacement
- Countywide centers
- Reasonable measures
- Coordination between jurisdictions, tribes, and other agencies



**Figure 1 – Policy Relationships Diagram**



## **Current Proposal**

*Summary:* Most of the changes proposed in both ordinances are to bring the CPPs into alignment with changes in Vision 2050. Other recommendations reflect new state law and local initiatives. The one policy difference between the SCT- and Executive-recommended ordinances relates to a potential local initiative.

*Effective Date:* TBD (Adoption must be by December 31, 2021)

*Fiscal Implications:* None

*Scope:* The proposed amendments would primarily align the CPPs with Vision 2050. Vision 2050 includes a greater emphasis on social justice and climate change, which are both reflected in proposed new or revised CPPs. Vision 2050 also includes the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) for allocating new housing and employment.

Other changes include necessary updates to reflect revisions in state law, including updated phrasing and references. Some changes also reflect local initiatives.

The discussion below describes the more significant or noteworthy policy changes. Page number references apply to both sets of proposed CPPs.

Central Principals (see page 18): Both proposals include a new central principal that would read, “Incorporate equity and inclusion into all aspects of countywide and local planning”. Illustrating this new principal is a proposed revision in policy GF-2 that changes the phrase “citizen input” to “public input”. Both recommendations include similar changes throughout the CPPs.

JP-3 (see page 21 of the SCT version): SCT proposes a new mandatory joint planning policy saying that the County shall facilitate annexation by adopting comprehensive plan policies “that acknowledge the city’s/town’s land use authority over newly annexed areas.” The County Executive recommendation does not include this new policy.

DP-2 (see pages 23-25): DP-2 lists eleven circumstances for possible expansion of an Urban Growth Area. Subsection e.10 allows for expansion in response to a “declaration by the County Executive, or the County Council by resolution, of a critical shortage of affordable housing.” SCT proposes to narrow this by adding a stipulation that the affordable housing will be for “low and moderate income households, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).” Other conditions for UGA expansion would remain effectively unchanged.

HO-1 (see page 38): SCT proposes to renumber current policy HO-2 as HO-1. This policy calls for local plans to include an assessment of housing needs by economic segment. Proposed revisions now also say that jurisdictions should “Support the creation of additional housing options in single-family neighborhoods to provide for more diverse housing types and choices to meet the various needs of all economic segments of the population.” This new language is in line with an assessment provided by the Housing Affordability Regional Task Force in 2020 known as the HART Report<sup>1</sup> which recommended that Snohomish County jurisdictions allow more options to develop “missing middle” housing such as small multi-plex buildings, apartments and townhomes in areas that are characterized by mostly detached single-family homes.

HO-4 (see page 39): This proposed new policy supports the addition to HO-1 above by saying that the “county and cities should implement policies that allow for the development of moderate density housing to help meet future housing needs, diversify the housing stock, and provide more affordable home ownership and rental opportunities. This approach should include code updates to ensure that zoning designations and allowed densities, housing capacity, and other restrictions do not preclude development of moderate density housing.”

HO-15 (see page 41): This proposed new policy proposes to address displacement by saying that jurisdictions fitting certain geographic categories in Vision 2050 “shall develop and implement strategies to address displacement of historically marginalized populations, including residents identified in the report prescribed in HO-5, and neighborhood-based small business owners”.

Transportation Policies (see pages 49-60): SCT proposes revisions to several transportation policies to prioritize transit- and pedestrian-oriented development to help achieve goals in Vision 2050 related to climate change and human health.

Natural Environment and Climate Change Policies (see pages 61-64): SCT recommends adding a new subchapter and several policies to address Climate Change to the Natural Environment chapter. Many of these changes are direct responses to new policies in Vision 2050.

PS-18 (see page 68): SCT proposes a new policy says that the “County and cities should work collaboratively at a local and countywide level to promote equitable access of public services and facilities for all residents, especially those that are historically underserved.” Equitable access to underserved communities is a theme of several new policies in Vision 2050.

---

<sup>1</sup> The HART report and action plan are available at <https://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/5560/Report>

PS-20 (see page 68): This new policy calls for jurisdictions to support planning for telecommunications infrastructure, especially in underserved areas. This reflects new topics in Vision 2050.

PS-21 (see page 68): This new policy calls on the County and cities to “work collaboratively with school districts to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities to meet the current and future community needs, consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, the regional growth strategy, and the growth targets in Appendix B” of the CPPs.

Amendment Sheet 1: Makes minor corrections and other housekeeping changes

Amendment Sheet 2: Updates the GMA goals cited in the CPPs

**Handling:** NORMAL

**Approved-as-to-form:** YES

**Risk Management:** APPROVE

**Executive Recommendation:** Approved the Executive Recommendation (Ord. 21-059)

### **Analysis**

The proposed ordinance would meet Snohomish County’s obligation to update its CPPs for alignment with Vision 2050. Vision 2050 introduced many new Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) and revised many others. Accordingly, SCT is recommending many new and revised CPPs. Although the scope of new topics and proposed initiatives is broad, the practical immediate effect of most of these changes is less than reading of the changes out of context would suggest. It is a matter of implications vs likely application.

Most of the new MPPs and corresponding CPPs fall into three categories. They either:

1. Restate existing requirements from other sources such as state law;
2. Summarize actions that jurisdictions are already undertaking, or in some cases have already completed; or
3. Give aspirational direction that will require later actions by others to fulfill.

Immediate general effects of adopting the proposed new CPPs would be to:

1. Satisfy the requirement that Snohomish County update its CPPs for consistency with Vision 2050;

2. Consolidate more of the required and expected elements for local plan updates in one place; and
3. Revise the conditions for evaluating Urban Growth Area expansions under the annual docketing or periodic GMA plan update processes.

Proposed new policy JP-3 addressing annexations was the source of disagreement between representatives in the SCT process. At the Steering Committee meeting that moved to recommend this ordinance to the County Council, County Executive Somers stated that he had concerns with the proposed phrasing coming from city representatives. Somers indicated the Executive branch would engage with the County Council on this policy; hence two version of the CPPs and ordinances that are otherwise the same.

Proposed changes to policies DP-2.e.10 and PS-21 are relevant to UGA sizing, but for different reasons. Both may impact the land use alternatives available to Snohomish County during the periodic plan update required in 2024 or may impact potential evaluation of current or future plan amendments proposed through the docketing process.

DP-2.e.10. This current condition allowing UGA expansion applies outside of periodic GMA update cycles. It allows expansion to address a “critical shortage of affordable housing” and is open-ended. The proposal to limit the expansion to be for only households with low to moderate incomes as defined by HUD would greatly reduce its potential application. Households with modest means often rely on close proximity to employment or on access to services such as public transportation. These features are not generally available at the outside edges of UGAs. The proposed revisions would therefore limit options for addressing housing affordability by expanding UGAs between plan update cycles to a circumstance that will not occur often.<sup>2</sup>

PS-21. The proposed new policy to require siting of new schools “consistent with adopted comprehensive plans [and] growth targets.” This proposed policy, including the word “consistent”, mirrors phrasing from a new policy from Vision 2050 (MPP-PS-26). However, “consistent” is undefined and could be interpreted in a manner that limits options available to Snohomish County and the school districts. Importantly, it also overlooks the County Council’s biennial role in approving Capital Facilities Plans (CFPs) for the school districts, which may already include implied decisions that could conflict with a strict reading of “consistent” in the proposed policy if consistent is just with land

---

<sup>2</sup> Council staff notes that development of SCT’s recommendations on DP-2.e.10 primarily took place prior to passage by the state legislature of Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 1220. ESSD 1220 made changes to the GMA housing goal and associated requirements. It went into effect on July 25, 2021. This new legislation may necessitate further refinement to this CPP condition or other policies related to housing. As a separate future action, it may be appropriate for SCT to review the implications of this legislation and make additional CPP recommendations based on the scope of ESSD 1220. Guidance from the state Department of Commerce is expected in 2022. ESSHB 1220 is available at: <http://lawfilesexternal.wa.gov/biennium/2021-22/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Laws/House/1220-S2.SL.pdf>

use plans. Although Snohomish County could still permit new schools outside UGAs, being strictly consistent with growth targets and adopted plans (if such plans omit consideration of the CFPs) may affect:

1. Whether Urban Growth Areas can expand to include new schools (the proposed language differs from existing CPP DP-2.e.6 which allows changes to UGAs, i.e. adopted plans, to allow for new school sites within UGAs);
2. Whether new schools at the outside edge of the currently adopted UGA can connect to sewers;
3. The size of the school and the ability to implement the adopted CFP since sewer availability is a major factor in how much land a school of a given size needs;
4. If connecting to sewers, whether the school district can collect impact fees to pay for the school; and
5. What standards relating to sidewalks and other safe walking conditions apply to the school and nearby development that would house schoolchildren.

Several other policy proposals perpetuate logical inconsistencies from Vision 2050 or create new contradictions of their own. Below are some examples. Snohomish County and its cities need not answer these questions at this time; rather, they will need work through these issues when updating their plans and programs.

- Proposed new policy PS-18 calls for “equitable access of public services and facilities for all residents”. Is differential access to safe walking conditions to schools, which would be one possible unintended effect of proposed policy PS-21, create an equitable or appropriate outcome?
- HO-15 calls for strategies to address displacement, but only in certain geographic areas defined by the Regional Growth Strategy in Vision 2050. What about potential displacement of vulnerable groups elsewhere? If said strategies involve public service programs, would programs based on geography be equitable per PS-18?
- The geographic areas where Vision 2050 and proposed HO-15 call for strategies addressing displacement are the same areas where the highest rates of growth and redevelopment will occur. These areas are also home to some of the highest concentrations of low-income and racial minority residents in Snohomish County. Strategies limited to certain geographic areas may reinforce existing settlement patterns, thus helping to prevent higher-income areas dominated by existing single-family development from experiencing new types of residents and changing demographics. Would that outcome be equitable?

Resolution of these questions, if possible, would occur through local planning processes and regional cooperation. Many of the public comments received during development of the proposed changes raise valid questions about the meaning of phrases that are unclear or about the purpose of contradictory policies such as those described above. Questions from the public or in this report do not need answers now. A significant hidden benefit of the Snohomish County Tomorrow process is that the process itself helps to educate staff and elected officials on the requirements and policy dilemmas they face. Meaning and resolution will emerge when and if policies based on the CPPs translate into action. Each city and the County will navigate these issues as they update their plans by the 2024 GMA deadline.

### **Request**

Move to General Legislative Session to set time and date for a public hearing.

# Countywide Planning Policies 2021 Update

Snohomish County Council  
Planning and Community Development Committee  
August 31, 2021



Snohomish County

# Overview of Changes

- Equity and inclusion
- Climate change
- Transit supportive and oriented development
- Identifying risk and mitigating the effects of displacement
- Countywide Centers
- Reasonable measures

## COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

ADOPTED JUNE 1, 2011  
AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 11-011; EFFECTIVE DATE: JUNE 24, 2011

### AMENDMENTS:

JUNE 1, 2011 (AMENDED ORD. NO. 11-021) EFF. DATE JUNE 24, 2011

JUNE 8, 2011 (AMENDED ORD. NO. 11-015) EFF. DATE JUNE 24, 2011

OCTOBER 17, 2012 (ORD. NO. 12-070) EFF. DATE NOVEMBER 10, 2012  
(APPENDIX A MAP CHANGE ONLY)

JUNE 12, 2013 (AMENDED ORD. NO. 13-032) EFF. DATE JUNE 30, 2013  
(APPENDIX A AND APPENDIX B CHANGES ONLY)

APRIL 16, 2014 (ORD. NO. 14-006) EFF. DATE APRIL 27, 2014  
(APPENDIX B CHANGES ONLY)

JUNE 4, 2014 (ORD. NO. 14-031) EFF. DATE JUNE 16, 2014

OCTOBER 12, 2016 (AMENDED ORD. NO. 16-078)  
EFF. DATE NOVEMBER 10, 2016

NOTE: This is an unofficial compilation of the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs). The official text of the CPPs can be found in the ordinances adopting and amending the CPPs and those ordinances will control in the event of a disparity between the ordinance and this unofficial compilation.




# Equity and Inclusion

- New Central Principle
- Inclusive community planning (DP-38)
- Health disparities (DP-40)
- Affordable and special needs housing (HO-2)
- Access to economic opportunity (ED-6)
- Transportation System (TR-19)
- Access to public services and facilities (PS-18)



# Interjurisdictional Coordination

- Military Installations (JP-7)
- Tribes (JP-8, PS-8)
- School Districts (PS-21)




Source: VISION 2050

# Climate Change


- New Subchapter: Climate Change
- Updated chapter goal
- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency GHG Goals (CC-1)
- Transportation System (TR-16)
- Renewable and alternative energy (PS-12)

Figure 21 – Sources of Regional Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emissions



Source: Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

Figure 20 – Sources of Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions




Source: Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

Sources: VISION 2050

# Displacement


- Add a displacement risk assessment to HO-5 Report (HO-5)
- New Polices:
  - Marginalized residents and businesses (DP-39)
  - Develop and implement strategies (HO-15)
  - Business displacement (ED-18)



Source: <https://www.psrc.org/displacement-risk-mapping>

# Land Use


- Urban Growth Areas (DP-1, DP-2, and DP-3)
- Transit Supportive and Oriented Development (DP-17, DP-18, DP-35, TR-4)
- Manage and reduce rural growth (DP-26)
- Moderate Density Housing (HO-4)
- Implement the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan (Env-3)



Source: VISION 2050



DISCLAIMER: Candidate Centers were identified based on activity unit density, mixed use zoning/planning classification, and approximate location relative to Community Transit Core Transit Emphasis Corridors or high-capacity transit stations. Center identification is also subject to other criteria. Boundaries shown on the map reflect existing mixed use zoning and are likely to change.



■ Candidate Centers Mixed Use Designations  
■ Major Roads  
■ Rays  
■ Flats (fill)  
■ Lake or pond  
■ Sand or gravel in open water  
■ Stream  
■ Incorporated Cities  
■ Urban Growth Area Boundary

0 250,000 500,000 750,000 1,000,000 Feet  
 \snooig\p\g\pds\_eng\ArcGIS\SnoCo\_Eng\_Base\SnoCoBase\_v10.mxd

# Appendices

- Appendix D - Update Reasonable Measures Process
  - In response to E2SSB-5254
- New Appendix I – Centers
  - Introduce Countywide Centers



Snohomish County

# Two Recommendations:

- July 28, 2021 Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee recommendation
  - Includes a new JP-3 – addressing annexation issues
- County Executive recommendation
  - Does not include SCT recommended JP-3



# Questions?

Mitchell Brouse

Senior Planner

Planning & Development Services

[mitchell.brouse@snoco.org](mailto:mitchell.brouse@snoco.org)

(425) 388-5127



Snohomish County



# **MARSHLAND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT**

P.O. Box 85 · Snohomish, WA 98291-0085  
360-568-6044 · [marshlandfloodcontrol@gmail.com](mailto:marshlandfloodcontrol@gmail.com)

August 25, 2021

**Snohomish County Council**  
3000 Rockefeller M/S  
Everett WA 98201


**Re: Marshland Opposition to CPP J-3 from the SnoCo Tomorrow Steering Committee**

Dear County Council:


As the three elected Commissioners of the Marshland Flood Control District, we have already sent you copies of two previous letters we have signed; one to the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee (SCTSC) and a second to County Executive Dave Somers. We have also received copies of letters from other agencies supporting our opposition to CPP J-3. Therefore, we need not repeat prior arguments.


We do, however, want to provide an update on our understanding of the current situation. We understand that Executive Somers will supply you with two options for a County Ordinance covering this and other issues at your August 31 meeting. One version will retain the CPP J-3 language adopted by the SCTSC. The second version will entirely delete the CPP J-3 language. Marshland requests that, on whatever date you set this matter for hearing on August 31, you adopt the second Ordinance version and reject the CPP J-3 language.

Sincerely,

  
Don Bailey  
Marshland Chairperson

Marv Thomas  
Marshland Commissioner



  
Tim Stocker  
Marshland Commissioner



THOMAS FAMILY FARM  
PO BOX 1697  
SNOHOMISH WA 98291-1697  
(P) 360-568-6945  
[Marv.t@thomsfamilyfarm.com](mailto:Marv.t@thomsfamilyfarm.com)

August 27, 2021

Re: Ag Board Unanimous Opposition to Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee CPP J-3

Dear County Council:

On behalf of the County Agriculture Board, and as its current Chairperson, I have been authorized to contact each of you. At an in-person monthly meeting on August 10, 2021, the Board voted unanimously to oppose CPP J-3 which the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee (SCTSC) adopted on July 28, 2021. The Ag Board respectfully requests that the County Council oppose it too.

This J-3 proposal was drafted by the City of Snohomish to appeal to a "local control" theme which resonated with cities and towns within the County. The argument was that, after an annexation, cities and towns should have local control of their newly-annexed areas and not be subject to County Interlocal Agreement provisions which require some County policies to continue in these newly annexed areas. The City of Snohomish proposed this J-3 language because it wishes to annex the Harvey Airport and the Airport wishes to avoid County floodplain regulations.

More specifically, the County has "Density Fringe" regulations which mitigate obstruction of floodwaters. SCC 30.65.250-.265 provide that uses which displace floodwaters may not exceed 2% of lot area and a use's width, perpendicular to floodwater flow, may not exceed 15% of lot area. The Airport desires to evade these provisions.

The Ag Board is interested in and concerned about this "Density Fringe" issue because, as you are all aware, the vast majority of remaining agricultural land in Snohomish County is in or abutting floodplain. Any policies which obstruct the flow of floodwater across agricultural land could result in greater erosion and increase the amount of time that floodwaters inundate fields, delaying the ability to prepare the soil for planting.

Further, other infrastructure is also adversely affected. Roadbeds cannot bear the weight of vehicles, especially school busses and semi-trucks transporting groceries and other essential supplies. Railroad beds are similarly compromised. Arterial traffic for commuting to and from work is also stymied.

Floodwaters don't recognize paper map boundaries between the County and its cities and towns. Floodplain management is not a "local issue." It is a County-wide issue. Please reject J-3.

Sincerely,

Marv Thomas, Chairperson  
Snohomish County Agriculture Board

## Eco, Debbie

---

**From:** Mike Pattison <mpattison@MBAKS.COM>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 30, 2021 2:49 PM  
**To:** Eco, Debbie; Countryman, Ryan  
**Subject:** CPP Comments  
**Attachments:** CPP Comment Letter 3-8-21.docx; Snohomish County CPP update comments by MBAKS.docx

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Dear Snohomish County Council,

Attached please find comments related to the Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) discussion currently before you. These comments were previously submitted to Snohomish County Tomorrow but we are unclear as to whether or not SCT provided you with these comments in their CPP transmittal.

Thank you,

Mike Pattison



**Mike Pattison** | Senior Snohomish County Manager

p 425.460.8203  
335 116<sup>th</sup> Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA 98004

[mbaks.com](http://mbaks.com) Find us on    

We aspire to be the most trusted and respected housing experts in the Puget Sound region.



March 8, 2021

Mitchell Brouse  
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue  
Everett, WA 98201

Re: MBAKS Comments on Draft Countywide Planning Policies

Dear Mr. Brouse,

Submitted with this cover letter please find comments from the Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties (MBAKS) regarding the proposed language updating the Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies.

MBAKS is a regular stakeholder in Snohomish County land use policy and development regulation issues with a strong interest in the CPP's and ensuing Comprehensive Plan Update. Our organization of approximately 2800 member companies represents many companies located in and doing business in Snohomish County.

Thank you for your consideration of our submitted comments.

*Mike Pattison*

Mike Pattison  
Snohomish County Manager

Attachment



Chapter	Policy Change	Comments
Central Principles and Framework Policies	GF-6 (page 3) – adds employment to allocations for UGAs, changes the “at least 90 percent” provision for urban areas to “assigning Snohomish County’s growth <i>first and foremost</i> ” to urban areas.	<p>This is more accurate in terms of Vision 2050. However, it is important the County ultimately adopt a realistic growth target that will be achieved, rather than an unrealistic target simply to be able to say you are consistent with Vision.</p> <p>Adopting an unrealistic growth target has real consequences including impacts to County transportation systems, utility providers, and schools.</p> <p>Amended policy works and will keep the County moving towards Vision without requiring a specific target.</p>
Development Patterns	DP-7 (page 5) – adds jobs-housing balance reference	<p>We appreciate that DP-7 has added jobs-housing balance to this policy.</p> <p>However, there does not appear to be anywhere in this chapter or in others stating how the county or cities achieve or work toward a jobs-housing balance – what are the consequences for development that exacerbates it?</p> <p>The focus seems to be adopting growth targets consistent with Vision 2050 even if those targets led to a jobs-housing imbalance.</p> <p>We believe this issue needs to be addressed further. Growth targets should certainly continue to head towards Vision, but jobs-housing balance must also be considered when making these decisions. E ask that you please revise policies accordingly.</p>
	DP-9 (page 6) – adds language that jurisdictions that have designated regional growth	Stronger language connecting the share of population and employment growth with the

	<p>centers and manufacturing and industrial centers shall <i>“direct a significant share of population and employment growth to those areas through the provision of”</i> land use policies and infrastructure investments that support growth levels consistent with the regional vision.</p>	<p>types of policies and investments jurisdictions must make is on point. It is still unclear, however, how it will be handled if population allocations in Vision do not align with where jobs are projected.</p> <p>We would also like to see stronger policy ties to the housing element here to ensure cities and the county adopt development regulations consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(2). This will ensure that when cities become centers, they are required to plan for and implement zoning that provides for a variety of housing types for all income levels near jobs. This is not occurring right now in all jurisdictions and it must be a requirement for DP-9 and Housing policies to be implemented properly.</p>
	<p>DP-14 (page 7) – add language stating, <i>“The County and cities should promote and focus new compact urban growth in <del>((urban centers))</del>local centers, countywide centers, regional centers, and transit emphasis corridors.”</i></p>	<p>We suggest that this should be a shall policy. You should not have a designated center unless you are going to focus growth in that area.</p> <p>In addition, please add additional language to the end of this policy that states:</p> <p><i>“Focused growth shall be implemented with zoning and development regulations that encourages a variety of housing types for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.”</i></p> <p>This addition would implement GMA housing element requirements.</p>
	<p>DP-15 (page 7) – adds language specifically referencing underutilized lands (consistent with MPP-DP-4 in Vision 2050)</p>	<p>This is very broad language. We believe this policy should be turned from a should to a shall policy. RCW 36.70A.110(1)</p>

		<p>states "Each county that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall designate an urban growth area or areas within which urban growth shall be encouraged."</p> <p>For this policy shall needs to be applied to the portions of the policy referring to policies and development regulations. Design guidelines is not a requirement.</p>
	<p>DP-31 (page 11) – "Jurisdictions should minimize the adverse impacts on resource lands and critical areas from new developments <u>through the use of environmentally sensitive development and land use practices.</u>"</p>	<p>This additional language should be removed. What is environmentally sensitive development? What are land use practices?</p> <p>Implementing land use and environmental regulations is already a requirement and it is redundant to repeat.</p>
	<p>NEW Policy 3 and 4 (page 12) – to seek to reduce disparities in access to opportunity for all residents</p>	<p>Thank you for including these new policies. We will be interested in discussing measures to implement these policies that will not in turn increase the cost of housing for current and future residents.</p>
<p>Housing</p>	<p>Goal (page 1) – language updated with fair housing, inclusion, and equity as key part of overall housing goal</p>	<p>We appreciate that this goal has been added. We ask that the housing types discussed in the Goal mirror the housing types that are required to be planned for in every jurisdiction pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070(2).</p> <p>Further, we appreciate that jobs-housing balance be included. However, it is still unclear how this will be implemented. It is vitally important that the county not only look at jobs-housing balance in the county but where people living in Snohomish County are going for jobs. As an example, Amazon alone is adding 25k new jobs in Bellevue. This must be considered as growth targets are discussed or jobs-housing imbalance will continue to occur.</p>

	<p>HO-3 (page 2) – updates policy to reference vision 2050, regional growth strategy, and growth targets as well as income classifications are considered when considering fair share of affordable housing</p>	<p>We're glad that regional fair share is part of the CPPs and that income classification is a big part of making sure there is provision at a county-wide level for housing for people at all income levels. We are curious how this will be implemented – is a regional fair share discussion part of the SCT work program? Further explanation is needed here.</p> <p>Also, we suggest that the policy statement that "jurisdictions should demonstrate within their land use and housing elements that they can accommodate [...]” be a <b>shall</b> statement since it deals with providing housing for all economic segments of the population, which is an explicit requirement of 36.70A.070(2).</p> <p>Lastly, there is consistent language in the CPPs referring to Vision and PSRC work. This is important. However, there is almost no reference to the GMA requirements for land use and housing.</p>
	<p>HO-5</p>	<p>This policy should be expanded to outline what happens if housing goals are not being met. This report provides information but does not require any action. If the county is going to spend money on collecting this information, then solving the issues identified, if any (including jobs-housing imbalance) must be addressed.</p>
	<p>HO-6 (page 3) – adding language on housing affordable to all income levels</p>	<p>The new language is very positive. However, the phrasing “encourage the upgrading of neighborhoods” is unclear. What exactly does this mean? This portion of the policy could be deleted without changing the main thrust of the text about rehabilitation and preservation</p>



		of affordable housing for all income levels.
	HO-9 (page 4) – language added to reference employment opportunities in proximity to existing <i>and planned</i> residential communities	Perhaps DP-7 could reference this policy, so they are connected.  We appreciate the changes in b. have been made. We believe it is imperative that assigned growth targets move towards Vision 2050. However, there must be alignment regarding where population is allocated and where jobs are planned. This study must extend beyond county borders so that housing is located closer to where we know jobs will be located.
	HO-10 (page 4) – adds language on sustainable construction in addition to environmentally sensitive land development practices, including that it should also consider the potential costs and benefits to balance affordability and sustainability	We appreciate these revisions. We ask that the terms “and environmentally sustainable building techniques and materials be removed” as these terms are undefined. If this is removed you have a solid policy that seeks to balance the environment but recognizes the costs added when new regulations are employed.
	HO-14 (page 4) – adds language directing jurisdictions to promote both the development and preservation of long-term affordable housing	Does Appendix G contain a definition of “long-term” affordable housing? Some extra specificity there might be helpful. In addition, while HO-5 calls for an evaluation of the risk of displacement for housing characteristics and needs overall, you may want to add language here stating that an analysis of displacement risk should be considered as part of development of long-term affordable housing
	HO-15 (page 5) – new policy: county and cities should implement policies that allow for the development of moderate density housing (missing middle)	Wonderful to see this in here. Thank you. We do believe this needs to be a shall policy given this is required under the GMA. Please consider.  ADUs can also be part of “missing middle” housing, perhaps that can be added to

		the definition in Appendix G or this policy in some way.
	HO-16 (page 5) – policy requires anti-displacement strategies	We ask that this policy be clarified to make it clear that new anti-displacement policies and regulations should not add to the overall cost of housing.
Economic Development	ED-3 (page 2) – deleted “containing an adequate supply of affordable housing as appropriate” and replaced with text emphasizing economic development of multi-modal linkage between centers	You didn’t delete that language at the end of ED-4. Should these be consistent with each other? Seems like multi-modal linkages should be especially emphasized between centers and residential areas that are more affordable.
	NEW ED-2 (page 5) – new policy on mitigating displacement of locally owned, small businesses	This is relevant to mitigating displacement of housing as well – connection could be made to housing element to make sure displacement mitigation efforts address both businesses and where their workforce can afford to live.
Transportation	NEW policy (page 12) – new policy stating arterial capacity improvements that encourage rural growth should be avoided with provisions for when increased arterial capacity is warranted	This is potentially problematic because it a) could limit arterial improvements to provide additional multi-modal (like commuter bus) capacity, and b) by reference to “efficient travel <i>through</i> UGAs” neglects the role that travel <i>between</i> UGAs on major commute routes plays in lengthening commutes and making a jobs-housing balance harder to achieve.
Natural Environment and Climate Change	NEW Env Policy 2 (page 2) – new policy connecting stormwater impacts and land development and redevelopment	This policy is redundant to regulations already in place and is not needed. If this is going to be retained, the policy must be restated to highlight that regulations, beyond those already required, must balance the need to provide housing that is affordable.
	CC-1 (page3) – this revised policy would require emissions reductions	While the policy is worthy, what action will the county and cities take if the growth targets under Vision will not actually reach these goals? Given that so many people commute to Bellevue and Seattle we believe that there could be conflicts between these worthy goals and some of the

		actions to implement Vision. How will this be trued up?
	<p>CC-3 (page 3) – added language to identify specific options or examples a jurisdiction could take, including retrofit of existing buildings, expansion of alternative/clean energy within the public and private sector, and use of environmentally sustainable building techniques and materials</p>	<p>We appreciate this policy but are concerned that there is no link between these actions and the cost to build housing. This policy must include language stating that implemented techniques shall not increase the cost to build housing.</p> <p>We un understand this is a very difficult issue but there is a big disconnect. We talk about the need to provide housing that is affordable for people at all income levels but at the same time we are also promoting new regulations and requirements that will increase the cost to provide housing. How is this being reconciled?</p>

---

**From:** Barb Bailey <barbarabailey55@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 18, 2021 2:24 PM  
**To:** Contact Council; Somers, Dave J; Parks, Eric  
**Subject:** Public Testimony for Hearing on Sept. 29, 2021 - Ordinance No. 21-059 re CPP JP-3  
**Attachments:** Ag Board Opposition to CPP JP-3.pdf; Marshland Flood Control District Opposition to CPP JP-3.pdf; Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy opposition to CPP JP-3.pdf

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

September 18, 2021

Snohomish County Council  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 609  
Everett, WA 98201

Re: Countywide Planning Policy JP-3 relating to floodplain concerns with potential annexation of Harvey Airfield in the South Snohomish Urban Growth Area.

Dear Council Members,

Our 5<sup>th</sup> generation family farm is just south of Harvey Airfield in Snohomish. We have experienced frequent and severe flooding along with Harvey Airfield and the Sea-Sno Mill over the past 60 years or so. We are concerned that the adoption of JP-3 would allow the City of Snohomish to change the current FEMA floodplain designation of Density Fringe upon annexation.

For the protection of life and property, the most important function of the floodplain is to convey floodwaters without much obstruction. Retaining the Density Fringe floodplain designation is critical for the floodplain safety for all of us.

We appreciate Executive Somer's opposition to CPP JP-3 and urge you to vote for his recommendation to remove Joint Planning CPP JP-3 from the proposed CPP update.

As fellow farmers, we appreciate Snohomish County Ag Board's opposition to CPP JP-3.

As residents within the 6,000 acre area of the Marshland Flood Control District, we appreciate the Marshland Commissioners' opposition to CPP JP-3.

We appreciate Daryl Williams and Linda Lyshall of Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy and their opposition to CPP JP-3.

I urge you to vote for Executive Somer's recommended Ordinance No. 21-059 at the Public Hearing on September 29, 2021.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara Bailey

12711 Springhetti Rd.  
Snohomish, WA 98296  
360-568-8826

Cc: County Executive Dave Somers

Enc: Letters from Snohomish County Ag Board, Marshland Flood Control District, and Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy



THOMAS FAMILY FARM  
PO BOX 1697  
SNOHOMISH WA 98291-1697  
(P) 360-568-6945  
[Marv.t@thomfamilyfarm.com](mailto:Marv.t@thomfamilyfarm.com)

August 27, 2021

Re: Ag Board Unanimous Opposition to Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee CPP J-3

Dear County Council:

On behalf of the County Agriculture Board, and as its current Chairperson, I have been authorized to contact each of you. At an in-person monthly meeting on August 10, 2021, the Board voted unanimously to oppose CPP J-3 which the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee (SCTSC) adopted on July 28, 2021. The Ag Board respectfully requests that the County Council oppose it too.

This J-3 proposal was drafted by the City of Snohomish to appeal to a "local control" theme which resonated with cities and towns within the County. The argument was that, after an annexation, cities and towns should have local control of their newly-annexed areas and not be subject to County Interlocal Agreement provisions which require some County policies to continue in these newly annexed areas. The City of Snohomish proposed this J-3 language because it wishes to annex the Harvey Airport and the Airport wishes to avoid County floodplain regulations.

More specifically, the County has "Density Fringe" regulations which mitigate obstruction of floodwaters. SCC 30.65.250-.265 provide that uses which displace floodwaters may not exceed 2% of lot area and a use's width, perpendicular to floodwater flow, may not exceed 15% of lot area. The Airport desires to evade these provisions.

The Ag Board is interested in and concerned about this "Density Fringe" issue because, as you are all aware, the vast majority of remaining agricultural land in Snohomish County is in or abutting floodplain. Any policies which obstruct the flow of floodwater across agricultural land could result in greater erosion and increase the amount of time that floodwaters inundate fields, delaying the ability to prepare the soil for planting.

Further, other infrastructure is also adversely affected. Roadbeds cannot bear the weight of vehicles, especially school busses and semi-trucks transporting groceries and other essential supplies. Railroad beds are similarly compromised. Arterial traffic for commuting to and from work is also stymied.

Floodwaters don't recognize paper map boundaries between the County and its cities and towns. Floodplain management is not a "local issue." It is a County-wide issue. Please reject J-3.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Marv Thomas'.

Marv Thomas, Chairperson  
Snohomish County Agriculture Board

# **MARSHLAND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT**

P.O. Box 85 · Snohomish, WA 98291-0085  
360-568-6044 · [marshlandfloodcontrol@gmail.com](mailto:marshlandfloodcontrol@gmail.com)

July 26, 2021

## ***Re: Objection to the Flood Obstruction Consequences of PAC's JP-3 Recommendation***

Dear Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee:

We are the three elected Commissioners of the Marshland Flood Control District. Marshland is a 6,000 acre special purpose district authorized under RCW Chapters 86.09 and 85.38, operating to drain and dike floodplain property for agriculture. Marshland is located between Everett and Snohomish on the south shore of the Snohomish River. Within Marshland's borders are the former Seattle-Snohomish Lumber Mill Site and the Harvey Airport, both of which the City of Snohomish has expressed an interest in annexing. We write to you to express that, while Marshland does not oppose annexation, it does oppose the JP-3 Countywide Planning Policy language as proposed by the City of Snohomish and recommended by the PAC. We would like to explain why.

The PAC recommended JP-3 language was proposed by the City of Snohomish. It includes words like the following:

...recognizing that local governments retain ultimate authority for land use and development decisions within their respective jurisdictions ....

and

... acknowledge the city's/town's land use authority over newly annexed areas.

The "soundbite" Snohomish is using is "local control." It sounds appealing by putting the County in a "big brother" posture. After all, why should the County "bully" cities and towns into adopting some County policies and regulations as a condition of annexation? But, as the late conservative broadcast journalist Paul Harvey used to point out, "The Rest of the Story" may shed a different light on things.

In this case, Marshland has supported the annexation desires of Snohomish, Mr. Waltz, owner of the Sea-Sno Mill Site and Ms. Harvey, owner of the Airport. County zoning of the Sea-Sno Mill Site, in particular, was very restrictive and Marshland has supported the desire to allow many other commercial purposes. And when that expansion of zoning uses was approved by the County Council on November 13, 2019, the City of Snohomish expressly agreed that the "Density Fringe" category would continue to apply to the properties sought to be annexed – precisely because those properties are in the floodplain. In fact, the Snohomish River at Snohomish is at one of its narrowest widths. Mayor Kartak himself referred to it as a "bottleneck" at the 11/13/19 hearing. Accordingly, both properties, but for the special "Density Fringe" category, would be part of the 100-year base flood "Floodway".

Recently, however, the City of Snohomish and the Harvey Airport have decided to try and have the Airport property re-categorized. Why? Because the "Density Fringe" rules require that uses and structures not obstruct floodwater; i.e. that uses which displace floodwaters may not exceed two (2) percent of lot area, and a use's width, perpendicular to floodwater flow, may not exceed fifteen (15) percent of lot area. SCC 30.65.250-.265. Since new uses and structures like airplane hangers, would violate these 2%/15% rules, the Airport and Snohomish do not want to be bound by them. And that, as Paul Harvey would say, is "The Rest of the Story."

Ignoring the impact to Marshland of obstructing floodwater at the Airport is not good policy. The Airport is upstream of most of Marshland, including major arterials like Hwy 9, Hwy 96, Seattle Hill Road, Marsh Road and Lowell-Snohomish River Road. Therefore, floodwater downstream from the Airport will be higher, run faster and create greater damage if obstructed by new uses and/or structures at the Airport. And if Snohomish unilaterally reclassified the Airport, the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) might threaten to disqualify the entire County from Federal Flood Insurance, as it has done in the past for lesser failures to enforce its directives.

Moreover, the Airport and City of Snohomish philosophy is the exact opposite of how all the Snohomish River diking, drainage and flood control districts have treated each other for the past 30 years. No district may have dikes higher than any other. That way, if anyone gets wet, everyone gets wet. But, more importantly, there have been no major dike breaches, so damages have been far less than in the past.

Marshland cannot speak to the necessity of each policy the County requires towns and cities adopt as a condition of annexation. But it can speak to the fact that the "Density Fringe" category for floodplains in this County is critical to all floodplain property, whether within the County or city/town limits. Floodwaters don't recognize the borders between the County and its cities and towns.

Sincerely,

Don Bailey, MFCD Chairperson

Marv Thomas, MFCD Commissioner

Tim Stocker, MFCD Commissioner

cc: Snohomish County Council  
Snohomish County Agriculture Board  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Snohomish Conservation District  
Coordinated Diking Council  
Surface Water Management  
Snohomish County Public Works  
Washington State Department of Transportation





## Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy

[www.farmfishflood.org](http://www.farmfishflood.org)

*Setting the table to develop understanding, relationships, and strategies to create and achieve a shared vision and beneficial outcomes for our watersheds.*

August 13, 2021

Snohomish County Executive Dave Somers  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 407  
Everett, WA 98201

RE: Opposition to CPP J-3 concerning annexation of Harvey Field and the former Seattle-Snohomish Mill site by the City of Snohomish.

Dear County Executive Somers,

The Sustainable Lands Strategy (SLS) is concerned about the proposed annexation of Harvey Field and the Seattle-Snohomish Mill site by the City of Snohomish. Harvey Field and the mill site are within the Snohomish River floodway and further development of new structures within the floodway should not be allowed.

One of the purposes of a city is to concentrate development into a small area and to help protect the rural character outside of the cities and their associated urban growth boundaries. Floodway areas should not be annexed into cities. These areas need to be protected from city types of development, to help limit damage to private development from flooding and to protect fish and wildlife habitats.

Snohomish County has worked with the Federal Emergency Management Agency to reduce the number of structures existing within the Snohomish River floodways and should continue to do so. Millions of taxpayer dollars are spent every year in this State to help people recover from flood damages. By reducing the number of structures that may be impacted by flood events, we also reduce the future need for taxpayer funding to cover those costs.

New development may also increase the impacts from flooding on neighboring communities. New structures may displace areas that water can spread to, causing an increase in flood levels around the developments.

For these reasons it would be inappropriate to annex floodway properties into a City. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely yours,

Linda Lyshall  
Co-Chair SLS

Daryl Williams  
Co-Chair SLS

cc: Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee and Snohomish County Council

SEP 28 2021

Don and Barbara Bailey  
12711 Springhetti Road  
Snohomish, WA 98296  
360-568-8826

EXHIBIT # 3.3.5

FILE ORD 21-059

CC'D TO	CF	
JLM	DIST 1	GOT
JDG	DIST 2	DLE
YSW	DIST 3	ALC
HCB	DIST 4	ELL
NAG	DIST 5	CM

September 18, 2021

Snohomish County Council  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 609  
Everett, WA 98201

Re: Countywide Planning Policy JP-3 relating to floodplain concerns with potential annexation of Harvey Airfield in the South Snohomish Urban Growth Area.

Dear Council Members,

Our 5<sup>th</sup> generation family farm is just south of Harvey Airfield in Snohomish. We have experienced frequent and severe flooding along with Harvey Airfield and the Sea-Sno Mill over the past 60 years or so. We are concerned that the adoption of JP-3 would allow the City of Snohomish to change the current FEMA floodplain designation of Density Fringe upon annexation.

For the protection of life and property, the most important function of the floodplain is to convey floodwaters without much obstruction. Retaining the Density Fringe floodplain designation is critical for the floodplain safety for all of us.

We appreciate Executive Somer's opposition to CPP JP-3 and urge you to vote for his recommendation to remove Joint Planning CPP JP-3 from the proposed CPP update.

As fellow farmers, we appreciate Snohomish County Ag Board's opposition to CPP JP-3.

As residents within the 6,000 acre area of the Marshland Flood Control District, we appreciate the Marshland Commissioners opposition to CPP JP-3.

We appreciate Daryl Williams and Linda Lyshall of Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy and their opposition to CPP JP-3.

I urge you to vote for Executive Somer's recommended Ordinance No. 21-059 at the Public Hearing on September 29, 2021.

Thank you for your consideration.

  
Barbara Bailey

Cc: County Executive Dave Somers  
Enc: Letters from Snohomish County Ag Board, Marshland Flood Control District, and Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy

Written testimony for  
Public Hearing  
Sept 29, 2021  
Ord 21-059



THOMAS FAMILY FARM  
PO BOX 1697  
SNOHOMISH WA 98291-1697  
(P) 360-568-6945  
[Marv.t@thomsfamilyfarm.com](mailto:Marv.t@thomsfamilyfarm.com)

August 27, 2021

Re: Ag Board Unanimous Opposition to Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee CPP J-3

Dear County Council:

On behalf of the County Agriculture Board, and as its current Chairperson, I have been authorized to contact each of you. At an in-person monthly meeting on August 10, 2021, the Board voted unanimously to oppose CPP J-3 which the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee (SCTSC) adopted on July 28, 2021. The Ag Board respectfully requests that the County Council oppose it too.

This J-3 proposal was drafted by the City of Snohomish to appeal to a "local control" theme which resonated with cities and towns within the County. The argument was that, after an annexation, cities and towns should have local control of their newly-annexed **areas** and not be subject to County Interlocal Agreement provisions which require **some** County policies to continue in these newly annexed areas. The City of Snohomish proposed this J-3 language because it wishes to annex the Harvey Airport and the Airport wishes to avoid County floodplain regulations.

More specifically, the County has "Density Fringe" regulations which mitigate obstruction of floodwaters. SCC 30.65.250-.265 provide that **uses** which displace floodwaters may not exceed 2% of lot **area** and a use's width, perpendicular to floodwater flow, may not exceed 15% of lot area. The Airport desires to evade these provisions.

The Ag Board is interested in and concerned about this "Density Fringe" issue because, as you **are** all **aware**, the vast majority of remaining agricultural land in Snohomish County is in or abutting floodplain. Any policies which obstruct the flow of floodwater **across** agricultural land could result in greater erosion and increase the amount of time that floodwaters inundate fields, delaying the ability to prepare the soil for planting.

Further, other infrastructure is also adversely affected. Roadbeds cannot bear the weight of vehicles, especially school busses and semi-trucks transporting groceries and other essential supplies. Railroad beds are similarly compromised. Arterial traffic for commuting to and from work is also stymied.

Floodwaters don't recognize paper map boundaries between the County and its cities and towns. Floodplain management is not a "local issue." It is a County-wide issue. Please reject J-3.

Sincerely,

Marv Thomas, Chairperson  
Snohomish County Agriculture Board

# **MARSHLAND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT**

P.O. Box 85 · Snohomish, WA 98291-0085  
360-568-6044 · [marshlandfloodcontrol@gmail.com](mailto:marshlandfloodcontrol@gmail.com)

July 26, 2021

## ***Re: Objection to the Flood Obstruction Consequences of PAC's JP-3 Recommendation***

Dear Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee:

We are the three elected Commissioners of the Marshland Flood Control District. Marshland is a 6,000 acre special purpose district authorized under RCW Chapters 86.09 and 85.38, operating to drain and dike floodplain property for agriculture. Marshland is located between Everett and Snohomish on the south shore of the Snohomish River. Within Marshland's borders are the former Seattle-Snohomish Lumber Mill Site and the Harvey Airport, both of which the City of Snohomish has expressed an interest in annexing. We write to you to express that, while Marshland does not oppose annexation, it does oppose the JP-3 Countywide Planning Policy language as proposed by the City of Snohomish and recommended by the PAC. We would like to explain why.

The PAC recommended JP-3 language was proposed by the City of Snohomish. It includes words like the following:

...recognizing that local governments retain ultimate authority for land use and development decisions within their respective jurisdictions ....

and

... acknowledge the city's/town's land use authority over newly annexed areas.

The "soundbite" Snohomish is using is "local control." It sounds appealing by putting the County in a "big brother" posture. After all, why should the County "bully" cities and towns into adopting some County policies and regulations as a condition of annexation? But, as the late conservative broadcast journalist Paul Harvey used to point out, "The Rest of the Story" may shed a different light on things.

In this case, Marshland has supported the annexation desires of Snohomish, Mr. Waltz, owner of the Sea-Sno Mill Site and Ms. Harvey, owner of the Airport. County zoning of the Sea-Sno Mill Site, in particular, was very restrictive and Marshland has supported the desire to allow many other commercial purposes. And when that expansion of zoning uses was approved by the County Council on November 13, 2019, the City of Snohomish expressly agreed that the "Density Fringe" category would continue to apply to the properties sought to be annexed – precisely because those properties are in the floodplain. In fact, the Snohomish River at Snohomish is at one of its narrowest widths. Mayor Kartak himself referred to it as a "bottleneck" at the 11/13/19 hearing. Accordingly, both properties, but for the special "Density Fringe" category, would be part of the 100-year base flood "Floodway".

Recently, however, the City of Snohomish and the Harvey Airport have decided to try and have the Airport property re-categorized. Why? Because the "Density Fringe" rules require that uses and structures not obstruct floodwater; i.e. that uses which displace floodwaters may not exceed two (2) percent of lot area, and a use's width, perpendicular to floodwater flow, may not exceed fifteen (15) percent of lot area. SCC 30.65.250-.265. Since new uses and structures like airplane hangers, would violate these 2%/15% rules, the Airport and Snohomish do not want to be bound by them. And that, as Paul Harvey would say, is "The Rest of the Story."

Ignoring the impact to Marshland of obstructing floodwater at the Airport is not good policy. The Airport is upstream of most of Marshland, including major arterials like Hwy 9, Hwy 96, Seattle Hill Road, Marsh Road and Lowell-Snohomish River Road. Therefore, floodwater downstream from the Airport will be higher, run faster and create greater damage if obstructed by new uses and/or structures at the Airport. And if Snohomish unilaterally reclassified the Airport, the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) might threaten to disqualify the entire County from Federal Flood Insurance, as it has done in the past for lesser failures to enforce its directives.

Moreover, the Airport and City of Snohomish philosophy is the exact opposite of how all the Snohomish River diking, drainage and flood control districts have treated each other for the past 30 years. No district may have dikes higher than any other. That way, if anyone gets wet, everyone gets wet. But, more importantly, there have been no major dike breaches, so damages have been far less than in the past.

Marshland cannot speak to the necessity of each policy the County requires towns and cities adopt as a condition of annexation. But it can speak to the fact that the "Density Fringe" category for floodplains in this County is critical to all floodplain property, whether within the County or city/town limits. Floodwaters don't recognize the borders between the County and its cities and towns.

Sincerely,

Don Bailey, MFCD Chairperson

Marv Thomas, MFCD Commissioner

Tim Stocker, MFCD Commissioner

cc: Snohomish County Council  
Snohomish County Agriculture Board  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Snohomish Conservation District  
Coordinated Diking Council  
Surface Water Management  
Snohomish County Public Works  
Washington State Department of Transportation



## Snohomish County Sustainable Lands Strategy

[www.farmfishflood.org](http://www.farmfishflood.org)

*Setting the table to develop understanding, relationships, and strategies to create and achieve a shared vision and beneficial outcomes for our watersheds.*

August 13, 2021

Snohomish County Executive Dave Somers  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 407  
Everett, WA 98201

RE: Opposition to CPP J-3 concerning annexation of Harvey Field and the former Seattle-Snohomish Mill site by the City of Snohomish.

Dear County Executive Somers,

The Sustainable Lands Strategy (SLS) is concerned about the proposed annexation of Harvey Field and the Seattle-Snohomish Mill site by the City of Snohomish. Harvey Field and the mill site are within the Snohomish River floodway and further development of new structures within the floodway should not be allowed.

One of the purposes of a city is to concentrate development into a small area and to help protect the rural character outside of the cities and their associated urban growth boundaries. Floodway areas should not be annexed into cities. These areas need to be protected from city types of development, to help limit damage to private development from flooding and to protect fish and wildlife habitats.

Snohomish County has worked with the Federal Emergency Management Agency to reduce the number of structures existing within the Snohomish River floodways and should continue to do so. Millions of taxpayer dollars are spent every year in this State to help people recover from flood damages. By reducing the number of structures that may be impacted by flood events, we also reduce the future need for taxpayer funding to cover those costs.

New development may also increase the impacts from flooding on neighboring communities. New structures may displace areas that water can spread to, causing an increase in flood levels around the developments.

For these reasons it would be inappropriate to annex floodway properties into a City. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely yours,

Linda Lyshall  
Co-Chair SLS

Daryl Williams  
Co-Chair SLS

cc: Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee and Snohomish County Council

**From:** Karen Crowley <karenacrowley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 9:32 PM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Countywide planning policies: a note in support of the Futurewise recommendations

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

You have recently received a letter submitted to the Council by Futurewise, detailing a list of recommended changes on the **Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059**. I support these recommendations and urge you to consider them carefully and fully. The policy changes will help increase equity, reduce pollution, protect the environment, protect people and property, and increase affordable housing.

Karen Crowley  
602 Avenue A  
Snohomish, WA 98290

---

**From:** Marjorie Fields <mvfields@me.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 4:27 PM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** County Planning Policies, Ordinance No. 21-059

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL**

**EXHIBIT #** 3.3.7

**FILE** ORD 21-059

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

I am writing in support of the points made in the letter submitted to County Council by Futurwise regarding Planning Ordinance 21-059.

If done properly, the policy changes will encourage responsible and sustainable land use.

Managing the expected population influx will require careful management in order protect quality of life in Snohomish County.

The need for increased urban density must not be met at the expense of tree canopy or healthy watersheds.

Thank you for your work on this important issue.

Marjie Fields



**From:** Nancy Johnson <najohnso@operamail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 10:09 PM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Changes on the Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059.

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Hello Councilmembers,  
Please include the recommended changes submitted by Futurewise on the Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059. The policy changes will help increase equity, reduce pollution, protect the environment, protect people and property, and increase affordable housing."  
Thank you,  
Nancy Johnson  
9411 216th St SW  
Edmonds, WA 98020  
206-371-5499

**From:** Kate Lunceford <kurlykate888@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 7:56 PM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Futurewise Recommended Countywide Planning Policies

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Hiew\$Syrx}\$Syrgrn\$erh\$vejj0  
Mwyttsw\$di\$ixi\$yfq m\$ih\$e\$di\$Syrx}\$Syrgrn\$}\$yxvi{ m\$lex\$igsq q irhw\$lerkiw\$rdi\$Vigsq q irhih:  
Gsyx}\$ mi\$Ternrk\$Tspgniw\$sv\$Vrslsq m1\$Syrx}\$ \$vnrergi\$R s2\$5149=\$Xli\$smg}\$lerkiw\$ m\$lip\$rgviewi:  
iuyx)\$ihygi\$sp\$xs\$C\$vxig\$li\$rzmsrq irx\$C\$vxig\$C\$istp\$erh\$vtiw}\$erh\$rgviewi\$jjsvhefpi\$Ssywark\$  
Glerkiw\$ps\$rgyhi\$

\$

Wmrgivip0  
Oxi\$Pyrgijsvh  
Fsxlip\$ E

--

"Do the best you can until you know better. Then when you know better, do better." Maya Angelou

---

**From:** Carlo Voli <carlovoli@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2021 8:17 PM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Support Futurewise recommendations for Ordinance No. 21-059

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL**

**EXHIBIT #** 3.3.10

**FILE** ORD 21-059

**CAUTION** : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Dear councilmembers,

I fully support the letter submitted to the County Council by Futurewise that recommends changes on the **Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059**. The policy changes will help increase equity, reduce pollution, protect the environment, protect people and property, and increase affordable housing.

I encourage you to also support the recommendations.

Thanking you in advance,

Carlo Voli  
9605 239th St SW  
Edmonds,  
WA 98020

**From:** Nicholas Bratton <nbratton@forterra.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 7:30 PM  
**To:** Contact Council  
**Subject:** comment letter Ordinance 21-059  
**Attachments:** Forterra CPP comment letter 9-28-21.pdf

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Dear members of Snohomish County Council, please find attached Forterra’s comments in support of Ordinance 21-059 in advance of the 9/29 hearing on the CPP updates. Thank you for considering our input.

Nick

**Nicholas Bratton**

**Senior Director of Policy**

**Forterra | Land for Good**

**T** 206-905-6941 | **M** 206-491-5335 | **W** [forterra.org](http://forterra.org)

*Pronouns: he, him, his*

---

Want to experience Forterra's work? [Take a virtual or self-guided tour.](#)

September 28, 2021

Dear Council Chair Wright and Council Members Nehring, Dunn, Mead, and Low:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on ordinance 21-059 updating the County-wide Planning Policies (CPPs). Forterra supports these updates and recognizes the work of the stakeholders, county staff, and Snohomish County Tomorrow in preparing a suite of revisions that integrates the regional growth strategy and improves equitable outcomes through land use policy.

Of the many policies we support, a few highlights include:

- DP-37 through DP-40, which prioritize equitable planning, including the topics of tribal lands, treaty rights, and displacement;
- HO-1, 2, and 4, which promote a wider range of housing options and affordability;
- Env-5, which prioritizes a collaborative approach to protect open space, natural resource lands, and critical areas. These lands are essential to environmental and human health on a countywide scale.

Forterra also supports the growth targets as proposed in Appendix B. Snohomish County is and will continue to be an attractive place to live and do business. In anticipation of the projected growth through the planning horizon of 2035, our urban spaces play an important role in achieving a sustainable future, both for the county and for the region. Planning for more growth in those areas while continuing to pursue resource land conservation will help to ensure a future that supports a diverse economy, is resilient to climate change, and creates more equitable access to housing and commerce. Thank you for your thoroughness so far and we look forward to further engagement as the comprehensive plan update process continues.

Sincerely,



Nicholas Bratton  
Senior Director of Policy

**From:** greg ferguson <gghhff@me.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 10:46 AM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Sustainable land use in Snohomish County

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

I support the letter submitted to the County Council by Futurewise that comments on the Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059.

Let's protect our natural areas.

Cheers  
Greg Ferguson  
Edmonds resident

**From:** Linda Gray <lgn899a@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 11:46 AM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** In support of letter from Futurewise

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Dear Snohomish County Councilmembers - this email is in support of the letter submitted to the County Council by Futurewise that recommends changes on the **Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059**. The policy changes will help increase equity, reduce pollution, protect the environment, protect people and property, and increase affordable housing. Thank you

Linda Gray  
22629-78th Ave SE  
Woodinville, WA 98072

**From:** hilltop.locust@frontier.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 6:35 PM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Countywide Planning Policies

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

I support the letter submitted to the County Council by Futurewise that recommends changes on the **Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059**. The policy changes will help increase equity, reduce pollution, protect the environment, protect people and property, and increase affordable housing."

Sincerely,

Mickie Gundersen  
1126 Lawton Road  
Lynnwood, WA 98036-7122  
425-218-9847



**From:** Tim Trohimovich <Tim@futurewise.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 3:13 PM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Comments on Countywide Planning Policies update  
**Attachments:** FW Comment Let to Sno Cty Council CPP Update Sept 28 2021 Final.pdf

**CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.**

Dear Council Members and Staff:

Enclosed please find Futurewise's comments on the Snohomish County Executive August 18, 2021, Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059. Thank you for considering our comments.

Tim Trohimovich  
Director of Planning & Law  
Futurewise  
816 Second Ave., Suite 200  
Seattle, WA 98104  
tim@futurewise.org  
(206) 343-0681 Ext. 102



816 Second Ave, Suite 200, Seattle, WA 98104  
p. (206) 343-0681  
futurewise.org

September 28, 2021

The Honorable Stephanie Wright, Council Chair  
Snohomish County Council  
Robert J. Drewel Building, Eighth floor  
3000 Rockefeller Ave., M/S 609  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Council Chair Wright and Council Members Nehring, Dunn, Mead, and Low:

**Subject: Comments on the Snohomish County Executive August 18, 2021, Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059**

Send via email: [contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org); [Debbie.Eco@snoco.org](mailto:Debbie.Eco@snoco.org);  
[Mitchell.Brouse@snoco.org](mailto:Mitchell.Brouse@snoco.org)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Snohomish County Executive August 18, 2021, Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County. We support the update to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) and the proposed amendments. We agree the amendments help incorporate VISION 2050 into the CPPs and address important local issues and opportunities. We particularly support the following policies:

- DP-37 which calls on the county and cities to consider the potential impacts of development on culturally significant sites and tribal treaty rights and to protect Tribal Reservation lands from encroachment by incompatible land uses and development.
- DP-38 and DP-40 provide that the county and cities should require equitable planning, zoning, and investments and reduce health disparities.
- PS-18 which provides that the county and cities should work collaboratively to promote equitable access of public services and facilities for all residents, especially those that are historically underserved.
- DP-39 and ED-18 which provide that the county and cities should include measures to reduce and mitigate residential and commercial displacement and HO-5(d) which calls on the county and cities to evaluate the risk of physical and economic displacement of residents, especially low-income households and marginalized populations.
- HO-1, formerly HO-2, which is amended to support additional housing options in single-family neighborhoods to provide for more diverse housing types and choices to meet the various needs of all economic segments of the population.
- HO-2, formerly HO-3, which specifies that the regional fair share targets for affordable housing include housing for very low, low, moderate, and middle-income households and special needs individuals. We also support the amendment to HO-2 which provides that jurisdictions should demonstrate within their land use and housing elements that they can accommodate needed housing.

Snohomish County Council

Re: Comments on the Countywide Planning Policies Update.

September 28, 2021

Page 2

- HO-4 which calls for allowing more moderate density housing.
- HO-15 which provides that Metropolitan cities, Core cities, and High Capacity Transit Communities shall incorporate anti-displacement strategies into local comprehensive and subarea plans to reduce the risk of displacement for historically marginalized populations and neighborhood based small business owners.
- ED-6 which calls on the county and cities to improve access to economic opportunity for residents that historically have low and very low access to opportunity.
- TR-3 which prioritizes investments that support compact, pedestrian- and transit-oriented development.
- TR-4 which provides that the county, cities, Washington State Department of Transportation, and transit agencies shall provide transportation facilities and services necessary to support and implement the regional growth strategy.
- TR-8 which provides that concurrency programs in designated regional, countywide, and local centers, and near high capacity transit facilities should be designed to encourage transit supportive development.
- TR-13 which provides that the county, cities, and transit agencies in the Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA) should collaborate with Sound Transit to ensure planning and right-of-way preservation for the future light-rail phases.
- TR-16 which calls on the county and cities, in cooperation with transit operating agencies and the Washington State Department of Transportation, to plan to reduce transportation emissions that contribute to climate change.
- TR-24 which provides that the county and cities should avoid arterial capacity improvements that encourage rural growth.
- Env-5 which calls on the county and cities to work with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes to identify and protect significant open space areas, natural resources, and critical areas. Many forested areas and critical areas cross jurisdictional boundaries and cooperative planning and regulations are important to maintain these areas and their important natural services such as storm water moderation and flood reduction.
- The Climate Change Policies which call on the county and cities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to plan for climate adaptation and resilience. See proposed CC-1 – CC-7.
- We support Amendment Sheet 2 which will incorporate the current version of the Growth Management Act Planning Goal, RCW 36.70A.020(4), into the Countywide Planning Policies.

The above policies will help increase equity, reduce pollution, protect the environment, protect people and property, and increase affordable housing. We do have some recommendations provided below.

Futurewise works throughout Washington State to support land-use policies that encourage healthy, equitable and opportunity-rich communities, and that protect our most valuable farmlands, forests & water resources. We have members across Washington State including Snohomish County.

## **The County, affected cities, and tribes should adopt interlocal agreements and prepare joint subarea plans. See page 21**

We support new policy JP-7. We recommend that the County, affected cities, and tribes should adopt interlocal agreements and prepare joint subarea plans. These agreements and plans should address usual and accustomed (U and A's) areas and mitigating and adapting to climate change. Our recommended addition is shown below and double underlined.

JP-7 Snohomish County Tomorrow, the County, and cities should coordinate countywide and local planning efforts with tribes, recognizing the shared benefits and impacts of growth occurring within and outside Tribal Reservation lands. The County, affected cities, and tribes should adopt interlocal agreements and prepare joint subarea plans. These agreements and plans should address usual and accustomed (U and A's) areas and mitigating and adapting to climate change.

## **Update DP-2 and DP-3 so they are consistent with the Growth Management Act and VISION 2050. See pages 23 through 26**

The Washington State Supreme Court has held that “a county’s [urban growth area] UGA designation cannot exceed the amount of land necessary to accommodate the urban growth projected by [the State of Washington Office of Financial Management] OFM, plus a reasonable land market supply factor.”<sup>1</sup> “VISION 2050 calls for a stable and sustainable urban growth area into the future, thus any adjustments to the urban growth area in the coming decades should continue to be minor. When adjustments to the urban growth area are considered, it will be important to avoid encroaching on important habitat and natural resource areas.”<sup>2</sup> Multicounty planning policy (MPP)-RGS-5 provides “[e]nsure long-term stability and sustainability of the urban growth area consistent with the regional vision.”<sup>3</sup> MPP-RGS-6 also provides “Encourage efficient use of urban land by optimizing the development potential of existing urban lands and increasing density in the urban growth area in locations consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.”<sup>4</sup> MPP-DP-42 provides “[s]upport the sustainability of designated resource lands. Do not convert these lands to other uses.”<sup>5</sup> The countywide planning policies must be consistent with VISION 2050 and the MPPs.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Thurston Cty. v. W. Washington Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd.*, 164 Wn.2d 329, 352, 190 P.3d 38, 49 (2008).

<sup>2</sup> Puget Sound Regional Council, *VISION 2050: A Plan for the Central Puget Sound Region* p. 24 (Adopted October 2020) last accessed on September 21, 2021 at: <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* p. 43.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* p. 78.

<sup>6</sup> RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.210; *Stickney v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd.*, 11 Wn. App. 2d 228, 246 – 49, 453 P.3d 25, 34 – 36 (2019).

We appreciate and support that the amendments proposed for the countywide planning policies recognize that that VISION 2050 calls for “[m]aintaining stable and sustainable urban growth areas into the future[.]”<sup>7</sup> However, the criteria for UGA expansions in DP-2 and the criteria for UGA swaps in DP-3 do not fully incorporate these concepts and requirements. DP-2(b) allows exceeding the population projection adopted by the county and cities by 15 percent which is inconsistent with the *Thurston County* decision. DP-2 and DP-3 do not require considering whether increasing density in the urban growth areas in locations consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy can substitute for capacity increases as MPP-RGS-6 requires. DP-2 and DP-3 appear to allow the addition of important habitats or natural resource lands of long-term commercial significance to the UGAs which is inconsistent with the regional growth strategy and MPP-DP-42.<sup>8</sup> We recommend the following revisions to DP-2 and DP-3 with our additions double underlined and our deletions double struck through to incorporate these requirements.

DP-2 Ensure long-term stability and sustainability of the urban growth areas consistent with the regional vision in VISION 2050. In those limited circumstances where an adjustment is needed, an ~~An adjustment expansion~~ of the boundary of an individual Urban Growth Area (UGA) that results in a net increase of residential, commercial or industrial land capacity shall not be permitted unless:

- a. The ~~adjustment expansion~~ is supported by a land capacity analysis adopted by the County Council pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110. The land capacity analysis must document why the need for additional capacity cannot be met by increasing densities in the urban growth areas in locations consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy;
- b. The resulting 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;~~
- c. The ~~adjustment expansion~~ otherwise complies with the Growth Management Act, VISION 2050, and multicounty planning policies;
- d. Any UGA ~~adjustment expansion~~ should have the support of affected cities. Prior to issuing a decision on a UGA boundary change, the County shall consult with affected cities and give substantial weight to a city’s position on the matter. If the County Council approves an ~~increase expansion~~ or contraction of a UGA boundary that is not supported by an affected city, it shall include in its findings how the public interest is served by the UGA ~~increase expansion~~ or contraction despite the objection of an affected city; and

<sup>7</sup> Snohomish County Executive August 18, 2021, Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County p. 14.

<sup>8</sup> Puget Sound Regional Council, *VISION 2050: A Plan for the Central Puget Sound Region* p. 7, p. 38, p. 78 (Adopted October 2020).

- e. One of the following conditions is met ~~except that an adjustment of the boundary of an individual UGA for additional residential land must meet the requirements of e.3 below:~~
1. The ~~adjustment expansion~~ is a result of the most recent buildable lands review and evaluation required by RCW 36.70A.215 and performed per policy GF-7 following the procedures in Appendix E.
  2. The ~~adjustment expansion~~ is a result of the review of UGAs at least every eight years to accommodate the succeeding twenty years of projected growth, as projected by the State Office of Financial Management, and adopted by the County as the 20-year urban allocated population projection as required by RCW 36.70A.130(3).
  3. ~~All~~ Both of the following conditions are met for ~~adjustment expansion~~ of the boundary of an individual UGA to include additional residential land:
    - a. Population growth in the UGA (city plus unincorporated UGA) 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. Acceptable sources of documentation are the most recent Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) Growth Monitoring Report (GMR) or the buildable lands review and evaluation (Buildable Lands Report [BLR]), ~~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, and any new information presented at public hearings that confirms or revises the conclusions is considered; and
    - c. The need for additional capacity cannot be met by increasing density in the urban growth areas in locations consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.
  4. Both of the following conditions are met for ~~adjustment expansion~~ of the boundary of an individual UGA to include additional employment land:
    - a. Employment growth in the UGA (city plus unincorporated UGA) since the start of the twenty-year planning period, equals or exceeds fifty percent of the additional employment capacity in the UGA at the start of the planning period. Acceptable sources of documentation are the most recent SCT GMR or the buildable lands review and evaluation (BLR), and
    - b. An updated employment land capacity analysis conducted by city and County staff for the UGA confirms the accuracy of the above finding using more recent employment capacity estimates and assumptions.
  5. The ~~adjustment expansion~~ will correct a demonstrated mapping error.
  6. Schools (including public, private and parochial), ~~((churches))~~ places of worship, institutions and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plans should be located in an urban growth area. In

the event that it is demonstrated that no site within the UGA can reasonably or logically accommodate the proposed facilities, urban growth area expansions may take place to allow the development of these facilities provided that the adjustment expansion area is adjacent to an existing UGA.

7. In UGAs where the threshold in Condition 4 has not been reached, the boundary of an individual UGA may be adjusted expanded to include additional industrial land if the adjustment expansion is based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.365 for the establishment of a major industrial development. This assessment shall be based on a collaborative County and city analysis of large developable industrial site needs in relation to land supply. "Large developable industrial sites" may include land considered vacant, redevelopable, and/or partially-used by the Buildable Lands Program (per GF-7 and Appendix E of these CPPs) and may include one or more large parcels or several small parcels where consolidation is feasible.
8. The adjustment expansion will result in the realization of a significant public benefit as evidenced by Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) to the expansion area added to the UGA from Agriculture or Forest lands designated as TDR sending areas. The expansion area added to the UGA shall comply with 12 below ~~not be a designated forest or agricultural land of longterm significance.~~
9. The adjustment expansion will permanently preserve a substantial land area containing one or more significant natural or cultural feature(s) as open space adjacent to the revised UGA boundary and will provide separation between urban and rural areas. The presence of significant natural or cultural features shall be determined by the respective legislative bodies of the county and the city or cities immediately adjacent to the proposed adjustment expansion, and 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.
10. The adjustment 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 is uncurable in a timely manner by the implementation of reasonable measures or other instrumentality reasonably available to the jurisdiction including increasing density in the urban growth areas in locations consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, and the adjustment expansion is reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing for low and moderate income households, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
11. The adjustment 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 adjustments 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.

12. No adjustment shall add important habitats or natural resource lands of long-term commercial significance into a UGA.

DP-3 Following consultation with the affected city or cities, the County may adjust urban growth areas – defined in this policy as concurrent actions to expand an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in one location while contracting the same UGA in another location – without resulting in a net increase of population or employment land capacity. Such action may be permitted when consistent with adopted policies and the following conditions:

- a. The area being removed from the UGA is not already characterized by urban development, and without active permits that would change it to being urban in character; ~~and~~
- b. The land use designation(s) assigned in the area removed from the UGA shall be ((~~among~~)) consistent with the existing rural or resource designations in the comprehensive plan for Snohomish County; and
- c. Important habitats or natural resource lands of long-term commercial significance shall not be added into a UGA.

## Revise DP-28 so it is consistent with the MPPs and the Growth Management Act. See page 32

MPP-Ec-23 calls on Snohomish County and its cities to “[s]upport economic activity in rural and natural resource areas at a size and scale that is compatible with the long-term integrity and productivity of these lands.”<sup>9</sup> RCW 36.70A.590 provides that:

For the purposes of complying with the requirements of this chapter relating to surface and groundwater resources, a county or city may rely on or refer to applicable minimum instream flow rules adopted by the department of ecology under chapters 90.22 and 90.54 RCW. Development regulations must ensure that proposed water uses are consistent with RCW 90.44.050 and with applicable rules adopted pursuant to chapters 90.22 and 90.54 RCW when making decisions under RCW 19.27.097 and 58.17.110.

DP-28 can be read as allowing the transfer of water needed to support economic activity in rural areas and on natural resource lands. That is inconsistent with MPP-Ec-23. DP-28 also does not require compliance with the instream flow rules under chapters 90.22 and 90.54 RCW. Since the new watershed restoration and enhancement plans do not mitigate for water used by urban growth

---

<sup>9</sup> Puget Sound Regional Council, *VISION 2050: A Plan for the Central Puget Sound Region* p. 97 (Adopted October 2020).



areas and many rural uses,<sup>10</sup> DP-28 should require that water uses comply with the instream flow rules unless mitigated by a watershed restoration and enhancement plan. Our recommended additions are double underlined and our recommended deletions are double struck through.

DP-~~(26)~~ 28 Domestic water supply systems may be developed in rural and resource areas to meet the needs of rural areas or resource lands respectively as provided in the county's coordinated water system plan and with the applicable rules adopted pursuant to chapters 90.22 and 90.54 RCW unless the water use is mitigated by a watershed restoration and enhancement plan. Water sources and transmission lines may be developed in rural and resource areas to meet the needs of urban growth areas provided they comply with applicable rules adopted pursuant to chapters 90.22 and 90.54 RCW and do not reduce the water needed to maintain and enhance economic activity on rural and natural resource lands.

### **Do not delete CPP HO-1 as it is needed now more than ever. See page 38**

Existing CPP HO-1 provides that the “county and cities shall support the principle that fair and equal access to housing is available to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, national origin, familial status, source of income, or disability.” There continues to be strong evidence of housing discrimination in our region.<sup>11</sup> And housing costs are increasing, making fair and equal access to housing more important than ever. We urge Snohomish County to retain this necessary CPP.

Some may argue that local governments do not have a role to play in providing access to fair and equal housing. But local governments can promote fair and equal housing access in many ways such as public education, providing reasonable accommodations for disabled and special needs housing in their zoning regulations and on a case-by-case basis, and planning and zoning that will allow the construction of housing that can meet these needs. Some jurisdictions are large enough to adopt and enforce equal housing laws. HO-1 helps local governments understand the need to continue and expand this work.

### **Do not amend HO-10 to balance costs and benefits of site development techniques related to protecting critical areas. See page 40**

HO-10 is proposed to be amended to provide that when jurisdictions encourage the use of environmentally sensitive housing development practices and environmentally sustainable building techniques and materials they should also “consider the potential costs and benefits to site

---

<sup>10</sup> RCW 90.94.030.

<sup>11</sup> Ian Kennedy, Chris Hess, Amandalynne Paullada, Sarah Chasins, *Racialized Discourse in Seattle Rental Ad Texts* SOCIAL FORCES, soaa075, <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soaa075> (03 August 2020). Social Forces is a peer-reviewed journal.

development, construction, and building maintenance to balance housing affordability and environmental sustainability.” However, the Growth Management Act requires that critical areas regulations must protect critical areas by maintaining existing conditions.<sup>12</sup> We are concerned that the proposed second sentence can be read as allowing impacts to critical areas. This is not allowed and we recommend that the second sentence not be adopted.

### **Amend TR-3 to call for a transportation funding systems that encourages compact, pedestrian- and transit-oriented development. See page 51**

Transportation finance can be a powerful incentive for achieving the transportation system called for in VISION 2050 and that we need to provide for future mobility. We appreciate and support that TR-3c calls for prioritizing transportation facility and service investments. The transportation finance system should also incentivize compact, pedestrian- and transit-oriented development too. We recommend the following addition to TR3c with our addition double underlined.

- c. Within cities and unincorporated county in urban growth areas, transportation facility and service investments should be prioritized that support compact, pedestrian- and transit-oriented development, especially within designated regional, countywide, and local centers, near HCT facilities, and along corridors connecting centers. The transportation finance system including impact fees should incentivize compact, pedestrian- and transit-oriented development, especially within designated regional, countywide, and local centers, near HCT facilities, and along corridors connecting centers.

### **Amend CC-6 to require achieving greenhouse gas reduction requirements and to conduct lifecycle analysis for policies and procurement decisions. See page 64**

The County Council has no doubt read about the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report issued in August that found “that unless there are immediate, rapid and large-scale reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, limiting warming to close to 1.5°C or even 2°C will be beyond reach.”<sup>13</sup> The report found that climate change is already affecting every region of the world including our beloved Pacific Northwest. “For 1.5°C of global warming, there will be increasing heat waves, longer warm seasons and shorter cold seasons. At 2°C of global warming, heat extremes would more often reach critical tolerance thresholds for agriculture and health ...”<sup>14</sup> Clearly the time to take action is now. For this reason, we recommend that CC-6 be changed from “should” to

<sup>12</sup> *Snohomish Indian Tribal Cmty. v. W. Washington Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd.*, 161 Wn.2d 415, 430, 166 P.3d 1198, 1206 (2007), as corrected (Nov. 28, 2007), as corrected (Apr. 3, 2008).

<sup>13</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Climate change widespread, rapid, and intensifying – IPCC News Release* (Aug. 9, 2021) last accessed on Sept. 23, 2021 at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/2021/08/09/ar6-wg1-20210809-pr/>.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

“shall.” This change is shown below the addition double underlined and the deletion double struck through.

In addition, county and city decisions on roads, public facilities and services will have a great impact on future greenhouse gas emissions. CC-6 should call on the county and cities to evaluate the life cycle costs and greenhouse gas emissions of governmental policies. Government procurement, building and mechanical system construction and replacement, and other capital expenditures should be analyzed to determine if there are alternatives and methods that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled. This recommended addition is shown below the addition double underlined and the deletion double struck through.

CC-6 The County and cities ~~shall should~~ support the achievement of regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets through adoption of policies and implementation of actions including identification of emissions reduction goals in local plans and providing support for land use, transportation, and development policies that reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. The County and cities shall evaluate the cycle costs and greenhouse gas emissions of governmental policies. Government procurement, building and mechanical system construction and replacement, and other capital expenditures should be analyzed to determine if there are alternatives and methods that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled.

## **The Growth Targets in Appendix B should include jurisdiction specific targets for affordable housing**

We have long supported Snohomish County Tomorrow’s regional fair share affordable housing concept. This concept provides the opportunity for an equitable distribution of affordable housing that can help meet housing needs throughout Snohomish County.

We strongly support the amendments to HO-2 which specify that the regional fair share targets for affordable housing includes housing for very low, low, moderate, and middle-income households and special needs individuals. VISION 2050 encourages counties and cities to establish coordinated local housing and affordable housing targets.<sup>15</sup> We agree and recommend that Appendix B should include coordinated housing targets for each jurisdiction including affordable housing targets for very low, low, moderate, and middle-income households and special needs individuals. This helps coordinate local government planning and will help comprehensive plans and development regulations provide real opportunities for housing and affordable housing throughout the county.

---

<sup>15</sup> Puget Sound Regional Council, *VISION 2050: A Plan for the Central Puget Sound Region* p. 83 (Adopted October 2020). The Puget Sound Regional Council, in coordination with subregional, county, and local housing efforts, will provide “[g]uidance for developing local housing targets (including affordable housing targets), model housing policies, and best housing practices.” *Id.* p. 89.

## The Countywide Planning Policies should call for a cooperatively funded Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment.

A cooperatively funded Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment would identify the vulnerabilities that the county, cities, and special districts are facing due to climate change. A Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment specific to Snohomish County would provide the jurisdictions with the information to conduct risk assessments, to identify changes needed to adapt to climate change, and to use in developing policies and programs. The Climate Impacts Group at the University of Washington is available to assist in this effort. The Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment should also include an analysis of health disparities, environmental justice, and the impacts on front-line communities.

## The Countywide Planning Policies should include a definition of urban density.

The CPPs should include a definition of urban densities of at least eight net dwelling units per acre for lands within urban growth areas with existing or planned transit service and four net dwelling units per acre for lands within urban growth areas without existing or planned access to transit service.<sup>16</sup> Lower densities may be appropriate for particular parcels with “environmentally sensitive systems [that] are large in scope (*e.g.*, watershed or drainage sub-basin), their structure and functions are complex and their rank order value is high, ....”<sup>17</sup>

Thank you for considering our comments. If you require additional information, please contact Tim Trohimovich at 206-853-6077 or [tim@futurewise.org](mailto:tim@futurewise.org).

Very Truly Yours,



Tim Trohimovich, AICP  
**Director of Planning and Law**

---

<sup>16</sup> Boris Pushkarev & Jeffrey Zupan, *Public Transportation and Land Use Policy* p. 30 (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, 1977) (public transit use is minimal at a net residential density of seven or fewer dwelling units per acre).

<sup>17</sup> *Master Builders of Pierce County & Brink (MBA/Brink), et al. v. Pierce County*, CPSGMHB Case No.: 02-3-0006 Final Decision and Order (Feb. 4, 2002), at \*10, 2002 WL 31998487 at \*11.

**From:** Karen Guzak <karenguzak@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 9:38 AM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Supporting the Futurewise proposal for CPPs

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

**RE: Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059.**

Futurewise is "right-on" regarding policy changes to the CPPs.

These proposed changes will help increase equity, reduce pollution, protect the environment, protect people and property, and increase affordable housing.

I know the Council wants to do the right thing. And, this is the time to do it.

Karen Guzak

[www.KarenGuzak.com](http://www.KarenGuzak.com)

[www.facebook.com/KarenGuzakCouncil](https://www.facebook.com/KarenGuzakCouncil)

360-568-1000

Caring for the health, safety, and happiness of all

**From:** DaveandJeanine SanClemente/Thompson <daveandjeanine@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 7:32 AM  
**To:** Contact Council; Eco, Debbie; Brouse, Mitchell  
**Subject:** Futurewise Letter-CPPs

**CAUTION :** This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

I support the letter submitted by Futurewise regarding CPPs because it helps to protect the environment and increases equity.

Jeanine SanClemente, Ph.D.  
Snohomish, WA

**From:** randy@bearcreekhw.org  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:16 AM  
**To:** Contact Council; Brouse, Mitchell; Eco, Debbie  
**Subject:** comments on ordinance No. 21-059

**CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.**

Dear Council Chair Wright and Council Members Nehring, Dunn, Mead, and Low:

We support the letter submitted to the County Council by Futurewise that recommends changes on the **Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, Ordinance No. 21-059**. The policy changes will help increase equity, reduce pollution, protect the environment, protect people and property, and increase affordable housing.

Randall J Whalen  
President, Bear Creek Headwaters

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, WashingtonNOTICE OF INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES  
AND  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that the Snohomish County Council will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, September 29, 2021, at the hour of 10:30 a.m. in the Henry M. Jackson Board Room, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, Robert J. Drewel Building, 3000 Rockefeller, Everett, Washington to consider two alternative proposed ordinances related to the Countywide Planning Policies: **Ordinance No. 21-057**, and **Ordinance No. 21-059**, both titled: **RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY**

**NOTE:** Due to current COVID-19 restrictions, Snohomish County Council is currently holding its public meetings remote only and will hold in-person meetings in conjunction with a remote platform when restrictions and conditions change. Please check the Council webpage 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing time for the most up-to-date information <https://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/2288/Meetings-Webcasts> or contact the Council Clerk at 425-388-3494 or at [contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org).

**Zoom Webinar Information:**

Join online at <https://zoom.us/j/94846850772>  
or by telephone call 1-253-215-8782 or 1-301-715-8592  
Meeting ID: 948 4685 0772

**Background:** These ordinances present alternative proposals for amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County (CPPs) to bring the CPPs into compliance with the recent amendments to the Growth Management Act (GMA) and the multicounty planning policies (MPPs) found in VISION 2050. The policies included in the ordinances were developed in collaboration with the various committees of Snohomish County Tomorrow, and include amendments intended to ensure continued consistency with the MPPs by including policy updates that address topics such as equity and inclusion, climate change, interjurisdictional coordination, countywide centers, reasonable measures, development patterns, housing, economic development and employment, transportation, natural environment, and public services and facilities. Ordinance No. 21-057 presents the CPPs as recommended to be updated by Snohomish County Tomorrow. Ordinance No. 21-059 presents the CPPs as recommended to be updated by Snohomish County Tomorrow, except that proposed new Joint Planning CPP JP-3 (related to annexation) is removed. Ordinance No. 21-059 is the Snohomish County Executive recommended ordinance.

A summary of the proposed ordinances is as follows:



Sections 1, 2, and 3 of both ordinances. Adopt recitals, findings, conclusions, and state that the Snohomish County Council bases its decision on the entire record and that any finding that should be a conclusion and any conclusion that should be a finding is adopted as such.

Section 4 of Ordinance No. 21-057. Amends the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County consistent with the recommendation by the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee as set forth in Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 21-057.

Section 4 of Ordinance No. 21-059. Amends the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County consistent with the recommendation by the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee, except that proposed new Joint Planning CPP JP-3 (related to annexation) is removed as set forth in Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 21-059.

Section 5 of both ordinances. Provides a standard severability and savings clause.

Section 6 of both ordinances. Directs the Code Revisor to update Snohomish County Code (SCC) 30.10.050 pursuant to SCC 1.02.020(3).

The Council may also consider other amendments. Housekeeping amendments are proposed for both ordinances to correct typographical errors, incorrect code citations and background information, inconsistent terminology, and inadvertently omitted text.

=====  
**State Environmental Policy Act:** State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements with respect to this non-project action have been satisfied through the issuance of Addendum No. 1 to the VISION 2050 Final Environmental Impact Statement on September 13, 2021.

**Where to Get Copies of the Proposed Ordinance:** Copies of the full ordinances and other documentation are available in the office of the County Council. They may be obtained by calling 425-388-3494, 1-800-562-4367 x3494, TDD 425-388-3700 or e-mail to: [contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org). Copies may be picked up at the council office at 3000 Rockefeller, Everett, Washington, or will be mailed upon request.

**Website Access:** These ordinances can be accessed through the Council website at: [snohomishcountywa.gov/council](http://snohomishcountywa.gov/council)

**Range of Possible Actions the County Council May Take on These Proposals:** At the conclusion of its public hearing(s), the County Council may make one of the following decisions regarding the proposed actions: (1) adopt a proposed ordinance; (2) adopt an amended version of a proposed ordinance; (3) decline to adopt a proposed ordinance; (4) adopt such other proposals or modification of such proposals as were considered by the council at its own hearing; or (5) take any other action permitted by law.

**Public Testimony:** Anyone interested may testify concerning the above described matter at the time and place indicated above or by remote participation in the meeting. The County Council may continue the hearing to another date to allow additional public testimony thereafter, if deemed necessary. Written testimony is encouraged and may be sent to the office of the County Council at the following address: Snohomish County Council, 3000 Rockefeller, M/S 609, Everett, WA 98201. Faxed documents may be sent to

425-388-3496 or e-mail to [contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org). Submitting public comments 24 hours prior to the hearing will ensure that comments are provided to the Council and appropriate staff in advance of the hearing.


**Party of Record:** You may become a party of record on this matter by sending a written request to the Clerk of the County Council at the above address, testifying at the public hearing, or entering your name and address on a register provided for that purpose at the public hearing.

**Americans with Disabilities Act Notice:** Accommodations for persons with disabilities will be provided upon request. Please make arrangements one week prior to the hearing by calling Debbie Eco at 425-388-3494, 1-800-562-4367 x3494, or TDD # 425-388-3700.

QUESTIONS: For additional information or specific questions on the proposed ordinances, please call Mitchell Brouse in the Department of Planning and Development Services at 425-388-5127 or [mitchell.brouse@snoco.org](mailto:mitchell.brouse@snoco.org).

DATED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Washington

  
Stephanie Wright  
Council Chair

ATTEST:

  
Debbie Eco, CMC  
Clerk of the Council

PUBLISH: September 15, 2021

Send Affidavit to: Council  
Send Invoice to: Planning #107010

# Everett Daily Herald

## Affidavit of Publication

State of Washington }  
County of Snohomish } ss


Michael Gates being first duly sworn, upon oath deposes and says: that he/she is the legal representative of the Everett Daily Herald a daily newspaper. The said newspaper is a legal newspaper by order of the superior court in the county in which it is published and is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of the first publication of the Notice hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continually as a daily newspaper in Snohomish County, Washington and is and always has been printed in whole or part in the Everett Daily Herald and is of general circulation in said County, and is a legal newspaper, in accordance with the Chapter 99 of the Laws of 1921, as amended by Chapter 213, Laws of 1941, and approved as a legal newspaper by order of the Superior Court of Snohomish County, State of Washington, by order dated June 16, 1941, and that the annexed is a true copy of EDH938155 ORDS 21-057, 21-059 as it was published in the regular and entire issue of said paper and not as a supplement form thereof for a period of 1 issue(s), such publication commencing on 09/15/2021 and ending on 09/15/2021 and that said newspaper was regularly distributed to its subscribers during all of said period.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
RECEIVED \_\_\_\_\_ TIME \_\_\_\_\_


SEP 23 2021

CC'D TO	CF	
JLM	DIST 1	GOT
JDG	DIST 2	DLE
YSW	DIST 3	ALC
HCB	DIST 4	ELL
NAG	DIST 5	CMF

The amount of the fee for such publication is \$174.24.



Subscribed and sworn before me on this 15<sup>th</sup> day of September 2021.





Notary Public in and for the State of Washington.  
Snohomish County Planning | 14107010  
DEBBIE ECO

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Washington  
NOTICE OF INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES  
AND  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Snohomish County Council will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, September 29, 2021, at the hour of 10:30 a.m. in the Henry M. Jackson Board Room, 8th Floor, Robert J. Drewel Building, 3000 Rockefeller, Everett, Washington to consider two alternative proposed ordinances related to the Countywide Planning Policies: Ordinance No. 21-057, and Ordinance No. 21-059, both titled: RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

**NOTE:** Due to current COVID 19 restrictions, Snohomish County Council is currently holding its public meetings remote only and will hold in-person meetings in conjunction with a remote meeting platform when restrictions and conditions change.

Please check the Council webpage 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing time for the most up-to-date information <https://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/2288/Meetings>. Webcasts or contact the Council Clerk at 425-388-3494 or at [contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org).

**Zoom Webinar Information:**

Join online at <https://zoom.us/j/94846850772>  
or by telephone call 1-253-215-8782 or 1-301-715-8592  
Meeting ID: 948 4685 0772

**Background:** These ordinances present alternative proposals for amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County (CPPs) to bring the CPPs into compliance with the recent amendments to the Growth Management Act (GMA) and the multicounty planning policies (MPPs) found in VISION 2050. The policies included in the ordinances were developed in collaboration with the various committees of Snohomish County Tomorrow, and include amendments intended to ensure continued consistency with the MPPs by including policy updates that address topics such as equity and inclusion, climate change, interjurisdictional coordination, countywide centers, reasonable measures, development patterns, housing, economic development and employment, transportation, natural environment, and public services and facilities. Ordinance No. 21-057 presents the CPPs as recommended to be updated by Snohomish County Tomorrow. Ordinance No. 21-059 presents the CPPs as recommended to be updated by Snohomish County Tomorrow, except that proposed new Joint Planning CPP JP-3 (related to annexation) is removed. Ordinance No. 21-059 is the Snohomish County Executive recommended ordinance.

A summary of the proposed ordinances is as follows:  
**Sections 1, 2, and 3 of both ordinances.** Adopt recitals, findings, conclusions, and state that the Snohomish County Council bases its decision on the entire record and that any finding that should be a conclusion and any conclusion that should be a finding is adopted as such.

**Section 4 of Ordinance No. 21-057.** Amends the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County consistent with the recommendation by the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee as set forth in Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 21-057.

**Section 4 of Ordinance No. 21-059.** Amends the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County consistent with the recommendation by the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee, except that proposed new Joint Planning CPP JP-3 (related to annexation) is removed as set forth in Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 21-059.

**Section 5 of both ordinances.** Provides a standard severability and savings clause.

**Section 6 of both ordinances.** Directs the Code Revisor to update Snohomish County Code (SCC) 30.10.050 pursuant to SCC 1.02.020(3).

The Council may also consider other amendments. Housekeeping amendments are proposed for both ordinances to correct

typographical errors; incorrect code citations and background information, inconsistent terminology, and inadvertently omitted text.

State Environmental Policy Act: State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements with respect to this non-project action have been satisfied through the issuance of Addendum No. 1 to the VISION 2050 Final Environmental Impact Statement on September 13, 2021.

Where to Get Copies of the Proposed Ordinance: Copies of the full ordinances and other documentation are available in the office of the County Council. They may be obtained by calling 425-388-3494, 1-800-562-4367 x3494, TDD 425-388-3700 or e-mail to: [contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org). Copies may be picked up at the council office at 3000 Rockefeller, Everett, Washington, or will be mailed upon request.

Website Access: These ordinances can be accessed through the Council website at: [snohomishcountywa.gov/council](http://snohomishcountywa.gov/council)

Range of Possible Actions the County Council May Take on These Proposals: At the conclusion of its public hearing(s), the County Council may make one of the following decisions regarding the proposed actions: (1) adopt a proposed ordinance; (2) adopt an amended version of a proposed ordinance; (3) decline to adopt a proposed ordinance; (4) adopt such other proposals or modification of such proposals as were considered by the council at its own hearing; or (5) take any other action permitted by law.

Public Testimony: Anyone interested may testify concerning the above described matter at the time and place indicated above or by remote participation in the meeting. The County Council may continue the hearing to another date to allow additional public testimony thereafter, if deemed necessary. Written testimony is encouraged and may be sent to the office of the County Council at the following address: Snohomish County Council, 3000 Rockefeller, M/S 609, Everett, WA 98201. Faxed documents may be sent to 425-388-3496 or e-mail to [contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org). Submitting public comments 24 hours prior to the hearing will ensure that comments are provided to the Council and appropriate staff in advance of the hearing.

Party of Record: You may become a party of record on this matter by sending a written request to the Clerk of the County Council at the above address, testifying at the public hearing, or entering your name and address on a register provided for that purpose at the public hearing.

Americans with Disabilities Act Notice: Accommodations for persons with disabilities will be provided upon request. Please make arrangements one week prior to the hearing by calling Debbie Eco at 425-388-3494, 1-800-562-4367 x3494, or TDD # 425-388-3700.

QUESTIONS: For additional information or specific questions on the proposed ordinances, please call Mitchell Brouse in the Department of Planning and Development Services at 425-388-5127 or [mitchell.brouse@snoco.org](mailto:mitchell.brouse@snoco.org).

DATED this 10th day of September, 2021.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Council  
/s/ Stephanie Wright  
Council Chair

ATTEST:  
/s/ Debbie Eco, CMC  
Clerk of the Council  
107010

Published: September 15, 2021.

EDH938155

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Washington

NOTICE OF ENACTMENT

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that on September 29, 2021, the Snohomish County Council adopted Amended Ordinance 21-059, which shall be effective October 22, 2021. A summary of the ordinance is as follows:

AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 21-059

RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

Sections 1, 2, and 3. Adopt recitals, findings, conclusions, and state that the Snohomish County Council bases its decision on the entire record and that any finding that should be a conclusion and any conclusion that should be a finding is adopted as such.

Section 4. Amends the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County consistent with the recommendation by the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee, except that proposed new Joint Planning CPP JP-3 (related to annexation) is removed as set forth in Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 21-059.

Section 5. Provides a standard severability and savings clause.

Section 6. Directs the Code Revisor to update Snohomish County Code (SCC) 30.10.050 pursuant to SCC 1.02.020(3).

=====  
**State Environmental Policy Act:** State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements with respect to this non-project action have been satisfied through the issuance of Addendum No. 1 to the VISION 2050 Final Environmental Impact Statement on September 13, 2021.

**Where to Get Copies of the Amended Ordinance:** Copies of the full ordinances and other documentation are available in the office of the County Council. They may be obtained by calling 425-388-3494, 1-800-562-4367 x3494, TDD 425-388-3700 or e-mail to:


[contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org). Copies may be picked up at the council office at 3000 Rockefeller, Everett, Washington, or will be mailed upon request.

**Website Access:** This ordinance can be accessed through the Council website at:

<http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/2134/County-Hearings-Calendar>.

DATED this 13<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2021.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Washington

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Debbie Eco, CMC  
Clerk of the Council

PUBLISH: October 20, 2021

Send Affidavit to: Council  
Send Invoice to: Planning #107010

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON

EXHIBIT # 3.5.4

FILE ORD 21-059

**NOTICE OF ACTION**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN under the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.290 that the Snohomish County Council took the action described in (1) below on September 29, 2021.

1. Description of agency action: Approval of Amended Ordinance No. 21-059.
  
2. Description of proposal: RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY
  
3. Documentation is available electronically upon request by calling the Snohomish County Council Office at (425) 388-3494, 1-800-562-4367 x3494, TDD 1-800-877-8339 or e-mailing to [Contact.Council@snoco.org](mailto:Contact.Council@snoco.org).
  
4. Name of agency giving notice: Snohomish County Council
  
5. This notice is filed by: Debbie Eco  
Clerk of the Council

Date: October 13, 2021

PUBLISH: October 20, 2021

Send Affidavit to: County Council  
Send Invoice to: Planning #107010



# Department of Commerce

Innovation is in our nature.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL

## Notice of Adopted Amendment

EXHIBIT # 3.5.5

FILE ORD 21-059

Indicate one (or both, if applicable):

- Comprehensive Plan Amendment  
 Development Regulation Amendment

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106, the following jurisdiction provides notice of an adopted comprehensive plan amendment and/or development regulation amendment.

*(If needed, you may expand this form and the fields below, but please try to keep the entire form under two pages in length.)*

<b>Jurisdiction:</b>	Snohomish County
<b>Mailing Address:</b>	3000 Rockefeller Avenue, MS 609, Everett, WA 98201
<b>Date:</b>	October 13, 2021
<b>Contact Name:</b>	Debbie Eco
<b>Title/Position:</b>	Clerk of the Council
<b>Phone Number:</b>	425-388-7038
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	<a href="mailto:debbie.eco@snoco.org">debbie.eco@snoco.org</a>
<b>Brief Description of the Adopted Amendment:</b> <i>(40 words or less)</i>	AMENDED ORDINANCE 21-059 RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY
<b>Was this action submitted to Commerce for 60-day notice of intent to adopt (or to request expedited review)?</b>	Yes. Material ID# 2021-S-2965
<b>Public Hearing Date:</b>	Planning Commission: N/A Council/County Commission: September 29, 2021
<b>Date Adopted:</b>	September 29, 2021

**REQUIRED:** Attach or include a copy the adopted ordinance (signed and dated) and the final amendment text.





# Department of Commerce

Innovation is in our nature.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL

## Notice of Adopted Amendment

EXHIBIT # 3.5.5

FILE ORD 21-059

Indicate one (or both, if applicable):

- Comprehensive Plan Amendment  
 Development Regulation Amendment

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106, the following jurisdiction provides notice of an adopted comprehensive plan amendment and/or development regulation amendment.

*(If needed, you may expand this form and the fields below, but please try to keep the entire form under two pages in length.)*

<b>Jurisdiction:</b>	Snohomish County
<b>Mailing Address:</b>	3000 Rockefeller Avenue, MS 609, Everett, WA 98201
<b>Date:</b>	October 13, 2021
<b>Contact Name:</b>	Debbie Eco
<b>Title/Position:</b>	Clerk of the Council
<b>Phone Number:</b>	425-388-7038
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	<a href="mailto:debbie.eco@snoco.org">debbie.eco@snoco.org</a>
<b>Brief Description of the Adopted Amendment:</b> <i>(40 words or less)</i>	AMENDED ORDINANCE 21-059 RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY
<b>Was this action submitted to Commerce for 60-day notice of intent to adopt (or to request expedited review)?</b>	Yes. Material ID# 2021-S-2965
<b>Public Hearing Date:</b>	Planning Commission: N/A Council/County Commission: September 29, 2021
<b>Date Adopted:</b>	September 29, 2021

**REQUIRED:** Attach or include a copy the adopted ordinance (signed and dated) and the final amendment text.

1 APPROVED: 09/29/21  
2 EFFECTIVE: 10/22/21

3  
4 SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
5 SNOHOMISH COUNTY WASHINGTON

6  
7 AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 21-059

8  
9 RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE  
10 PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

11  
12 WHEREAS, a provision of the Growth Management Act (GMA), Revised Code  
13 of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.210(2), requires the legislative authority of each county  
14 which is subject to the GMA's comprehensive planning requirements to adopt a  
15 countywide policy framework in cooperation with the cities and towns within that  
16 county, and from which the county's, cities' and towns' comprehensive plans are  
17 developed and adopted; and

18  
19 WHEREAS, a provision of the GMA, RCW 36.70A.210(7), requires the adoption  
20 of multicounty planning policies (MPPs) for contiguous counties, each with a population  
21 of four hundred fifty thousand or more, with contiguous urban areas; and

22  
23 WHEREAS, on July 17, 1991, the Snohomish County Council (County Council),  
24 approved, through Motion No. 91-210, an interlocal agreement (ILA) process that  
25 includes King, Pierce and Kitsap counties for the adoption of MPPs by the Puget Sound  
26 Regional Council (PSRC) as part of the duties performed by PSRC for regional planning  
27 in the Central Puget Sound area; and

28  
29 WHEREAS, in 1992, the PSRC and its member jurisdictions adopted an ILA that  
30 provides the PSRC with the authority to carry out functions required under state and  
31 federal law and calls for the PSRC to maintain an adopted regional growth strategy; and

32  
33 WHEREAS, on February 4, 1993, the county council, through Ordinance No. 93-  
34 004, adopted countywide planning policies (CPPs), which were later amended in  
35 Ordinance No. 94-002 on February 2, 1994; Amended Ordinance No. 95-005 on  
36 February 15, 1995; Ordinance No. 95-110 on December 20, 1995; Ordinance No. 98-054  
37 on July 15, 1998; Amended Ordinance No. 99-120 on January 19, 2000; Amended  
38 Ordinance No. 99-121 on February 16, 2000; Amended Ordinance Nos. 03-071, 03-072  
39 and 03-073 on July 9, 2003; Amended Ordinance No. 03-070 on December 10, 2003;  
40 Amended Ordinance No. 04-006 on February 11, 2004; Amended Ordinance No. 04-007  
41 on March 31, 2004; Amended Ordinance Nos. 06-098 and 06-116 on December 20,  
42 2006; Amended Ordinance No. 08-054 on June 3, 2008; Amended Ordinance No. 09-061  
43 on August 12, 2009 (with veto override vote on September 8, 2009 through Amended  
44 Ordinance No. 09-062); and Ordinance No. 10-037 on July 7, 2010; and

1 WHEREAS, on June 1, 2011, the County Council, through Amended Ordinance  
2 No. 11-011, repealed the CPPs and adopted new CPPs for Snohomish County, which  
3 were later amended in Amended Ordinance No. 11-021 on June 1, 2011; Amended  
4 Ordinance No. 11-015 on June 8, 2011; Ordinance No. 12-070 on October 17, 2012;  
5 Amended Ordinance No. 13-032 on June 12, 2013; Ordinance No. 14-006 on April 16,  
6 2014; and Amended Ordinance No. 16-078 on November 10, 2016; and  
7

8 WHEREAS, on October 29, 2020, the General Assembly of the PSRC adopted  
9 VISION 2050 A Plan for the Central Puget Sound Region, including new Multicity  
10 Planning Policies (MPPs) and Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), which updated the  
11 previously adopted VISION 2040; and  
12

13 WHEREAS, policy MPP-RC-13 within VISION 2050 requires Snohomish  
14 County to update its countywide planning policies to address the new MPPs within  
15 VISION 2050 prior to December 31, 2021.  
16

17 WHEREAS, since the County Council's adoption of the CPPs in 1993, revisions  
18 have been made to the GMA that require changes to the CPPs in order to maintain  
19 consistency between the CPPs and the GMA; and  
20

21 WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.215 requires counties planning under the GMA, in  
22 consultation with their cities and towns, to adopt a review and evaluation program in the  
23 CPPs; and  
24

25 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) process for updating the  
26 CPPs typically begins with review of current CPPs by the Planning Advisory Committee  
27 (PAC) of SCT, followed by recommendations by the PAC to the Snohomish County  
28 Tomorrow Steering Committee (SCT SC) to revise current CPPs; and  
29

30 WHEREAS, the SCT process for updating the CPPs allows the SCT SC to discuss  
31 recommendations from the PAC, revise those recommendations, and make final  
32 recommendations from SCT to the County Council; and  
33

34 WHEREAS, the County Council receives the recommendations from SCT and  
35 then holds one or more public hearings on the recommendations before taking action to  
36 revise the CPPs; and  
37

38 WHEREAS, on February 13, 2020, the PAC set up a subcommittee to draft a  
39 proposal for updating the CPPs that the subcommittee would then submit back to the  
40 PAC for review and approval by consensus; and  
41

42 WHEREAS, the PAC subcommittee included representation from cities, towns,  
43 tribes, Snohomish County, PSRC, and Community Transit; and  
44

45 WHEREAS, the PAC subcommittee initiated in person meetings on February 20,  
46 2020, with scheduled meetings during the months of March and April 2020 canceled due

1 to the COVID-19 public health emergency, and subcommittee meetings continuing  
2 virtual between May 2020 and January 2021, working topic by topic reviewing and  
3 updating the CPPs; and  
4

5 WHEREAS, the PAC subcommittee submitted a proposed updated draft of the  
6 CPPs (dated February 12, 2021), including tables with a description of each  
7 subcommittee proposed policy amendment and associated MPPs, to the PAC to begin  
8 review at the February 11, 2021, PAC meeting; and  
9

10 WHEREAS, the PAC recommended draft of the CPPs was available for public  
11 comment between February 18, 2021, and March 16, 2021; and  
12

13 WHEREAS, the PAC referred all submitted comments back to the PAC  
14 subcommittee for review and consideration; and  
15

16 WHEREAS, the PAC subcommittee met on April 22 and April 29, 2021, to  
17 review the comments, update the subcommittee recommendation, and resubmit a  
18 proposed updated draft of the CPPs (dated May 5, 2021) to the PAC for their review and  
19 consideration; and  
20

21 WHEREAS, from February 11, 2021, to June 10, 2021, the SCT PAC convened  
22 to discuss and consider the 2021 update of the CPPs, including meetings on March 11,  
23 2021; April 8, 2021; and May 13, 2021; and  
24

25 WHEREAS, the minutes of the PAC meetings reflect the discussions and  
26 recommendations made by the PAC to the SCT SC; and  
27

28 WHEREAS, on May 26, 2021, June 23, 2021, and July 28, 2021, the SCT SC  
29 convened to discuss, review, and consider the PAC recommendation on the 2021 update  
30 of the CPPs; and  
31

32 WHEREAS, the SCT SC concluded its review of the PAC recommendations and  
33 made a recommendation to the County Council for updating the CPPs on July 28, 2021; and  
34

35 WHEREAS, except in the removal of the SCT SC recommended new policy JP-3,  
36 Exhibit A to this ordinance reflects the SCT SC recommendation to the County Council,  
37 as shown in strike through and underline, with minor formatting changes to conform with  
38 County standards on the form of ordinances; and  
39

40 WHEREAS, the minutes of the SCT SC meetings reflect the discussion and  
41 recommendations made by the SCT SC to the County Council; and  
42

43 WHEREAS, the County Council held a public hearing(s) on September 29, 2021,  
44 to consider the entire record, including the July 28, 2021, SCT recommendation and to  
45 hear public testimony on this Ordinance No. 21-059.  
46

1  
2 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED:  
3

4 Section 1. The County Council adopts the following findings in support of this  
5 ordinance:  
6

7 A. The foregoing recitals are adopted as findings as if set forth in full herein.  
8

9 B. The updated CPPs, which include new policies and modified versions of current CPPs,  
10 are consistent with VISION 2050 and state law.  
11

12 C. The County Council adopts and incorporates the following general findings of fact  
13 related to the updated CPPs:  
14

- 15 1. The proposed updated CPPs consider the internal consistency of the current CPPs  
16 and reflect a careful balance between maintaining the historic nature of the  
17 policies and the functional advantages of improved consistency.  
18
- 19 2. The formation of the updated CPPs reflect a careful balancing of the requirements  
20 found in: (a) the MPPs in VISION 2050; (b) the fourteen goals of the GMA  
21 (RCW 36.70A.020 and .480(1)); and (c) the requirements for CPPs for  
22 Snohomish County under RCW 36.70A.210 and RCW 36.70A.215. Of these  
23 requirements, the MPPs in VISION 2050 have undergone the greatest degree of  
24 recent change. Hence, the majority of policy-level changes in the new CPPs  
25 reflect local implementation of regional policies adopted in VISION 2050.  
26
  - 27 a. The updated CPPs proposed by this ordinance make changes to address  
28 the updated MPPs in VISION 2050 to include the addition of new topics  
29 and concepts from the MPPs that are directive to counties and cities.  
30
  - 31 b. Consistent with the changes to the MPPs between VISION 2040 and  
32 VISION 2050, the proposed amendments to the CPPs include increased  
33 emphasis on the topics of equity and inclusion. This emphasis can be seen  
34 through revised central principles, updated chapter goals, and new and  
35 updated policies throughout all chapters of the CPPs. The updated and  
36 enhanced focus directs jurisdictions, through local and countywide  
37 planning processes, to more readily consider and include the impacts of  
38 governmental decision making on historically marginalized populations;  
39 work to reduce the discrepancies in access to opportunity, health  
40 outcomes, and services; and include equity considerations in decision  
41 making and jurisdictional investments.  
42
  - 43 c. The proposed policy updates include additional direction on coordination  
44 between jurisdictions and governmental agencies. This direction also  
45 incorporates additional guidance for jurisdictional coordination with tribes

1 and military installations that is consistent with regional direction from  
2 VISION 2050.

- 3
- 4 d. The proposed amendments include additional emphasis on slowing and  
5 mitigating the impacts of climate change, including the addition of a new  
6 subchapter in the Natural Environment chapter (proposed to be renamed to  
7 The Natural Environment and Climate Change), dedicated to policies  
8 addressing climate change and greenhouse gas emissions reductions.  
9
- 10 e. The proposed amendments include new and amended policies intended to  
11 address and mitigate potential displacement of residents and businesses as  
12 a result of pressure from population and employment growth and  
13 development and redevelopment.  
14
- 15 f. The proposed amendments include additional focus on transit-oriented  
16 development and directing population and employment growth to centers.  
17 This includes the addition of a new appendix, Appendix I – Centers, which  
18 includes new and additional direction on the centers hierarchy, consistent  
19 with VISION 2050 and the Regional Centers Framework. Within the  
20 proposed appendix is newly proposed criteria for the identification of  
21 Countywide Growth Centers and Countywide Industrial Centers.  
22
- 23 g. The proposed amendments include updates to the reasonable measures  
24 process, consistent with new guidance adopted by the Washington State  
25 Legislature in 2017 through E2SSB 5254.  
26

- 27 3. This ordinance is consistent with the record.  
28
- 29 4. Except in the removal of the SCT SC recommended new policy JP-3, the updated  
30 CPPs in Exhibit A to this ordinance reflect the recommendation from the SCT SC,  
31 with minor formatting changes to Exhibit A as necessary to conform with County  
32 standards on the form of ordinances.  
33
- 34 5. The SCT SC recommended new policy JP-3 is removed because: (a) The SCT SC  
35 policy JP-3 assigns obligations to only the County in facilitating annexation of  
36 Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs),  
37 which is an action that inherently requires collaboration between jurisdictions; (b)  
38 The SCT SC recommended policy JP-3 does not address disagreement related to  
39 annexations and will not likely result in consistency between County and city  
40 comprehensive plans; (c) Portions of the SCT SC recommended policy JP-3 are  
41 redundant to existing policy language within the CPPs, with, for example, JP-1  
42 emphasizing the importance of coordinating annexation between jurisdictions and  
43 JP-4 (formerly JP-6) directing the County and cities to develop policies in their  
44 comprehensive plans that provide for the orderly transition of unincorporated  
45 UGAs into cities; and (d) The SCT SC recommended policy JP-3 includes  
46 unnecessary restatements of basic legal principles about city/town land use

1 authority, which are already found in existing policies DP-5 and DP-7 (formally  
2 DP-8).

- 3  
4 6. Housekeeping amendments have been made to the updated CPPs in Exhibit A to  
5 this ordinance. Amendments include correction of typographical errors, incorrect  
6 code citations and background information, and inconsistent terminology. In  
7 addition, Figure 2 is amended to reflect the headings and organization of the  
8 updated CPPs and to restore a footnote that was inadvertently omitted.  
9

10 D. The County Council adopts and incorporates the following additional specific findings  
11 of fact related to the updated CPPs:

- 12  
13 1. The updated CPPs include amended narrative in the introductory chapter titled  
14 “Introduction to the Countywide Planning Policies.” In addition to the changes  
15 described below, amendments to the existing narrative are intended to improve  
16 readability, update references as needed, and make minor corrections.  
17 a. The “State Context and Goals” section is updated to (1) incorporate a 14<sup>th</sup>  
18 goal of GMA related to shorelines of the state that is in a different section  
19 of GMA than the 13 goals currently listed in the CPPs and (2) revise Goal  
20 4 (housing) to reflect amendments to this goal adopted by the state  
21 legislature in 2021.  
22 b. The “Regional Context” section is updated to incorporate the regional  
23 vision as found in VISION 2050, including updates to reflect the  
24 description of the plan, the updated “vision for 2050”, the updated  
25 regional overarching goals, and the updated Regional Growth Strategy.  
26 c. The Countywide Context section is updated to acknowledge the unknown  
27 aspects of the COVID-19 public health emergency, which occurred during  
28 the updated CPP development process.  
29  
30 2. The second chapter in the CPPs is titled “Central Principles and Framework  
31 Policies” and sets the stage for cooperative action between jurisdictions. The  
32 chapter includes three parts: (1) Central Principles, which guide all policies within  
33 the CPPs; (2) General Framework Policies, which includes one unchanged policy  
34 and six amended policies; and (3) Joint Planning Policies, which includes four  
35 unchanged policies, one amended policy, two new policies, and two deleted  
36 policies. In addition to the changes described below, amendments are made to  
37 improve readability, update references as needed, and make minor corrections.  
38

39 *Central Principles*

- 40  
41 a. The first Central Principle is amended to provide improved readability and  
42 include reference to the MPPs and regional vision within VISION 2050.  
43  
44 b. A proposed new third Central Principle calls for jurisdictions to  
45 incorporate equity and inclusion into all aspects of planning. This

1 principle is consistent with new focus on social equity throughout the  
2 MPPs and is reflected in updated and new policies throughout the  
3 amended CPPs.

4  
5 *General Framework Policies*  
6

- 7 c. Policy GF-2 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
8 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
9
- 10 d. Policy GF-3 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
11 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
12
- 13 e. Policy GF-4 is amended to update the reference to the current regional  
14 plan, VISION 2050. The policy direction remains unchanged.  
15
- 16 f. Policy GF-5 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy  
17 clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
18
- 19 g. Policy GF-6 is amended to simplify the language for easier policy  
20 maintenance and updates over time and to directly reflect the language in  
21 MPP-RGS-4, which prioritizes the accommodation of growth within the  
22 UGA.  
23
- 24 h. Policy GF-7 is amended to incorporate the revised deadline for the  
25 Buildable Lands Report as described in RCW 36.70A.215(2)(b), which  
26 was enacted in 2017 through E2SSB 5254.  
27

28 *Joint Planning Policies*  
29

- 30 i. Policy JP-1 is amended to include reference to the portions of the GMA  
31 that provide directives about urban growth, and to stress the importance of  
32 coordination between jurisdictions in local planning, governance,  
33 provision of services, and annexation, consistent with MPP-RGS-16.  
34
- 35 j. Existing policy JP-2 is deleted because jurisdictions did not express  
36 interest in utilizing this dispute resolution process. Alternate methods of  
37 dispute resolution have been utilized by jurisdictions. Subsequently listed  
38 policies are renumbered as appropriate.  
39
- 40 k. Existing policy JP-5 is deleted because the described interjurisdictional  
41 group and process was never implemented by Snohomish County  
42 Tomorrow. Alternate methods have been used to resolve disputes between  
43 jurisdictional comprehensive plans. Other policies are renumbered as  
44 appropriate.  
45





1 creating a situation where the County Council wished to retain its greatest  
2 flexibility in responding to new trends.

- 3
- 4 d. Policy DP-3 is amended to clarify that areas that are removed from the  
5 UGA should be “consistent” with existing rural and resource designations.  
6
- 7 e. Policy DP-4 is amended to include specific reference to the Procedures  
8 Report that is referenced in Appendix E – Procedures for Buildable Lands  
9 Reporting in Response to GF-7 to the CPPs, leaving the existing policy  
10 direction unchanged.  
11
- 12 f. Existing policy DP-6 is deleted from the Development Patterns chapter  
13 and relocated to the Public Services and Facilities chapter as policy PS-22,  
14 while renumbering all other DP policies as applicable. The policy provides  
15 direction on the extension of sanitary sewer mains outside of the UGA and  
16 is most appropriately located in the General Public Services subchapter.  
17
- 18 g. Renumbered Policy DP-6 (formerly DP-7) is amended to state that  
19 locating employment and living areas in close proximity should improve  
20 the jobs-housing balance. The policy is consistent with MPP-RGS-Action-  
21 8 and MPP-H-1.  
22
- 23 h. New proposed policy DP-8 directs the designation and development of  
24 local, countywide, and regional centers to be consistent with the Regional  
25 Growth Strategy in VISION 2050, the Regional Centers Framework, and  
26 the Countywide Center Criteria contained in new Appendix I to the CPPs.  
27 The proposed policy is consistent with MPP-DP-21 and MPP-DP-25.  
28
- 29 i. Policy DP-9 is amended to update language to provide direction to those  
30 jurisdictions with a regional growth center and/or a regional  
31 Manufacturing/Industrial center to ensure that those areas develop  
32 consistent with the regional vision. The policy is consistent with and  
33 implements MPP-RGS-8, MPP-RGS-9, MPP-RGS-10, and the Regional  
34 Centers Framework.  
35
- 36 j. Policy DP-10 is amended to update terminology to be consistent with new  
37 language within VISION 2050 regarding types of centers, to ensure that  
38 planning efforts for centers provides economic opportunities for all  
39 residents, and that development results in a reduction of greenhouse gas  
40 emissions from transportation. The amendments are consistent with the  
41 Development Patterns VISION 2050 goal, and policies MPP-DP-21,  
42 MPP-DP-22, MPP-DP-24, MPP-DP-25, and MPP-CC-Action-3.  
43
- 44 k. Policy DP-11 is amended to emphasize that higher densities and greater  
45 employment concentrations should be consistent with the Regional  
46 Growth Strategy and the Snohomish County growth targets. The

1 amendments are consistent with MPP-RGS-1, MPP-RGS-4, and MPP-  
2 RGS-Action-7.

- 3  
4 1. Policy DP-12 is amended to clarify that UGAs should provide sufficient  
5 levels of land and public facilities to support population and employment  
6 growth consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.  
7  
8 m. Policy DP-13 is amended to encourage jurisdictions to include design  
9 guidelines and other standards in urban centers to achieve compact urban  
10 areas with multimodal transportation facilities. The updated policy  
11 language is meant to implement policy direction from MPP-DP-1.  
12  
13 n. Policy DP-14 is amended to replace the term “urban centers” with the term  
14 “local centers, countywide centers, regional centers” to promote greater  
15 clarity and consistency with the terminology in VISION 2050.  
16  
17 o. Policy DP-15 is amended to specifically include underutilized lands  
18 among those areas that should be considered for infill and redevelopment.  
19 The updated language is consistent with policy direction from MPP-DP-4.  
20  
21 p. New policy DP-17 is policy language relocated from the Transportation  
22 chapter (formerly TR-24) to the Development Patterns chapter because the  
23 policy is land use in nature. The policy direction is proposed to remain  
24 unchanged. Other policies are renumbered as applicable.  
25  
26 q. New policy DP-18 is added to relocate the portions of the existing TR-12  
27 that provide direction on land use issues. The policy direction remains  
28 unchanged. Other policies are renumbered as applicable.  
29  
30 r. Policy DP-19 (formerly DP-17) is amended with minor language changes  
31 for policy clarification. The policy direction remains unchanged.  
32

33 *Rural Land Use and Resource Lands*

- 34  
35 s. Policy DP-26 (formerly DP-24) is amended to clarify that standards in the  
36 rural areas should result in reduced rural growth rates over time. This is  
37 consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and MPP-RGS-13.  
38  
39 t. Policy DP-27 (formerly DP-25) is amended with minor language updates  
40 to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.  
41  
42 u. Policy DP-28 (formerly DP-26) is amended to add reference to the  
43 county’s coordinated water system plan, while maintaining the existing  
44 policy direction.  
45

- v. Policy DP-30 (formerly DP-28) is amended to direct communities to plan to locate commercial and community services that serve rural residents within nearby UGAs, consistent with MPP-RGS-12.
- w. Policy DP-31 (formerly DP-29) is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.
- x. Policy DP-32 (formerly DP-30) is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.

*Orderly Development*

- y. Policy DP-33 (formerly DP-31) is amended to include minor changes to incorporate regional direction from MPP-DP-32 to reduce impacts on resource lands and critical areas.
- z. New policy DP-35 is added to provide direction for the creation of parks and other civic and public places within centers and urban areas. The proposed policy is consistent with MPP-DP-11. All other policies are renumbered as appropriate.
- aa. Policy DP-37 (formerly DP-34) is amended to add additional direction for jurisdictions to work with tribes to protect Tribal Reservation lands and other culturally significant sites. The amended language is consistent with MPP-RC-1, MPP-RC-4, MPP-DP-7, and MPP-DP-51.
- bb. New policy DP-38 is added to direct jurisdictions to utilize inclusive community planning and to consider needs of current and future residents and businesses when making investment decisions. The proposed policy is consistent with MPP-DP-2 and MPP-DP-8 in VISION 2050 which promote access to opportunity and reduction of disparities.
- cc. New policy DP-39 is added to encourage jurisdictions to consider and mitigate the displacement impacts that planning, development, and redevelopment have on marginalized residents and businesses. The proposed policy is consistent with MPP-DP-23.
- dd. Policy DP-40 (formerly DP-35) is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. In addition, new language is proposed which directs jurisdictions to incorporate consideration of reducing disparities in health and well-being into local and countywide planning efforts. The amended language is meant to implement MPP-RC-3, MPP-DP-16, MPP-DP-18, and MPP-DP-19.
- ee. Policy DP-42 (formerly DP-37) is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.

- 1  
2 4. The fourth chapter in the CPPs is titled “Housing” and includes an amended  
3 overall goal and four unchanged policies, nine amended policies, two new  
4 policies, and one deleted policy.  
5  
6 a. The narrative section of the Housing chapter is updated to improve clarity  
7 of the section, update references as needed, reflect new regional guidance,  
8 and make corrections as needed to reflect the updated policies.  
9  
10 b. The overall Housing chapter Goal is amended to incorporate the concept  
11 of fair housing into the overall housing goal and highlight equity and  
12 inclusion as a key part of housing policies within the CPPs. The  
13 amendments are consistent with the Housing Goal from VISION 2050.  
14  
15 c. Existing policy HO-1 is deleted because the topic of fair housing, which it  
16 currently addresses, has been incorporated into the overall Housing  
17 chapter Goal. All other Housing policies have been renumbered as  
18 appropriate.  
19  
20 d. Policy HO-1 (formerly HO-2) is amended with minor language changes  
21 for clarification and the addition of section HO-1.f to promote diverse  
22 housing types in single-family neighborhoods to meet the various needs of  
23 residents. These amendments increase consistency with MPP-H-1 and  
24 MPP-H-2.  
25  
26 e. Policy HO-2 (formerly HO-3) is amended to provide reference to VISION  
27 2050, the Regional Growth Strategy, and Snohomish County Growth  
28 Targets for affordable housing goals. The amendment includes that  
29 regional fair share of affordable housing should address housing for all  
30 income levels, which is consistent with MPP-H-3.  
31  
32 f. Policy HO-3 (formerly HO-4) is amended to update language  
33 promoting interjurisdictional efforts to provide an adequate supply  
34 of “affordable, special needs, and diverse” housing throughout the  
35 county. These modifications improve consistency with MPP-H-11.  
36  
37 g. New proposed policy HO-4 promotes the development of moderate  
38 density housing, also referred to as “missing middle housing”, through  
39 amendments to County and city codes and removal of other  
40 restrictions. This new policy is consistent with MPP-H-9.  
41  
42 h. Policy HO-5 is amended to replace the term “redevelopable residential  
43 land” with the phrase “land that is undeveloped, partially used and/or has  
44 the potential to be developed or redeveloped for residential purposes” for  
45 greater clarity. The amended language also includes the addition of a new  
46 section HO-5.d that adds the evaluation of physical and economic  
47 displacement risk as part of the Housing Characteristics and Needs Report

1 for Snohomish County. The changes are consistent with the intent and  
2 language in MPP-H-12 and MPP-H-Action-2.

- 3
- 4 i. Policy HO-6 is amended to emphasize affordable housing for all by  
5 adding “for residents of all income levels” to the policy. The phrase  
6 “upgrading of neighborhoods,” which is ambiguous language, is  
7 deleted. These modifications promote alignment with MPP H-3.
- 8
- 9 j. Policy HO-7 is amended to strike the term “growth monitoring report” and  
10 replace it with an updated reference to the “Housing Characteristics and  
11 Needs Report prescribed in HO-5” which is the report that provides  
12 housing definitions.
- 13
- 14 k. Policy HO-9 is amended with minor language changes for clarity. The  
15 policy direction is unchanged.
- 16
- 17 l. Policy HO-10 is amended to include reference to “environmentally  
18 sensitive building techniques and materials” to minimize impacts on  
19 natural resource systems. Language is added for jurisdictions  
20 to seek balance between the costs and benefits of housing affordability and  
21 environmental sustainability. This amended language increases  
22 consistency with several of the MPPs in VISION 2050, including MPP-  
23 En-5, MPP-CC-2, and MPP-DP-19.
- 24
- 25 m. Policy HO-14 is proposed to be amended to add emphasis and possible  
26 strategies for jurisdictions to develop and preserve long-term affordable  
27 housing. These modifications promote alignment with MPP-H-8.
- 28
- 29 n. New proposed policy HO-15 requires certain jurisdictions to develop and  
30 implement strategies to address displacement of at-risk populations and  
31 those identified by the report proscribed by policy HO-5. This policy is  
32 consistent with MPP-H-Action-6 which focuses upon the risk of  
33 displacement in urban areas and MPP-H-12 which addresses displacement  
34 risk due to development and redevelopment.
- 35
- 36 5. The fifth chapter in the CPPs is titled “Economic Development and Employment”  
37 and includes an amended overall goal and four unchanged policies, nine amended  
38 policies, five new policies, and three deleted policies.
- 39
- 40 a. The narrative section of the Economic Development and Employment  
41 chapter is updated to improve clarity of the section, update references as  
42 needed, reflect new regional guidance, and make minor corrections as  
43 needed to reflect the updated policies.
- 44

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  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

- b. The overall Economic Development and Employment Goal is updated to emphasize that economic growth that is encouraged by governments should be sustainable.
- c. Policy ED-1 is amended to update the reference to regional planning documents, including VISION 2050 and the Regional Economic Strategy. The amendments also remove reference to specific industry clusters, and instead direct that jurisdictions should support existing and emerging industry clusters as identified in local and regional economic development plans, which is consistent with MPP-EC-3.
- d. Policy ED-2 is amended to direct jurisdictions to promote equity and inclusion in the local economy by fostering a business and regulatory environment that is supportive of local, small, and startup businesses, particularly those that are minority- and woman-owned. The amended policy is consistent with MPP-EC-7.
- e. Policy ED-3 is amended to direct jurisdictions to prioritize multi-modal transportation linkages between centers that improve access to opportunities and support economic development. This amendment is in alignment with MPP-EC-18.
- f. Policy ED-4 is amended with minor language updates that reference the hierarchy of centers, consistent with MPP-RC-7, MPP-RC-8, and the Regional Centers Framework.
- g. Existing policy ED-5 is deleted from the Economic Development and Employment chapter and all applicable information is relocated to the new proposed Appendix I – Centers. The new Appendix I includes steps for the countywide designation of new regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, which was previously included as CPP-ED-5.
- h. New proposed policy ED-5 provides direction for jurisdictions to incorporate equity and inclusion principles into the local economy by promoting economic growth that provides a diverse range of living wage jobs. The new policy is consistent with MPP-EC-9.
- i. Existing policy ED-6 is deleted and all applicable information is relocated to the new proposed Appendix I – Centers. The new Appendix I replaces the existing ED-6 by referencing the Regional Centers Framework for regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center designation criteria.
- j. New proposed policy ED-6 provides direction for jurisdictions to incorporate equity and inclusion into economic development strategies to improve access to economic opportunity for those populations that have historically low access. The policy is consistent with MPP-EC-14.

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  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

- k. Policy ED-7 is amended with an updated reference to regional planning documents and with minor language updates. The amendments do not alter policy direction.
  - l. Policy ED-8 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.
  - m. Policy ED-11 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.
  - n. Policy ED-12 is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.
  - o. New proposed policy ED-15 addresses the connection between economic development and the natural environment and climate change. The policy is consistent with MPP-EC-16. Other policies are renumbered as applicable.
  - p. Policy ED-16 (formerly ED-15) is amended with minor language updates to improve policy clarity. Policy direction remains unchanged.
  - q. Existing policy ED-16 is deleted because the Arlington/ and Marysville Manufacturing/Industrial Center (Cascade Industrial Center) has been identified as a regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC) under the Regional Centers Framework.
  - r. New proposed policy ED-17 directs the County and cities to support the Cascade Industrial Center as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center and identifies it as a key employment area for the county and region. Policy ED-7 identifies the Paine Field-Boeing Manufacturing/Industrial Center as a key area for employment. Policy ED-17 adds consistency to the CPPs by providing a similar policy for the Cascade Industrial Center.
  - s. New proposed policy ED-18 directs jurisdictions to identify and, where appropriate, mitigate the impacts of displacement on locally owned and small businesses. The policy is consistent with MPP-EC-12.
6. The sixth chapter in the CPPs is titled “Transportation” and includes an amended overall goal and ten unchanged policies, thirteen amended policies, two new policies, and one deleted policy.
- a. The narrative section of the Transportation chapter is amended to update references as needed and make corrections to reflect the updated policies.



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  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

- b. The overall Transportation Goal is amended to direct jurisdictions to emphasize affordability, equity, inclusion, and safety to plan a transportation system that promotes economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and human health. The amendments are consistent with the VISION 2050 Transportation goal and the transportation MPPs.
- c. Policy TR-3 is amended to maintain consistency with updated language in VISION 2050 on transportation funding priorities and to update the names of regional and statewide plans. The amendments are consistent with MPP-T-12 and MPP-T-15.
- d. Policy TR-4 is amended to maintain consistency with updated policy language from VISION 2050 to address changing transportation technologies, street connectivity, and multimodal level of service (LOS). The amended language is consistent with MPP-T-7, MPP-T-16, MPP-T-17, and MPP-T-33.
- e. Policy TR-5 is amended to direct jurisdictions to consider the transportation system’s compatibility with the natural environment, consistent with MPP-T-21.
- f. Policy TR-6 is amended to differentiate between TR-6, which addresses the natural environment, and TR-16, which addresses climate change. The amendments also incorporate regional direction on stormwater (MPP-En-9), fish passages (MPP-T-32), and human health (MPP-T-5).
- g. Policy TR-8 is amended to add expectations for concurrency determinations within regional, countywide, and local centers and near high-capacity transit facilities. Additionally, the amended language deletes portions of the existing policy that serve as narrative rather than providing policy direction. The amendments are consistent with MPP-DP-52, MPP-DP-53, and MPP-DP-54.
- h. Policy TR-12 is amended to focus this policy on transportation, including transit and transit-supportive infrastructure. The deleted language provided direction on land use issues and is relocated to the Development Patterns chapter as policy DP-18.
- i. Policy TR-13 is amended to reflect the passage of Sound Transit 3 System Expansion Plan (ST3). The existing policy references potential locations for Sound Transit 2 System Expansion Plan (ST2) stations within Snohomish County. The revisions add specific reference to ST3 including the proposed station locations.
- j. Policy TR-14 is amended to clarify that the process to evaluate possible transit service area expansion is the responsibility of transit agencies rather

1 than that of the County and/or cities and towns. The new language directs  
2 jurisdictions to work with and support efforts by transit agencies to  
3 evaluate possible expansion.  
4

- 5 k. Policy TR-15 is amended to add language directing jurisdictions to  
6 improve the resiliency of the transportation system to better plan for  
7 disasters and other impacts. The amendments are consistent with MPP-T-  
8 31 and MPP-CC-8.  
9
- 10 l. Policy TR-16 is amended to mirror the increased emphasis on the role of  
11 transportation on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions outlined in  
12 VISION 2050. The amendments also seek to differentiate between TR-6,  
13 addressing the natural environment, and TR-16, addressing climate  
14 change. The amendments are consistent with MPP-En-3, MPP-CC-3,  
15 MPP-T-13, MPP-T-29, and MPP-T-30.  
16
- 17 m. Policy TR-18 is amended with minor language changes that emphasize the  
18 need for the local transportation network to support global trade and the  
19 local, regional, and statewide economic needs related to distribution of  
20 goods and services. The amendments are consistent with MPP-T-14,  
21 MPP-T-23, MPP-T-24, MPP-T-25, and MPP-T-26.  
22
- 23 n. Policy TR-19 is amended to incorporate equity and inclusion  
24 considerations into transportation system planning. The policy is  
25 consistent with major changes between VISION 2040 and VISION 2050  
26 and the overall proposed updates to the CPPs that emphasize social equity  
27 within regional, countywide, and local planning. Specifically, the  
28 amendments are consistent with MPP-T-9 and MPP-T-Action-9.  
29
- 30 o. Policy TR-21 is amended with minor changes to further emphasize  
31 planning for pedestrian connections between activity centers throughout  
32 Snohomish County. The amendments are consistent with MPP-T-17.  
33
- 34 p. Existing policy TR-24 is deleted from the Transportation chapter and  
35 relocated to the Development Patterns chapter as DP-17 because it  
36 provides direction on land use issues. The policy direction remains  
37 unchanged.  
38
- 39 q. New policy TR-24 is added to provide direction to jurisdictions on the  
40 improvement of arterial roads outside of urban growth areas. The  
41 proposed new policy is consistent with the existing CPP-DP-25  
42 (renumbered to be CPP-DP-27) and MPP-T-22.  
43
- 44 r. New policy TR-25 is added to direct jurisdictions to coordinate with  
45 airports on local and regional aviation needs, consistent with state and

1 regional aviation system plans. The proposed policy is consistent with  
2 MPP-T-28.  
3

- 4 7. The seventh chapter in the CPPs is titled “The Natural Environment” and includes  
5 policies that address protection of the natural environment and slowing and  
6 mitigating the impacts of climate change. Within the existing CPPs, the chapter  
7 has an overall chapter goal, and a series of policies related to the natural  
8 environment and climate change. Through adoption of this ordinance, the chapter  
9 is renamed to “The Natural Environment and Climate Change” and includes two  
10 new subchapters: (1) The Natural Environment, including policies related to  
11 topics such as, air and water resources, the natural environment, habitat, and open  
12 space, with one unchanged policy, four amended policies, and six new policies;  
13 and (2) Climate Change, including policies that provide direction on slowing and  
14 mitigating the impacts of climate change, with one unchanged policy, four  
15 amended policies, and two new policies.  
16

- 17 a. The narrative section of the Natural Environment and Climate Change  
18 chapter is updated to improve clarity of the section, update references as  
19 needed, reflect new regional guidance, and make corrections as needed to  
20 reflect the updated policies.  
21  
22 b. The overall Natural Environment and Climate Change goal is amended to  
23 highlight climate change as a key focus of the overall chapter and  
24 incorporate equity and inclusion considerations into the chapter. The  
25 amendments are consistent with the Environment Goal and the Climate  
26 Change Goal from VISION 2050.  
27

### 28 *The Natural Environment*

29

- 30 c. Env-1 is amended with updated language to emphasize interjurisdictional  
31 and interdisciplinary planning for the protection of natural ecosystems and  
32 natural environment. This amendment increases alignment of this policy  
33 with MPP-En-1 and MPP-En-2.  
34  
35 d. Policy Env-2 is amended with minor language updates that highlight the  
36 importance of working across jurisdictional boundaries to accomplish  
37 environmental goals. Specific language is added to emphasize  
38 equitable access to parks and open space. These modifications promote  
39 alignment with MPP-En-12, MPP-En-14 and MPP-En-Action-4 and the  
40 overall emphasis on interjurisdictional cooperation and social equity in  
41 VISION 2050.  
42  
43 e. New proposed policy Env-3 provides direction for interjurisdictional  
44 commitment to implementing the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan  
45 within Snohomish County. This new policy is consistent with MPP-En-12  
46 and MPP-En-Action-4. Other policies are renumbered as applicable.

- 1  
2 f. Policy Env-4 (formerly Env-3) addresses protection of wildlife corridors  
3 and habitat for endangered or threatened species and is amended  
4 with specific reference to protection of habitat for orca and salmon,  
5 highlighting them as a key indicator species for the region. These changes  
6 better align this policy with the language in MPP-En-16.  
7  
8 g. Policy Env-5 (formerly Env-4) is amended to include tribes in  
9 interjurisdictional efforts to protect open space. The changes are  
10 closely aligned with the overall emphasis on inclusion and regional  
11 cooperation in VISION 2050. The addition of “other best practices” for  
12 protection of open space and natural resources expands the strategies that  
13 jurisdictions can consider.  
14  
15 h. New proposed policy Env-7 provides new direction for reduction and  
16 mitigation of stormwater impacts, including through collaborative  
17 watershed planning. This connection between stormwater management  
18 and development is not specifically addressed in the existing CPPs. This  
19 new policy is well aligned with MPP-En-18, which advocates reduction of  
20 stormwater impacts.  
21  
22 i. New proposed policy Env-8 provides direction for protecting and  
23 improving air and water quality for all residents, which is a topic not  
24 specifically addressed in other policies. This new policy is consistent with  
25 MPP-En-3 and MPP-En-4.  
26  
27 j. New proposed policy Env-9 provides direction for the reduction of light  
28 and noise pollution from a variety of sources, with a specific emphasis on  
29 reducing impacts upon vulnerable populations. The proposed policy  
30 is consistent with MPP-En-7 and MPP-En-8. This new policy addresses  
31 a topic not specifically addressed in other CPPs.  
32  
33 k. New proposed policy Env-10 provides direction for the reduction of  
34 pesticide use and promotion of programs to protect human and  
35 environmental health. The proposed policy is aligned with MPP-En-19  
36 and addresses a topic not specifically addressed in other CPPs.  
37  
38 l. New proposed policy Env-11 provides direction for the prevention and  
39 reduction of the spread of invasive species. This policy is consistent with  
40 MPP-En-13 to help protect overall ecological function.  
41

42 *Climate Change*

- 43  
44 m. Policy CC-1 (formerly Env-6) is amended to include specific reference to  
45 the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, by stating that jurisdictions shall  
46 adopt actions and initiatives to comply with that agency’s emission

1 reduction goals. This policy is consistent with reduction goals outlined in  
2 the Climate Change goal for VISION 2050 and MPP-CC-1.

- 3
- 4 n. Policy CC-2 (formerly Env-7) is relocated to the Climate Change
- 5 subsection and be renumbered as CC-2. Policy language remains
- 6 unchanged.
- 7
- 8 o. Policy CC-3 (formerly Env-8) is relocated to the Climate Change
- 9 subchapter and amended to add specific examples that jurisdictions can
- 10 use to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These modifications increase this
- 11 policy’s alignment with MPP-CC-2 and MPP-CC-3.
- 12
- 13 p. Policy CC-4 (formerly Env-9) is relocated to the Climate Change
- 14 subchapter and amended by adding a specific reference to maintain and
- 15 increase natural resources that sequester and store carbon. This
- 16 amendment is aligned with the direction provided in MPP-CC-4.
- 17
- 18 q. Policy CC-5 (formerly Env-10) is relocated to the Climate Change
- 19 subchapter and amended to reflect environmental justice priorities outlined
- 20 in VISION 2050. The proposed policy specifically includes “adaptation
- 21 and resilience” as a priority for local planning regarding climate change.
- 22 These amendments increase the alignment of this policy with MPP-CC-8
- 23 and MPP-CC-Acion-4.
- 24
- 25 r. New proposed policy CC-6 provides direction to jurisdictions by
- 26 identifying high level measures to meet greenhouse gas reduction
- 27 targets. This policy is consistent with emission reduction goals outlined in
- 28 VISION 2050 and MPP-CC-1, MPP-CC-11, and MPP-CC-Action-3.
- 29
- 30 s. New policy CC-7 provides direction to jurisdictions to consider sea level
- 31 rise when siting or relocating essential public facilities and hazardous
- 32 industries. This CPP is consistent with MPP-CC-8, MPP-CC-10, and
- 33 MPP-CC-Action 4.
- 34

35 8. The eighth chapter in the CPPs is titled “Public Services and Facilities”, and  
36 includes an amended overall Public Services and Facilities Goal and two  
37 subchapters: (1) General Public Services, including eleven unchanged policies,  
38 four amended policies, and seven new policies; and (2) Essential Public Services  
39 including three unchanged policies and two amended policies.

- 40
- 41 a. The narrative section of the Public Services and Facilities chapter is
- 42 updated to improve clarity of the section, update references as needed,
- 43 reflect new regional guidance, and make minor corrections as needed.
- 44

- b. The overall Public Services and Facilities goal is updated with minor changes to direct jurisdictions to consider all residents when planning for the provision of public services and facilities.

*General Public Services*

- c. Policy PS-7 is amended to include a focus on long-term availability of water for human use and environmental needs, including reference to possible strategies. This change increases this policy’s alignment with MPP-PS-9, MPP-PS-22, MPP-PS-23 and MPP-PS-24. The amendment also incorporates reference to interjurisdictional collaboration which is a major theme in VISION 2050 and included in MPP-PS-23.
- d. New policy PS-8 provides direction for jurisdictions and tribal governments to engage in collaborative planning of water and wastewater utilities which is closely aligned with the policy language of MPP-PS-23. All other policies are renumbered as applicable.
- e. New policy PS-9 provides direction for jurisdictions to include consideration of the potential impacts of climate change in planning for the county’s long-term water supply. This amendment is consistent with MPP-PS-20, MPP-PS-21, and MPP-PS-23. Other policies are renumbered as applicable.
- f. Policy PS-10 (formerly PS-8) is amended to add the phrase “and, if desired exceed” in reference to reduction targets of solid waste set by the state, which promotes exceeding the minimum requirement. This amendment is aligned with MPP-PS-8.
- g. Policy PS-12 (formerly PS-10) is amended to replace the term “encourage” with “promote” to urge jurisdictions to move towards renewable and alternative energy sources. This modification contributes to greater alignment with this major theme from VISION 2050 and policies MPP-PS-13, MPP-PS-15 and MPP-CC-3.
- h. Policy PS-13 (formerly PS-11) is amended with a reference to new facilities in addition to existing facilities for promotion of energy conservation and efficiency. This policy amendment is aligned with MPP-PS-4, MPP-PS-14 and MPP-PS-15.
- i. New policy PS-18 provides direction to jurisdictions to work collaboratively to promote equitable access to public services. This proposed policy is consistent with MPP-PS-2, which has a particular focus on populations that are historically underserved.

- 1 j. New policy PS-19 provides direction to jurisdictions to identify  
2 connection to sanitary sewers as the preferred alternative to address failing  
3 septic systems. The new policy is consistent with MPP-PS-11.  
4
- 5 k. New policy PS-20 provides direction to jurisdictions to plan for the  
6 provision of telecommunication infrastructure, including a focus on  
7 underserved areas. The new policy is consistent with MPP-PS-16.  
8
- 9 l. New policy PS-21 provides direction to jurisdictions to work  
10 collaboratively to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities  
11 and ensure that school siting is consistent with comprehensive plans  
12 including adopted capital facilities plans for each school district. Regional  
13 policy MPP-PS-26 does not mention the Regional Growth Strategy  
14 (RGS); therefore, referencing the RGS in PS-21 is not necessary for  
15 consistency between the countywide and multi-county planning policies.  
16
- 17 m. New proposed PS-22 (formerly DP-6) is the relocation of the existing DP-  
18 6 to the Public Service and Facilities chapter because it is directly related  
19 to the provision of public services. New language is added “and as  
20 allowed in RCW 36.70A.213” to be consistent with HB 2243 passed in  
21 2017 which created RCW 36.70A.213 and allows utilities to be extended  
22 under certain circumstances.  
23

24 *Essential Public Facilities*  
25

- 26 n. Policy EPF-2 is amended to add consideration of future impacts from  
27 climate change in planning the siting of local essential public services,  
28 including risk of sea level rise. The updated language is consistent  
29 with MPP-CC-8 and MPP-CC-10.  
30
- 31 o. Policy EPF-3 is amended to add equity considerations in the siting of local  
32 essential public services. The updated language is consistent with MPP-  
33 PS-28.  
34
- 35 9. The CPPs also include appendices that supplement the policies. The nine  
36 appendices include: a) UGA and MUGA Boundary Maps; b) Growth Targets; c)  
37 Growth Targets Procedure Steps for GF-5; d) Reasonable Measures; e)  
38 Procedures for Buildable Lands Reporting in Response to GF-7; f) List of Issues  
39 for Interlocal Agreements; g) Definitions of Key Terms; h) Fiscal Impact  
40 Analysis; and i) Centers (a proposed new appendix). The proposed amendments  
41 include several revisions to the appendices of the CPPs and the adoption of a new  
42 appendix, which are described below.  
43

1  
2 *Appendix C – Growth Target Procedure Steps for GF-5*  
3

- 4 a. Appendix C is amended to emphasize the role of the Regional Growth  
5 Strategy in the growth targeting process for Snohomish County. These  
6 amendments include highlighting key features of the RGS, including their  
7 associated countywide planning policies, that should be emphasized in  
8 initial subcounty population and employment distributions. The features  
9 include growth near centers and high-capacity transit (HCT), improving  
10 the jobs/housing balance, managing and reducing rural growth over time,  
11 and supporting UGA infill.  
12

13 *Appendix D – Reasonable Measures*  
14

- 15 b. Appendix D is amended in response to 2017 Senate Bill E2SSB 5254,  
16 which required local evaluation and review of the reasonable measures  
17 process. On June 24, 2020, the SCT Steering Committee approved the  
18 Reasonable Measures Technical Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254,  
19 containing recommended updates to the reasonable measures tables. To  
20 complement the recommendation, on October 12, 2020, ECONorthwest  
21 provided additional documentation that identified a recommended scale of  
22 impact, measure applicability, and issue category for each potential  
23 measure to add that was identified in the Reasonable Measures Technical  
24 Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254. The revisions to Appendix D  
25 reflect the recommendations included in the Reasonable Measures  
26 Technical Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254, the October 12, 2020  
27 additional documentation, the SCT PAC subcommittee recommendations,  
28 or are intended to improve clarity.  
29
- 30 c. First, the Reasonable Measures List is amended to add a description of  
31 measure field, which includes a brief description of each measure to  
32 provide clarity. These descriptions were added at the recommendation of  
33 the SCT PAC subcommittee. Descriptions of existing measures were  
34 taken from the Phase II Report: Recommended Method for Evaluating  
35 local Reasonable Measures Programs, from June 2003, while descriptions  
36 of new measures were developed based on information in the Buildable  
37 Lands Guidelines, published by the Department of Commerce in 2018,  
38 and the Reasonable Measures Technical Supplement: Response to E2SSB-  
39 5254.  
40
- 41 d. Second, the Reasonable Measures List is amended by adding an Issue  
42 Category field, stating which issue or issues each measure is intended to  
43 address. The issue categories included were identified in the Reasonable  
44 Measures Technical Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254, and are: 1)  
45 planned densities not achieved; 2) insufficient capacity; and 3)  
46 inconsistent development patterns. Based on recommendations from the



1 SCT PAC subcommittee, certain measures have different issue categories  
2 checked than set forth in the Reasonable Measures Technical Supplement:  
3 Response to E2SSB-5254.  
4

5 e. Third, the Reasonable Measures List is amended to add a scale of impact  
6 field, identifying the anticipated impact each measure is expected to have.  
7 The scale ranges from small to moderate to high.  
8

9 f. Finally, the amendments add eight new measures to the Reasonable  
10 Measures List, derived from the list of thirty-one potential measures  
11 identified in the supplement to the Reasonable Measures Technical  
12 Supplement: Response to E2SSB-5254, approved by the SCT Steering  
13 Committee June 24, 2020. The eight new measures are: 1) allow garden  
14 and larger scale apartments and other moderate and higher density  
15 housing; 2) administrative and procedural reforms; 3) streamline  
16 development regulations and/or standards; 4) phasing/tiering urban  
17 growth; 5) promote vertical growth; 6) SEPA categorical exemptions for  
18 mixed use and infill development and increased threshold for SEPA  
19 categorical exemptions; 7) provide for regional stormwater facilities; and  
20 8) public land disposition.  
21

22 *Appendix F – List of Issues for Interlocal Agreements*  
23

24 g. Appendix F is amended to expand the list of example issues that are  
25 appropriate to coordinate between jurisdictions using interlocal  
26 agreements to include “response to climate crisis through restoration and  
27 protection of the environment’s natural functions and wildlife habitats.”  
28 This addition is consistent with the increased focus on slowing and  
29 mitigating the impacts of climate change throughout the proposed CPP  
30 amendments and VISION 2050.  
31

32 *Appendix G – Definitions of Key Terms*  
33

34 h. Appendix G is amended to expand the list of defined terms to assist in the  
35 interpretation and implementation of the policies contained within the  
36 CPPs. The added terms are: 1) Activity Unit; 2) Built Environment; 3)  
37 Centers; 4) Clean Energy; 5) Countywide Center; 6) Displacement; 7)  
38 Environmentally Sensitive Development Practice; 8) Environmentally  
39 Sensitive Housing Development; 9) Equity; 10) Greenhouse Gas; 11)  
40 Growth Target; 12) Historically Marginalized Communities; 13) Jobs-  
41 Housing Balance; 14) Living Wage Jobs; and 15) Moderate Density  
42 Housing. Terms that are also defined within VISION 2050 include a  
43 definition consistent with that definition.  
44

Appendix I - Centers

- i. New Appendix I – Centers is added to the CPPs. The new appendix is intended to help implement the Regional Centers Framework, VISION 2050 policies MPP-RC-8, MPP-RGS-8, MPP-RGS-9, MPP-RGS-10, MPP-RGS-11, MPP-DP-25, and MPP-DP-26, and Countywide Planning Policies DP-8, DP-9, DP-10, DP-14, and ED-4.
- j. Included in Appendix I is the new Countywide Growth Center and Countywide Industrial designation criteria and process, consistent with regional guidance provided in the Regional Centers Framework and an identified list of candidate centers, which jurisdictions can choose to plan for formal identification.

E. Procedural requirements.

1. State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requirements with respect to this non-project action have been satisfied through the issuance of Addendum No. 1 to the VISION 2050 Final Environmental Impact Statement on September 13, 2021.
2. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106(1), a notice of intent to adopt this ordinance was transmitted to the Washington State Department of Commerce for distribution to state agencies on August 2, 2021
3. The public participation process used in the adoption of this ordinance complies with all applicable requirements of the GMA and the SCC.
4. The Washington State Attorney General last issued an advisory memorandum, as required by RCW 36.70A.370, in September of 2018 entitled “Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property” to help local governments avoid the unconstitutional taking of private property. The process outlined in the State Attorney General’s 2018 advisory memorandum was used by the County in objectively evaluating the regulatory changes proposed by this ordinance.

Section 2. The County Council makes the following conclusions:

1. The proposed updated CPPs increase consistency between the CPPs and VISION 2050.
2. The proposed updated CPPs increase consistency between the CPPs and the GMA.

- 1 3. The proposed updated CPPs satisfy the requirements of RCW 36.70A.210 and  
2 RCW 36.70A.215 and are consistent with the GMA.  
3  
4 4. The County has complied with all SEPA requirements with respect to this non-  
5 project action.  
6  
7 5. The public participation process used in the adoption of this ordinance complies  
8 with all applicable requirements of the GMA and title 30 SCC.  
9  
10 6. The updated CPPs proposed by this ordinance do not result in an unconstitutional  
11 taking of private property for a public purpose.  
12

13 Section 3. The County Council bases its findings and conclusions on the entire  
14 legislative record, including all testimony and exhibits. Any finding which should be  
15 deemed a conclusion, and any conclusion that should be a finding, is hereby adopted  
16 as such.  
17

18 Section 4. Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Snohomish  
19 County Countywide Planning Policies, last amended by Amended Ordinance No. 16-  
20 078 on October 16, 2017, are amended as set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto.  
21

22 Section 5. Severability and Savings. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of  
23 this ordinance shall be held to be invalid by the Growth Management Hearings Board  
24 (Board), or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or  
25 unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section,  
26 sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance. Provided, however, that if any section,  
27 sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is held to be invalid by the Board or court of  
28 competent jurisdiction, then the section, sentence, clause or phrase in effect prior to the  
29 effective date of this ordinance shall be in full force and effect for that individual section,  
30 sentence, clause or phrase as if this ordinance had never been adopted.  
31

32 Section 6. The County Council directs the Code Reviser to update SCC  
33 30.10.050 pursuant to SCC 1.02.020(3).  
34

35 PASSED this 29<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021.  
36

37 SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
38 Snohomish County, Washington  
39

40   
41 \_\_\_\_\_  
42 Council Acting-Chair

43 ATTEST:  
44

45   
46 \_\_\_\_\_  
47 Clerk of the Council


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

APPROVED

EMERGENCY

VETOED

DATE: 10/12/2021



County Executive

ATTEST:

Melissa Geraghty

Approved as to form only:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

**EXHIBIT A:**

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY EXECUTIVE AUGUST 18,  
2021, RECOMMENDED**

**COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES**

**FOR**

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

1 **Table of Contents**

2

3 Introduction to the Countywide Planning Policies ..... 3

4 Purpose..... 3

5 Organization of the Document..... 5

6 State Context and Goals..... 8

7 Regional Context ..... 9

8 Countywide Context ..... 15

9 Central Principles and Framework Policies..... 17

10 General Framework Policies..... 18

11 Joint Planning Policies..... 21

12 Development Patterns ..... 23

13 Urban Growth Areas and Land Use..... 23

14 Rural Land Use and Resource Lands..... 32

15 Orderly Development ..... 35

16 Housing ..... 37

17 Economic Development and Employment ..... 43

18 Transportation ..... 50

19 The Natural Environment and Climate Change..... 62

20 The Natural Environment Policies..... 63

21 Climate Change Policies ..... 64

22 Public Services and Facilities ..... 66

23 General Public Services ..... 67

24 Essential Public Facilities ..... 67

25 Appendices..... 71

26 Appendix A – UGA & MUGA Boundary Maps ..... 72

27 Appendix B – Growth Targets..... 74

28 Appendix C – Growth Target Procedure Steps for GF-5 ..... 80

29 Appendix D – Reasonable Measures ..... 82

30 Appendix E – Procedures for Buildable Lands Reporting in Response to GF-7 ..... 91

31 Appendix F – List of Issues for Interlocal Agreements..... 92

32 Appendix G – Definitions of Key Terms..... 93

33 Appendix H – Fiscal Impact Analysis ..... 96

34 Appendix I – Centers ..... 97

35

1                                   **INTRODUCTION TO THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES**

2   Snohomish County is home to over ~~((700,000))~~ 800,000 residents, hundreds of businesses, 20  
3   cities and towns, ~~((two))~~ three tribal governments, one county government, and a number of  
4   special purpose districts and agencies. Each has separate aspirations for the future and priorities  
5   for projects and programs, ~~((though))~~ however ties of geography, history, and day-to-day  
6   governance unite all. At every level, there is recognition that local governments better serve  
7   residents and businesses ~~((better))~~ by planning and working together.

8   **Purpose**

9   Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) establish a countywide framework for developing and  
10   adopting county ~~((and))~~, city, and town comprehensive plans. These comprehensive plans are the  
11   long-term policy documents used by each jurisdiction to plan for its future. They include  
12   strategies for land use, housing, capital facilities, utilities, transportation, economic development,  
13   and parks and recreation (as well as a rural element for counties only) (RCW 36.70A.070). The  
14   role of the CPPs is to coordinate comprehensive plans of jurisdictions in the same county ~~((for))~~  
15   in regard to regional issues ~~((or))~~ and issues affecting common borders (RCW 36.70A.100).  
16   Under state law, RCW 36.70A.210(1) describes the relationship between comprehensive plans  
17   and CPPs. It says that a countywide planning policy is:

18                   *~~((a 'countywide planning policy' is))~~ a written policy statement or statements used solely*  
19                   *for establishing a countywide framework from which county and city comprehensive*  
20                   *plans are developed and adopted pursuant to this chapter. This framework shall ensure*  
21                   *that city and county comprehensive plans are consistent as required in RCW 36.70A.100.*  
22                   *Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the land use powers of ~~((the))~~ cities.*

23   ~~((Guidance comes from the))~~ Washington Administrative Code~~((:))~~ (WAC 365-196-510) ~~((says~~  
24   ~~that))~~ also provides guidance, stating that:

25                   *interjurisdictional consistency should be met by the adoption of comprehensive plans,*  
26                   *and subsequent amendments, which are consistent with and carry out the relevant*  
27                   *county-wide planning policies and, where ~~((required))~~applicable, the relevant*  
28                   *multicounty planning policies. Adopted county-wide planning policies are designed to*  
29                   *ensure that county and city comprehensive plans are consistent.*

30   ~~((From the perspective of))~~ Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT), the body that recommends the  
31   CPPs to the County Council, outlines that the goal of the CPPs is:

32                   *[To] more clearly distinguish between the roles and responsibilities of the county, cities,*  
33                   *Tribes, state and other governmental agencies in managing Snohomish County's future*  
34                   *growth, and to ensure greater interjurisdictional cooperation and coordination in the*  
35                   *provision of services.<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> Snohomish County Tomorrow Long-Term Goals, 1990, Government Roles and Responsibilities, pg 17.

1 To meet this ~~((stated))~~ SCT goal, some of the CPPs do more than meet the Growth Management  
2 Act (GMA) mandate of ensuring consistency of comprehensive plans. The CPPs also provide  
3 ~~((to Snohomish County jurisdictions))~~ direction to Snohomish County jurisdictions that is  
4 necessary for the coordinated implementation of GMA goals and the ~~((VISION 2040))~~  
5 Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) within VISION 2050. Thus, in the context of state law,  
6 administrative guidance, and the goals of Snohomish County Tomorrow, the CPPs have been  
7 developed to accomplish the following functions:

- 8 • ~~((Meet a specific requirement to ensure))~~ Ensure consistency between County and city  
9 comprehensive plans as required by ~~((RCW 36.70A.100))~~;
- 10 • Satisfy other GMA mandates~~((;))~~;
- 11 • ~~((Maintain ongoing efforts))~~ Continue cooperative countywide planning, through ~~((SCT))~~  
12 Snohomish County Tomorrow ~~((SCT))~~ ~~((to plan cooperatively))~~ for countywide  
13 initiatives~~((, and))~~;
- 14 • Provide direction to Snohomish County jurisdictions for the coordinated implementation  
15 of the Multicounty Planning Policies in VISION 2050; and
- 16 • Support local implementation of the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) in VISION  
17 ~~((2040))~~ 2050 that seeks to promote compact urban development ~~((in a sustainable~~  
18 manner)), protect rural and resource lands, maximize use of existing and planned  
19 infrastructure, and provide open space.


20  
21 The CPPs encourage flexibility in local interpretations to support diverse interests throughout the  
22 county. Through the process of updates to their comprehensive plans, each individual  
23 jurisdiction will update General Policy Plans (GPPs) and corresponding regulations that are  
24 tailored to local needs while still maintaining consistency with these Countywide Planning  
25 Policies.



1 **Organization of the Document**


2 ((The GMA specifies certain topic areas that must be included in CPPs. It does not speak to the  
3 topic areas that must be included in MPPs)). The Washington Administrative Code (WAC)  
4 specifies topic areas that, at the minimum, must be addressed by the MPPs and the CPPs. Under  
5 state law, the CPPs must be consistent with the MPPs. VISION ((2040)) 2050 is not organized  
6 around the topics that GMA requires CPPs to cover. ((To facilitate review and development of  
7 the CPPs for consistency with VISION 2040, the chapter headings in the CPPs follow the  
8 categories in VISION 2040.)) Historically, the chapter layout of the CPPs directly follows the  
9 chapters in the MPPs. Under VISION 2050, three new chapters, Regional Collaboration,  
10 Regional Growth Strategy, and Climate Change, were added to the MPPs. No new chapters were  
11 added to the CPPs, so the chapter layout does not directly parallel VISION 2050 as it has in the  
12 past. Where several GMA topics for CPPs fall into the same chapter, each individual topic uses a  
13 subheading. By doing this, the CPPs can readily demonstrate how they cover topics required  
14 under GMA.

15 The design of the CPPs is in response to the authorities that give policy direction to the CPPs and  
16 the need for the CPPs to guide local plan development. Unless otherwise specified, ((the)) all  
17 actions ((that the CPPs call for)) identified by the CPPs apply to ((the cities and the County)) all  
18 jurisdictions. Figure 1 shows this relationship.



19

**Figure 1 – Policy Relationships Diagram**



Similar to the flow of external policies, there is a pattern to how policies within the CPPs relate. Figure 2 shows this relationship.


\* = GMA Mandated Topic

**Figure 2—Internal Flow of the Countywide Planning Policies**

1 The CPPs are organized around a set of principles, goals and policies arranged generally as a  
2 hierarchy moving from the general to the more specific (refer to the Policy Hierarchy diagram in  
3 Figure 3). At the policy apex are the central principles and, just below them, the framework  
4 policies. Together, the principles and framework policies help define the general purpose and  
5 approach of the CPPs. The succeeding sections of the CPPs deal with specific topic areas, with  
6 each topic containing an overall goal statement followed by a number of supporting policies.  
7 Taken as a whole, the central principles, framework policies, and topical goals and policies form  
8 the basic policy direction of the CPPs.

9 In addition to the basic policy direction, the CPPs also contain a number of appendices. Some of  
10 the appendices provide procedures for accomplishing specific policy direction. (~~A second~~  
11 ~~category of appendices are those that~~) Others provide more detail or elaborate on particular  
12 policy direction; the reason for their inclusion in an appendix is that they contain lists or tables  
13 that would be unwieldy if included as part of the pertinent policy statement. Maps and definitions  
14 are also contained in the appendices.

15 Note that some policies have footnotes for illustration purposes. Although these footnotes are not  
16 a part of the policy statements, they are intended to be explanatory or provide examples.  
17 Likewise, the narrative sections provide context but are not policy.



**Figure 3 – Policy Hierarchy in the Countywide Planning Policies**

1 **State Context and Goals**

2 The GMA contains ((a set of)) statewide planning goals in RCW 36.70A.020 and RCW  
3 36.70A.480. These goals are intended to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive  
4 plans for those counties and cities planning under chapter 36.70A RCW. The numbering of the  
5 goals does not indicate priority((, and the list comes from RCW 36.70A.020:)),

6 *(1) **Urban growth.** Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public*  
7 *facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.*

8 *(2) **Reduce sprawl.** Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into*  
9 *sprawling, low-density development.*

10 *(3) **Transportation.** Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are*  
11 *based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.*

12 *(4) **Housing.** ((Encourage the availability of affordable))Plan for and accommodate*  
13 *housing affordable to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a*  
14 *variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing*  
15 *housing stock.*

16 *(5) **Economic development.** Encourage economic development throughout the state that*  
17 *is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all*  
18 *citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, promote*  
19 *the retention and expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new businesses,*  
20 *recognize regional differences impacting economic development opportunities, and*  
21 *encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the*  
22 *capacities of the state’s natural resources, public services, and public facilities.*

23 *(6) **Property rights.** Private property shall not be taken for public use without just*  
24 *compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners shall be protected*  
25 *from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.*

26 *(7) **Permits.** Applications for both state and local government permits should be*  
27 *processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.*

28 *(8) **Natural resource industries.** Maintain and enhance natural resource-based*  
29 *industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage*  
30 *the conservation of productive forestlands and productive agricultural lands, and*  
31 *discourage incompatible uses.*

32 *(9) **Open space and recreation.** Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities,*  
33 *conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water,*  
34 *and develop parks and recreation facilities.*

35 *(10) **Environment.** Protect the environment and enhance the state’s high quality of life,*  
36 *including air and water quality, and the availability of water.*

1 *(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the*  
2 *planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to*  
3 *reconcile conflicts.*

4 *(12) Public facilities and services. Ensure that those public facilities and services*  
5 *necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time*  
6 *the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service*  
7 *levels below locally established minimum standards.<sup>2</sup>*

8 *(13) Historic preservation. Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and*  
9 *structures that have historical or archaeological significance.*

10 *(14) For shorelines of the state, the goals and policies of the shoreline management act*  
11 *as set forth in RCW 90.58.020 are added as one of the goals of [GMA] without creating*  
12 *an order of priority among the fourteen goals.*

## 13 **Regional Context**

### 14 **Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)**

15 The PSRC is a Regional Transportation Planning Organization under chapter 47.80 RCW. (~~It~~  
16 ~~is~~) Its major planning document, VISION ((2040)) 2050((, the PSRC describes itself as)) states:

17 ~~((an association of cities, towns, counties, ports, and state agencies that serves as a~~  
18 ~~forum for developing policies and making decisions about regional growth management,~~  
19 ~~environmental, economic, and transportation issues in the four county central Puget~~  
20 ~~Sound region of Washington state.~~

21 ~~The Regional Council is designated under federal law as the Metropolitan Planning~~  
22 ~~Organization (required for receiving federal transportation funds), and under state law~~  
23 ~~as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization for King, Kitsap, Pierce, and~~  
24 ~~Snohomish counties. The Regional Council's members include 71 of the region's 82 cities~~  
25 ~~and towns. Other statutory members include the four port authorities of Bremerton,~~  
26 ~~Everett, Seattle, and Tacoma, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and~~  
27 ~~the Washington Transportation Commission. Both the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe and the~~  
28 ~~Suquamish Tribe are members. In addition, a memorandum of understanding with the~~  
29 ~~region's six transit agencies outlines their participation in the Regional Council.)) The~~  
30 region's local governments come together at the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)  
31 to make decisions about transportation, growth management, and economic development.

---

<sup>2</sup> RCW 36.70A.070(3)(d) requires that the capital facilities plan element of the county's comprehensive plan include "at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes." RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) requires transportation improvements or strategies to be provided concurrent with the development, where "concurrent with the development" means that "improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years."

1 PSRC serves King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap counties, along with cities and towns,  
2 tribal governments, ports, and state and local transportation agencies within the region.

3 PSRC is a federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the region.<sup>3</sup>

#### 4 **VISION ((2040)) 2050**

5 VISION ((2040)) 2050 is the result of a process undertaken by the region’s elected officials,  
6 public agencies, interest groups, and individuals. It was adopted in ((2008)) 2020 and establishes  
7 the regional vision, sets the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), and provides guidance to the CPPs  
8 as shown in Figure 1. VISION ((2040)) 2050 describes itself with the following ((paragraphs))  
9 excerpt:

10 *((VISION 2040 is a shared strategy for moving the central Puget Sound region toward a*  
11 *sustainable future. The combined efforts of individuals, governments, organizations and*  
12 *the private sector are needed to realize this vision. As the region has continued to grow*  
13 *and change, its residents have stepped up to ensure that what is most valued about this*  
14 *place remains timeless. Positive centers oriented development trends in recent years are*  
15 *a cause for optimism. Yet VISION 2040 recognizes that "business as usual" will not be*  
16 *enough. As a result, VISION 2040 is a call for personal and institutional change.*

17 *VISION 2040 recognizes that local, state, and federal governments are all challenged to*  
18 *keep up with the needs of a growing and changing population. VISION 2040 is designed*  
19 *to guide decisions that help to make wise use of existing resources—and ensure that*  
20 *future generations will have the resources they need*)

21 *VISION 2050 is the shared regional plan for moving toward a sustainable and more*  
22 *equitable future. It encourages decision-makers to make wise use of existing resources*  
23 *and planned transit investments while achieving the region’s shared vision. VISION 2050*  
24 *sets forth a pathway that strengthens economic, social, and environmental resiliency,*  
25 *while enhancing the region’s ability to cope with adverse trends such as climate change*  
26 *and unmet housing needs. As the region experiences more growth, VISION 2050 seeks to*  
27 *provide housing, mobility options, and services in more sustainable ways. Most*  
28 *importantly, VISION 2050 is a call to action to meet the needs of a growing population*  
29 *while considering the current needs of residents. VISION 2050 recognizes that clean air,*  
30 *health, life expectancy, and access to jobs and good education can vary dramatically by*  
31 *neighborhood. VISION 2050 works to rectify the inequities of the past, especially for*  
32 *communities of color and people with low incomes.*<sup>4</sup>

33 The concept of sustainability ((behind)) is integrated into VISION ((2040)) 2050 and has long  
34 been ((around for a while)) a key feature of the regional vision. ((In 1987, the United Nations

---

<sup>3</sup> ((Vision 2040, page ii [http://psrc.org/projects/vision/pubs/vision2040/vision2040\\_021408.pdf](http://psrc.org/projects/vision/pubs/vision2040/vision2040_021408.pdf)) VISION 2050,  
page vi. Available at: <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> ((VISION 2040, page 1. Available at: <http://www.psrc.org/assets/366/FullReport.pdf>) VISION 2050, page 2.  
Available at: <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 issued the Bruntland Report, which defines sustainable development))The United Nations  
2 defined the term sustainable development in the Bruntland Report, issued in 1987, as  
3 “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future  
4 generations to meet their own needs.”<sup>5</sup> This concept is present throughout the goals, policies, and  
5 actions within VISION 2050.

6 ((Sustainability in VISION 2040 is described as meaning that:

7 *[Our region] ensures the well-being of all living things, carefully meshing human*  
8 *activities with larger patterns and systems of the natural world. This translates into*  
9 *avoiding the depletion of energy, water, and raw natural resources. A sustainable*  
10 *approach also prevents degradation of land, air, and climate, while creating built*  
11 *environments that are livable, comfortable, safe and healthy, as well as promote*  
12 *productivity.))*

13 VISION 2050 sets a vision for the central Puget Sound region, which reads as follows:

14 **A Vision for 2050**

15 The central Puget Sound region provides an exceptional quality of life and opportunity  
16 for all, connected communities, a spectacular natural environment, and an innovative,  
17 thriving economy.

18 **In 2050...**

- 19 • Climate. *The region’s contribution to climate change has been substantially reduced.*
- 20 • Community. *Distinct, unique communities are supported throughout the region.*
- 21 • Diversity. *The region’s diversity continues to be a strength. People from all backgrounds*  
22 *are welcome, and displacement due to development pressure is lessened.*
- 23 • Economy. *Economic opportunities are open to everyone, the region competes globally,*  
24 *and has sustained a high quality of life. Industrial, maritime, and manufacturing*  
25 *opportunities are maintained.*
- 26 • Environment. *The natural environment is restored, protected, and sustained, preserving*  
27 *and enhancing natural functions and wildlife habitats.*
- 28 • Equity. *All people can attain the resources and opportunities to improve their quality of*  
29 *life and enable them to reach their full potential.*
- 30 • Health. *Communities promote physical, social, and mental well-being so that all people*  
31 *can live healthier and more active lives.*
- 32 • Housing. *A range of housing types ensures that healthy, safe, and affordable housing*  
33 *choices are available and accessible for all people throughout the region.*

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm>

- 1       • **Innovation.** The region has a culture of innovation that embraces and responds to  
2       change.
- 3       • **Mobility and Connectivity.** A safe, affordable, and efficient transportation system  
4       connects people and goods to where they need to go, promotes economic and  
5       environmental vitality, and supports the Regional Growth Strategy.
- 6       • **Natural Resources.** Natural resources are sustainably managed, supporting the  
7       continued viability of resource-based industries, such as forestry, agriculture, and  
8       aquaculture.
- 9       • **Public Facilities and Services.** Public facilities and services support the region’s  
10       communities and plans for growth in a coordinated, fair, efficient, and cost-effective  
11       manner.
- 12       • **Resilience.** The region’s communities plan for and are prepared to respond to potential  
13       impacts from natural and human hazards.
- 14       • **Rural Areas.** Rural communities and character are strengthened, enhanced, and  
15       sustained.<sup>6</sup>

16       **VISION 2050 Overarching Goals**

17       VISION ((2040)) 2050 contains the following topic specific Overarching Goals:

18       **Regional Collaboration.** The region plans collaboratively for a healthy environment,  
19       thriving communities, and opportunities for all.

20       **Regional Growth Strategy.** The region accommodates growth in urban areas, focused in  
21       designated centers and near transit stations, to create healthy, equitable, vibrant  
22       communities well-served by infrastructure and services. Rural and resource lands  
23       continue to be vital parts of the region that retain important cultural, economic, and  
24       rural lifestyle opportunities over the long term.

25       **Environment.** The region ((will care)) cares for the natural environment by protecting  
26       and restoring natural systems, conserving habitat, improving water quality, and reducing  
27       ((greenhouse gas emissions and)) air pollutants((, and addressing potential climate  
28       change impacts)). The ((region acknowledges that the)) health of all residents and the  
29       economy is connected to the health of the environment. Planning at all levels ((should  
30       consider)) considers the impacts of land use, development ((patterns)), and  
31       transportation on the ecosystem.

32       **Climate Change.** The region substantially reduces emissions of greenhouse gases that  
33       contribute to climate change in accordance with the goals of the Puget Sound Clean Air

---

<sup>6</sup> ((VISION 2040, page 7.)) VISION 2050, page 1. Available at: <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/2050-plan.pdf>



1 Agency (50% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050) and  
2 prepares for climate change impacts.

3 **Development Patterns.** ~~The region ((will focus growth within already urbanized areas to~~  
4 ~~create walkable, compact, and transit-oriented communities that maintain unique local~~  
5 ~~character. Centers will continue to be a focus of development. Rural and natural~~  
6 ~~resource lands will continue to be permanent and vital parts of the region)) creates~~  
7 ~~healthy, walkable, compact, and equitable transit-oriented communities that maintain~~  
8 ~~unique character and local culture, while conserving rural areas and creating and~~  
9 ~~preserving open space and natural areas.~~

10 **Housing.** ~~The region ((will preserve, improve, and expand)) preserves, improves, and~~  
11 ~~expands its housing stock to provide a range of affordable, accessible, healthy, and safe~~  
12 ~~housing choices to every resident. The region ((will continue)) continues to promote fair~~  
13 ~~and equal access to housing for all people.~~

14 **Economy.** ~~The region ((will have)) has a prospering and sustainable regional economy~~  
15 ~~by supporting businesses and job creation, investing in all people and their health,~~  
16 ~~sustaining environmental quality, and creating great central places, diverse communities,~~  
17 ~~and high quality of life.~~

18 **Transportation.** ~~The region ((will have)) has a sustainable, equitable, affordable, safe,~~  
19 ~~((cleaner, integrated, sustainable,)) and ((highly)) efficient multimodal transportation~~  
20 ~~system, with specific emphasis on an integrated regional transit network that supports the~~  
21 ~~((regional growth strategy,)) Regional Growth Strategy and promotes ((economic and~~  
22 ~~environmental)) vitality of the economy, environment, and ((contributes to better public))~~  
23 ~~health.~~

24 **Public Services.** ~~The region ((will support)) supports development with adequate public~~  
25 ~~facilities and services in a timely, coordinated, efficient, and cost-effective manner that~~  
26 ~~supports local and regional growth planning objectives.~~

## 27 **Regional Growth Strategy**

28 ~~((To achieve the goals in VISION 2040, there is a new Regional Growth Strategy.)) The~~  
29 ~~Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) is a major component of VISION 2050. Implementation of the~~  
30 ~~RGS is a key in achieving the regional vision and goals. The central Puget Sound region is~~  
31 ~~forecasted to grow to 5.8 million people and 3.4 million jobs by 2050. The RGS considers how~~  
32 ~~the region can distribute growth. VISION 2050 describes the Regional Growth Strategy as:~~

33 a description of a preferred pattern of urban growth that has been designed to minimize  
34 environmental impacts, support economic prosperity, advance social equity, promote  
35 affordable housing choices, improve mobility, and make efficient use of new and existing  
36 infrastructure.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> VISION 2050, page 26. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

- 1 The major parts of the growth strategy include:
- 2 a. Designation of ~~((geographic areas for))~~ regional growth centers, regional ~~((manufacturing and industrial))~~ manufacturing/industrial centers, ~~((as well as other centers such as town))~~ countywide centers and local centers and activity hubs in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and cities to concentrate population and employment growth and other services and activities;
  - 7 b. Planning for multi-modal connections and supportive land uses between centers and activity hubs and building transit-oriented development along existing and planned infrastructure investments;
  - 10 c. ~~((Promotion of sustainability in all decision-making))~~ Maintaining stable and sustainable urban growth areas into the future; ~~((and))~~
  - 12 d. Achieving a better balance of jobs and housing throughout the region; and
  - 13 e. Allocation of population and employment growth to regional geographies in Snohomish County.

15 Under the RGS, Snohomish County is expected to grow by 424,000 people and 225,000 jobs  
 16 between 2017 and 2050.

17 **Multicounty Planning Policies**

18 VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 contains MPPs that are intended to provide an integrated framework for  
 19 addressing land use, economic development, transportation, other infrastructure, ~~((and))~~  
 20 environmental, and climate change planning. These policies play three key roles: (1) give  
 21 direction for implementing the Regional Growth Strategy, (2) create a common framework for  
 22 planning at various levels in the four-county region, including countywide planning, local plans,  
 23 transit agency plans, and others, and (3) provide the policy structure for ~~((the Regional~~  
 24 Council's)) PSRC's functional plans (the ~~((Metropolitan))~~ Regional Transportation Plan and the  
 25 Regional Economic Strategy). The MPPs are presented as a part of VISION 2050 through a three  
 26 part framework:

- 27 • Goals. Overview the desired outcome for each of the subject areas covered in VISION  
 28 2050.
- 29 • Policies. Provide overall guidance for planning and decision-making at the local,  
 30 countywide, and regional level.
- 31 • Actions. Implement the policies and identify specific tasks for local governments, PSRC,  
 32 and other partners.<sup>8</sup>

33 The MPPs address the following subject areas:

- 34 • ~~((General Multicounty Planning Policies))~~ Regional Collaboration
- 35 • Regional Growth Strategy
- 36 • Environment
- 37 • Climate Change

---

<sup>8</sup> VISION 2050, Page 13. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

- 1 • Development Patterns
- 2     ⊖ ((Land Use (including urban lands, rural lands, and resource lands)
- 3     ⊖ Elements of Orderly Development and Design))
- 4 • Housing
- 5 • Economy
- 6 • Transportation
- 7 • Public Services

## 8 **Countywide Context**

### 9 **History**

10 SCT began in 1989 as a voluntary association of cities, towns, the County, and the Tulalip  
 11 Tribes. Its genesis was the recognition that growth presents “a challenge of great dimension that  
 12 will ultimately shape our future quality of life” and that “it is imperative that this challenge be  
 13 faced resolutely, and with a county-wide perspective”.<sup>9</sup> In 1990, the SCT Steering Committee  
 14 had reached consensus on a number of goals that formed a “regional vision and framework for  
 15 growth management for the county”.<sup>10</sup> These became official through the adoption of  
 16 “Snohomish County Tomorrow’s Long-Term Goals”.<sup>11</sup>

17 The GMA went into effect in 1990 and the addition of a requirement for CPPs took place in  
 18 1991. The SCT Steering Committee decided to use the SCT Long-Term Goals as a basis for  
 19 establishing their recommendations for CPPs under GMA to the County Council.

### 20 **Process Overview**

21 The continuing cooperative and collaborative efforts of all jurisdictions in Snohomish County are  
 22 essential to fulfilling the promise of the GMA. At stake is the delicate balance between our  
 23 environment and our economy. This balance determines our quality of life. The *Snohomish*  
 24 *County Tomorrow Goals* (1990) and the CPPs (1993) set out the countywide vision for managing  
 25 future growth in the County and cities. Similarly, the County and cities have developed their own  
 26 GMA comprehensive plans. These plans are consistent with this countywide vision, and  
 27 coordinate the intricate relationships between land use, the environment, transportation,  
 28 infrastructure investment, public services and the economy. The CPPs and each of the plans have  
 29 undergone periodic revisions. Following adoption of these CPPs, the County’s and cities’  
 30 Comprehensive Plans will be made consistent with the vision and policies in this document.

31 During the 2021 CPP update process, the world was hit with the COVID-19 pandemic. The  
 32 pandemic had a significant impact on the lives of all Snohomish County residents and  
 33 businesses. At this time, it is impossible to know the full impacts of the pandemic, however those

---

<sup>9</sup> Snohomish County Council Motion 89-159, creating SCT

<sup>10</sup> History of Snohomish County Tomorrow, undated.


[http://www.co.snohomish.wa.us/documents/County\\_Services/SCT/HistoryofSnohomishCountyTomorrow Draft.pdf](http://www.co.snohomish.wa.us/documents/County_Services/SCT/HistoryofSnohomishCountyTomorrow Draft.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.co.snohomish.wa.us/documents/County\\_Services/sct/sctgoals.pdf](http://www.co.snohomish.wa.us/documents/County_Services/sct/sctgoals.pdf)

1 impacts may be long lasting. Future evaluation will be needed to understand the full impact of  
2 the pandemic.

3 **Current and Future Policy Refinements**

4 This document recognizes that some of the planning and development issues have been well  
5 researched and discussed so that strategies are generally accepted; for other issues, the situation  
6 is still emerging. Refinements and future amendments to these policies will use the process  
7 agreed to by the SCT Steering Committee. This process generally calls for one of the standing  
8 committees of SCT – usually, but not always, the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) – to take  
9 the lead in formulating draft policy amendments to the Steering Committee. The Steering  
10 Committee then takes input and forwards its recommendation(s) to the County Council. Finally,  
11 the Council holds a public hearing and takes final action.



12

13 **How to read these Goals and Policies**

14 Most CPPs apply to all cities and the County. ~~((For these the))~~ These policies use ~~((the))~~ “County  
15 and cities” interchangeably with “jurisdictions” and “municipalities”. Some CPPs apply only to  
16 the County or to cities (and sometimes to a subset of cities). For clarity, policies normally state  
17 who implements the policy. Policies without a subject apply to all jurisdictions.

18 Unless otherwise stated, all policies have equal priority and each one should be understood in the  
19 context of the entire document. A number of policies include examples of actions, programs, or  
20 concepts. The intent of these lists is that they are illustrative unless otherwise noted or unless the  
21 list refers to specific documents.

22 The CPPs specify how directive a policy should be. They make use of three different words to do  
23 this: shall, should, and may. Usage of these verbs in the CPPs is more precise than their use in  
24 common expression. Even though in common usage “will” is synonymous with “shall”, in the  
25 CPPs the use of “will” does not specify how directive a policy is. Instead, it is used to express a  
26 future situation (i.e. after this happens then that will happen). It is an expression of intention.

- 1 • **“Shall”** means implementation of the policy is mandatory and imparts a higher degree of  
2 substantive direction than “should”. “Shall” is used for polices that repeat State of  
3 Washington requirements or where the intent is to mandate action. However, “shall” can  
4 not be used when it is largely a subjective determination whether a policy’s objective has  
5 been met.  
6
- 7 • **“Should”** means implementation of the policy is expected but its completion is not  
8 mandatory. The policy is directive with substantive meaning, although to a lesser degree  
9 than “shall” for two reasons. (1) “Should” policies recognize the policy might not be  
10 applicable or appropriate for all municipalities due to special circumstances. The decision  
11 to not implement a “should” policy is appropriate only if implementation of the policy is  
12 either inappropriate or not feasible. (2) Some “should” policies are subjective; hence, it is  
13 not possible to demonstrate that a jurisdiction has implemented it.  
14
- 15 • **“May”** means the actions described in the policy are either advisable or are allowed.  
16 “May” gives permission and implies a preference. Because “may” does not have a  
17 directive meaning, there is no expectation the described action will be implemented.

18 **Common Acronyms**

- 19 **BLR** = Buildable Lands Report
- 20 **CPP** = Countywide Planning Policy
- 21 **GMA** = Growth Management Act
- 22 **GMR** = Growth Monitoring Report
- 23 **HCT** = High-Capacity Transit
- 24 **MPP** = Multicounty Planning Policy
- 25 **MUGA** = Municipal Urban Growth Area
- 26 **PAC** = Snohomish County Tomorrow Planning Advisory Committee (~~((of SCT))~~)
- 27 **PSRC** = Puget Sound Regional Council
- 28 **SCT** = Snohomish County Tomorrow
- 29 **RCW** = Revised Code of Washington (state law)
- 30 **RGS** = Regional Growth Strategy
- 31 **UGA** = Urban Growth Area
- 32 **WAC** = Washington Administrative Code
- 33 **WSDOT** = Washington State Department of Transportation

34 **CENTRAL PRINCIPLES AND FRAMEWORK POLICIES**

35 These CPPs represent a significant contribution to a process designed to define and direct the  
36 collective vision of our community. The policies are significant both in substance and in the  
37 commitment they represent by local governments of Snohomish County. Guiding these policies  
38 are the central principles that the CPPs shall:

- 1 • Be consistent with the ~~((GMA))~~ Growth Management Act (GMA), other state laws,
- 2 ~~((and))~~ the ~~((MPPs in VISION 2040))~~ Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs), and the
- 3 overall regional Vision 2050 described in VISION 2050;
- 4 • Establish a framework for continuing coordination and collaboration between all
- 5 jurisdictions of Snohomish County;
- 6 • Incorporate equity and inclusion into all aspects of countywide and local planning;
- 7 • Allow for flexibility in local implementation;
- 8 • Support attaining an environmentally, socially, and economically/fiscally sustainable
- 9 county within Snohomish and within the regional context;
- 10 • Establish a framework for mitigating and adapting to climate change;
- 11 • Address and maintain quality of life; and
- 12 • Enhance the built environment and human health.

13 The purpose of the CPPs is to guide development of local comprehensive plans. The mandate for  
 14 CPPs comes from the GMA. Policy direction in the CPPs reflects a local interpretation of how to  
 15 blend the direction in GMA with the regional values expressed in VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 and  
 16 local priorities.

17 The CPPs include General Framework policies that define and broaden the objectives in the  
 18 Central Principles while setting the stage for cooperative action. The CPPs also include Joint  
 19 Planning policies that address procedures for cooperation between ~~((multiple))~~ jurisdictions and  
 20 agencies. Under Joint Planning, such cooperation does not necessarily involve all jurisdictions  
 21 and agencies at one time. Other chapters of the CPPs are more ~~((directed toward))~~ focused on  
 22 promoting consistency among local plans. CPPs are prepared under the authorities of RCW  
 23 36.70A.210 and RCW 36.70A.215~~((Their))~~ and their implementation, to the extent necessary at  
 24 the countywide and local levels, meets the intent of ~~((the General MPPs in))~~ VISION ~~((2040))~~  
 25 2050.

26 **General Framework Policies**

27 The following policies expand on the Central Principles (previous page) and provide a  
 28 framework and a foundation for the topic-specific policies in the rest of this document. ~~((They))~~  
 29 The General Framework Policies acknowledge the role of the GMA and VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050  
 30 in setting the goals and direction ~~((particularly regarding sustainability))~~ for the CPPs. They  
 31 also ~~((achieve))~~ address the need to plan for projected population and employment growth  
 32 ~~((population and employment))~~ and the prerogative of each jurisdiction in the County to  
 33 conduct its local planning in a manner that responds to local situations and issues.

**GF-1** The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) guide development of policies in local  
 plans per RCW 36.70A.210. This guidance allows for flexibility in local  
 interpretation; however, local policies shall be free of contradictions or conflicts with  
 the CPPs.

- GF-2** Through Snohomish County Tomorrow and adoption by the County Council, the process for updating the Countywide Planning Policies shall be collaborative and participatory. This process should include regional service providers, state agencies, ~~((other))~~ tribal governments, and ~~((citizen))~~ public input.
- GF-3** Decisions on land use, transportation, and economic and social infrastructure should consider ~~((and include ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions))~~ impacts on climate change and provide ~~((for “soft”))~~ solutions to ~~((address both traditional needs as well as emerging challenges))~~ reduce greenhouse gas emissions. ~~((Soft solutions))~~ Solutions should emphasize:
- a. Integrated planning;
  - b. Adaptive management;
  - c. Efficiency and resiliency;
  - d. Minimize single use~~((s))~~ products and maximize re-use; and
  - e. Minimize the need for air quality treatment by minimizing ~~((the level of pollution))~~ emissions.
- GF-4** The Countywide Planning Policies shall be consistent with VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategy. To be consistent means that they shall be absent of conflicts or contradictions with the regional planning or transportation objectives. The policy response to the growth strategy focuses on issues of interest to Snohomish County jurisdictions and some flexibility in detail is possible while retaining overall consistency per RCW 36.70A.100 and WAC 365-196-510.

**GF-5** Subcounty allocation of projected growth shall be established for purposes of conducting the eight-year UGA review and plan update required by the Growth Management Act at RCW 36.70A.130(3). This allocation shall occur through a cooperative planning process of Snohomish County Tomorrow and be consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies. The allocation shall include cities (within current city boundaries), unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), unincorporated Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs), and the rural/resource area of Snohomish County. The subcounty allocation shall use the most recent Office of Financial Management population projections for Snohomish County and the Puget Sound Regional Council's Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) as the starting point for this process. The process shall consider each community's vision and its regional role as described in the RGS. The process shall ensure flexibility for jurisdictions in implementing the RGS. Such implementation shall seek compatibility with the RGS, considering levels of infrastructure investment, market conditions, and other factors that will require flexibility in achieving growth allocations. The subcounty allocation of projected growth shall be depicted as a set of "growth targets," and shall be shown in Appendix B of the countywide planning policies. The growth targets shall indicate the amount of growth each jurisdiction is ~~((capable of accommodating over the 20-year planning period, as described))~~ expected to plan for in its comprehensive plan. The growth target development process in Snohomish County shall use the procedures in Appendix C, which call for the following steps:

- a. Initial Growth Targets;
- b. Target Reconciliation; and
- c. Long Term Monitoring.

**GF-6** Ensure that the final population ~~((allocation))~~ and employment allocations for Urban Growth Areas supports the Regional Growth Strategy as provided for in VISION ~~((2040. This shall include assigning at least ninety percent (90%) of the county's future population growth after 2008))~~ 2050 by assigning Snohomish County's growth first and foremost to urban areas.



- GF-7** Maintain the review and evaluation program, which includes an annual data collection component, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.215 (“Buildable Lands Program”). Complete the evaluation component required by the Buildable Lands Program at least once every eight years, and no later than three years prior to the deadline for review and update of comprehensive plans and development regulations as required by RCW 36.70A.130. ~~((This evaluation may be combined with the review and evaluation of County and city comprehensive land use plans and development regulations required by RCW 36.70A.130(1), and the review of Urban Growth Areas required by RCW 36.70A.130(3).))~~
- a. Use the procedures report in Appendix E for the Buildable Lands Program.
  - b. A list of reasonable measures that may be used to increase residential, commercial and industrial capacity in UGAs, without adjusting UGA boundaries, is contained in Appendix D. The County Council shall use the list of reasonable measures and guidelines for review contained in Appendix D to evaluate all UGA boundary expansions proposed pursuant to DP-2.

## 1 **Joint Planning Policies**

- 2 RCW 36.70A.210(3) requires that, at a minimum, Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) address
- 3 joint County and city planning in urban growth areas. The CPPs also recognize that it is
- 4 important to encourage joint planning outside the Urban Growth Area and that it may involve
- 5 public agencies in addition to the County and cities.

**JP-1** Coordination of county and municipal planning particularly for urban services, governance, and annexation is ~~((important))~~ fundamental in implementing the Regional Growth Strategy and GMA directives related to urban growth areas in RCW 36.70A.110. Interlocal agreements for this purpose are encouraged pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperation Act (chapter 39.34 RCW). These agreements should emphasize the importance of early and continuous public participation, focus on decision-making by elected or other appropriate officials, and review the consistency of comprehensive plans with each other and the Growth Management Act, where applicable. Appendix F provides an illustrative list of issues that could be considered appropriate for Interlocal Agreements.

~~((**JP-2**) ((Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) shall develop a process for mediation and/or alternative dispute resolution. In developing this process, SCT shall convene a task force to make recommendations that outline procedures, timelines, and responsibilities associated with the mediation and/or dispute resolution processes.))~~

**JP-((3))**  
2 In the event of a proposed annexation of unincorporated lands in Snohomish County by a city or special district with no incorporated or district territory currently located in Snohomish County, an interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and any jurisdiction determined necessary by the County shall be in place, consistent with CPP JP-1 and Appendix F. This agreement shall be in effect before the city or district submits a Notice of Intent to Annex to the State Boundary Review Board (BRB) of Snohomish County or, if not subject to BRB review, prior to approval of the annexation to the city or special district.

**JP-((4))**  
3 Encourage policies that allow accessible, effective and frequent interjurisdictional coordination relating to the consistency of comprehensive plans in a particular Urban Growth Area (UGA) and to the expansion of a UGA.

~~**JP-5)** ((Through Snohomish County Tomorrow, establish an interjurisdictional group of elected officials, appointed officials, citizens and staff to review disputes regarding the consistency of comprehensive plans with each other.))~~

**JP-((6))**  
4 The County and cities shall develop comprehensive plan policies and development regulations that provide for the orderly transition of unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) to incorporated areas in UGAs. Mutual agreements may be utilized to address governance issues and expedite the transition.

**JP-((7))**  
5 The County and affected cities should collaborate on the development of appropriate urban design measures in unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.

**JP-6** Snohomish County Tomorrow, the County, and cities should coordinate countywide and local planning efforts with military installations, recognizing the shared benefits and impacts of growth occurring within and outside installation boundaries.

**JP-7** Snohomish County Tomorrow, the County, and cities should coordinate countywide and local planning efforts with tribes, recognizing the shared benefits and impacts of growth occurring within and outside Tribal Reservation lands.

## DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

The physical form ~~(,)~~ and location ~~(, and servicing)~~ of development ~~((throughout Snohomish County are vitally important if we are to achieve))~~ as well as the provision of services play a significant role in the development of livable places that are environmentally sustainable, economically viable, ~~((and))~~ socially responsible, and equitable for the long-term ~~((future))~~. The following countywide planning policies (CPPs) provide guidance for concentrating growth into existing Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), centers, and along high-capacity transit, and ensuring that ~~((such))~~ growth occurs in a variety of healthy, accessible and well-designed communities that are connected with an efficient transportation network.

### Development Patterns Goal

The cities, towns, and Snohomish County will ~~((promote and guide well designed))~~ provide livable communities for all residents by directing growth into designated urban areas to create ~~((more vibrant))~~ urban places ~~((while preserving our valued))~~ that are equitable, walkable, compact, and transit oriented, preserve and create open space, and protect rural and resource lands.

## Urban Growth Areas and Land Use

### State Context

The Growth Management Act (GMA) establishes a framework for coordinated and comprehensive planning to help local communities manage their growth. The GMA calls for UGAs where growth will be encouraged and supported with adequate facilities and urban services (RCW 36.70A.110). Areas outside the UGAs are reserved for non-urban uses such as rural and resource lands (RCW 36.70A.070(5)).

### Regional Context

VISION ~~((2040 is))~~ 2050 outlines a strategy for using the region's land more efficiently and sustainably. It identifies existing urban lands as central to accommodating population and employment growth. In particular, VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 directs development into regional growth centers ~~((and))~~, ~~((to a lesser extent, other))~~ countywide centers ~~((and compact urban communities))~~, local centers, and high capacity transit station areas. It seeks to ~~((limit growth on rural lands))~~ manage and reduce rural growth rates over time by accommodating the region's growth first and foremost in the urban growth area. ~~((VISION 2040 recognizes that unincorporated urban lands are often similar in character to cities they are adjacent to, calling for them to be affiliated with adjacent cities for joint planning purposes and future annexation.))~~

VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 recognizes that compact, transit oriented development creates vibrant, livable, and healthy urban communities. Such communities offer economic opportunities, ~~((for all. They also provide))~~ housing choices, and multiple transportation ~~((choices))~~ options for all. This reduces demand for inefficient forms of transportation that contribute to air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Further, VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 supports brownfield and

1 contaminated site clean-up as well as the identification and redevelopment of underutilized lands  
2 (~~compact communities and centers with high levels of amenities~~).

3 **Local Context**

4 The County designates UGAs (~~per~~) in accordance with RCW 36.70A.110. (~~The~~) According  
5 to RCW 36.70A.100, the designation of UGAs must be coordinated between the county and  
6 cities(~~per RCW 36.70A.100~~). This document provides the process and criteria for considering  
7 expansion or adjustment of UGAs to accommodate the projected growth. (~~While a change to an~~  
8 ~~established UGA is most often expected to result in an expansion, in some instances a change to~~  
9 ~~a UGA may instead be an adjustment, correction, or even a constriction.~~)

- DP-1** The County shall maintain Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), as shown on the map in Appendix A, that:
- a. Include all cities in Snohomish County;
  - b. Can be supported by an urban level of service consistent with capital facilities plans for public facilities and utilities;
  - c. Are based on the best available data and plans regarding future urban growth including new development, redevelopment, and infill;
  - d. Have identifiable physical boundaries such as natural features, roads, or special purpose district boundaries when feasible;
  - e. Do not include designated agricultural or forest land unless the city or County has enacted a program authorizing transfer or purchase of development rights;
  - f. Have been evaluated for the presence of critical areas;
  - g. Where possible, include designated greenbelts or open space within their boundaries and on the periphery of the UGA to provide separation from adjacent urban areas, rural areas, and resource lands;
  - h. Should consider the vision of each jurisdiction regarding the future of their community during the next 20 years;
  - i. Are large enough to ensure an adequate supply of land for an appropriate range of urban land uses to accommodate the planned growth; and
  - j. Support pedestrian, bicycle and transit compatible design.

- DP-2** An expansion of the boundary of an individual Urban Growth Area (UGA) that results in a net increase of residential, commercial or industrial land capacity shall not be permitted unless:
- a. The expansion is supported by a land capacity analysis adopted by the County Council pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110;
  - b. The resulting 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;
  - c. The expansion otherwise complies with the Growth Management Act;
  - d. Any UGA expansion should have the support of affected cities. Prior to issuing a decision on a UGA boundary change, the County shall consult with affected cities and give substantial weight to a city's position on the matter. If the County Council approves an expansion or contraction of a UGA boundary that is not

supported by an affected city, it shall include in its findings how the public interest is served by the UGA expansion or contraction despite the objection of an affected city; and

- e. One of the following conditions is met:
  1. The expansion is a result of the most recent buildable lands review and evaluation required by RCW 36.70A.215 and performed per policy GF-7 following the procedures in Appendix E.
  2. The expansion is a result of the review of UGAs at least every eight years to accommodate the succeeding twenty years of projected growth, as projected by the State Office of Financial Management, and adopted by the County as the 20-year urban allocated population projection as required by RCW 36.70A.130(3).
  3. Both of the following conditions are met for expansion of the boundary of an individual UGA to include additional residential land:
    - a. Population growth in the UGA (city plus unincorporated UGA) 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. Acceptable sources of documentation are the most recent Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) Growth Monitoring Report (GMR) or the buildable lands review and evaluation (Buildable Lands Report [BLR]), 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, and any new information presented at public hearings that confirms or revises the conclusions is considered.
  4. Both of the following conditions are met for expansion of the boundary of an individual UGA to include additional employment land:
    - a. Employment growth in the UGA (city plus unincorporated UGA) since the start of the twenty-year planning period, equals or exceeds fifty percent of the additional employment capacity in the UGA at the start of the planning period. Acceptable sources of documentation are the most recent SCT GMR or the buildable lands review and evaluation (BLR), and
    - b. An updated employment land capacity analysis conducted by city and County staff for the UGA confirms the accuracy of the above finding using more recent employment capacity estimates and assumptions.
  5. The expansion will correct a demonstrated mapping error.<sup>12</sup>
  6. Schools (including public, private and parochial), ~~((churches))~~ places of worship, institutions and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plans should be located in an urban growth area. In the event that it is demonstrated that no site within the UGA can reasonably or logically accommodate the proposed facilities, urban growth area expansions

---

<sup>12</sup> The type of errors that this policy intends to correct are cases where the UGA line incorrectly bisects an existing building or parcel, where it inadvertently and incorrectly follows an arbitrary feature such as a section line, or where the boundary is on the wrong side of a right-of-way that is expected to be annexed by a city.

may take place to allow the development of these facilities provided that the expansion area is adjacent to an existing UGA.

7. In UGAs where the threshold in Condition 4 has not been reached, the boundary of an individual UGA may be expanded to include additional industrial land if the expansion is based on the criteria contained in RCW 36.70A.365 for the establishment of a major industrial development. This assessment shall be based on a collaborative County and city analysis of large developable industrial site needs in relation to land supply. “Large developable industrial sites” may include land considered vacant, redevelopable, and/or partially-used by the Buildable Lands Program (per GF-7 and Appendix E of these CPPs) and may include one or more large parcels or several small parcels where consolidation is feasible.
8. 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.
9. The expansion will permanently preserve a substantial land area containing one or more significant natural or cultural feature(s) as open space adjacent to the revised UGA boundary and will provide separation between urban and rural areas. The presence of significant natural or cultural features shall be determined by the respective legislative bodies of the county and the city or cities immediately adjacent to the proposed expansion, and 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.
10. 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 is incurable in a timely manner by the implementation of reasonable measures or other instrumentality reasonably available to the jurisdiction, and the expansion is reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing.
11. 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.

- DP-3** Following consultation with the affected city or cities, the County may adjust urban growth areas – defined in this policy as concurrent actions to expand an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in one location while contracting the same UGA in another location – without resulting in a net increase of population or employment land capacity. Such action may be permitted when consistent with adopted policies and the following conditions:
- a. The area being removed from the UGA is not already characterized by urban development, and without active permits that would change it to being urban in character; and
  - b. The land use designation(s) assigned in the area removed from the UGA shall be ~~((among))~~ consistent with the existing rural or resource designations in the comprehensive plan for Snohomish County.

**DP-4** The County and cities shall use consistent land capacity analysis methods as ~~((approved by the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee))~~ established in the Procedures Report called for in Appendix E.

- DP-5** The County and cities shall adopt comprehensive plans and development regulations (RCW 36.70A.040). In Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), such plans and regulations shall:
- a. Achieve urban uses and densities;
  - b. Provide for urban governmental services and capital facilities sufficient to accommodate the broad range of needs and uses that will accompany the projected urban growth; and
  - c. Permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the succeeding twenty-year period (RCW 36.70A.110(2)).

The County shall adopt such plans and regulations for its unincorporated territory. Each city shall adopt such plans and regulations for territory within its city limits. Additionally, cities may adopt such plans and proposed development regulations for adjacent unincorporated territory within its UGA or Municipal UGA (MUGA) to which the city has determined it is capable of providing urban services at some point in the future, via annexation.

When amending its comprehensive plan, the County shall give substantial consideration to the city’s adopted plan for its UGA or MUGA. Likewise, the affected city shall give substantial consideration to the County’s adopted plan for the same area.

However, nothing in this policy shall limit the authority of the County to plan for and regulate development in unincorporated territory for as long as it remains unincorporated, in accordance with all applicable county, state and federal laws. Similarly, nothing in this policy shall limit the authority of cities to plan for territory in and adjacent to their current corporate limits and to regulate development in their current corporate limits, in accordance with all applicable city, county, state and federal laws.

~~((DP-6)) ((Sanitary sewer mains shall not be extended beyond Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) into rural areas except when necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment, and when such sewers are financially supportable at rural densities and do not result in the inducement of future urban development outside of UGAs. Sewer transmission lines may be developed through rural and resource areas to meet the needs of UGAs as long as any extension through resource areas does not adversely impact the resource lands. Sanitary sewer connections in rural areas are not allowed except in instances where necessary to protect public health and safety and the environment. Sanitary sewer mains are prohibited in resource areas.))~~

**DP-((7))** City and County comprehensive plans should locate employment areas and living areas in close proximity in order to maximize transportation choices, ~~((and))~~ minimize vehicle miles traveled, ~~((and to))~~ optimize the use of existing and planned transportation systems and capital facilities, and improve the jobs-housing balance.

**DP-((8))** The County and cities shall coordinate their comprehensive plans (RCW 36.70A.100). Coordination in unincorporated territory planned by both the County and a city means that each plan should provide for the orderly transition of unincorporated to incorporated areas, including appropriate urban design provisions, by:

- a. Creating a safe and attractive urban environment that enhances livability; and
- b. Balancing actions necessary to meet the requirement of achieving urban uses and densities with the goal of respecting already established neighborhoods.

When amending its comprehensive plan, the County shall give substantial consideration to the city's adopted plan for its UGA or MUGA. Likewise, the affected city shall give substantial consideration to the County's adopted plan for the same area.

However, nothing in this policy shall limit the authority of the County to plan for and regulate development in unincorporated territory for as long as it remains unincorporated, in accordance with all applicable county, state and federal laws. Similarly, nothing in this policy shall limit the authority of cities to plan for territory in and adjacent to their current corporate limits and to regulate development in their current corporate limits, in accordance with all applicable city, county, state and federal laws.

## 1 **Centers and Compact Urban Communities**

**DP-8** If applicable, the County and cities shall designate and provide for the development of local, countywide, and regional centers consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, the Regional Centers Framework, and the Countywide Center Criteria contained in Appendix I.



- DP-9** (~~Local plans should identify centers as designated by the Regional Growth Strategy presented in VISION 2040.~~) Jurisdictions (~~(in which)~~) that have designated regional growth centers and (~~(manufacturing and industrial)~~) manufacturing/industrial centers (~~(are located)~~) shall (~~(provide)~~) direct a significant share of population and employment growth to those areas through the provision of land use policies and infrastructure investments that support growth levels and densities consistent with the regional vision (~~(for these centers)~~).
- DP-10** The County and cities shall coordinate the designation and planning of (~~(urban)~~) regional, countywide, and local centers with transit service and other service providers to promote well-designed and transit oriented developments that enhance economic development opportunities for all residents, address environmental goals, and reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.
- DP-11** (~~(The)~~) Consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and growth targets in Appendix B, the County and cities should (~~(revise development regulations and incentives, as appropriate, to)~~) encourage higher residential densities and greater employment concentrations in Urban Growth Areas by revising development regulations and incentive programs as appropriate.
- DP-12** Urban Growth Areas should provide for sufficient levels of development and developable or redevelopable land so that adequate sources of public revenue and public facilities are available to support the projected population and employment growth in Snohomish County consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, GF-5, and the growth targets in Appendix B. In addition, the allowed density should support transit services and the efficient utilization of infrastructure.
- DP-13** The County and cities should integrate the desirable qualities of existing residential neighborhoods when planning for urban centers and mixed-use developments. Jurisdictions should adopt design guidelines and standards for urban centers to provide for compact, efficient site design that integrates building design(~~(;)~~) with multimodal transportation facilities(~~(;)~~) and publicly accessible open spaces.
- DP-14** The County and cities should promote and focus new compact urban growth in (~~(urban centers)~~)local centers, countywide centers, regional centers, and transit emphasis corridors.
- DP-15** The County and cities should adopt policies, development regulations, and design guidelines that allow for infill and redevelopment of underutilized lands and other appropriate areas(~~( as identified in their comprehensive plans)~~).
- DP-16** Jurisdictions should encourage the use of innovative development standards, design guidelines, regulatory incentives, and applicable low impact development measures to provide compact, high quality communities.

**DP-17** The County and cities should encourage transit supportive land uses in non-contiguous Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) in order to help preserve transit service between non-contiguous UGAs.

**DP-18** In coordination with transit agencies, jurisdictions that are served by transit should, where appropriate, enact transit oriented development policies and development standards. Transit oriented development should include the following common elements:

- a. Located to support the development of designated local growth centers, countywide growth centers, regional growth centers, and existing and planned transit emphasis corridors;
- b. Include pedestrian scale neighborhoods and activity centers to stimulate use of transit and ride sharing;
- c. Plan for an appropriate intensity and mix of development, including both employment and housing options, that support transit service; and
- d. Plan for growth near high-capacity transit.

## 1 **Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas**

**DP-((17)) 19** City comprehensive plans should have policies on ~~((annexing the))~~ the annexation of areas ((in))within their unincorporated Urban Growth Area ((/))and/or Municipal Urban Growth Area.

**DP-((18)) 20** In the Southwest Urban Growth Area (SWUGA), Municipal Urban Growth Areas shall be maintained as a part of these Countywide Planning Policies for the purposes of allocating growth as required by the Growth Management Act and CPP GF-5 and shall be portrayed on the map in Appendix A and documented in County and city comprehensive plans.

**DP-((19)) 21** Where the Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA) map in Appendix A portrays agreement – meaning in places that do not include areas of gap, overlap, or other special notation – the MUGAs shall be used to designate future annexation areas for each of the nine cities in the Southwest Urban Growth Area. An interlocal agreement should be executed by the County and city addressing transition of services.

**DP-**  
**~~((20))~~ 22** Where Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA) gaps and overlaps occur, the affected cities are encouraged to negotiate a solution and, if needed, to use a mediation process to fill gaps and resolve overlaps before proceeding with a proposed action to annex. The following guidance is provided for reconciling overlapping MUGAs and MUGA gaps:

- a. Overlapping MUGAs and MUGA gaps may be reconciled between the affected cities and in consultation with the County. As used in this policy, the term “affected cities” means cities that are adjacent to MUGAs located in Snohomish County. For cities located in Snohomish County, “affected cities” include cities identified on the map in Appendix A that have MUGAs in common, as “overlaps” and cities that have incorporated boundaries or designated MUGAs adjacent to “gap” areas on the map. Cities having no territory in Snohomish County only qualify as “affected cities” after adoption of interlocal agreement(s) pursuant to Countywide Planning Policy (~~(JP-3)~~) JP-2 and Appendix F.
- b. Amendments to MUGA boundaries that occur in conjunction with changes to the outer Southwest UGA boundary may take place through agreement and action by the County and affected cities following consultation with the cities.
- c. Amendments to MUGA boundaries that are internal to the Southwest UGA boundary may take place through agreement and action by the affected cities following consultation with the County.
- d. When an agreement is reached under (a), (b), or (c), the County Council shall consider the recommendation of the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee on the proposed changes to the MUGA boundary and may amend the MUGA map in Appendix A.

**DP-**  
**~~((21))~~ 23** Where jurisdictions are unable to reach agreement under (~~(DP-20)~~) DP-22, it is not necessary for affected cities to resolve overlapping Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs) or MUGA gaps as a precondition to proposing annexation of property in the MUGA gap or overlap. In such cases, the established annexation processes under state law will guide city boundary decisions.

**DP-**  
**~~((22))~~ 24** Paine Field represents a unique situation in the Southwest Urban Growth Area, as it is a County-administered regional essential public facility. Any proposal to annex Paine Field is not subject to (~~(DP-20)~~) DP-22 and requires an approved agreement with the County prior to proceeding with any action to annex.

1

2

1

## 2 **Rural Land Use and Resource Lands**

3 This sub-section of the Development Patterns ~~((section meets))~~ chapter is intended to meet three  
4 purposes. First, it includes the countywide response to GMA requirements. Second, it includes  
5 policies to support parts of ~~((the regional plan,))~~ VISION ~~((2040,))~~ 2050 that ~~((go))~~ extend  
6 beyond state mandates. Third, it provides policies for issues that are specific to Snohomish  
7 County and its cities.

### 8 **State Context**

9 GMA distinguishes between Rural Lands and Resource Lands. In rural areas, there is a mix of  
10 low intensity uses including; housing, agriculture, forested areas, recreation, and appropriately  
11 scaled business and services, often following historic development patterns. Resource Lands are  
12 primarily for agriculture, forestry, or mineral extraction. Other activities on resource lands are to  
13 be of a subordinate nature.

### 14 **Regional Context**

15 VISION ~~((2040 identifies))~~ 2050 states that rural lands ~~((as permanent and vital parts of the~~  
16 ~~region.))~~ “are expected to retain important cultural, economic, and rural lifestyle opportunities in  
17 the region.”<sup>13</sup> ~~((It recognizes that rural lands accommodate many activities associated with~~  
18 ~~natural resources, as well as small scale farming and cottage industries.))~~ VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050  
19 emphasizes the preservation of these lands ~~((and acknowledges that managing rural growth))~~ by  
20 calling for reduced rural growth rates by directing urban development into designated urban  
21 lands ~~((helps to preserve vital ecosystems and economically productive lands))~~. It further  
22 encourages counties, wherever possible, to plan for rural growth rates that are lower than the  
23 levels that are contained in the regional growth strategy.

24 VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 also identifies that permanent protection of natural resource lands—  
25 forest, agricultural, and mineral lands—~~((are crucial))~~ is critical to the region’s sustainability. It  
26 recognizes that the loss or fragmentation of these lands ~~((—along with their productivity—has~~  
27 ~~impacts on the environment, including air and water quality and quantity, our economy, and~~  
28 ~~ultimately the health of the region’s people))~~ is particularly concerning for the long-term  
29 sustainability of the region.

### 30 **Local Context**

31 Beyond the guidance in GMA and VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050, ~~((these))~~ the rural land use and  
32 resource lands CPPs ~~((give))~~ provide direction ~~((for))~~ in the coordination of local issues outside  
33 of the UGA ~~((that may arise between jurisdictions))~~.

---

<sup>13</sup> VISION 2050, page 40. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 The objective of these policies is to ~~((ensure a future that maintains))~~ manage and reduce rural  
2 growth over time and maintain the non-urban character of rural areas, an active resource  
3 economy, and prosperous rural cities.

**DP-** The County shall establish low intensities of development and uses in areas outside of  
~~((23))~~ **25** Urban Growth Areas to preserve resource lands and protect rural areas from  
sprawling development.

**DP-** Density and development standards in rural and resource areas shall ~~((be based on~~  
~~((24))~~ **26** ~~accommodating the projected population and employment growth not allocated to the~~  
~~urban growth areas, consistent with))~~ work to manage and reduce rural growth rates  
over time, consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, GF-5, and the growth  
targets in Appendix B.

**DP-** The County shall establish~~((, in rural and resource areas,))~~ infrastructure and road  
~~((25))~~ **27** standards in rural and resource areas that are consistent with appropriate development  
patterns and densities ~~((in rural and resource areas))~~ to maintain rural character.

**DP-** Domestic water supply systems may be developed in rural and resource areas to meet  
~~((26))~~ **28** the needs of rural areas as provided in the county's coordinated water system plan.  
Water sources and transmission lines may be developed in rural and resource areas to  
meet the needs of urban growth areas.

**DP-** The county may permit rural clustering in accordance with the Growth Management  
~~((27))~~ **29** Act.

**DP-** The County and cities should meet the demand for new commercial activity and  
~~((28))~~ **30** services as well as new industrial job base in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) with  
limited exceptions as identified below. Outside of UGAs, the County should limit  
commercial and industrial development consistent with GMA and the Regional  
Growth Strategy ~~((, by allowing))~~ and should plan for commercial and community  
services that serve rural residents to locate within nearby UGAs, but can otherwise  
allow for:

- a. Resource-based and resource supportive commercial and industrial uses;
- b. Limited convenience commercial development serving the daily needs of rural  
area residents;
- c. Home-based businesses;
- d. Low traffic and employment enterprises that benefit from a non-urban location  
due to large lots, vegetative buffers, etc.; ~~((and,))~~
- e. Maintenance of the historical locations, scale, and character of existing  
commercial services and industrial activities~~((,))~~; and
- f. Resource-dependent tourism and recreation oriented uses provided they do not  
adversely impact adjoining rural and resource uses.

**DP-**  
**((29)) 31** The County shall develop strategies and programs to support agricultural and forest activities.

- a. Strategies should reduce ~~((conversion pressures on all))~~ pressure to convert resource ((lands)) and ~~((on))~~ rural lands with resource-based activities ~~((and))~~ to non-resource uses. Strategies may include redesignation of rural land to resource land.
- b. Programs may include transfer of development rights, purchase of development rights, and other conservation incentives that encourage ~~((the))~~ and focus ~~((of))~~ growth in the Urban Growth Areas.

**DP-**  
**((30)) 32** Jurisdictions should encourage the use of transfer of development rights (TDR), purchase of development rights, and conservation incentives. The objective is to focus growth in the Urban Growth Areas while lessening development pressure on rural and resource areas. Specific steps regarding TDR include:

- a. Designating additional TDR sending and receiving areas;
- b. Developing zoning incentives to use TDR in urban areas not already designated as receiving areas;
- c. Coordinating ~~((with))~~ efforts to establish a regional TDR program; and
- d. Ensuring that an area designated as a TDR receiving area by the County remains a receiving area after annexation or that the city provides an equivalent capacity for receiving TDR certificates elsewhere in the city when the County and the affected cities have adopted an interlocal agreement addressing the TDR program.

1

2



1       **The Built Environment and Health**

2 Urban design has a profound effect on ~~((how well we live))~~ quality of life. This subsection of the  
3 Development Patterns chapter ties together how we build the urban environment and ~~((the values~~  
4 ~~of))~~ livability, health, and safety. It responds to the legislative findings in the GMA where the  
5 state connects land use planning to health and public safety.<sup>14</sup> The GMA considers provisions for  
6 health and safety to be a part of the goal of Public Services.<sup>15</sup> VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 articulates  
7 the regional response to this state requirement and sets the stage for the CPPs to guide local  
8 plans. The policies here are the local response to state and regional initiatives that seek to  
9 connect land use planning with public health and safety.

- DP-**       The County and cities should address the safety, health, and well-being of residents  
~~((35))~~ **40**    and employees ~~((by))~~ in countywide and local planning through:
- a. ~~((Adopting))~~ Adoption of development standards ~~((encouraging))~~ that encourage  
design and construction of healthy buildings and facilities; ~~((and))~~
  - b. ~~((Providing))~~ Provision of infrastructure that promotes physical activity~~((:));~~ and
  - c. Incorporating a focus on health and well-being, including the reduction of  
existing disparities between population groups, into countywide and local  
decision-making processes.

- DP-**       The County and cities should adopt policies that create opportunities for:  
~~((36))~~ **41**    a. Supporting urban food production practices, distribution, and marketing such as  
community gardens and farmers markets; and
- b. Increasing the local agricultural economy’s capacity to produce, market, and  
distribute fresh and minimally processed foods.

10       **Incompatible Land Uses**

- DP-**       The County and cities should conserve designated industrial land for future industries  
~~((37))~~ **42**    and related jobs by:
- a. Protecting ~~((#))~~ industrial land from encroachment by incompatible uses and  
development on adjacent land;
  - b. Discouraging non-industrial uses on ~~((#))~~ industrial land unless such uses support  
and enhance existing industrial land uses; and
  - c. Discouraging conversion of ~~((#))~~ industrial land to other land use designations  
unless it can be demonstrated that a specific site is not suitable for industrial  
uses.

**DP-**       Adjacent to military lands, the County and cities should encourage land uses that are  
~~((38))~~ **43**    compatible with military uses and discourage land uses that are incompatible.

**DP-**       The County and cities shall protect the continued operation of general aviation  
~~((39))~~ **44**    airports from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.

---

<sup>14</sup> RCW 36.70A.010

<sup>15</sup> RCW 36.70A.020(12) and 36.70A.030(13)



## HOUSING

### State Context

~~((Washington's))~~ The Growth Management Act (GMA) ~~((establishes a))~~ housing goal ~~((pertaining to housing, to))~~ states that comprehensive plans and development regulations should encourage a full range of affordable housing types to meet the needs of all segments of the population, and to encourage the preservation of the existing housing stock.<sup>16</sup>

Pursuant to the GMA, the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) ~~((must))~~ specifically address how local comprehensive plans will consider the need for affordable housing ~~((, such as))~~. That consideration includes the creation of housing for all economic segments of the population and parameters for ~~((its))~~ the distribution of affordable housing among counties and cities.<sup>17</sup> In turn, each county and city is obligated to plan for affordable housing consistent with the regional context determined by CPPs.<sup>18</sup> Counties and cities planning under GMA must ensure that, taken collectively, their comprehensive plans provide sufficient land capacity for projected housing ~~((growth))~~ needs, consistent with the county's 20-year population growth allocation.<sup>19</sup>

CPPs may not, however, alter the land-use powers of cities.<sup>20</sup>

### Regional Context

~~((The regional plan, Vision 2040 contains an "overarching goal" for housing that calls for the region to))~~ VISION 2050 includes a regional housing goal, stating that the region:

*~~((preserve, improve, and expand))~~ preserves, improves, and expands its housing stock to provide a range of affordable, accessible, ~~((health))~~ healthy, and safe housing choices for every resident. The region ~~((will continue))~~ continues to promote fair and equal access to housing for all people.*

~~((Vision 2040's Multi-county))~~ The Multicounty Planning Policies MPPs ~~((also require jurisdictions to establish local housing targets based on population projections, and local housing and employment targets for each designated regional growth center))~~ provide a regional policy framework for housing, which includes consideration of affordability, home ownership, housing location, and housing choice. In particular, the Housing chapter of VISION 2050 identifies the need for local action as a critical component in the provision of affordable housing.<sup>21</sup> It includes policies related to affordability, displacement, and jobs-housing balance. In addition, the housing

---

<sup>16</sup> RCW 36.70A.020(4).

<sup>17</sup> RCW 36.70A.210(3)(e) and WAC 365-196-410(2)(e)(ii).

<sup>18</sup> WAC 365-196-410(2)(e)(ii).

<sup>19</sup> RCW 36.70A.115.

<sup>20</sup> RCW 36.70A.210(1).

<sup>21</sup> ~~((MPP D-3.))~~ VISION 2050, page 103. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 policies ((of Vision 2040)) place significant emphasis on ((the location of)) locating housing in  
2 close proximity to growth and employment centers and ((to)) transportation and transit corridors.

### 3 **Snohomish County Housing**

4 Snohomish County continues to face the following housing challenges:

- 5 1. Adequate supply of affordable housing for all economic segments in each community.
- 6 2. Adequate supply of quality housing options in proximity or satisfactory access to places  
7 of employment.
- 8 3. Infill housing development and community concerns about density and design.
- 9 4. Adequate resources for, and equitable distribution of low-income and special needs  
10 housing across the county.
- 11 5. Housing types suitable for changing household demographics and an aging population.
- 12 6. Maintenance of existing affordable housing stock, including mobile home and  
13 manufactured housing.
- 14 7. Overall increase in housing cost.

15 It is important to remember that housing is created, priced, and demolished as the result of  
16 complicated interactions of market forces and government policies that reach across regions and  
17 even nations. Snohomish County is part of a regional market where housing is a commodity  
18 largely produced by the private sector, with a small but significant portion provided by  
19 government housing authorities and non-profit agencies. Sufficient housing, concurrent with  
20 employment and population growth and adequate transportation access, is a regional challenge  
21 that needs attention at all levels of government.

22 It is beyond the financial capacity of local governments and nonprofits to satisfy unmet housing  
23 needs through their own expenditures. Historically, the federal government has taken the lead in  
24 the financial strategies, but federal funding does not meet the need. The housing affordability  
25 issue will get worse if federal funding trends continue.

26 Snohomish County jurisdictions recognize that their actions alone will not eliminate unmet  
27 housing needs. Financial constraints, however, are not a valid reason for jurisdictions not to  
28 address countywide unmet housing needs in their comprehensive plans' land use and housing  
29 strategies.

30 Despite the limited control that local governments have over housing markets, Snohomish  
31 County jurisdictions have made progress in meeting these housing challenges. Snohomish  
32 County Tomorrow regularly monitors and analyzes these housing challenges to better understand  
33 them and to suggest steps toward their diminishment. The *2007 Housing Evaluation Report*  
34 illustrates that, alone and in cooperation, the county and cities have adopted policies, strategies  
35 and regulations that help preserve affordable housing or remove barriers or reduce the costs of  
36 producing new housing units.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> The report can be found online at [www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/Departments/PDS/Divisions/LR\\_Planning/Information/Plans/SCT+Reports/HER07.htm](http://www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/Departments/PDS/Divisions/LR_Planning/Information/Plans/SCT+Reports/HER07.htm)

1 Beyond that, the Snohomish County Housing Affordability Regional Taskforce was established  
2 in 2019 and issued the HART Report and Five-Year Action Plan in January 2020. The report  
3 identifies housing challenges and provides an action plan for addressing housing affordability.<sup>23</sup>

4 The CPPs on housing are required and intended to support both GMA and ~~((Vision 2040))~~  
5 VISION 2050. Generally speaking, they follow the organization of the ~~((Vision 2040 Multi-~~  
6 ~~county Planning Housing Policies))~~ VISION 2050 Multicounty Planning Policies on housing.

## 7 **Housing Goal**

8 Snohomish County and its cities ~~((will promote an affordable lifestyle where residents~~  
9 ~~have access to safe, affordable, and))~~ shall promote fair and equitable access to safe, affordable,  
10 and accessible housing options for every resident through the expansion of a diverse  
11 housing ~~((options near their jobs))~~ stock that is in close proximity to employment, services, and  
12 transportation options.

~~((HO-1))~~ ~~((The county and cities shall support the principle that fair and equal access to housing is available to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, national origin, familial status, source of income, or disability.))~~

**HO-**  
~~((2))~~ 1 The county and cities shall make provisions in their comprehensive plans to accommodate existing and projected housing needs, ~~((including))~~ consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and Snohomish County Growth Targets. Plans must include a specific assessment of housing needs by economic segment ~~((within the community)),~~ as ~~((indicated))~~ described in the housing report prescribed in CPP HO-5. Those provisions should consider the following ~~((factors))~~ strategies:

- a. ~~((Avoiding))~~ Avoid further concentrations of low-income and special needs housing.
- b. ~~((Increasing))~~ Increase opportunities and capacity for affordable housing in ~~((urban))~~ Regional, Countywide, and local growth centers.
- c. ~~((Increasing))~~ Increase opportunities and capacity for affordable housing close to employment, education, shopping, public services, and public transit.
- d. ~~((Increasing))~~ Increase opportunities and capacity for affordable and special needs housing in areas where affordable housing is currently lacking.
- e. ~~((Supporting))~~ Support affordable housing opportunities in other Snohomish County jurisdictions, as described below in ~~((CPP HO-4))~~ CPP-HO-3.
- f. Support the creation of additional housing options in single-family neighborhoods to provide for more diverse housing types and choices to meet the various needs of all economic segments of the population.

---

<sup>23</sup> HART Report and Five-Year Action Plan. Available at <https://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/71290/HART-Report-and-5-Year-Action-Plan?bidId=>

**HO-~~(3)~~ 2** County and city comprehensive plans shall include policies ~~((for accommodating))~~ to meet affordable housing goals ((throughout the County)) consistent with ((Vision 2040)) VISION 2050. ((The land use and housing elements should demonstrate they)) Jurisdictions should demonstrate within their land use and housing elements that they can accommodate needed housing ((availability and facilitate)) consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and Snohomish County Growth Targets. These efforts should include facilitating the regional fair share of affordable housing for very low, low, moderate, and middle-income households and special needs individuals. Housing elements of comprehensive plans shall be periodically evaluated for success in facilitating needed housing.

**HO-~~(4)~~ 3** The county and cities should participate in ~~((a))~~ multi-jurisdictional affordable housing ~~((program or))~~ programs and engage in other cooperative ~~((effort))~~ efforts to promote and contribute to an adequate ~~((and diversified))~~ supply of affordable, special needs, and diverse housing countywide.

**HO-4** The county and cities should implement policies that allow for the development of moderate density housing to help meet future housing needs, diversify the housing stock, and provide more affordable home ownership and rental opportunities. This approach should include code updates to ensure that zoning designations and allowed densities, housing capacity, and other restrictions do not preclude development of moderate density housing.

**HO-5** The cities and the county shall collaborate to report housing characteristics and needs in a timely manner for jurisdictions to conduct major comprehensive plan updates and to assess progress toward achieving CPPs on housing. The report shall be sufficiently easy to understand and use for planning and evaluation. To the extent made possible by the availability of valid data, this report shall, for the entire county and each jurisdiction:

- a. Describe the measures that jurisdictions have taken (individually or collectively) to implement or support CPPs on housing, especially measures taken to support housing affordability.
- b. Quantify and map existing characteristics that are relevant to the results prescribed in the CPPs on housing, including (but not limited to):
  - i. The supply of housing units, including subsidized housing, by type, tenure, affordability, and special needs populations served.
  - ii. The availability and general location of existing affordable housing units and the distribution and location of vouchers and similar assistance methods.
  - iii. The supply of land that is undeveloped, partially used ((and redevelopable residential land)) and/or has the potential to be developed or redeveloped for residential purposes.
- c. Identify the number of housing units necessary to meet the various housing needs ~~((of the))~~ for the projected population ((, by income ranges,)) of households of all incomes and special needs populations. The number of units identified for each jurisdiction will be utilized for planning purposes and to acknowledge the responsibility of all jurisdictions to plan for affordable housing within the regional context.

d. Evaluate the risk of physical and economic displacement of residents, especially low-income households and marginalized populations.

**HO-6** The county and cities should implement policies and programs that encourage ~~((the upgrading of neighborhoods and))~~ the rehabilitation and preservation of existing legally established, affordable housing for residents of all income levels, including but not limited to mobile/manufactured housing and single - room occupancy (SRO) housing.

**HO-7** Jurisdictions shall use housing definitions consistent with those of the Snohomish County Tomorrow ~~((growth monitoring report))~~ Housing Characteristics and Needs Report prescribed in HO-5. Definitions may be periodically revised based on consideration of local demographic data and the definitions used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

**HO-8** Each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan should reconcile the need to encourage and respect the vitality of established residential neighborhoods with the need to identify and site essential public residential facilities for special needs populations, including those mandated under RCW 36.70A.200.

**HO-9** In order to improve the jobs-to-housing balance in Snohomish County, jurisdictions shall adopt comprehensive plans that provide for the development of:

- a. A variety of housing choices, including affordable housing, so that workers at all income levels may choose to live in proximity to existing and planned employment concentrations and transit service; and
- b. ~~((Provide for employment))~~ Employment opportunities in proximity to existing and planned residential communities.

**HO-10** Jurisdictions should encourage the use of environmentally sensitive housing development practices and environmentally sustainable building techniques and materials in order to minimize the impacts of growth and development on the county's natural resource systems. This approach should also consider the potential costs and benefits to site development, construction, and building maintenance to balance housing affordability and environmental sustainability.

**HO-11** The county and cities should consider the economic implications of proposed building and land use regulations so that the broader public benefit they serve is achieved with the least additional cost to housing.

**HO-12** The county and cities should minimize housing production costs by considering the use of a variety of infrastructure funding methods, such as existing revenue sources, impact fees, local improvement districts, and general obligation bonds.

- HO-13** Jurisdictions should ensure that their impact fee programs add no more to the cost of each housing unit produced than a fairly-derived proportionate share of the cost of new public facilities necessary to accommodate the housing unit as determined by the impact fee provisions of the Growth Management Act cited in chapter 82.02 RCW.
- HO-14** The county and cities should ~~((provide incentives for))~~ incentivize and promote the development and preservation of long-term affordable housing ~~((such as))~~ through the use of zoning, taxation, and other tools, including height or density bonuses, property tax incentives and parking requirement reductions. The incentives should apply where feasible to encourage affordable housing.
- HO-15** Metropolitan cities, Core cities, and High Capacity Transit Communities, as defined by the Regional Growth Strategy in VISION 2050, shall develop and implement strategies to address displacement of historically marginalized populations, including residents identified in the report prescribed in HO-5, and neighborhood-based small business owners.

1

2 **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT**

3 A solid economic foundation is fundamental to our quality of life. Economic growth and activity  
4 provides jobs and income for our citizens, the goods and services that we use daily, and revenues  
5 that fund local government services and programs. Strengthening our ~~((businesses))~~ business  
6 climate keeps our region competitive with other regions, and expands opportunities for new and  
7 better jobs as our population grows. Diversifying and expanding Snohomish County’s economic  
8 base will provide important long-term benefits to our ~~((citizens))~~ residents and communities.

9 ~~((Local))~~ In partnership with the private sector, local government should promote economic  
10 development by creating opportunities for a wide range of businesses, jobs ~~((and))~~, careers, ~~((in~~  
11 ~~partnership with the private sector))~~ and educational opportunities for all residents. Through  
12 education and training programs, land use planning, construction permitting, and building  
13 infrastructure, local government “sets the table” for private investment and continued economic  
14 growth.

15 **State Context**

16 The Growth Management Act requires that Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) include  
17 policies to promote economic development and employment (RCW 36.70A.210(3)(g)). It also  
18 requires local plans—which the CPPs guide—to include an economic development element  
19 (RCW 36.70A.070(7)).

20 **Regional Context**

21 VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 sets the following ~~((“))~~overarching goal~~((”))~~ for ~~((economic~~  
22 ~~development))~~ the regional economy:

23 *The region ~~((will have))~~ has a prospering and sustainable regional economy by*  
24 *supporting businesses and job creation, investing in all people and their health,*  
25 *sustaining environmental quality, and creating great central places, diverse communities,*  
26 *and high quality of life.*

27 It goes on to state:

28 ~~*(VISION 2040’s economic goals and policies promote a sustainable economy that*~~  
29 ~~*creates and maintains a high standard of living and quality of life for all. The create*~~  
30 ~~*stable and lasting prosperity, VISION 2040 focuses on businesses, people, and places,*~~  
31 ~~*recognizing that growth management, transportation, economic, and environmental*~~  
32 ~~*policies must be integrated and must take social, economic, and environmental issues*~~  
33 ~~*into account while preserving key regional assets.))*~~

34 *To create stable and lasting prosperity, VISION 2050 focuses on businesses, people, and*  
35 *places. Strong regional growth necessitates continuous coordination to ensure that the*  
36 *region’s quality of life remains an economic asset in the future. Success of the region’s*

1 economy is built on quality of life policies across VISION 2050 that manage the region's  
2 growth, invest in transportation, protect the environment, enhance community assets, and  
3 provide housing options for the region's residents. Economy policies in VISION 2050  
4 build on these policies.

5 In ~~((2008, the Prosperity Partnership for the Puget Sound adopted a))~~ 2017 Amazing Place was  
6 adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council, updating the Regional ((Growth)) Economic  
7 Strategy ((RGS)) for ((the area that identifies 14 industrial clusters in the region's economy. It  
8 also identifies the following seven clusters for strategic development)) the Central Puget Sound  
9 Region. In the Regional Economic Strategy, three economic goals were identified for the region.  
10 Those goals are as follows:

11 Goal: Open economic opportunities to everyone.

12 Goal: Compete globally.

13 Goal: Sustain a high quality of life.<sup>24</sup>

14 In addition to setting goals and providing strategies to achieve those goals, Amazing Place  
15 identifies the following nine key export industries that the economic strategy is designed to  
16 support:

- 17 • Aerospace
- 18 • Business Services
- 19 • Clean Technology
- 20 • Information and Communication Technology
- 21 • Life Sciences and Global Health
- 22 • Logistics and International Trade
- 23 • Maritime
- 24 • Military and Defense
- 25 • Tourism((/Visitors)).<sup>25</sup>

## 26 **Snohomish County Economy**

27 The CPPs in this chapter are intended to promote economic development in Snohomish County  
28 consistent with the goals and policies of VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050. Snohomish County is an  
29 important international center for the aerospace industry, and the home of Boeing Company's  
30 largest aircraft manufacturing complex. This county also accounts for about one-fourth of the  
31 biotech industry in the State of Washington. Looking into the future, economic development  
32 organizations have identified three industry clusters as the ultimate focus of Snohomish County.  
33 These three industry clusters are Aerospace, Life Sciences (Biotech and Medical Devices), and  
34 Technology Manufacturing.

---

<sup>24</sup> Amazing Place, Page 11. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/amazingplacestrategy.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> Amazing Place, Page 3. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/amazingplacestrategy.pdf>



1 To achieve sustainable economic vitality for all the communities of Snohomish County,  
2 jurisdictions are required to incorporate an economic development element in their  
3 comprehensive plans. Coordination of economic development planning with the other required  
4 elements of comprehensive plans is vital to attracting new business, promoting economic  
5 diversity and encouraging expansion and retention of existing businesses.

6 Snohomish County residents provide a skilled workforce for many businesses in both King and  
7 Snohomish counties. An important part of creating sustainable communities and improving the  
8 quality of life will be realized by creating more opportunities for residents of Snohomish County  
9 to work closer to home. The CPPs, as the framework for local comprehensive plans, support the  
10 integration of economic opportunities, transportation improvements, investments in education,  
11 protection of environmental quality, and focusing of growth in designated centers, consistent  
12 with the RGS in VISION ((2040)) 2050.

13 **Economic Development and Employment Goal**

14 Cities, towns, and Snohomish County government will encourage coordinated,  
15 sustainable economic growth by building on the strengths of the county’s economic base and  
16 diversifying it through strategic investments in infrastructure, education and training, and sound  
17 management of land and natural resources.

**ED-1** The County and cities, through Snohomish County Tomorrow, should support the  
Regional Growth Strategy of VISION ((2040)) 2050 and the ((economic priorities of  
~~the Prosperity Partnership~~) Regional Economic Strategy. ((While recognizing the  
need to accommodate other businesses and industries and to diversify our economy,  
jurisdictions)) Jurisdictions should utilize comprehensive plan policies, infrastructure  
investments, and regulations to support the ((following)) existing and emerging  
industry clusters that play an important role in ((the health of)) growing and  
sustaining Snohomish County’s economy. ((, through our comprehensive plan  
policies, infrastructure investments and land use regulations:  
a. ~~Aerospace;~~  
b. ~~Technology;~~  
c. ~~Life sciences and healthcare;~~  
d. ~~International trade;~~  
e. ~~Military;~~  
f. ~~Tourism;~~  
g. ~~Agriculture; and~~  
h. ~~Education~~))

**ED-2** The County and cities should ((encourage)) foster an equitable business and  
regulatory environment that supports and encourages the establishment and growth  
of ((locally owned,)) small and startup businesses ((through comprehensive plan  
policies, infrastructure investments, and fair and appropriate land use regulations in  
all communities)), especially those that are woman- and minority-owned .

- ED-3** Jurisdictions should prioritize multi-modal transportation system linkages between growth centers, ~~((manufacturing and industrial))~~ manufacturing/industrial centers, and ~~((supporting))~~ residential areas ~~((containing an adequate supply of affordable housing (as appropriate)))~~ to support economic development and improve access to a wide variety of job opportunities and employment.
- ED-4** State and federal economic development and transportation funding should be prioritized to regionally designated centers~~((and sub-centers))~~, countywide centers, high-capacity station areas with a station area plan, and other local centers, as well as transportation system linkages between regional growth centers, ~~((manufacturing industrial))~~ manufacturing/industrial centers, and supporting residential areas containing an adequate supply of affordable housing.
- ED-5** ~~((The process for designating Manufacturing/Industrial Centers (MICs) shall be as follows:~~
- ~~a. A local jurisdiction may nominate an MIC;~~
  - ~~b. An economic development subcommittee of Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) reviews the proposal for conformity with the criteria in ED-6;~~
  - ~~c. If the MIC proposal is found to be appropriate, the SCT Steering Committee recommends the MIC for designation; and~~
  - ~~d. The County Council holds a public hearing and makes the decision to seek designation of the MIC as a candidate center to be forwarded to the Puget Sound Regional Council for consideration.))~~
- Jurisdictions should promote economic and employment growth that creates a countywide economy that consists of a diverse range of living wage jobs for all of the county's residents.

- ED-6** (~~Manufacturing/Industrial Centers (MICs)~~ designated through the process in ED-5 shall be located in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs). MICs should have clearly defined geographic boundaries and develop in accordance with the general guidelines established in the VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy. Specifically, an MIC should meet the following criteria, it:
- a. Consists of major, existing regional employment areas of intensive, concentrated manufacturing, industrial and high technology land uses, including— but not limited to— aviation facilities and services;
  - b. Provides capacity and planning for a minimum of 20,000 jobs;
  - c. Is located outside other designated centers but in a UGA;
  - d. Includes land uses that cannot easily be mixed at higher densities with other uses;
  - e. Is supported by adequate public facilities and service, including good access to the regional transportation system; and
  - f. ~~Discourages retail and office uses unless they are supportive of the preferred uses in (a.-))~~

As a part of the overall countywide economic development strategy, jurisdictions should target economic development activities that improve access to economic opportunity for residents that historically have low and very low access to opportunity.

- ED-7** The County and adjacent cities shall protect the Paine Field-Boeing area as a (~~Manufacturing/Industrial~~) Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC), recognizing that it is a major, existing regional employment area of intensive, concentrated manufacturing and industrial land uses, including aerospace, aircraft manufacturing and high-technology uses. Notwithstanding the VISION (~~2040~~) 2050 guidelines for MIC designation, land uses and zoning of Paine Field continue to be governed by the Snohomish County Airport Paine Field Master Plan and Snohomish County Zoning Code consistent with federal aviation policies and grant obligations. This MIC should:
- a. Accommodate aerospace related employment and associated activities;
  - b. Accommodate employment which requires a high floor area to employee ratio but (~~strive to~~) increase the overall employment density in the manufacturing and industrial center;
  - c. Encourage a mix of uses which support and enhance manufacturing, aerospace and industrial centers; and
  - d. Be supported by adequate public facilities and services, including good access to the region's transportation system, which are essential to the success of the MIC.

- ED-8** Jurisdictions (~~are encouraged to work~~) should collaborate with businesses and organizations to develop economic development plan elements and analyze the land use designations, infrastructure and services needed (~~by business uses~~) to support businesses.

- ED-9** As appropriate, the County and cities should adopt plans, policies, and regulations that preserve designated industrial, commercial, agricultural, and resource land base for long-term regional economic benefit.
- ED-10** In their local comprehensive plans, jurisdictions shall include economic development policies consistent with existing or planned capital and utility facilities. These plans should identify and implement strategies to ensure timely development of needed facilities.
- ED-11** In cooperation with school districts, other education providers, and each other, jurisdictions should ensure the availability of sufficient land and services for future K-20 school needs, and support ~~((improved))~~ high-quality education and job training resources for all ~~((citizens))~~ residents, such as a 4-year university or technical college in Snohomish County.
- ED-12** The County and cities should coordinate economic development plans and economic elements within comprehensive plans with transportation, housing, and land use policies~~((that))~~, and the Regional Growth Strategy to support economic development ~~((and predictability for future growth))~~ that is compatible with each community.
- ED-13** Jurisdictions should recognize, where appropriate, the growth and development needs of businesses of local, regional, or statewide significance and ensure that local plans and regulations provide opportunity for the growth and continued success of such businesses.
- ED-14** The County and cities should promote an appropriate balance of jobs-to-housing to:
- a. Support economic activity;
  - b. Encourage local economic opportunities and housing choice;
  - c. Improve mobility; and
  - d. Respond to the challenge of climate change.
- ED-15** Jurisdictions should ensure that economic development sustains and respects the county's natural environment and encourages the development of existing and emerging industries, technologies, and services that promote environmental sustainability, especially those addressing climate change and resilience.
- ED-~~((15))~~ 16** The expeditious processing of development applications ~~((by the County and the cities))~~ shall not result in the ~~((lowering))~~ reduction of environmental and land use standards.

**ED-** ((In their comprehensive plans, the cities of Arlington and Marysville identify an industrial center spanning those two cities as a candidate for regional designation as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC). The proposed MIC is entirely within the urban growth area and predominantly within the city limits of Arlington and Marysville. Based on the recommendation of Snohomish County Tomorrow, developed through a collaborative and participatory process, the County identifies the proposed Arlington-Marysville Manufacturing Industrial Center as a candidate for regional designation as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center.)) **((16)) 17** The County and cities shall support the Cascade Industrial Center as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC), recognizing that it is a major, existing regional employment area of intensive, concentrated manufacturing and industrial land uses.

**ED-18** Jurisdictions should identify the potential for physical, economic, and cultural displacement of existing locally owned, small businesses as a result of development or redevelopment and market pressure. Jurisdictions should consider a range of mitigation strategies to mitigate the impacts of displacement to the extent feasible.

1

2

# TRANSPORTATION

## State Context

These transportation policies have been prepared under the authority of RCW 36.70A.210 (3) which states that "A countywide planning policy [CPP] shall ~~((as))~~ at a minimum, address the following... (d) Policies for countywide transportation facilities and strategies". They apply to designated, countywide transportation facilities and services, which are those that serve travel needs and have impacts beyond the particular jurisdiction(s) in which they are located.

## Regional Context

VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 provides a framework for long-range transportation planning in the region by integrating planning for freight, ferries, roads, transit, bicycling, and walking. VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 recognizes the importance of continued mobility for people, goods, and services. It also recognizes that transportation in our region is the source for approximately half of the greenhouse gas emissions, as well as a primary source of pollution in Puget Sound. As a result, VISION ~~((2040))~~ 2050 commits to a sustainable, clean and safe transportation system that increases transportation choices while improving the natural environment.

The multicounty planning policies for transportation are organized around the maintenance, management, and safety of the transportation systems. The policies call for better integrated land use and transportation planning, with a priority placed on transportation investments that serve centers and compact urban communities. An emphasis is also placed on cleaner operations, dependable financing mechanisms transportation, alternatives to driving alone (and reduced vehicle miles traveled), and lower transportation-related energy consumption—which, in turn, lowers particulate pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

## Local Context

Transportation and land use are profoundly interrelated. The type, intensity, and timing of land development will influence the mode of transportation provided, its effectiveness in moving people and goods and the travel behavior of people using the land. Distinctions need to be made between the types and levels of transportation services provided to urban areas and rural areas. People living in low-density areas traveling to employment dispersed throughout the county tend to use the automobile over other modes of transportation.

~~((It is very difficult to serve these types of trips with traditional, fixed route, public transportation (i.e., bus or rail).))~~ Public transportation is most effective in moving people where population and employment are concentrated in denser neighborhoods and activity centers. Site design features need to accommodate public transportation allowing efficient access and circulation of transit vehicles.

In order to achieve the long-term growth management goals that are established by Snohomish County Tomorrow, the following overarching principles should guide implementation of the CPPs for multimodal transportation.

- 1 • Provide a wide range of choices in transportation services to ensure that all citizens have  
2 the ability to travel regardless of age, sex, race, income, disability, or place of residence.
- 3 • Pursue sustainable funding and informed decision-making that recognizes the economic,  
4 environmental, and social context of transportation.
- 5 • Balance the various modes of travel in order to enhance person-carrying capacity, as  
6 opposed to vehicle-moving capacity.
- 7 • Implement efficient levels of service for the various surface transportation modes (i.e.,  
8 roadways, bikeways, transit, and freight) that are applied effectively to serve different  
9 intensities of land development.

10 Policies related to level of service, transportation location, and design need to be coordinated  
11 across state, regional, and local agencies to ensure effective and efficient transportation. We need  
12 to ensure that our countywide transportation systems are designed to support the level of land  
13 development we allow and forecast while at the same time recognizing and responding to the  
14 context in which those systems are located.

15 The CPPs presented here are intended to guide transportation planning by the County and cities  
16 in Snohomish County and to provide the basis for regional coordination with the Washington  
17 State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), and  
18 transportation operating agencies.

## 19 **Transportation Goal**

20 The County and cities will work proactively with transportation planning agencies and service  
21 providers to plan, finance, and implement an efficient, affordable, equitable, inclusive, and safe  
22 multi-modal transportation system that supports state-level planning, the Regional Growth  
23 Strategy, and local comprehensive plans and promotes economic vitality, environment  
24 sustainability, and human health.

- TR-1** Jurisdictions should establish agreements and procedures for jointly mitigating traffic impacts, including provisions for development and design review and sharing of developer impact mitigation.
- a. Interlocal agreements among the cities and County should be used in Urban Growth Areas and areas proposed for annexation, to define procedures and standards for mitigating traffic impacts, sharing improvement and debt costs for transportation facilities, and addressing maintenance and funding for future transportation facilities and services. These interlocal agreements may also include transit agencies or the Washington State Department of Transportation where mitigation includes transportation demand management strategies or transit related improvements, such as park and ride facilities, bus rapid transit stations, or high-occupancy lanes.
  - b. Joint development and plan review teams should be formed for major projects having impacts that extend across jurisdictional boundaries.
  - c. Development impact mitigation should be shared where a project's impacts extend across jurisdictional boundaries.
  - d. Local comprehensive plans and long-range transit agency plans should provide

policies that encourage private sector investment in transportation services and facilities.

- e. Local land use regulations should provide for integrated design of transportation facilities in designated urban growth centers to encourage transit-oriented land uses and nonmotorized modes of travel.

**TR-2** Jurisdictions may designate transportation service areas that provide the geographic basis for joint projects, maintenance, level of service methods, coordinated capital and mitigation programs and finance methods for transportation facilities and services. In these transportation service areas, the Washington State Department of Transportation, the County, cities and transit agencies may coordinate future land use, transportation, and capital facilities planning efforts to ensure consistency between jurisdictional comprehensive plans and long-range transit agency plans.

**TR-3** ~~((In support of VISION 2040, the))~~ The County and cities should establish ~~((agreements))~~ processes and procedures for setting priorities, programming, and financing for countywide, regional and state transportation facilities and services consistent with VISION 2050, the Growth Management Act, and federal transportation legislation.

a. The County and cities, in coordination with public transit agencies and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), should develop consistent methodologies to determine transportation needs and their estimated costs in terms of capital, operations, preservation, and maintenance.

b. Transportation needs should be prioritized based on the extent to which they fulfill the objectives of the adopted Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), local comprehensive plans, long range transit agency plans, and transportation policies.

c. Within cities and unincorporated county in urban growth areas, transportation facility and service investments should be prioritized that support compact, pedestrian- and transit- oriented development, especially within designated regional, countywide, and local centers, near HCT facilities, and along corridors connecting centers.

d. Transportation investments should be prioritized that support the achievement of regional greenhouse gas emission reduction goals.

~~((e-))~~ e. The Puget Sound Regional Council, WSDOT, County, and cities should maintain an ongoing and coordinated six-year program that specifies the financing of immediate transportation improvements consistent with the RGS, ~~((Transportation 2040, and the WSDOT Highway System Plan))~~ The Regional Transportation Plan, and WSDOT's Washington Transportation Plan.

~~((d-))~~ f. The financing of transportation systems and improvements should reflect the true costs of providing service, reflecting the costs and benefits attributable to those who use the system as well as those who benefit from it. Revenues to finance transportation should come from traditional measures (e.g., fuel taxes, property taxes, and impact mitigation fees), but also from other innovative measures (e.g., user fees, high occupancy tolls, Vehicle Miles Travelled assessments, and private-sector contributions). Importantly, impacts of transportation system choices and funding decisions on climate change should be considered as part of this process.



**TR-4**

The County and cities, together with WSDOT and transit agencies, shall provide transportation facilities and services ~~((that))~~ necessary to support and implement the RGS and the land use elements of ((their)) local comprehensive plans, including roadway capacities~~((and nonmotorized))~~, active transportation options~~((together with))~~, and public transportation services appropriate to the designated land use types and intensities by:

- a. Maintaining and improving existing arterials, neighborhood streets, and associated pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure in order to promote safe and efficient use for all modes;
- b. Providing a network of multimodal arterials based on a consistent classification system and appropriate design standards that will improve connectivity, circulation, and reduce vehicle miles of travel;
- c. Using land use projections based on the Regional Growth Strategy and implemented through local comprehensive plans to identify and plan for adequate roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit services to meet travel needs;
- d. Reviewing land use designations where ~~((roadway capacity and/or transit service capacity))~~ transportation levels of service cannot adequately serve or expect to achieve concurrency for development allowed under the designation;
- e. Providing adequate access to and circulation for public service and priority for public transportation vehicles will be part of the planning for comprehensive plan land use designations and subsequent development as appropriate; ~~((and))~~
- f. Consulting with transit agencies, as appropriate, when planning future land use in designated transit emphasis corridors and in the area of high capacity transit stations for consistency with long-range transit agency plans and to ensure that the land use and transit services are mutually supported;
- g. Preparing for changes in technology and travel patterns for moving people and goods; and
- h. Improving street connectivity to encourage walking, bicycling, transit use, and physical activity.

- TR-5** The County and cities together with the Washington State Department of Transportation should develop consistent transportation design standards for urban and rural areas throughout the County that address public transportation, roadways, ferries, walkways, bikeways, and access for people with disabilities, low-income and special needs populations, and that recognize differences among communities by:
- a. Identifying major travel routes needing additional public transportation, pedestrian, or bicycle-related improvements to increase people-carrying capacity;
  - b. Coordinating local comprehensive plans to develop or complete a system of interconnected walkways and bikeways;
  - c. Establishing multimodal transportation facility design, level of service standards and site plan design standards that will address the movement of goods and services to enhance the wellbeing of the economy and public health; and
  - d. Implementing context-sensitive solutions that recognize the variety of functions of transportation facilities and that promote compatibility with the natural environment, adjoining land uses, and activities and that create high quality public spaces.

- TR-6** The County and cities should prepare consistent rules and procedures among affected jurisdictions and transit agencies for locating, ~~((and))~~ designing, and constructing transportation facilities and services to minimize and mitigate their adverse impacts on the natural environment, ~~((or))~~ resource lands, or human health. Depending on the jurisdiction, these may include:
- a. Design standards and consistent methods to reduce stormwater pollution, improve fish passages, and minimize other adverse impacts on shorelines, water resources, drainage patterns, and soils;
  - b. Location criteria that minimize the disruption to natural habitat, flood plains, wetlands, geologically and other environmentally sensitive areas;
  - c. Cooperation with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, PSRC, and local jurisdictions to ensure consistency with the transportation control measure requirements of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments; and
  - d. ~~((Measures to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change.))~~ Development of a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to and promotes human health.

- TR-7** The County and cities shall employ professionally accepted methodologies for determining transportation levels of service that consider different development intensities for urban centers, other urban areas and rural areas, high-occupancy vehicle use and community values as reflected by the city and County comprehensive plans, and transit agency long range plans.
- The County and cities should use – in coordination with transit agencies – a consistent technique in calculating transportation level of service on a systems basis that:
- a. Incorporates different levels of service depending on development form, mix of uses and intensity/density of land use, availability and adequacy of transit service, and the availability and adequacy of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in accordance with local comprehensive plans and long-range transit agency plans;

- b. Employs consistent data collection and processing in determining travel demand and system operations along with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), adjacent local jurisdictions and transit agencies; and
- c. Monitors level of service and concurrency on a routine basis on those critical transportation facilities and services that serve as indicators of system operation.

**TR-8** The County and cities shall establish concurrency requirements for land development by considering transportation levels of service and available financial resources to make needed transportation improvements.

- a. The goals, policies, and objectives of local comprehensive plans shall be the basis for making interpretations of development concurrency with transportation.
- b. Level of service shall be used as a growth management tool to limit development in rural areas and offer incentives for more intense development in existing urban areas. ~~((Implementation of this policy will require higher levels of service in rural areas than in urban areas.))~~
- c. The impact of alternate modes of travel (e.g., pedestrian, bicycle, carpools, vanpools, buses, rail, etc.), as well as single-occupant vehicles, shall be considered in ~~((making))~~local concurrency ~~((determinations))~~ programs, both in assessment and mitigation.
- d. Recognize there are transportation services and facilities that are at their ultimate capacity.
- e. The County and cities will reconsider land use designations where it is evident transportation facilities and services cannot be financed or provided in sufficient time to maintain concurrency with land development. ~~((Implementation of this policy will likely require increased density in centers, additional restrictions on rural development, shifting of transportation dollars to projects supporting centers, and lower levels of service and/or inability to maintain concurrency in some areas.))~~
- f. Concurrency programs in designated regional, countywide, and local centers, and near HCT facilities should be designed to encourage transit supportive development.

**TR-9** The County and cities should establish common policies and technical procedures for transportation system management and transportation demand management programs that reduce trip making, total miles traveled, and the climate change and air quality impacts associated with development, and improve the efficiency of the transportation system.

- a. The Washington State Department of Transportation, Puget Sound Regional Council, County and cities should establish consistent commute trip reduction, vehicle-miles-of-travel and single-occupant vehicles goals and consistent methods of measuring progress to ensure consistency and equity.
- b. The County and cities should coordinate with transit agencies and with each other for the implementation of employer and residential trip reduction programs.

- TR-10** The County and cities should collaborate with federal, state, and regional agencies, and adjacent counties, cities, and transit agencies to prepare uniform criteria for locating and mitigating the impacts of major countywide and regional transportation facilities and services. These agencies should:
- Designate transportation facilities of countywide and regional significance;
  - Prepare criteria for locating park-and-ride lots, transit stations, and similar components of a regional transportation system; and
  - Coordinate studies that look at alternative sites with affected public agencies and impacted neighborhoods.
- TR-11** The County and cities should establish an education program utilizing state, County, transit agency, city transportation resources, and local school districts that encourages use of public transportation. The County and cities, in cooperation with transit agencies, should also establish an ongoing public awareness program for ridesharing and public transportation.
- TR-12** Each local jurisdiction served by transit should, in cooperation with transit agencies, map the general locations of planned major transit facilities in their comprehensive plans and ~~((shall enact appropriate transit-oriented policies and development standards for such locations. Where appropriate, transit-oriented development should encompass the following common elements))~~ provide for transit-supportive infrastructure and programs, including:
- ~~Be located to support the development of designated growth centers and existing or planned transit emphasis corridors;~~
  - ~~Include pedestrian-scale neighborhoods and activity centers to stimulate use of transit and ridesharing;~~
  - ~~Plan for appropriate intensity and mix of development—including both employment and housing options—that support transit service;))~~
  - ~~Provide safe~~) a. Safe, pleasant, and convenient access for pedestrians and bicyclists;
  - ~~Provide safe~~) b. Safe and convenient access to and transfer between all forms of transit and other modes of travel; and
  - ~~Promote pricing~~) c. Pricing or regulatory mechanisms<sup>26</sup> to encourage transit use and reduce reliance on the automobile.

---

<sup>26</sup> Such as metered parking and tolling.

- TR-13** The County, cities, and transit agencies in the Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA) should collaborate with Sound Transit to ensure planning and right-of-way preservation for ~~((a))~~ future ~~((phase))~~ phases of light-rail corridor development that will extend to the Everett Regional Growth Center as soon as possible. Planning for light-rail transit should:
- a. Be compatible with the Sound Transit 2 ((plans for Snohomish County)) System Expansion Plan, which ~~((include))~~ includes commitments for stations in Lynnwood and Mountlake Terrace;
  - b. Be compatible with the Sound Transit 3 System Expansion Plan, which includes commitments for stations near Alderwood Mall, in the vicinity of 164<sup>th</sup> St SW near I-5, in the vicinity of 128<sup>th</sup> St SW near I-5, at the Southwest Everett Industrial Center, in the vicinity of SR526 near Evergreen Way, and near Everett Station, with provisions for a possible station at Airport Rd near SR 99;
  - ~~((b-))~~c. Recognize and be compatible with local land use planning and urban design objectives in the Southwest UGA; and
  - ~~((e-))~~d. Include consideration and evaluation of additional transit services to major employment centers in the Southwest UGA.

- TR-14** In order to improve countywide and regional transit service ~~((throughout the county, cities, the County and))~~, the County and cities should provide assistance and support to transit agencies ((should evaluate))in evaluating the potential to expand the Public Transportation Benefit Area (PTBA) and/or the Regional Transit District (RTD) to Urban Growth Areas beyond the current boundaries in Snohomish County. ~~((This effort should consider the following:-~~
- ~~a. Revenues to be generated from the expanded areas;-~~
  - ~~b. Potential transit service improvements in the expanded PTBA and RTD;~~
  - ~~c. Benefits to communities to be added to the PTBA and RTD from improved transit services;~~
  - ~~e. Overall countywide benefit to implementing the Regional Growth Strategy and the objectives of city and County comprehensive plans by improving countywide and regional transit services;-~~
  - ~~d. Roles countywide and regional agencies will assume in providing transit services; and~~
  - ~~e. Other relevant factors pertaining to the countywide and regional transportation system.))~~

- TR-15** The County and cities shall maintain, preserve and operate the existing transportation systems in a safe and usable state. The County and cities should collaborate on maintenance, management, predictable funding and safety practices that:
- a. Maintain and operate transportation systems to provide safe, efficient, and reliable movement of people, goods, and services;
  - b. Protect the investment in the existing system and lower overall life-cycle costs through effective maintenance and preservation programs;
  - c. Reduce the need for some capital improvements through investments in operations; pricing programs; demand management strategies, and system management activities that improve the efficiency of the current system;
  - d. Improve the safety of the transportation system and, in the long term, pursue the goal of zero deaths and ~~((disabling))~~serious injuries;
  - e. ~~((Protect the transportation system against disaster by developing prevention and recovery strategies and coordinating emergency responses))~~ Advance the resilience of the transportation system by incorporating redundancies, preparing for disasters and other impacts, and coordinated planning for system recovery; and
  - f. Assess and plan for adaptive transportation responses to potential threats and hazards arising from climate change.

- TR-16** The County and cities, in cooperation with transit operating agencies and the Washington State Department of Transportation, should plan strategically to integrate ~~((concepts related to sustainability and climate change))~~ measures to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change in transportation planning, by:
- a. Developing and coordinating transportation plans that support land use and other plan elements and contribute to a flexible, holistic and long-term approach to promote sustainability and mitigate impacts contributing to climate change;
  - b. Maximizing efficiency of existing transportation investments and pursuing measures to reduce vehicle miles of travel and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation;
  - c. ~~((Fostering a less polluting system that reduces the negative effects of transportation infrastructure and operation on climate and natural environment))~~ Supporting the transition to a cleaner transportation system by planning for and encouraging investment in clean energy options such as zero emission vehicles, low carbon fuels and the necessary infrastructure to support clean energy options;
  - d. Developing and implementing transportation modes, fuels and technologies that are energy-efficient and reduce negative impacts on the environment;
  - e. Investing in nonmotorized transportation improvements in and between urban centers; and
  - f. ~~((Promoting convenient and low impact alternatives to single occupancy vehicles; and))~~ Increasing the proportion of trips made by transportation modes that are alternatives to driving alone by ensuring availability of reliable and competitive mobility options, especially to and within centers and along corridors connecting centers.
- ~~((g. Developing a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to human~~

health.))

- TR-17** The County and cities should collaborate with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and transit operating agencies in order to designate transit emphasis corridors that allow effective and integrated planning of land use and transportation. Transit emphasis corridors – as delineated by local comprehensive plans – should:
- a. Be served, or planned to be served, by public transportation;
  - b. Provide for transit-compatible and transit-oriented land uses and densities in transit emphasis corridors that recognize and reflect appropriate activity zones and walking distances, generally within ¼ to ½ mile of the corridor;
  - c. Connect all designated mixed-use urban centers;
  - d. Conform to urban design and infrastructure standards that accommodate and enhance the operations of transit services;
  - e. Be planned for compact, mixed-use commercial and residential development that is designed to be transit-oriented;
  - f. Include programs to implement vehicle access management measures that preserve capacity, maintain level of service standards and promote traffic safety;
  - g. Include transportation control measures, transportation demand management programs, and transportation system management programs to reduce travel delay and vehicle-miles of travel; and
  - h. Promote consistency between County, city, WSDOT, and transit agency long-range transportation plans.
- TR-18** The County and cities, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation and port authorities, should plan and implement projects and programs ~~((to promote freight mobility and access needs being addressed))~~that support global trade and the needs of state, regional, and local distribution of goods and services and attract and retain industries and skilled workers through:
- a. Coordinated design and construction of regional and local transportation facilities that support manufacturing and international trade;
  - b. Traffic operations measures and capital improvements that minimize the impacts of freight movement on other modes of travel;
  - c. Maintenance, preservation, and expansion of freight rail capacity;
  - d. Establishment of interjurisdictional programs aimed at preserving rail rights-of-way; and
  - e. Special efforts to ensure any ongoing conflicts and other needs are planned for and resolved to the greatest extent possible.

- TR-19** The County (~~and cities~~), cities, and transit agencies should prepare compatible rules and procedures (~~(among affected jurisdictions and transit agencies for locating transportation facilities and services to minimize and mitigate potential adverse impacts on low income, minority, and special need populations.)~~)to implement transportation programs and projects that provide access to opportunities while preventing and mitigating potential adverse impacts to people of color, people with low incomes, and people with special transportation needs.
- TR-20** The County and cities, in cooperation with transit agencies, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and port authorities, should plan and design transportation facilities and services to efficiently interface with waterborne and air transportation terminals and facilities. It is intended that these efforts would:
- a. Promote a seamless transportation system for all modes of travel;
  - b. Emphasize multi-modal intersection points at efficiently designed terminals;
  - c. Lead to coordinated fare and ticketing systems;
  - d. Benefit local transportation systems by reducing traffic volumes or improving traffic flows; and
  - e. Accommodate and complement existing and planned local land use patterns.
- TR-21** The County and cities, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation (as appropriate), shall coordinate in planning, designing programming, and constructing nonmotorized transportation facilities in Snohomish County. The County and affected cities recognize a need for:
- a. Bikeway and walkway standards that are compatible among affected jurisdictions;
  - b. Joint planning to achieve continuous and/or direct bicycle routes and pedestrian connections between cities and major centers in Snohomish County and the region;
  - c. Joint planning for a safe system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities that link residential areas, schools, recreational areas, business districts, and transit centers and facilities; and
  - d. New development to accommodate nonmotorized transportation facilities in its site planning.
- TR-22** The County and cities, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation and transit operating agencies, should preserve existing freight and passenger railroad rights-of-way for continued rail transportation use.



- TR-23** The County, along with affected cities, should cooperate in efforts to acquire and/or purchase abandoned railroad right-of-way in order to preserve options for alternative transit corridors, such as commuter rail, between growth centers in or adjacent to Snohomish County.<sup>27</sup> The County and affected cities recognize that:
- a. Interim or co-existing uses, such as freight rail, nonmotorized transportation, and recreational activities need to be considered and planned in conjunction with commuter rail service;
  - b. Compatible land use types and densities need to be strategically planned at key locations to support the rail corridors; and
  - c. Impacts on resource lands, the natural environment, and the community shall be considered with regard to preservation and use of abandoned railroad rights-of-way.

- TR-24** ~~((The County and cities should encourage transit supportive land uses in noncontiguous Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) in order to help preserve transit service between non-contiguous UGAs-))~~ Consistent with the RGS, arterial capacity improvements that encourage rural growth should be avoided. Where increased arterial capacity is warranted to provide safe and efficient travel between UGAs:
- a. Road standards shall be consistent with appropriate development patterns and densities; and
  - b. Appropriate rural land development and access management regulations should be in place prior to authorizing improvements.

- TR-25** The County and cities should coordinate with the county’s airports to meet local and regional aviation system needs while minimizing impacts to the community consistent with state and regional aviation system plans.

1

2

---

<sup>27</sup> One example is a potential link between the cities of Woodinville and Snohomish.

# 1 THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

## 2 State Context

3 The goal for the environment in the Growth Management Act (GMA) (~~(says to)~~) states “Protect  
4 the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and  
5 the availability of water” (RCW 36.70A.020(10)). There is no specific requirement in GMA for  
6 environmental policies; however, achievement of other requirements in GMA contributes to  
7 accomplishment of this goal.

## 8 Regional Context

9 VISION (~~(2040)~~)2050 includes two chapters, Environment and Climate Change that include  
10 goals and polices that are relevant to this chapter. The Environment chapter acknowledges that  
11 certain development patterns and practices have damaged and threaten further disruption of the  
12 region’s ecosystems. (~~(It)~~) While this chapter recognizes that (~~(while)~~) some impacts are  
13 irreversible, it provides guidance on how the region can curb pollution, change land use and  
14 transportation patterns, and better manage waste to protect and restore key ecological functions  
15 (~~(and help restore the environment)~~). VISION (~~(2040)~~) 2050 stresses the ecological, economic,  
16 and health benefits of preserving and restoring our natural environment and open space.  
17 Additionally, the environment chapter identifies recovery of Puget Sound as a key part of this  
18 environmental strategy. According to VISION 2050:

19 *“Local governments play a critical role in Puget Sound recovery through actions such as*  
20 *protecting and restoring critical habitat, converting hardened shorelines back to more*  
21 *natural conditions, protecting aquifers, promoting and installing stormwater*  
22 *infrastructure, and upgrading sewage treatment facilities.”<sup>28</sup>*

23 The Climate Change chapter provides polices identifying regional methods to slow and mitigate  
24 the impacts of climate change. The Climate Change goal includes a regional benchmark for  
25 greenhouse gas emissions reduction, stating:

26 *The region substantially reduces emissions of greenhouse gases that contribute to climate*  
27 *change in accordance with the goals of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (50% below*  
28 *1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050) and prepares for climate*  
29 *change impacts.*

## 30 Local Context

31 These regional policies form the basis (~~(of)~~) to develop and update countywide planning policies  
32 to facilitate coordinated countywide (~~(environmental)~~) strategies for environmental stewardship  
33 (~~(earth and)~~) and justice, addressing climate change, habitat, and water (~~(quality,)~~) and air  
34 quality(~~(, and climate change)~~). The CPPs for the environment and climate change are addressed  
35 in this chapter, with two subchapters, natural environment and climate change. (~~(Related policies~~

---

<sup>28</sup> VISION 2050, page 60. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 ~~in the~~) Other chapters, including Development Patterns and Transportation (~~sections address~~  
2 ~~some of the major sources of~~), also include policies on air and water quality and (climate  
3 ~~change pollutants)~~ greenhouse gas emissions. Protecting and enhancing the quality of the  
4 natural environment (~~is~~) and combating and mitigating the impacts of climate change are  
5 central to providing (~~for the~~) high quality of life for residents of Snohomish County.

## 6 **The Natural Environment and Climate Change Goal**

7 Snohomish County and local jurisdictions will act as a steward of the natural environment (~~by~~  
8 ~~protecting and restoring natural systems, conserving~~) in an effort to protect and restore natural  
9 systems and public health and mitigate climate change. This will be achieved through natural  
10 resource and habitat conservation, (~~improving air and~~) water quality improvement, and  
11 (~~reducing~~) air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions reduction (and air pollutants,  
12 ~~and addressing potential climate change impacts)~~). Planning for the future will include  
13 addressing climate change and resilience at local and regional levels of government to (will  
14 ~~embrace sustainable ways to integrate care of)~~ protect the natural environment (with) and meet  
15 the economic and social needs of all residents.

## 16 **The Natural Environment Policies**

**Env-1** All jurisdictions shall protect and enhance natural ecosystems through their comprehensive plans, development regulations, capital facilities programs, and management practices. Jurisdictions should work collaboratively, employing integrated and interdisciplinary approaches, to consider regional and countywide strategies and assessments, as well as best available qualitative and quantitative information, in formulating plans and regulations that are specific to their community.

**Env-2** The County and cities should work collaboratively to identify, designate, and protect regional open space (networks/wildlife) networks and wildlife corridors both inside and outside the Urban Growth Area and across the jurisdictional boundaries. Jurisdictions should establish policies and coordinated approaches to preserve and enhance these (~~networks/corridors across jurisdictional boundaries~~) open space networks and corridors and ensure that all residents have access to parks and open space.

**Env-3** The County and cities shall work collaboratively to create goals and policies intended to implement and address the needs identified in the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan.

**Env-  
(3) 4** The County and cities should identify and protect, enhance, or restore wildlife corridors and important habitat areas that support designated species of local or state significance, such as orca and salmon, and those areas that are critical for survival of endangered or threatened species.

**Env-**  
**((4)) 5**      The County and cities should work with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes to identify and protect significant open space areas, natural resources, and critical areas through appropriate local policies, regulations or other mechanisms such as public acquisition, easements, voluntary agreements, ((or by-))supporting the efforts of conservation organizations, and other best practices.

**Env-**  
**((5)) 6**      In recognition of the broad range of benefits from ecological systems, the County and cities should establish policies and strategies to restore – where appropriate and possible – the region’s freshwater and marine shorelines, watersheds, and estuaries to a natural condition for ecological function and value.

**Env-7**      The County and cities should reduce and mitigate the stormwater impacts of land development and redevelopment through collaboration in watershed planning, implementation of low impact development, and other best practices.

**Env-8**      The County and cities shall work to maintain and improve air and water quality and ensure that all residents have equitable access to clean air and water.

**Env-9**      The County and cities should reduce the impacts of light and noise pollution upon residents, including an emphasis on reducing these impacts on vulnerable populations, through land use, development, and transportation decisions.

**Env-10**      The County and cities should support the use of integrated pest management and other programs that work to reduce the use of toxic pesticides and other products that present a risk to the health of the environment and humans.

**Env-11**      The County and cities should establish and/or support programs that manage and work to reduce the spread of invasive species that are harmful to natural ecological function and habitat throughout the county.

1

2      **Climate Change Policies**

**((Env-6)) CC-1**      The County and cities shall incorporate emissions reduction actions into local plans and collaborate with regional and state agencies on initiatives to ensure that air quality meets or ((is better than)) exceeds established state and federal standards and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced in accordance with the goals of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Any initiatives which exceed established state and federal standards shall be voluntary between jurisdictions and are not required by ((Env-6)) CC-1.

**((Env-7)) CC-2**      The County and cities should support the implementation of the state’s climate change initiatives and work toward developing a common framework to analyze climate change impacts when conducting environmental review under SEPA.

~~((Env-8))~~ CC-3 The County and cities should establish and/or support programs ~~((to))~~ that work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and ~~((to))~~ increase energy conservation~~((and alternative/clean energy among both public and private entities.))~~, including the retrofit of existing buildings, expansion of alternative/clean energy within the public and private sector, and the use of environmentally sustainable building techniques and materials.

~~((Env-9))~~ CC-4 The County and cities should use natural systems to reduce carbon in the atmosphere by establishing programs and policies that maintain and increase natural resources that sequester and store carbon, such as forests, ~~((and-))~~vegetative cover, wetlands, farmland, and estuaries.

~~((Env-10))~~ CC-5 The County and cities should ~~((establish))~~ plan for climate adaptation and resilience by establishing a planning framework in local plans and ~~((coordinate))~~ coordinating regionally to identify, anticipate, prepare for, and adapt ~~((as necessary))~~ to likely impacts of climate change on natural systems, infrastructure, public health, and the economy. These efforts should identify measures to mitigate climate impacts and include a focus on minimizing these impacts upon highly impacted and vulnerable populations.

CC-6 The County and cities should support the achievement of regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets through adoption of policies and implementation of actions including identification of emissions reduction goals in local plans and providing support for land use, transportation, and development policies that reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.

CC-7 Jurisdictions should consider rising sea level by planning for the siting of new and relocation of existing essential public facilities and hazardous industries to areas that are outside the 500-year floodplain.

1

2

1 **PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES**

2 **State Context**

3 ~~((The)) Planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) requires jurisdictions to determine~~  
4 ~~which facilities and services are necessary to serve the desired growth pattern. Jurisdiction are~~  
5 ~~also required to identify current and future capital facility needs necessary to serve anticipated~~  
6 ~~growth and how to fund those needs (RCW 36.70A.070). The state’s intent is to ensure that~~  
7 ~~public facilities and services adequately support development and are provided in a timely~~  
8 ~~manner while maintaining locally established minimum standards. Further, the GMA~~  
9 ~~differentiates between urban and rural public services and facilities (RCW 36.70A.110)((-~~  
10 ~~Certain)) allowing certain public services and facilities, such as sanitary sewers, ((are allowed))~~  
11 ~~only in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), with ((very)) few exceptions. ((The GMA requires local~~  
12 ~~jurisdictions to determine which facilities and services are necessary to serve the desired growth~~  
13 ~~pattern and how they will be financed (RCW 36.70A.070). The state’s intent is to ensure that~~  
14 ~~those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate and~~  
15 ~~provided in a timely manner without decreasing the current service levels below locally~~  
16 ~~established minimum standards.))~~

17 ~~((The GMA ((requires countywide planning policies (CPPs) to contain policies related to~~  
18 ~~essential public facilities (EPFs) (RCW 36.70A.210(3)(C)). The GMA provides that no~~  
19 ~~comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public~~  
20 ~~facilities (RCW 36.70A.200(5)). The GMA)) The GMA framework also maintains specific~~  
21 ~~policy requirements regarding essential public facilities (EPFs) for countywide planning policies~~  
22 ~~(CPPs) (RCW 36.70A.210(3)(C). That framework allows counties to adopt comprehensive plan~~  
23 ~~policies and development regulations related to the siting of EPFs ((of a local nature as long as))~~  
24 ~~however, it states that those policies and regulations ((do not)) may not preclude the siting of any~~  
25 ~~such facility.~~

26 ~~((Essential)) Under state law, essential public facilities include those facilities that are typically~~  
27 ~~difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, state and regional transportation~~  
28 ~~facilities as defined in RCW 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste~~  
29 ~~handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health~~  
30 ~~facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities as defined in RCW 71.09.020.~~

31 ~~Since the enactment of the GMA, ((government’s)) the ability of jurisdictions to fund the~~  
32 ~~expanding demand for critical public facilities and services and ((ability to)) achieve GMA goals~~  
33 ~~has been reduced. As a result, government agencies have been forced to re-evaluate service~~  
34 ~~levels and delivery while looking to other sources of funds for critical public facilities and~~  
35 ~~services.~~

36 **Regional Context**

37 The Public Services and Facilities chapter responds to the overarching Public Services goal and  
38 supporting Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) in VISION ((2040 that)) 2050. The VISION

1 2050 goal reads, in part, “support development with adequate public facilities and services in a  
2 coordinated, and cost-effective manner”. Some of the services addressed in VISION ((2040))  
3 2050 are included in the Joint Planning subsection of the General Framework and Coordination  
4 chapter, and others appear in the Transportation chapter. The following policies are for those  
5 public services and facilities that are appropriate for discussion in this chapter and that are not  
6 covered elsewhere in the CPPs.

7 Conservation is a major theme throughout VISION ((2040)) 2050. It calls for jurisdictions to  
8 invest in facilities and amenities that serve centers and to restrict urban facilities in rural and  
9 resource areas. The ((~~multicounty planning policies~~)) MPPs also discourage schools and other  
10 institutions serving urban residents from locating outside the urban growth area.

### 11 **Local Context**

12 The designation of UGAs or Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGAs) establishes the public  
13 facilities and service area for cities in Snohomish County. The detailed planning and timing of  
14 such facilities and services and the installation of infrastructure improvements is determined  
15 through shorter-term 6-year capital improvement plans.

16 Public services and facilities in UGAs and MUGAs are expected to be provided at service levels  
17 to support urban densities and development intensity while reflecting the realities of limited  
18 funding resources and prioritization between those services and facilities.

19 Public services and facilities in rural areas of Snohomish County are expected be provided at  
20 service levels reflecting lower densities and more dispersed patterns of development.

### 21 **Public Services and Facilities Goal**

22 Snohomish County and its cities will coordinate and ((~~strive to~~)) develop and provide adequate  
23 and efficient public facilities and services to ensure the health, safety, conservation of resources,  
24 and economic vitality of our communities and all residents.

### 25 **General Public Services**

**PS-1** Jurisdictions should support cities as the preferred urban service providers.

**PS-2** Cities shall determine the appropriate methods for providing urban services in their incorporated areas including any annexations thereto. Cities that currently have no territory in Snohomish County shall have an interlocal agreement in place with the County prior to annexations into the county, to address the provision of public services.

**PS-3** Jurisdictions should support the County as the preferred provider for regional services, rural services, agricultural services, and services for natural resource areas.

- PS-4** The County and cities should support the planned development of jobs and housing through strategic investment decisions and coordination of public services and facilities.
- PS-5** Public services and infrastructure provided by jurisdictions in rural and resource areas should be at a level, scale, and in locations that do not induce urban development pressures.
- PS-6** The County and cities should design infrastructure and public services to promote conservation of natural resources.
- PS-7** ~~((Jurisdictions))~~ To ensure long-term water availability for both human use and environmental needs, jurisdictions should ~~((promote improved-))~~ work collaboratively to reduce per capita water consumption through conservation ~~((and efficient use of water to ensure long-term water availability))~~, improvements in efficiency, and if applicable, reclamation and reuse.
- PS-8** The County and cities shall work collaboratively, in coordination with tribal governments, for the planning of water and wastewater utilities to meet the area’s long-term needs and support the regional growth strategy.
- PS-9** The County and cities, in collaboration with water providers and utilities, should consider the potential impacts of climate change, including impacts exacerbated by seasonal or cyclical conditions, when engaged in planning efforts to ensure the county’s long-term water supply.
- PS-((8)) 10** Jurisdictions should coordinate with solid waste service providers in order to meet and, if desired, exceed state mandates for the reduction of solid waste and promotion of recycling.
- PS-((9)) 11** The County and cities shall permit new development in urban areas only when sanitary sewers are available with the exception of where sewer service is not likely to be feasible for the duration of the jurisdiction’s adopted plan.<sup>29</sup>
- PS-((10)) 12** Jurisdictions should ~~((encourage))~~ promote the use ~~((of low impact development techniques, and))~~ and investment in renewable and alternative energy sources to meet the local and countywide energy needs.
- PS-((11)) 13** The County and cities should ~~((maximize the use of ))~~ support energy conservation and efficiency in new and existing public facilities ~~((to promote financial and energy conservation benefits and))~~ in order to achieve fiscal savings and reduce environmental impacts associated with energy generation and use.

---

<sup>29</sup> Currently identified exceptions include unsewerable enclaves, as well as the Darrington, Gold Bar, and Index Urban Growth Areas.



- PS-  
(~~12~~) 14** Jurisdictions in Urban Growth Areas shall coordinate on the data, analysis and methodologies relating to the Levels of Service (LOS) standards for all public facilities and services that are required by the Growth Management Act. Each jurisdiction may implement and monitor its own LOS standards in accordance with each jurisdiction's adopted comprehensive plan.
- PS-  
(~~13~~) 15** Jurisdictions should adopt capital facilities plans, and coordinate with other service providers, to provide the appropriate level of service to support planned growth and development in Urban Growth Areas.
- PS-  
(~~15~~) 16** The County and cities should develop and coordinate compatible capital facility construction standards for all service providers in individual Urban Growth Areas.
- PS-  
(~~16~~) 17** The County and cities should encourage the location of new human services facilities near access to transit.
- PS-18** The County and cities should work collaboratively at a local and countywide level to promote equitable access of public services and facilities for all residents, especially those that are historically underserved.
- PS-19** The County and cities should promote connection to sanitary sewers for residents and businesses within urban growth areas as the preferred alternative to resolving failing septic systems.
- PS-20** The County and cities should support planning for the provision of telecommunication infrastructure in order to improve and facilitate access to telecommunication for all residents and businesses, especially those in underserved areas.
- PS-21** The County and cities should work collaboratively with school districts to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities to meet the current and future community needs. Considerations should include recent growth, 6-year projections of population and student enrollment growth, adopted comprehensive plans including capital facilities plans, and the growth targets in Appendix B.
- PS-22** Sanitary sewer mains shall not be extended beyond Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) into rural areas except when necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment, and when such sewers are financially supportable at rural densities and do not result in the inducement of future urban development outside of UGAs. Sewer transmission lines may be developed through rural and resource areas to meet the needs of UGAs as long as any extension through resource areas does not adversely impact the resource lands. Sanitary sewer connections in rural areas are not allowed except in instances where necessary to protect public health and safety and the environment and as allowed in RCW 36.70A.213. Sanitary sewer mains are prohibited in resource areas.

# 1 Essential Public Facilities

- EPF-1** The County and each city may impose reasonable conditions and/or mitigation of adverse environmental impacts on approval of a development agreement or other land use approvals as a result of the siting of local, regional, statewide, or federal essential public facilities.
- EPF-2** The County and each city may establish a process through their respective comprehensive plans and implementing development regulations to identify and site local essential public facilities(;) that are consistent with the provisions of the GMA and ensure long-term resilience of these facilities. This process should include:
- a. A definition of these facilities;
  - b. An inventory of existing and future facilities;
  - c. Economic and other incentives to jurisdictions receiving facilities;
  - d. A public involvement strategy;
  - e. Assurance that the environment and public health and safety are protected; (~~and~~)
  - f. Consideration of impacts from climate change when selecting locations for facilities, including, but not limited to, potential flood risk and sea-level rise; and
  - g. A consideration of alternatives to the facility.
- EPF-3** Local essential public facilities should be sited or expanded to support the countywide land use pattern, (~~(support economic activities, reduce environmental impacts, provide amenities or incentives, and minimize public costs)~~) minimize public costs, and protect the environment and public health, including reducing adverse impacts upon historically marginalized populations and disproportionately burdened communities.
- EPF-4** Local essential public facilities shall first be considered for location inside Urban Growth Areas unless it is demonstrated that a non-urban site is the most appropriate location for such a facility. Local essential public facilities located outside of an Urban Growth Area shall be self-contained or be served by urban governmental services in a manner that shall not promote sprawl.
- EPF-5** The County and each city should collaborate with public agencies and special districts to identify opportunities for the co-location of local essential public facilities.

2


3

1

**APPENDICES**


2





## MUNICIPAL URBAN GROWTH AREA (MUGA) BOUNDARIES

Appendix A – CPP Southwest Snohomish County Effective Date: November 10, 2016



NOTE: Paine Field is not assigned to a city at the request of the County.

## Appendix B – Growth Targets

APPENDIX B, Table 1 - 2035 Reconciled Population Growth Targets for Cities, UGAs and the Rural/Resource Area				
Area	2011 Population Estimates	2035 Population Targets	2011-2035 Population Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>Non-S.W. County UGA</b>	161,288	233,097	71,809	30.1%
Arlington UGA	18,489	26,002	7,512	3.2%
Arlington City	17,966	24,937	6,971	2.9%
Unincorporated	523	1,065	541	0.2%
Darrington UGA	1,420	2,161	741	0.3%
Darrington Town	1,345	1,764	419	0.2%
Unincorporated	75	397	322	0.1%
Gold Bar UGA	2,909	3,319	411	0.2%
Gold Bar City	2,060	2,406	346	0.1%
Unincorporated	849	913	65	0.0%
Granite Falls UGA	3,517	8,517	5,000	2.1%
Granite Falls City	3,370	7,624	4,254	1.8%
Unincorporated	147	893	746	0.3%
Index UGA (incorporated)	180	220	40	0.0%
Lake Stevens UGA	33,218	46,380	13,162	5.5%
Lake Stevens City	28,210	39,340	11,130	4.7%
Unincorporated	5,008	7,040	2,032	0.9%
Maltby UGA (unincorporated)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Marysville UGA	60,869	87,798	26,929	11.3%
Marysville City	60,660	87,589	26,929	11.3%
Unincorporated	209	209	-	0.0%
Monroe UGA	18,806	24,754	5,948	2.5%
Monroe City	17,351	22,102	4,751	2.0%
Unincorporated	1,455	2,652	1,197	0.5%
Snohomish UGA	10,559	14,494	3,935	1.7%
Snohomish City	9,200	12,139	2,939	1.2%
Unincorporated	1,359	2,354	996	0.4%
Stanwood UGA	6,353	11,085	4,732	2.0%
Stanwood City	6,220	10,116	3,896	1.6%
Unincorporated	133	969	836	0.4%
Sultan UGA	4,969	8,369	3,399	1.4%
Sultan City	4,655	7,345	2,690	1.1%
Unincorporated	314	1,024	709	0.3%
<b>S.W. County UGA</b>	434,425	582,035	147,610	62.0%
Incorporated S.W.	261,506	363,413	101,907	42.8%
Bothell City (part)	16,570	23,510	6,940	2.9%
Brier City	6,201	6,972	771	0.3%
Edmonds City	39,800	45,550	5,750	2.4%
Everett City	103,100	164,812	61,712	25.9%
Lynnwood City	35,860	54,404	18,544	7.8%
Mill Creek City	18,370	20,196	1,826	0.8%
Mountlake Terrace City	19,990	24,767	4,777	2.0%
Mukilteo City	20,310	21,812	1,502	0.6%
Woodway Town	1,305	1,389	84	0.0%
Unincorporated S.W.	172,919	218,623	45,704	19.2%
<b>UGA Total</b>	595,713	815,132	219,419	92.1%
City Total	412,723	578,994	166,271	69.8%
Unincorporated UGA Total	182,990	236,138	53,148	22.3%
<b>Non-UGA Total</b> (Uninc Rural/Resource Area)	121,287	140,125	18,838	7.9%
<b>County Total</b>	717,000	955,257	238,257	100.0%

NOTES: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; NA = not applicable.

APPENDIX B, Table 2 - 2035 Reconciled Population Growth Targets for Cities and MUGAs within the SW County UGA				
Area	2011 Population Estimates	2035 Population Targets	2011-2035 Population Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>SW County UGA Total</b>	434,425	582,035	147,610	62.0%
Incorporated SW County UGA Total	261,506	363,413	101,907	42.8%
Unincorporated SW County UGA Total	172,919	218,623	45,704	19.2%
<b>Bothell Area</b>	39,760	53,117	13,357	5.6%
Bothell City (part)	16,570	23,510	6,940	2.9%
Unincorporated MUGA	23,190	29,607	6,418	2.7%
<b>Brier Area</b>	8,199	9,327	1,128	0.5%
Brier City	6,201	6,972	771	0.3%
Unincorporated MUGA	1,998	2,354	356	0.1%
<b>Edmonds Area</b>	43,420	49,574	6,155	2.6%
Edmonds City	39,800	45,550	5,750	2.4%
Unincorporated MUGA	3,620	4,024	405	0.2%
<b>Everett Area</b>	145,184	211,968	66,784	28.0%
Everett City	103,100	164,812	61,712	25.9%
Unincorporated MUGA	42,084	47,156	5,072	2.1%
<b>Lynnwood Area</b>	63,327	92,022	28,695	12.0%
Lynnwood City	35,860	54,404	18,544	7.8%
Unincorporated MUGA	27,467	37,617	10,150	4.3%
<b>Mill Creek Area</b>	54,747	67,940	13,193	5.5%
Mill Creek City	18,370	20,196	1,826	0.8%
Unincorporated MUGA	36,377	47,744	11,367	4.8%
<b>Mountlake Terrace Area</b>	20,010	24,797	4,787	2.0%
Mountlake Terrace City	19,990	24,767	4,777	2.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	20	30	10	0.0%
<b>Mukilteo Area</b>	32,545	36,453	3,909	1.6%
Mukilteo City	20,310	21,812	1,502	0.6%
Unincorporated MUGA	12,235	14,641	2,407	1.0%
<b>Woodway Area</b>	1,305	4,361	3,056	1.3%
Woodway Town	1,305	1,389	84	0.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	-	2,972	2,972	1.2%
Paine Field Area (Unincorporated)	-	-	-	0.0%
Larch Way Overlap (Unincorporated)	3,370	5,007	1,637	0.7%
Lake Stickney Gap (Unincorporated)	7,161	9,786	2,625	1.1%
Silver Firs Gap (Unincorporated)	15,398	17,683	2,285	1.0%
<b>County Total</b>	<b>717,000</b>	<b>955,257</b>	<b>238,257</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

NOTE: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; MUGA = Municipal Urban Growth Area.

APPENDIX B, Table 3 - 2035 Reconciled Housing Growth Targets for Cities, UGAs and the Rural/Resource Area

Area	2011 Housing Unit Estimates	2035 Housing Unit Targets	2011-2035 Housing Unit Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>Non-S.W. County UGA</b>	60,509	87,340	26,831	27.4%
Arlington UGA	7,128	10,018	2,890	3.0%
Arlington City	6,931	9,654	2,723	2.8%
Unincorporated	197	364	167	0.2%
Darrington UGA	682	948	266	0.3%
Darrington Town	644	764	120	0.1%
Unincorporated	38	184	146	0.1%
Gold Bar UGA	1,205	1,304	99	0.1%
Gold Bar City	831	917	86	0.1%
Unincorporated	374	387	13	0.0%
Granite Falls UGA	1,412	3,516	2,104	2.1%
Granite Falls City	1,348	3,090	1,742	1.8%
Unincorporated	64	425	361	0.4%
Index UGA (incorporated)	117	127	10	0.0%
Lake Stevens UGA	12,281	17,311	5,030	5.1%
Lake Stevens City	10,470	14,883	4,413	4.5%
Unincorporated	1,811	2,428	617	0.6%
Maltby UGA (unincorporated)	71	71	NA	NA
Marysville UGA	22,709	32,936	10,227	10.4%
Marysville City	22,649	32,876	10,227	10.4%
Unincorporated	60	60	-	0.0%
Monroe UGA	5,838	7,443	1,605	1.6%
Monroe City	5,326	6,526	1,200	1.2%
Unincorporated	512	917	405	0.4%
Snohomish UGA	4,545	6,115	1,570	1.6%
Snohomish City	4,013	5,204	1,191	1.2%
Unincorporated	532	911	379	0.4%
Stanwood UGA	2,634	4,578	1,944	2.0%
Stanwood City	2,586	4,179	1,593	1.6%
Unincorporated	48	398	350	0.4%
Sultan UGA	1,887	2,972	1,085	1.1%
Sultan City	1,752	2,581	829	0.8%
Unincorporated	135	391	256	0.3%
<b>S.W. County UGA</b>	178,958	243,179	64,221	65.6%
Incorporated S.W.	112,679	155,760	43,081	44.0%
Bothell City (part)	6,780	9,782	3,002	3.1%
Brier City	2,226	2,536	310	0.3%
Edmonds City	18,396	21,168	2,772	2.8%
Everett City	44,656	70,067	25,411	26.0%
Lynnwood City	14,947	22,840	7,893	8.1%
Mill Creek City	7,991	8,756	765	0.8%
Mountlake Terrace City	8,643	10,928	2,285	2.3%
Mukilteo City	8,574	9,211	637	0.7%
Woodway Town	466	472	6	0.0%
Unincorporated S.W.	66,279	87,419	21,141	21.6%
<b>UGA Total</b>	239,466	330,519	91,052	93.0%
City Total	169,346	236,563	67,217	68.7%
Unincorporated UGA Total	70,120	93,955	23,835	24.3%
<b>Non-UGA Total (Uninc Rural/Resource Area)</b>	48,973	55,816	6,844	7.0%
<b>County Total</b>	288,439	386,334	97,895	100.0%

NOTES: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; NA = not applicable.



APPENDIX B, Table 4 - 2035 Reconciled Housing Growth Targets for Cities and MUGAs within the SW County UGA

Area	2011 Housing Unit Estimates	2035 Housing Unit Targets	2011-2035 Housing Unit Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>SW County UGA Total</b>	178,958	243,179	64,221	65.6%
Incorporated SW County UGA Total	112,679	155,760	43,081	44.0%
Unincorporated SW County UGA Total	66,279	87,418	21,140	21.6%
<b>Bothell Area</b>	15,738	21,249	5,511	5.6%
Bothell City (part)	6,780	9,782	3,002	3.1%
Unincorporated MUGA	8,958	11,467	2,509	2.6%
<b>Brier Area</b>	3,045	3,431	387	0.4%
Brier City	2,226	2,536	310	0.3%
Unincorporated MUGA	819	896	77	0.1%
<b>Edmonds Area</b>	19,896	22,809	2,913	3.0%
Edmonds City	18,396	21,168	2,772	2.8%
Unincorporated MUGA	1,500	1,641	141	0.1%
<b>Everett Area</b>	61,276	88,848	27,572	28.2%
Everett City	44,656	70,067	25,411	26.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	16,620	18,781	2,161	2.2%
<b>Lynnwood Area</b>	26,205	39,716	13,511	13.8%
Lynnwood City	14,947	22,840	7,893	8.1%
Unincorporated MUGA	11,258	16,876	5,618	5.7%
<b>Mill Creek Area</b>	21,411	26,575	5,165	5.3%
Mill Creek City	7,991	8,756	765	0.8%
Unincorporated MUGA	13,420	17,819	4,400	4.5%
<b>Mountlake Terrace Area</b>	8,652	10,941	2,289	2.3%
Mountlake Terrace City	8,643	10,928	2,285	2.3%
Unincorporated MUGA	9	13	4	0.0%
<b>Mukilteo Area</b>	13,148	15,100	1,952	2.0%
Mukilteo City	8,574	9,211	637	0.7%
Unincorporated MUGA	4,574	5,889	1,315	1.3%
<b>Woodway Area</b>	466	2,004	1,538	1.6%
Woodway Town	466	472	6	0.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	-	1,532	1,532	1.6%
Paine Field Area (Unincorporated)	-	-	-	0.0%
Larch Way Overlap (Unincorporated)	1,155	2,187	1,033	1.1%
Lake Stickney Gap (Unincorporated)	2,850	4,249	1,399	1.4%
Silver Firs Gap (Unincorporated)	5,117	6,067	950	1.0%
<b>County Total</b>	<b>288,439</b>	<b>386,334</b>	<b>97,895</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

NOTE: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; MUGA = Municipal Urban Growth Area.

APPENDIX B, Table 5 - 2035 Reconciled Employment Growth Targets for Cities, UGAs and the Rural/Resource Area				
Area	2011 Employment Estimates	2035 Employment Targets	2011-2035 Employment Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>Non-S.W. County UGA</b>	46,644	93,571	46,927	31.8%
Arlington UGA	8,660	20,884	12,224	8.3%
Arlington City	8,659	20,829	12,170	8.3%
Unincorporated	1	55	54	0.0%
Darrington UGA	500	886	386	0.3%
Darrington Town	498	800	302	0.2%
Unincorporated	2	86	84	0.1%
Gold Bar UGA	223	666	443	0.3%
Gold Bar City	218	661	443	0.3%
Unincorporated	5	5	-	0.0%
Granite Falls UGA	760	2,276	1,516	1.0%
Granite Falls City	759	2,275	1,516	1.0%
Unincorporated	1	1	-	0.0%
Index UGA (incorporated)	20	25	5	0.0%
Lake Stevens UGA	4,003	7,821	3,818	2.6%
Lake Stevens City	3,932	7,412	3,480	2.4%
Unincorporated	71	409	338	0.2%
Maltby UGA (unincorporated)	3,190	6,374	3,184	2.2%
Marysville UGA	12,316	28,113	15,797	10.7%
Marysville City	11,664	27,419	15,755	10.7%
Unincorporated	652	694	42	0.0%
Monroe UGA	7,779	11,781	4,002	2.7%
Monroe City	7,662	11,456	3,794	2.6%
Unincorporated	117	325	208	0.1%
Snohomish UGA	4,871	6,941	2,070	1.4%
Snohomish City	4,415	6,291	1,876	1.3%
Unincorporated	456	650	194	0.1%
Stanwood UGA	3,456	5,723	2,267	1.5%
Stanwood City	3,258	4,688	1,430	1.0%
Unincorporated	198	1,035	837	0.6%
Sultan UGA	866	2,081	1,215	0.8%
Sultan City	862	2,077	1,215	0.8%
Unincorporated	4	4	-	0.0%
<b>S.W. County UGA</b>	187,653	279,479	91,826	62.3%
Incorporated S.W.	163,409	241,271	77,862	52.8%
Bothell City (part)	13,616	18,576	4,960	3.4%
Brier City	319	405	86	0.1%
Edmonds City	11,679	13,948	2,269	1.5%
Everett City	93,739	140,000	46,261	31.4%
Lynnwood City	24,266	42,229	17,963	12.2%
Mill Creek City	4,625	6,310	1,685	1.1%
Mountlake Terrace City	6,740	9,486	2,746	1.9%
Mukilteo City	8,369	10,250	1,881	1.3%
Woodway Town	56	68	12	0.0%
Unincorporated S.W.	24,244	38,209	13,965	9.5%
<b>UGA Total</b>	234,297	373,050	138,753	94.1%
City Total	205,356	325,204	119,848	81.3%
Unincorporated UGA Total	28,941	47,846	18,905	12.8%
<b>Non-UGA Total *</b> (Uninc Rural/Resource Area)	14,693	23,323	8,630	5.9%
<b>County Total</b>	248,990	396,373	147,383	100.0%

NOTES: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries.

Employment includes all full- and part-time wage and salary workers and self-employed persons, excluding jobs within the resource (agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining) and construction sectors.

\* - Non-UGA Total includes projected employment on the Tulalip Reservation which is anticipated to reach 13,890 by 2030 according to the Tulalip Tribes' 2009 adopted plan, representing a 7,003 increase over the 2008 jobs estimate of 6,887.

APPENDIX B, Table 6 - 2035 Reconciled Employment Growth Targets for Cities and MUGAs within the SW County UGA				
Area	2011 Employment Estimates	2035 Employment Targets	2011-2035 Employment Growth	
			Amount	Pct of Total County Growth
<b>SW County UGA Total</b>	187,653	279,479	91,826	62.3%
Incorporated SW County UGA Total	163,409	241,271	77,862	52.8%
Unincorporated SW County UGA Total	24,244	38,209	13,965	9.5%
Bothell Area	14,996	20,271	5,275	3.6%
Bothell City (part)	13,616	18,576	4,960	3.4%
Unincorporated MUGA	1,380	1,696	316	0.2%
Brier Area	388	476	88	0.1%
Brier City	319	405	86	0.1%
Unincorporated MUGA	69	71	2	0.0%
Edmonds Area	11,835	14,148	2,313	1.6%
Edmonds City	11,679	13,948	2,269	1.5%
Unincorporated MUGA	156	200	44	0.0%
Everett Area	98,989	148,324	49,335	33.5%
Everett City	93,739	140,000	46,261	31.4%
Unincorporated MUGA	5,250	8,324	3,074	2.1%
Lynnwood Area	27,840	48,225	20,385	13.8%
Lynnwood City	24,266	42,229	17,963	12.2%
Unincorporated MUGA	3,574	5,996	2,422	1.6%
Mill Creek Area	7,372	10,279	2,907	2.0%
Mill Creek City	4,625	6,310	1,685	1.1%
Unincorporated MUGA	2,747	3,969	1,222	0.8%
Mountlake Terrace Area	6,740	9,486	2,746	1.9%
Mountlake Terrace City	6,740	9,486	2,746	1.9%
Unincorporated MUGA	-	-	-	0.0%
Mukilteo Area	11,166	15,278	4,112	2.8%
Mukilteo City	8,369	10,250	1,881	1.3%
Unincorporated MUGA	2,797	5,029	2,232	1.5%
Woodway Area	70	246	176	0.1%
Woodway Town	56	68	12	0.0%
Unincorporated MUGA	14	178	164	0.1%
Paine Field Area (Unincorporated)	4,622	8,010	3,388	2.3%
Larch Way Overlap (Unincorporated)	1,630	2,051	421	0.3%
Lake Stickney Gap (Unincorporated)	694	794	100	0.1%
Silver Firs Gap (Unincorporated)	1,311	1,891	580	0.4%
<b>County Total</b>	<b>248,990</b>	<b>396,373</b>	<b>147,383</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

NOTES: All estimates and targets above are based on December 13, 2012 city boundaries; MUGA = Municipal Urban Growth Area. Employment includes all full- and part-time wage and salary workers and self-employed persons, excluding jobs within the resource (agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining) and construction sectors.

1 **Appendix C – Growth Target Procedure Steps for GF-5**

- 2 **1. Initial Growth Targets:** Initial population, housing, and employment projections shall be  
3 based on the following sources:
- 4 a. The most recently published official 20-year population projections for Snohomish  
5 County from the Office of Financial Management (OFM);
  - 6 b. The Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) most recent population and employment  
7 distribution as represented in the VISION ((2040)) 2050 Regional Growth Strategy  
8 (RGS); and
  - 9 c. A further distribution of the population and employment RGS allocations to jurisdictions  
10 in each of the PSRC regional geographies in Snohomish County to arrive at initial  
11 subcounty population, housing, and employment ((projections)) target distribution that  
12 emphasizes growth in and near centers and high-capacity transit (CPP-DP-8 and CPP-  
13 DP-18), addresses jobs/housing balance (CPP-DP-6), manages and reduces the rate of  
14 rural growth over time (CPP-DP-26), and supports infill within the urban growth area  
15 (CPP-DP-15).

16 Results of the initial growth target allocation process shall be shown in Appendix B of the  
17 CPPs. These initial allocations shall be used for at least one of the plan alternatives evaluated  
18 by jurisdictions for their GMA plan updates.

- 19 **2. Target Reconciliation:** Once the GMA comprehensive plan updates of jurisdictions in  
20 Snohomish County are adopted, the Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) process shall be  
21 used to review and, if necessary, adjust the population, housing, and employment growth  
22 targets contained in Appendix B of the CPPs.
- 23 a. The County and cities shall jointly review the preferred growth alternatives in adopted  
24 local comprehensive plans for discrepancies with the target allocation associated with the  
25 County's preferred plan alternative.
  - 26 b. Based on the land supply, permitted densities, capital facilities, urban service capacities  
27 and other information associated with the preferred growth alternatives of adopted local  
28 comprehensive plans, the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) of SCT shall recommend  
29 to the SCT Steering Committee a reconciled 20-year population, housing, and  
30 employment allocation.
  - 31 c. The SCT Steering Committee shall review and recommend to the County Council a  
32 reconciled 20-year population, housing, and employment allocation. Substantial  
33 consideration shall be given to the plan of each jurisdiction, and the recommendation  
34 shall be consistent with the GMA, the Regional Growth Strategy, and the CPPs.
  - 35 d. The County Council shall consider the recommendation of the Steering Committee and  
36 shall replace Appendix B of the CPPs with a reconciled 20-year population, housing, and  
37 employment allocation.

- 38
- 39 **3. Long Term Monitoring:** Subsequent to target reconciliation, SCT shall maintain a long  
40 term monitoring process to review annually the population, housing, and employment growth  
41 targets contained in Appendix B of the CPPs.

- 1 a. Snohomish County and the cities shall jointly monitor the following:  
2 i. Estimated population and employment growth;  
3 ii. Annexations and incorporations;  
4 iii. Residential and non-residential development trends;  
5 iv. Availability and affordability of housing.  
6 b. Results of the target monitoring program shall be published in a growth monitoring report  
7 developed by the PAC.  
8
- 9 **4. Target Adjustments:** The SCT process may be used to consider adjustments to the  
10 population, housing, and employment growth targets contained in Appendix B of the CPPs.  
11 a. Based on the results of the long term monitoring process, the PAC may review and  
12 recommend to the SCT Steering Committee an adjustment to the population, housing,  
13 and employment targets.  
14 b. The SCT Steering Committee shall review a PAC recommendation to adjust growth  
15 targets and may recommend to the County Council, an adjustment to the population,  
16 housing, and employment targets. Adjustments to the growth targets shall be based on the  
17 results of the target monitoring program and shall be consistent with the GMA and the  
18 CPPs.  
19 c. The County Council shall consider the recommendation of the Steering Committee and  
20 may amend Appendix B of the CPPs with adjusted population, housing, and employment  
21 targets for cities, UGAs, and rural areas.

22

1 **Appendix D – Reasonable Measures**

2 **Guidelines for Review**

3 The County Council has adopted the attached list of Reasonable Measures and the following  
4 guidance, pursuant to Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) GF-7.

5 **A. Applicable Policies.**

6 As a component of the on-going monitoring of growth and development undertaken through a  
7 county-wide collaborative process, the Growth Monitoring Report and Buildable Lands Report  
8 required under statute, starting with the first report (~~issued~~) adopted by the County Council in  
9 January 2003, the second in October 2007, (~~and~~) the third in June 2013, contain information on  
10 the buildable land capacity of Snohomish County cities and urban areas to accommodate future  
11 growth.

12 Several consistency problems were found in the second and third (~~report~~) reports. Therefore,  
13 the affected jurisdictions (~~need~~) needed to adopt and implement reasonable measures  
14 implementation programs. In UGAs where a consistency problem has been found (e.g. not  
15 achieving urban densities or a lack of sufficient capacity), GMA (RCW 36.70A.215) and  
16 Countywide Planning Policy GF-7 direct cities and the county to consider “reasonable  
17 measures,” other than expanding Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), to resolve the inconsistency.  
18 RCW 36.70A.215 define reasonable measures as “those actions necessary to reduce the  
19 differences between growth and development assumptions and targets contained in the  
20 countywide planning policies and the county and city comprehensive plans with actual  
21 development patterns.”

22 The County Council shall use the guidance in this Appendix and its list of reasonable measures  
23 to evaluate proposed expansions of UGAs. CPP GF-7 provides that, once this Appendix and the  
24 list are adopted, “the County Council shall use the list of reasonable measures and guidelines for  
25 review contained in Appendix D to evaluate all UGA boundary (~~expansion proposals consistent~~  
26 ~~with CPPs GF-7 and~~) expansions proposed pursuant to DP-2.”

27 **B. Mechanism for Local Review and Adoption of Reasonable Measures.**

28 The appropriate forum for consideration and adoption of reasonable measures is the adoption of  
29 individual County and city comprehensive plans and implementing regulations. Through these  
30 public processes, measures appropriate for each jurisdiction are evaluated and incorporated into  
31 plan policies, and implementing regulations.

32 Beginning with the updates to be completed in 2004 and 2005, each jurisdiction (the relevant city  
33 and the county) will demonstrate its consideration of reasonable measures in its comprehensive  
34 plan or, at its discretion, in a separate report. Each plan’s environmental review or adoption  
35 documents will report on the sufficiency of the reasonable measures specified in its plan or  
36 report. ECONorthwest has provided optional useful steps in its final report: *Document*

1 *development trends; Identify and analyze current and proposed reasonable measures; and,*  
2 *Determine sufficiency.*

3 **C. Evaluation.**

4 The County Executive and Council’s evaluation of UGA expansion proposals under CPP DP-2  
5 shall include findings that the jurisdiction has made a determination of consideration of UGA  
6 expansion requests.

7 **D. Consultation with Snohomish County Tomorrow.**

8 The County Council adopted this list of Reasonable Measures and guidance after considering the  
9 recommendation of the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee, as provided in CPP  
10 GF-7.

11 **E. Review and Evaluation Program.**

12 Annual monitoring of growth and development information, including any reasonable measures  
13 programs, occurs through Snohomish County Tomorrow’s (SCT) annual Growth Monitoring  
14 Report, and/or the SCT Housing (~~(Evaluation)~~) Characteristics and Needs Report, regular  
15 updates of buildable lands reports, and other updates of those reports produced for review  
16 processes undertaken by a city or the county.

17 Jurisdictions should review and update their reasonable measures programs and finding of  
18 sufficiency at least every eight years in conjunction with the buildable lands review or their  
19 comprehensive plan update.

20 Detailed descriptions of the reasonable measures and the optional evaluation methodology are  
21 contained in the final (~~(report)~~) reports by ECONorthwest titled “Phase II Report: Recommended  
22 Method for Evaluating Local Reasonable Measures Programs,” approved by the SCT Steering  
23 Committee in June 2003 (~~((Final Report))~~) and the “Reasonable Measures Program Technical  
24 Supplement,” approved by the SCT Steering Committee in June 2020.

25 The attached list of reasonable measures are a part of this Appendix D. The identified “issue  
26 category” is intended to help readers understand the predominant applicability of each measure,  
27 it is not intended to limit which measures can be used to resolve specific findings of differences  
28 between growth and development assumptions and targets, or as an alternative to UGA  
29 expansions.

Reasonable Measures List

- Directly applicable
- ◐ Partially applicable

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
<b>Measures that Increase Residential Capacity</b>															
Permit Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in single family zones.	Communities use a variety of terms to refer to the concept of accessory dwellings: secondary residences; “granny” flats; and single-family conversions, among others. Regardless of the title, all of these terms refer to an independent dwelling unit that shares, at least, a tax lot in a single-family zone. Some accessory dwelling units share parking and entrances. Some may be incorporated into the primary structure; others may be in accessory structures. Accessory dwellings can be distinguished from “shared” housing in that the unit has separate kitchen and bathroom facilities. ADUs are typically regulated as a conditional uses. Some ordinances only allow ADUs where the primary dwelling is owner-occupied.	◐		•	◐	•		•					✓		Small
Provide Multifamily Housing Tax ((Credits)) exemptions to Developers	Local governments can provide tax credits to developers for new or rehabilitated multi-family housing. Tax credits provide an incentive to developers by reducing future tax burden. In some markets, this can make projects financially feasible. This policy is intended to encourage development of multifamily housing, primarily in urban centers. This policy is primarily applicable in larger cities and is typically offered for projects that meet specific criteria.	•		•	•	◐		◐	•			✓	✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Provide Density Bonuses to Developers	The local government allows developers to build housing at densities higher than are usually allowed by the underlying zoning. Density bonuses are commonly used as a tool to encourage greater housing density in desired areas, provided certain requirements are met. This policy is generally implemented through provisions of the local zoning code and is allowed in appropriate residential zones.	•	◐	◐	◐	◐		•	•			✓	✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Transfer/Purchase of Development Rights	This policy is intended to move development from sensitive areas to more appropriate areas. Development rights are transferred to “receiving zones” and can be traded. This policy can increase overall densities. This policy is usually implemented through a subsection of the zoning code and identifies both sending zones (zones where decreased densities are desirable) and receiving zones (zones where increased densities are allowed).	•	◐	◐	◐			◐				✓	✓	✓	Small-Moderate



Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Allow Clustered Residential Development	Clustering allows developers to increase density on portions of a site, while preserving other areas of the site. Clustering is a tool most commonly used to preserve natural areas or avoid natural hazards during development. It uses characteristics of the site as a primary consideration in determining building footprints, access, etc. Clustering is typically processed during the site review phase of development review.	●			●			●	●		●	✓	✓	✓	Moderate
Allow Co-housing	Co-housing communities balance the traditional advantages of home ownership with the benefits of shared common facilities and connections with neighbors. This approach would be implemented through the local zoning or development code and would list these housing types as outright allowable uses in appropriate residential zones.	●	●	●	●	●							✓		Small
Allow Duplexes, Townhomes, and Condominiums	Allowing these housing types can increase overall density of residential development and may encourage a higher percentage of multi-family housing types. This approach would be implemented through the local zoning or development code and would list these housing types as outright allowable uses in appropriate residential zones.	●		●		●		●				✓	✓		Moderate
Increase Allowable Residential Densities	This approach seeks to increase holding capacity by increasing allowable density in residential zones. It gives developers the option of building to higher densities. This approach would be implemented through the local zoning or development code.	●				●						✓	✓		High
Mandate Maximum Lot Sizes	This policy places an upper bound on lot size and a lower bound on density in single-family zones. For example, a residential zone with a 6,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size might have an 8,000 sq. ft. maximum lot size yielding an effective net density range between 5.4 and 7.3 dwelling units per net acre.	●						●	●			✓	✓	✓	High
Mandate Minimum Residential Densities	This policy is typically applied in single-family residential zones and is places a lower bound on density. Minimum residential densities in single-family zones are typically implemented through maximum lot sizes. In multiple-family zones they are usually expressed as a minimum number of dwelling units per net acre. Such standards are typically implemented through zoning code provisions in applicable residential zones.	●						●	●			✓	✓	✓	High

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Reduce Street Width Standards	This policy is intended to reduce land used for streets and slow down traffic. Street standards are typically described in development and/or subdivision ordinances. Reduced street width standards are most commonly applied on local streets in residential zones. Implementation of this policy should ensure that streets are wide enough to allow access for emergency, transit, other service providers.	•						●	•			✓	✓		Small
Allow Small Residential Lots	Small residential lots are generally less than 5,000sq. ft. This policy allows individual small lots within a subdivision or short plat. Small lots can be allowed outright in the minimum lot size and dimensions of a zone, or they could be implemented through the subdivision or planned unit development ordinances.	•				•	●	•				✓	✓		Small
Encourage Infill and Redevelopment	This policy seeks to maximize use of lands that are fully-developed or underdeveloped. Make use existing infrastructure by identifying and implementing policies that (1) improve market opportunities, and (2) reduce impediments to development in areas suitable for infill or redevelopment.	•	•	•				●	•				✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Enact an inclusionary zoning ordinance for new housing developments	Inclusionary zoning requires developers to provide a certain amount of affordable housing in developments over a certain size. Inclusionary zoning is applied during the development review process.	●			●	•							✓		Small-Moderate
Plan and zone for affordable and manufactured housing development	This policy would add manufactured housing as an outright use in specified residential zones. This policy ensures that land is available for this housing type.	●			•	•							✓		Small-Moderate
Allow Garden and Larger Scale Apartments and other moderate and higher density housing	Allowing higher and moderate density housing types, such as medium (garden) and high-density (larger scale) apartments, can result in increased development capacity and encourage a higher percentage of multi-family development. This approach can be implemented by amending the zoning code to allow them as an outright allowed use in appropriate zones.	•	●	●	●	●	●	●	•	●		✓	✓		Small-Large
<b>Measures that Increase Employment Capacity</b>															
Develop an Economic Development Strategy	An economic development strategy is intended to (1) identify desired types of businesses, and (2) identify the land needs of those businesses. Economic development strategies can be incorporated into the economic element of local comprehensive plans, or can be stand-alone policy documents.						•				●		✓		Small-Moderate
Create Industrial Zones	Industrial zoning is intended to limit uses on specific sites to appropriate industrial uses. Some cities have ordinances that specify what types of industries can locate on specific sites. This measure is implemented through the local zoning ordinance.		●				•						✓	✓	Small-Moderate

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Zone areas by building type, not by use	A local jurisdiction can alter its zoning code so that zones define the physical aspects of allowed buildings, not the uses within those buildings. This zoning approach recognizes that many land uses are compatible and locate in similar building types. For example, a manufacturing firm may have similar space requirements as a print shop.	•					•						✓	✓	Moderate
Develop or strengthen local brownfields programs	Local jurisdictions provide policies or incentives to encourage the redevelopment of underused industrial sites, known as brownfields. This policy can be implemented through provisions in local zoning ordinances that provide incentives for redevelopment of brownfields such as expedited permitting or reduced fees, or through targeted public investments.		•	•									✓	✓	Small-Moderate
<b>Measures that Support Increased Densities</b>															
Encourage the Development of Urban Centers and Urban Villages	An urban center or urban village provides mixed uses with a development. Residences are near retail establishments, parks, schools, and other urban amenities. The goal of urban centers and villages is to create integrated, more complete, and inter-related neighborhoods. Such concepts are often implemented through specific area or downtown plans and may require public investment. This measure should include encouraging development in Regional and Countywide Centers.	•	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐						✓	✓	Moderate-High
Allow Mixed Uses	The zoning code would specifically allow multiple uses in a zone, instead of all residential, or all commercial. Mixed uses can be vertical (i.e., multiple uses within a single building) or horizontal (i.e., multiple uses in a given geographic area).	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐			•	•			✓	✓	Low
Encourage Transit-Oriented Design	The goal of transit-oriented development is to create development patterns that complement transit. Transit-oriented development allows people to more easily use transit systems and helps businesses near transit stations be more accessible. When done well, the result will be desirable urban neighborhoods.	◐			◐	◐	◐	•	•				✓	✓	Moderate-High
Downtown Revitalization	Downtown revitalization includes redevelopment of blighted areas, developing a viable business district, and improving retail opportunities.	◐	•	•	◐	◐	•	◐					✓	✓	High
Require Adequate Public Facilities	Local jurisdictions require developers to provide adequate levels of public services, such as roads, sewer, water, drainage, and parks, as a condition of development.	◐						•					✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Specific Development Plans	Work with landowners, developers, and neighbors to develop a detailed site plan for development of an area. Allow streamlined approval for projects consistent with the plan. This policy results in a plan for a specific geographic area that is adopted as a supplement or amendment to the jurisdictions comprehensive land use plan.	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐			◐		✓	✓	Moderate-High

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Encourage Transportation-Efficient Land Use	Review and amend comprehensive plans to encourage patterns of land development that encourage pedestrian, bike, and transit travel. This policy is typically implemented at the development review level. It can also be implemented through plan designation and zoning maps through consideration of the geographic distribution of planned land uses and densities.	●			●	●	●	●				✓		✓	Small-Moderate
Urban Growth Management Agreements	Identify a lead jurisdiction for growth management inside urban growth areas. The urban growth area can include city and county land. The agreements define lead responsibility for planning, zoning, and urban service extension within these areas. The agreements exist between various government jurisdictions and specify jurisdiction over land use decisions, infrastructure provision, and other elements of urban growth.	●						●	●		●	✓		✓	Small
Create Annexation Plans	In an Annexation Plan, cities identify outlying areas that are likely to be eligible for annexation. The Plan identifies probable timing of annexation, needed urban services, effects of annexation on current service providers, and other likely impacts of annexation.	●						●	●		●	✓		✓	Small-Moderate
Encourage developers to reduce off-street surface parking	This policy provides incentives to developers to reduce the amount of off-street surface parking through shared parking arrangements, multi-level parking, or use of alternative transportation modes.	●						●	●			✓			Small-Moderate
Implement a program to identify and redevelop vacant and abandoned buildings	Many buildings sit vacant for years before the market facilitates redevelopment. This policy encourages demolition and would clear sites, making them more attractive to developers and would facilitate redevelopment.	●					●	●				✓		✓	Small-Moderate
Concentrate critical services near homes, jobs, and transit	This policy would require critical facilities and services be located in areas that are accessible by all people. For example, a hospital could not be located at the urban fringe in a business park. This policy would be implemented through provisions in the local zoning ordinance pertaining to siting specific critical services.										●	✓		✓	Small
Locate civic buildings in existing communities rather than in Greenfield areas	Local governments, like private builders, are tempted to build on greenfield sites because it is less expensive and easier. However, local governments can "lead by example" by making public investments in desired areas, or redeveloping target sites.									●	●	✓		✓	Small
Implement a process to expedite plan and permit approval for smart growth projects	Streamlined permitting processes provide incentives to developers. This policy would be implemented at the development review phase.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	✓		✓	Small
Administrative and Procedural Reforms	Permit and development project process can be streamlined to reduce barriers to development while still achieving the intended objectives of development policies.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	✓	✓	✓	Small

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Streamline Development Regulations and/or Standards	Regulatory reforms that simplify development regulations and standards while still maintaining appropriate restrictions on development can reduce barriers on development.	●			●	●			●			✓			Small-Moderate
Phasing/tiering Urban Growth	Strategies can be incorporated into comprehensive plans and capital facilities plans to phase urban growth as a method to provide for orderly development and encourage infill ahead of "urban fringe" development.	●	●	●	●			●	●				✓	✓	Small-Moderate
Promote Vertical Growth	Modifications to building height restrictions to allow taller structures can result in increases development capacity and assist in achieving planned densities.	●	●	●	●			●	●	●		✓	✓		Small-Moderate
SEPA Categorical Exemptions for mixed use and infill development & increased thresholds for SEPA Categorical Exemptions	Modifications to SEPA exemptions for mixed use and infill development can streamline the development review process and encourage more efficient development.		●	●	●				●					✓	Small-Large
<b>Measures to Mitigate the Impact of Density</b>															
Design standards	Design standards seek to preserve and enhance the character of a community or district. They are most typically applied in the design phase of projects or during site review. Design standards are typically implemented as another section of the development code. Some cities have design review boards in addition to the planning commission.									●				✓	Small
Urban Amenities for Increased Densities	Amenities include parks, trails, waterfront access, and cultural centers. Such amenities are typically implemented through the parks plan, the downtown plan, specific area plans or other public investments. Some cities require amenities to be included with larger projects.									●		✓		✓	Small
Conduct community visioning exercises to determine how and where the community will grow	Community visioning processes attempt to build consensus around the type, amount, and location of future development. Visioning exercises are typically included at the beginning of a comprehensive planning process and are used to update plan goals and objectives.									●				✓	Small
Provide for Regional Stormwater Facilities	The provision of regional stormwater facilities can provide stormwater treatment that supports development in areas where on-site treatment facilities are not financially feasible.	●		●	●				●					✓	Moderate-Large
<b>Other Measures</b>															
Mandate Low Densities in Rural and Resource Lands	This policy is intended to limit development in rural areas by mandating large lot sizes. It can also be used to preserve lands targeted for future urban area expansion. Low density urban development in fringe areas can have negative impacts of future densities and can increase the need for and cost of roads and other infrastructure.								●					✓	Small

Measures to increase density	Description of Measure	Applicability of Measure										Issue Category			Scale of Impact
		Increases densities	Increases redevelopment	Increases infill	Changes housing type/ increases options	Provides affordable housing	Economic development	Make efficient use of infrastructure	Ensure efficient land uses	Urban design/form	Prevents development in critical areas	Planned densities not achieved	Insufficient capacity	Inconsistent dev. patterns	
Urban Holding Zones	<u>This policy identifies sites for future expansion and limits development to preserve options in those sites. This policy would be implemented through a specific zone or overlay. Urban holding areas would be identified on a map.</u>								•				✓	✓	Moderate-High
Capital Facilities Investments	<u>Investment in public facilities can be effectively used to guide the location of growth. This policy is implemented through capital improvement plans and the local capital budgeting process.</u>							•	•				✓	✓	High
Environmental Review and Mitigation Built into the Subarea Planning Process	<u>Building environmental review and mitigation into the subarea planning process can address key land use concerns at a broader geographic scale, streamlining review and approval of individual developments.</u>	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			✓	Small
Partner with nongovernmental organizations to preserve natural resource lands	<u>Local governments can partner with land trusts and other nongovernmental organizations to leverage limited public resources in preserving natural resource lands. The two work together to acquire natural resource lands or to place conservation easements on them. Land trusts are natural partners in this process and have more flexibility than local governments in facilitating land transactions. This policy is implemented through the development of long-term partnerships.</u>										•			✓	Small
<u>Public Land Disposition</u>	<u>Land owned or acquired by public agencies can be sold or leased at below market rates for various projects to help achieve development or redevelopment objectives.</u>		•			●	●						✓	✓	Small-Moderate

1 **Appendix E – Procedures for Buildable Lands Reporting in Response to GF-7**

2 **Procedures Report**

3 Use the procedures report that has been accepted and recommended by the Snohomish County  
4 Tomorrow (SCT) Steering Committee and adopted by the County Council. The procedures  
5 report used by local jurisdictions shall address the following issues:

- 6 1. Multi-year work program and schedule;
- 7 2. Jurisdictional responsibilities for data collection, analysis, and reporting;
- 8 3. Eight-year buildable lands review and evaluation methodology, including a methodology  
9 for establishing an accurate countywide baseline inventory of commercial and industrial  
10 lands;
- 11 4. Annual data collection requirements;
- 12 5. Coordinated interjurisdictional data collection strategy;
- 13 6. Definitions and relationships of key urban land supply terms and concepts, including  
14 market availability factor and the UGA safety factor;
- 15 7. Content of the eight-year buildable lands review and evaluation report;
- 16 8. Criteria and timelines for consistency and inconsistency determinations based on the  
17 review and evaluation results; and
- 18 9. Process for public involvement during preparation and finalization of the eight-year  
19 buildable lands reports.

20 **Resolving Inconsistencies in Collection and Analysis of Data**

21 In the event of a dispute among jurisdictions relating to inconsistencies in collection and analysis  
22 of data, the affected jurisdictions shall meet and discuss methods of resolving the dispute. In the  
23 event a successful resolution cannot be achieved, the SCT Steering Committee shall be asked to  
24 meet and resolve the matter. In such instances, the Steering Committee co-chairs will make every  
25 effort to ensure that all Steering Committee jurisdictions are present and in attendance, and that  
26 the affected jurisdictions are provided with proper notice of such discussion. Nothing in this  
27 policy shall be construed to alter the land use power of any Snohomish County jurisdiction under  
28 established law.

29

1 **Appendix F – List of Issues for Interlocal Agreements**

2 *(To Illustrate Policy JP-1 and to Implement (~~JP-3~~) JP-2)*

3 Interlocal agreements may coordinate any number of issues, such as, but not limited to:

- 4 1. Facilitation of annexations;
- 5 2. Principles for annexation;
- 6 3. Public service delivery;
- 7 4. Clarification of roles;
- 8 5. Coordination between long term and current planning at both the city and the County
- 9 level;
- 10 6. Land Use Designations;
- 11 7. Population and employment growth targets;
- 12 8. Delineation of tasks of city/County staff;
- 13 9. Development of schedule for completion of tasks;
- 14 10. Delineation of roles of the various planning commissions;
- 15 11. Delineation of roles of city/County council in adoption process;
- 16 12. Provision of consistent processes for design and development;
- 17 13. Permit processing;
- 18 14. Ensuring non-duplicative process for the development community;
- 19 15. Development of application procedures;
- 20 16. Determination of applicable regulations and standards to be used;
- 21 17. Determination of SEPA process and lead agency roles;
- 22 18. Development of appeal processes;
- 23 19. Provision for realistic capital facilities planning;
- 24 20. Provision for fiscal equity between the County and the cities;
- 25 21. Bonded debt;
- 26 22. Identification of funding sources, fees, and revenue sharing;
- 27 23. Provision of clear, adequate public participation processes;
- 28 24. Provision for viable, quality communities;
- 29 25. Transportation mitigation, concurrency, or other issues including those detailed in TR-
- 30 1(a);
- 31 26. Interjurisdictional affordable housing agreements or programs; and/or
- 32 27. Other issues such as surface water, solid waste, and public safety.
- 33 28. Response to climate crisis through restoration and protection of the environment’s natural
- 34 functions and wildlife habitats.

35



1 **Appendix G – Definitions of Key Terms**

2 **Activity Unit:** A measure of total activity that combines the number of jobs and population.

3 **Affordable Housing:** The generally accepted definition of housing affordability is for a  
4 household to pay no more than 30 percent of its annual income on housing (HUD).

5 **Buildable Lands Report:** A Buildable Lands Report (BLR) analyzes the urban development  
6 that has occurred since the adoption of the previous Growth Management Act comprehensive  
7 plans. Using this information, the report evaluates the adequacy of the land supply in the Urban  
8 Growth Area to accommodate the remaining portions of the projected growth. In this sense, a  
9 BLR ‘looks back’ to compare planned vs. actual urban densities to determine whether the  
10 original plan assumptions were accurate. (See GF-7 and RCW 36.70A.215.)

11 **Built Environment:** Refers to the human-created surroundings that provide the setting for  
12 human activity, ranging from large-scale civic districts, commercial and industrial buildings, to  
13 neighborhoods and individual homes.

14 **Centers:** A defined focal area within a city or community that is a priority for local planning and  
15 infrastructure. VISION 2050 and the CPPs identify mixed-use centers, which have a mix of  
16 housing, employment, retail and entertainment uses and are served by multiple transportation  
17 options. Industrial centers concentrate and preserve manufacturing and industrial lands. Regional  
18 centers are formally designated by PSRC, countywide centers are formally identified by the  
19 CPPs, and local centers are designated by local comprehensive plans.

20 **City:** Any city or town, including a code city. [RCW 36.70A.030(3)]

21 **Clean Energy:** Energy derived through renewable, zero emission sources.

22 **Consistency:** The definitions and descriptions of the term "consistency" contained in the Growth  
23 Management Act procedural criteria Chapter ((365-196-210(9))) 365-196-210(8) Washington  
24 Administrative Code, and as further refined in statute, Growth Management Hearings Board  
25 decisions and court decisions should be used to determine consistency between jurisdictions'  
26 comprehensive plans.

27 **Countywide Center:** Countywide growth centers serve important roles as places for  
28 concentrating jobs, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. Countywide industrial  
29 centers serve as important local industrial areas. Countywide centers are designated in Appendix  
30 I of this document.

31 **Displacement:** The involuntary relocation of current residents or businesses from their current  
32 residence. This is a different phenomenon than when property owners voluntarily sell their  
33 interests to capture an increase in value. Physical displacement is the result of eviction,  
34 acquisition, rehabilitation, or demolition of property, or the expiration of covenants on rent- or  
35 income-restricted housing. Economic displacement occurs when residents and businesses can no  
36 longer afford escalating housing costs. Cultural displacement occurs when people choose to  
37 move because their neighbors and culturally related businesses have left the area.

1 **Economic Infrastructure:** The combination of economic activity, institutions (e.g. banks,  
2 investment firms, research and development organizations, and education providers) and  
3 physical infrastructure – such as transportation systems – that support economic activity.

4 **Environmentally Sensitive Development Practice:** Practices intended to limit the  
5 environmental impacts and energy use associated with development, such as low-impact  
6 development.

7 **Environmentally Sensitive Housing Development:** The development of housing that is  
8 designed such that it yields environmental benefits, such as savings in energy, building materials,  
9 and water consumption, or reduced waste generation.

10 **Equity:** All people can attain the resources and opportunities that improve their quality of life  
11 and enable them to reach full potential. Those affected by poverty, communities of color, and  
12 historically marginalized communities are engaged in decision-making processes, planning, and  
13 policy making. Also referred to as “social equity”.

14 **Essential public facilities:** Those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports,  
15 state education facilities and state or regional transportation facilities as defined in RCW  
16 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient  
17 facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure  
18 community transition facilities as defined in RCW 71.09.020. [RCW 36.70A.200(1)]

19 **Greenhouse Gas:** Components of the atmosphere which contribute to global warming, including  
20 carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases. Human activities have added to  
21 the levels of most of these naturally occurring gases.

22 **Growth Target:** The number of residents, housing, or jobs that a jurisdiction is expected to plan  
23 for in its comprehensive plan. Growth targets are set by countywide planning groups for counties  
24 and cities to meet the Growth Management Act requirement to allocate urban growth that is  
25 projected for the succeeding twenty-year period (RCW 36.70A.110).

26 **Historically Marginalized Communities:** Include, but are not limited to, native and Indigenous  
27 peoples, people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with low incomes, those with  
28 disabilities and health conditions, and people with limited English proficiency.

29 **Jobs-Housing Balance:** A planning concept which advocates that housing and employment be  
30 located closer together, with an emphasis on matching housing options with nearby jobs, so  
31 workers have shorter commutes or can eliminate vehicle trips altogether.

32 **Jurisdictions:** County and city governments (when used in a policy).

33 **Land Capacity Analysis:** A land capacity analysis focuses on the reestablishment of a new 20-  
34 year urban land supply for accommodating the urban growth targets. As such, it fulfills the  
35 Growth Management Act “show your work” requirement for the sizing of Urban Growth Areas  
36 for future growth. (See DP-1 and RCW ((~~36.70.A.110(2))~~) 36.70A.110(2))

1 **Living Wage Jobs:** Jobs that pay enough to meet the basic needs and costs of supporting a  
2 family or individual independently. Factors for determining living-wage jobs include housing,  
3 food, transportation, utilities, health care, child care, and recreation.

4 **May:** The actions described in the policy are either advisable or are allowed. “May” gives  
5 permission and implies a preference. Because “may” does not have a directive meaning, there is  
6 no expectation the described action will be implemented.

7 **Moderate Density Housing:** A classification of housing type that has densities greater than  
8 what would ordinarily be seen in single-family neighborhoods, but less than in more intensive  
9 high density multifamily development. Moderate density housing includes, but is not limited to,  
10 duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, walkup apartments, and accessory dwelling units. Moderate  
11 density housing is often referred to as “missing middle housing”.

12 **Municipality:** In the context of these Countywide Planning Policies, municipalities include  
13 cities, towns, and counties.

14 **Public facilities:** Streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic  
15 signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreational  
16 facilities, and schools. ((~~36.70A.030(12)~~)) RCW 36.70A.030(17)

17 **Shall:** Implementation of the policy is mandatory and imparts a higher degree of substantive  
18 direction than “should”. “Shall” is used for policies that repeat State of Washington requirements  
19 or where the intent is to mandate action. However, “shall” cannot be used when it is largely a  
20 subjective determination whether a policy’s objective has been met.

21 **Should:** Implementation of the policy is expected but its completion is not mandatory. The  
22 policy is directive with substantive meaning, although to a lesser degree than “shall” for two  
23 reasons. (1) “Should” policies recognize the policy might not be applicable or appropriate for all  
24 municipalities due to special circumstances. The decision to not implement a “should” policy is  
25 appropriate only if implementation of the policy is either inappropriate or not feasible. (2) Some  
26 should policies are subjective; hence, it is not possible to demonstrate that a jurisdiction has  
27 implemented it.

28 **Social Infrastructure:** The underlying institutions, community organizations, and safety  
29 networks that support society in general and local service standards and delivery in particular.

30 **Special Needs Housing:** Affordable housing for persons that require special assistance or  
31 supportive care to subsist or achieve independent living, including but not limited to persons that  
32 are frail, elderly, developmentally disabled, chronically mentally ill, physically handicapped,  
33 homeless, persons participating in substance abuse programs, persons with AIDS, and youth at  
34 risk.

35

36

1 **Appendix H – Fiscal Impact Analysis**

2 RCW 36.70A.210 requires that each county mandated to plan under the GMA develop and adopt  
3 CPPs in cooperation with the cities in the county. These policies establish a framework for the  
4 preparation of local comprehensive plans and development regulations. These policies are not  
5 the equivalent of a regional comprehensive plan. The legislative direction is to develop policy  
6 statements to be used solely for attaining consistency among plans of the county and the  
7 cities/towns.

8 These CPPs have no direct fiscal impact. They are an agreed upon method of guiding the  
9 planning activities required by the GMA. Actions requiring further analysis could include (but  
10 are not limited) those listed in Appendix F.

11

1 **Appendix I – Centers**

2 Centers are a key feature of VISION 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategy. Centers are mixed  
3 use and industrial locations that attract robust employment and population growth. The Regional  
4 Centers Framework sets up a hierarchy of centers, starting at the regional level and moving  
5 though the countywide level to local centers.

6 **Regional Context**

7 VISION 2050 includes narrative and Multicounty Planning Policies that describe the role of  
8 centers in the Regional Growth Strategy and provide guidance for the implementation of the  
9 centers framework locally. VISION 2050 states:

10 *Mixed-use centers of different sizes and scales—including large designated regional*  
11 *growth centers, countywide centers, local downtowns, and other local centers—are*  
12 *envisioned for all of the region's cities. Concentrating growth in mixed-use centers of*  
13 *different scales allows cities and other urban service providers to maximize the use of*  
14 *existing infrastructure, make more efficient and less costly investments in new*  
15 *infrastructure, and minimize the environmental impacts of urban growth.*<sup>30</sup>

16 Additional policies provide guidance for implementing the regional centers framework  
17 throughout the region including providing guidance on subregional funding allocation,  
18 countywide center designation, and guiding development and growth. The following policies and  
19 actions provide an overview of this guidance:

20 *MPP-RC-8: Direct subregional funding, especially county-level and local funds, to*  
21 *countywide centers, high-capacity transit areas with a station area plan, and other local*  
22 *centers. County-level and local funding are also appropriate to prioritize to regional*  
23 *centers.*

24 *MPP-DP-25: Support the development of centers within all jurisdictions, including high-*  
25 *capacity transit station areas and countywide and local centers.*

26 *DP-Action-1: Implement the Regional Centers Framework: PSRC will study and*  
27 *evaluate existing regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers to assess*  
28 *their designation, distribution, interrelationships, characteristics, transportation*  
29 *efficiency, performance, and social equity. PSRC, together with its member jurisdictions*  
30 *and countywide planning bodies, will work to establish a common network of countywide*  
31 *centers.*

32 **Regional Centers**

33 Regional Centers are identified by PSRC at the regional level. The Regional Centers Framework  
34 outlines the process for identifying new regional centers and provides detailed criteria for the

---

<sup>30</sup> VISION 2050, page 28. Available at <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/vision-2050-plan.pdf>

1 designation of such areas. There are three Regional Growth Centers and two Regional  
2 Manufacturing/Industrial Centers within Snohomish County:

3 Regional Growth Centers

- 4 • Bothell Canyon Park RGC
- 5 • Everett RGC
- 6 • Lynnwood RGC

7 Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

- 8 • Cascade MIC
- 9 • Paine Field/Boeing Everett MIC

10 Snohomish County Tomorrow has identified the following process for designation of a new  
11 Regional Center within Snohomish County:

- 12 1. A local jurisdiction nominates a center;
- 13 2. A working group of Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) reviews the proposal for  
14 conformity with the criteria in the Regional Centers Framework;
- 15 3. If the prospective center is found to be appropriate, the SCT Steering Committee  
16 recommends the center for designation; and
- 17 4. The County Council holds a public hearing and makes the decision whether or not to seek  
18 designation of the prospective center and forward the proposal to the Puget Sound  
19 Regional Council for consideration.

20 **Countywide Centers**

21 Countywide center are the middle level of center under the centers hierarchy. There are two  
22 types of countywide center, growth centers and industrial centers. VISION 2050 requires  
23 countywide planning policies to include criteria and processes for the identification of  
24 countywide centers. The Regional Framework provides baseline designation criteria and  
25 descriptions of the two types of countywide center. However, “depending on county  
26 circumstance and priorities, countywide planning policies may include additional criteria (such  
27 as planning requirements or mix of uses) or other additional standards within this overall  
28 framework.”<sup>31</sup>

29 Countywide Growth Centers are areas that “serve important roles as places for concentrating  
30 jobs, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. These are often smaller downtowns,  
31 high-capacity transit station areas, or neighborhood centers that are linked by transit, provide a  
32 mix of housing and services, and serve as focal points for local and county investment.”<sup>32</sup>

33 Countywide Industrial Centers are areas that “serve as important local industrial areas. These

---

<sup>31</sup> Regional Centers Framework, page 11. Available at [https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final\\_regional\\_centers\\_framework\\_march\\_22\\_version.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf)

<sup>32</sup> Regional Centers Framework, page 11. Available at [https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final\\_regional\\_centers\\_framework\\_march\\_22\\_version.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf)

1 areas support living wage jobs and serve a key role in the county’s manufacturing/industrial  
 2 economy.”<sup>33</sup>

3 **Countywide Center Criteria**

4 The following criteria must be met for designation of a Countywide Growth Center:

<b><u>Countywide Growth Center</u></b>	
<u>Identification</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Shall be identified as a Countywide Growth Center in the Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies.</u></li> <li>● <u>Shall be identified as a Countywide Growth Center in the local comprehensive plan.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Prioritization</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>It is recommended that the locality has developed a subarea plan for the center; and</u></li> <li>● <u>Clear evidence that the area is a priority for investment, such as planning efforts or infrastructure.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<p><u>At the time of identification, the center shall have:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>An existing activity unit (AU) density of 10 AU/acre;</u></li> <li>● <u>An existing planning and zoning designation for a mix of uses of 20% residential and 20% employment;</u></li> <li>● <u>An existing capacity and planning for additional growth; and</u></li> <li>● <u>Goals and policies that encourage mixed use development and increased densities in the local comprehensive or subarea plan.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Other Requirements</u>	<p><u>The center is served by a Community Transit Core Transit Emphasis Corridor or High-Capacity Transit (HCT). The center shall encompass areas that fall within the following radii:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>¼ mile from a planned or existing Community Transit Core Transit Emphasis Corridor or local transit service that is equivalent in level of service;</u></li> <li>● <u>¼ mile from an existing or planned bus rapid transit stop; or</u></li> <li>● <u>½ mile of an existing or planned light rail station or commuter rail station.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>The center has a compact, walkable, shape and size:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Size of ¼ square mile (160 acres), up to ½ mile transit walkshed (500 acres).</u></li> <li>● <u>It is recommended that centers are nodal with a generally round or square shape.</u></li> <li>● <u>Centers should generally avoid linear or gerrymandered shapes that are not walkable or connected by transit.</u></li> <li>● <u>The local comprehensive or subarea plan shall have goals and policies for the center that support the development of infrastructure and/or street patterns that encourage nonmotorized forms of transportation, such as walking and bicycling.</u></li> </ul>

5

<sup>33</sup> Regional Centers Framework, page 11. Available at [https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final\\_regional\\_centers\\_framework\\_march\\_22\\_version.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf)

1 The following criteria must be met for the designation of a Countywide Industrial Center:

<b>Countywide Industrial Centers</b>	
<u>Identification</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Shall be identified as a Countywide Industrial Center in the Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies.</u></li> <li>• <u>Shall be identified as a Countywide Industrial Center in the local comprehensive plan.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Prioritization</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>It is recommended that the locality has developed a subarea plan for the center; and</u></li> <li>• <u>Clear evidence that the area is a priority for investment, such as planning efforts or infrastructure.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<p><u>At the time of identification, the center shall have:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>A minimum 1,000 existing jobs;</u></li> <li>• <u>A minimum of 500 acres of industrial zoning;</u></li> <li>• <u>At least 75% of the center zoned for core industrial uses; and</u></li> <li>• <u>Existing capacity and planning for additional employment growth.</u></li> </ul>
<u>Other Requirements</u>	<p><u>The center shall:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Through local or countywide planning have industrial retention strategies in place; and</u></li> <li>• <u>Play an important county role and concentration of industrial land or jobs with evidence of long-term demand.</u></li> </ul>

2 **Identification Process**

3 Initial identification of Countywide Centers shall occur through the process outlined below:

- 4 1. Candidate Countywide Centers are identified in the 2021 update of the Countywide  
 5 Planning Policies for Snohomish County (below).  
 6 2. Jurisdictions determine whether or not to pursue formal identification of Candidate  
 7 Countywide Centers within their jurisdictional boundaries.  
 8 3. Localities choosing to pursue formal identification complete local planning for each  
 9 Candidate Countywide Center as a part of the 2024 GMA Comprehensive Plan Update.  
 10 Local planning shall:  
 11 a. Formalize boundaries;  
 12 b. Identify Center location as a Countywide Center in the local comprehensive plan;  
 13 c. Adopt policies required by the Countywide Center criteria; and  
 14 d. If applicable, complete subarea planning.  
 15 4. Countywide Planning Policies are amended to finalize designation of Countywide  
 16 Growth and Industrial centers that meet the criteria in this Appendix.

17 After initial countywide center designation, new countywide centers can be designated through  
 18 the following process:

- 19 1. Prospective center is nominated by a local jurisdiction;  
 20 2. A working group of Snohomish County Tomorrow reviews the prospective center for  
 21 consistency with the Countywide Center Criteria;



- 1        3. If the center proposal is found to be appropriate, the SCT Steering Committee  
2        recommends the countywide center for designation; and  
3        4. The County Council holds a public hearing and makes the decision whether or not to  
4        designate the prospective center as a Countywide Center.

5  
6        **Candidate Countywide Centers**

7        The following candidate centers were identified during the 2021 Countywide Planning Policies  
8        update. As outlined in the identification process above, these locations will not formally be  
9        designated as countywide centers until local planning has occurred, candidate centers have been  
10       evaluated to ensure they meet the criteria, and the CPPs have been amended to designate the  
11       locations. Jurisdictions will need to complete local planning for each area to ensure it is an  
12       appropriate location for a countywide center in accordance with local plans and complete all  
13       necessary planning to ensure the area meets the countywide center criteria identified above.

14       Candidate County Growth Centers:

- 15       • 196<sup>th</sup> Street Mixed Use Node – Lynnwood  
16       • Airport Road and Highway 99 Provisional Light Rail Station – Everett and Snohomish  
17       County  
18       • Ash Way Light Rail Station Area– Snohomish County  
19       • Edmonds Downtown – Edmonds  
20       • Everett Mall – Everett  
21       • Evergreen Way and SR 526 – Everett  
22       • Lakewood – Marysville  
23       • Mariner Light Rail Station Area – Snohomish County  
24       • Marshall/Kruse Area – Marysville  
25       • Marysville Downtown – Marysville  
26       • Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center – Edmonds, Lynnwood, and Mountlake Terrace  
27       • Mill Creek Town Center – Mill Creek  
28       • Mountlake Terrace Town Center/Light Rail Station Area – Mountlake Terrace  
29       • Mukilteo Old Town – Mukilteo  
30       • North Everett – Everett  
31       • Red Barn Village – Bothell  
32       • Smokey Point – Arlington  
33       • Thrasher’s Corner – Snohomish County

34       Candidate Countywide Industrial Centers

- 35       • Harbour Reach – Mukilteo  
36       • Maltby – Snohomish County  
37       • Port of Everett/Navy Mill – Everett  
38       • Snohomish River Delta – Everett

1        **Local Centers**

2        Local centers are designated through local planning processes by each local jurisdiction. There is  
3        no countywide or regional designation process for local centers, but according to the Regional  
4        Centers Framework, local centers should “play an important role in the region and help define  
5        our community character, provide local gathering places, serve as community hubs, and are often  
6        appropriate places for additional growth and focal points for services.”<sup>34</sup> As local centers grow,  
7        they may become eligible for designation as a countywide or regional center if they meet the  
8        designation criteria identified in this document and the Regional Centers Framework.

---

<sup>34</sup> Regional Centers Framework, page 12. Available at  
[https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final\\_regional\\_centers\\_framework\\_march\\_22\\_version.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf)



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
1011 Plum Street SE • PO Box 42525 • Olympia, Washington 98504-2525 • (360) 725-4000  
[www.commerce.wa.gov](http://www.commerce.wa.gov)

10/13/2021

Ms. Debbie Eco  
Clerk of the Council  
Snohomish County  
3000 Rockefeller Ave.  
Everett, WA 98201

Sent Via Electronic Mail

Re: Snohomish County--2021-S-3256--Notice of Final Adoption

Dear Ms. Eco:

Thank you for sending the Washington State Department of Commerce the Notice of Final Adoption as required under [RCW 36.70A.106](#). We received your submittal with the following description.

**Adopted Ordinance 21-059 updating the county-wide planning policies.**

We received your submittal on 10/13/2021 and processed it with the Submittal ID 2021-S-3256. Please keep this letter as documentation that you have met this procedural requirement.

If you have any questions, please contact Growth Management Services at [reviewteam@commerce.wa.gov](mailto:reviewteam@commerce.wa.gov), or call Kirsten Larsen, (360) 280-0320.

Sincerely,

Review Team  
Growth Management Services

# Everett Daily Herald

## Affidavit of Publication

State of Washington }  
County of Snohomish } ss

Michael Gates being first duly sworn, upon oath deposes and says: that he/she is the legal representative of the Everett Daily Herald a daily newspaper. The said newspaper is a legal newspaper by order of the superior court in the county in which it is published and is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of the first publication of the Notice hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continually as a daily newspaper in Snohomish County, Washington and is and always has been printed in whole or part in the Everett Daily Herald and is of general circulation in said County, and is a legal newspaper, in accordance with the Chapter 99 of the Laws of 1921, as amended by Chapter 213, Laws of 1941, and approved as a legal newspaper by order of the Superior Court of Snohomish County, State of Washington, by order dated June 16, 1941, and that the annexed is a true copy of EDH940652 AMENDED ORD 21-059 as it was published in the regular and entire issue of said paper and not as a supplement form thereof for a period of 1 issue(s), such publication commencing on 10/20/2021 and ending on 10/20/2021 and that said newspaper was regularly distributed to its subscribers during all of said period.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
RECEIVED \_\_\_\_\_ TIME \_\_\_\_\_

OCT 25 2021

CC'D TO _____	CF _____	GOT _____
JLM _____	DIST 1 _____	DLE _____
JDG _____	DIST 2 _____	ALC _____
YSW _____	DIST 3 _____	ELL _____
HCS _____	DIST 4 _____	CMF _____
NAG _____	DIST 5 _____	

The amount of the fee for such publication is \$58.08.



Subscribed and sworn before me on this 20<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2021.

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Washington  
NOTICE OF ENACTMENT

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that on September 29, 2021, the Snohomish County Council adopted Amended Ordinance 21-059, which shall be effective October 22, 2021. A summary of the ordinance is as follows:

AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 21-059  
RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT: UPDATING THE  
COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR  
SNOHOMISH COUNTY

Sections 1, 2, and 3. Adopt recitals, findings, conclusions, and state that the Snohomish County Council bases its decision on the entire record and that any finding that should be a conclusion and any conclusion that should be a finding is adopted as such.

Section 4. Amends the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County consistent with the recommendation by the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee, except that proposed new Joint Planning CPP JP-3 (related to annexation) is removed as set forth in Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 21-059.

Section 5. Provides a standard severability and savings clause.

Section 6. Directs the Code Revisor to update Snohomish County Code (SCC) 30.10.050 pursuant to SCC 1.02.020(3)

State Environmental Policy Act. State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements with respect to this non-project action have been satisfied through the issuance of Addendum No. 1 to the VISION 2050 Final Environmental Impact Statement on September 13, 2021.

Where to Get Copies of the Amended Ordinance: Copies of the full ordinance and other documentation are available upon request by calling the Snohomish County Council Office at (425) 388-3494, 1-(800) 562-4367x3494, TDD (425) 877-8339 or by e-mailing [contact.council@snoco.org](mailto:contact.council@snoco.org).

Website Access: This ordinance can be accessed through the Council website at:

<http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/2134/County-Hearings-Calendar>.

DATED this 13th day of October, 2021.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Washington  
/s/ Debbie Eco, CMC  
Clerk of the Council

107010

Published: October 20, 2021.

EDH940652

Everett Daily Herald

Affidavit of Publication

State of Washington }  
County of Snohomish } ss

Michael Gates being first duly sworn, upon oath deposes and says: that he/she is the legal representative of the Everett Daily Herald a daily newspaper. The said newspaper is a legal newspaper by order of the superior court in the county in which it is published and is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of the first publication of the Notice hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continually as a daily newspaper in Snohomish County, Washington and is and always has been printed in whole or part in the Everett Daily Herald and is of general circulation in said County, and is a legal newspaper, in accordance with the Chapter 99 of the Laws of 1921, as amended by Chapter 213, Laws of 1941, and approved as a legal newspaper by order of the Superior Court of Snohomish County, State of Washington, by order dated June 16, 1941, and that the annexed is a true copy of EDH940651 GMA ACTION 21-059 as it was published in the regular and entire issue of said paper and not as a supplement form thereof for a period of 1 issue(s), such publication commencing on 10/20/2021 and ending on 10/20/2021 and that said newspaper was regularly distributed to its subscribers during all of said period.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
RECEIVED \_\_\_\_\_ TIME \_\_\_\_\_

OCT 25 2021

CC'D TO \_\_\_\_\_ CF \_\_\_\_\_ GOT \_\_\_\_\_  
JLM \_\_\_\_\_ DIST 1 \_\_\_\_\_ DLE \_\_\_\_\_  
JDG \_\_\_\_\_ DIST 2 \_\_\_\_\_ ALC \_\_\_\_\_  
YSW \_\_\_\_\_ DIST 3 \_\_\_\_\_ ELL \_\_\_\_\_  
HCS \_\_\_\_\_ DIST 4 \_\_\_\_\_  
NAG \_\_\_\_\_ DIST 5 \_\_\_\_\_

The amount of the fee for such publication is \$27.72.

Subscribed and sworn before me on this 20<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2021.



*Linda Phillips*

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON  
NOTICE OF ACTION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN under the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.290 that the Snohomish County Council took the action described in (1) below on September 29, 2021.

1. Description of agency action: Approval of Amended Ordinance No. 21-059.
2. Description of proposal: RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT; UPDATING THE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES (CPPS) FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY
3. Documentation is available electronically upon request by calling the Snohomish County Council Office at (425) 388-3494, 1-800-562-4367 x3494, TDD 1-800-877-8339 or e-mailing to [ContactCouncil@snooco.org](mailto:ContactCouncil@snooco.org)
4. Name of agency giving notice: Snohomish County Council
5. This notice is filed by: Debbie Eco  
Clerk of the Council

Date: October 13, 2021  
107010

Published: October 20, 2021

EDH940651

**EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDED**  
**HOUSEKEEPING AMENDMENT SHEET 1**  
**ORDINANCE NO. 21-059**

**Amendment Name:** Housekeeping amendments to Exhibit A

**Brief Description:** Housekeeping amendments to Exhibit A: Snohomish County Executive August 18, 2021, Recommended Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County. Amendments update Figure 2 and correct typographical errors, incorrect code citations and background information, and inconsistent terminology.

**Existing Ordinance Findings or Conclusions to Modify:**

On page 6, line 1, insert new finding as follows:

6. Housekeeping amendments have been made to the updated CPPs in Exhibit A to this ordinance. Amendments include correction of typographical errors, incorrect code citations and background information, and inconsistent terminology. In addition, Figure 2 is amended to reflect the headings and organization of the updated CPPs and to restore a footnote that was inadvertently omitted.


**Deletions or Modifications to the Existing Ordinance Exhibit A:**

On Exhibit A, page 3, line 3, after “towns,” delete “two” and insert “~~((two))~~ three”

On Exhibit A, page 5, lines 3-4, after “(WAC)” delete “specific” and insert “specifies”



On Exhibit A, page 6, delete Figure 2-Internal Flow of the Countywide Planning Policies and replace with:



\* = GMA Mandated Topic

Figure 2—Internal Flow of the Countywide Planning Policies

On Exhibit A, page 13, lines 18-19, after “supports the” delete “regional growth strategy,” and insert “~~((regional growth strategy,))~~ Regional Growth Strategy and”

On Exhibit A, page 13, lines 35-36, after “regional growth centers, regional” delete “manufacturing and industrial” and insert “~~((manufacturing and industrial))~~ manufacturing/industrial”

On Exhibit A, page 14, line 7, after “future,” delete “and” and insert “~~((and))~~”

On Exhibit A, page 14, line 8, after “region,” insert “and”

On Exhibit A, page 14, line 20, after “~~Council’s~~”)” delete “PSRCs” and insert “PSRC’s”

On Exhibit A, page 20, GF-7, in the fourth line of text, after “and no later” delete “then” and insert “than”

On Exhibit A, page 20, JP-1, in the third and fourth line of text, after “RCW” delete “20.70A.110” and insert “36.70A.110”

On Exhibit A, page 22, lines 27-28, after “~~((and compact urban communities))~~” insert “ ”

On Exhibit A, page 24, DP-2.e.5, after “mapping” delete “error.” and insert “~~((error.))~~ error.<sup>12</sup>” and insert as footnote 12 the text below and renumber subsequent footnotes accordingly

<sup>12</sup> The type of errors that this policy intends to correct are cases where the UGA line incorrectly bisects an existing building or parcel, where it inadvertently and incorrectly follows an arbitrary feature such as a section line, or where the boundary is on the wrong side of a right-of-way that is expected to be annexed by a city.

On Exhibit A, page 28, DP-9, in the third line of text, after “growth centers and” delete “manufacturing and industrial” and insert “~~((manufacturing and industrial))~~ manufacturing/industrial”

On Exhibit A, page 30, DP-22.a, in the ninth line of text, after “Policy” delete “JP-3” and insert “~~((JP-3))~~ JP-2”

On Exhibit A, page 30, DP-23, in the first line of text, after “under” delete “DP-20” and insert “~~((DP-20))~~ DP-22”

On Exhibit A, page 30, DP-24, in the third line of text, after “subject to” delete “DP-20” and insert “~~((DP-20))~~ DP-22”

On Exhibit A, page 31, line 22, after “counties,” delete “where ever” and insert “wherever”

On Exhibit A, page 32, DP-30.d, in the second line of text, after “etc.,” delete “and,” and insert “(~~and,~~)”

On Exhibit A, page 32, DP-30.e, in the second line of text, after “activities” delete “.” and insert “(~~.)~~; and”

On Exhibit A, page 34, DP-39, in the second line of text, after “intended” insert “to”

On Exhibit A, page 38, line 4, after “GMA and” delete “Vision 2040” and insert “(~~(Vision 2040))~~ VISION 2050”

On Exhibit A, page 38, line 6, after “Planning” insert “Policies”

On Exhibit A, page 38, HO-1.e, in the second line of text, after “in” delete “CPP HO-4” and insert “(~~(CPP HO-4))~~ CPP-HO-3”

On Exhibit A, page 45, ED-3, in the second line of text, after “growth centers,” delete “manufacturing and industrial” and insert “(~~(manufacturing and industrial))~~ manufacturing/industrial”

On Exhibit A, page 45, ED-4, in the fourth and fifth lines of text, after “regional growth centers,” delete “manufacturing industrial” and insert “(~~(manufacturing industrial))~~ manufacturing/industrial”

On Exhibit A, page 46, ED-7, in the first and second line of text, after “as a” delete “Manufacturing Industrial” and insert “(~~(Manufacturing Industrial))~~ Manufacturing/Industrial”

On Exhibit A, page 48, ED-17, in the second line of new text, after “Cascade Industrial Center as a” delete “Manufacturing Industrial” and insert “Manufacturing/Industrial”

On Exhibit A, page 49, line 4, after “shall” delete “as” and insert “(~~as~~) at”

On Exhibit A, page 65, line 10, after “sewers,” delete “are (~~allowed~~)” and insert “(~~(are allowed))~~”

On Exhibit A, page 65, line 22, after “(RCW” delete “23.70A.210(3)(C)” and insert “36.70A.210(3)(c)”

On Exhibit A, page 79, line 12, after “high-capacity transit (” delete “DP-8 and DP-18” and insert “CPP-DP-8 and CPP-DP-18”

On Exhibit A, page 79, line 13, after “balance (” delete “CPP-DP-7” and insert “CPP-DP-6”

On Exhibit A, page 79, line 14, after “time (” delete “CPP-DP-24” and insert “CPP-DP-26”

On Exhibit A, page 82, line 24, after “Steering” delete “Committed” and insert “Committee”

On Exhibit A, page 92, line 23, after “Chapter” delete “365-196-210(9)” and insert “(~~365-196-210(9)) 365-196-210(8)”~~

On Exhibit A, page 93, line 36, after “RCW” delete “36.70.A.110(2)” and insert “(~~36.70.A.110(2)) 36.70A.110(2)”~~

On Exhibit A, page 94, line 16, after “schools.” delete “[36.70.A.030(12)]” and insert “(~~36.70.A.030(12)) RCW 36.70A.030(17)”~~

On Exhibit A, page 97, lines 1-2, after “and two Regional” delete “Manufacturing Industrial” and insert “Manufacturing/Industrial”

On Exhibit A, page 97, line 7, after “Regional” delete “Manufacturing and Industrial” and insert “Manufacturing/Industrial”

**Council Disposition:** Mead Wright u approved Date: 09/29/21

## AMENDMENT SHEET 2

**Ordinance No. 21-059 (ECAF 2021-0661)**

**Amendment Name:** Growth Management Act goals in the Countywide Planning Policies

**Brief Description:** Updating the GMA goals as stated in the CPPs

**Affected Ordinance Section:** Ord. 21-059 adopting CPPs [Executive Version]

**Affecting:** Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County [Executive Version]

**Existing Ordinance Recitals, Findings, or Sections to Add, Delete, or Modify:****A. Ordinance Page 6, Lines 4-16, delete:**

1. The updated CPPs include amended narrative in the introductory chapter titled "Introduction to the Countywide Planning Policies." In addition to the changes described below, amendments to the existing narrative are intended to improve readability, update references as needed, and make minor corrections.
  - a. The "Regional Context" section is updated to incorporate the regional vision as found in VISION 2050, including updates to reflect the description of the plan, the updated "vision for 2050", the updated regional overarching goals, and the updated Regional Growth Strategy.
  - b. The Countywide Context section is updated to acknowledge the unknown aspects of the COVID-19 public health emergency, which occurred during the updated CPP development process.

**And insert:**

1. The updated CPPs include amended narrative in the introductory chapter titled "Introduction to the Countywide Planning Policies." In addition to the changes described below, amendments to the existing narrative are intended to improve readability, update references as needed, and make minor corrections.
  - a. The "State Context and Goals" section is updated to (1) incorporate a 14<sup>th</sup> goal of GMA related to shorelines of the state that is in a different section of GMA than the 13 goals currently listed in the CPPs and (2) revise Goal 4 (housing) to reflect amendments to this goal enacted by the state legislature in 2021.
  - b. The "Regional Context" section is updated to incorporate the regional vision as found in VISION 2050, including updates to reflect the description of the plan, the updated "vision for 2050", the updated regional overarching goals, and the updated Regional Growth Strategy.



## AMENDMENT SHEET 2a

**Ordinance No. 21-059 (ECAF 2021-0661)**

**Amendment Name:** Growth Management Act goals in the Countywide Planning Policies

**Brief Description:** Updating the GMA goals as stated in the CPPs

**Affected Ordinance Section:** Ordinance Section 1.D.1 and Exhibit A

**Affecting:** Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County [Executive Version]

**Existing Ordinance Recitals, Findings, or Sections to Add, Delete, or Modify:****A. Ordinance Page 6, Lines 4-16, delete Finding D.1:**

1. The updated CPPs include amended narrative in the introductory chapter titled "Introduction to the Countywide Planning Policies." In addition to the changes described below, amendments to the existing narrative are intended to improve readability, update references as needed, and make minor corrections.
  - a. The "Regional Context" section is updated to incorporate the regional vision as found in VISION 2050, including updates to reflect the description of the plan, the updated "vision for 2050", the updated regional overarching goals, and the updated Regional Growth Strategy.
  - b. The Countywide Context section is updated to acknowledge the unknown aspects of the COVID-19 public health emergency, which occurred during the updated CPP development process.

**And insert:**

1. The updated CPPs include amended narrative in the introductory chapter titled "Introduction to the Countywide Planning Policies." In addition to the changes described below, amendments to the existing narrative are intended to improve readability, update references as needed, and make minor corrections.
  - a. The "State Context and Goals" section is updated to (1) incorporate a 14<sup>th</sup> goal of GMA related to shorelines of the state that is in a different section of GMA than the 13 goals currently listed in the CPPs and (2) revise Goal 4 (housing) to reflect amendments to this goal adopted by the state legislature in 2021.
  - b. The "Regional Context" section is updated to incorporate the regional vision as found in VISION 2050, including updates to reflect the description of the plan, the updated "vision for 2050", the updated regional overarching goals, and the updated Regional Growth Strategy.
  - c. The Countywide Context section is updated to acknowledge the unknown aspects of the COVID-19 public health emergency, which occurred during the updated CPP development process.

**B. Exhibit A: Countywide Planning Policies page 8, lines 1-5, delete:**

State Context and Goals

The GMA contains a set of statewide planning goals in RCW 36.70A.020. These goals are intended to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans for those counties and cities planning under chapter 36.70A RCW. The numbering of the goals does not indicate priority (~~and the list comes from RCW 36.70A.020~~).

And Insert:

The GMA contains (~~a set of~~) statewide planning goals in RCW 36.70A.020 and RCW 36.70A.480. These goals are intended to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans for those counties and cities planning under chapter 36.70A RCW. The numbering of the goals does not indicate priority (~~and the list comes from RCW 36.70A.020~~).

**C. Exhibit A: Countywide Planning Policies page 8, lines 12-14, delete:**

**(4) Housing.** *Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.*

And Insert:

**(4) Housing.** (~~Encourage the availability of affordable~~) Plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

**D. Exhibit A: Countywide Planning Policies page 9, line 10, insert:**

**(14) For shorelines of the state, the goals and policies of the shoreline management act as set forth in RCW 90.58.020 are added as one of the goals of [GMA] without creating an order of priority among the fourteen goals.**

Council Disposition: Mead Wright u approved Date: 09/29/21



## AMENDMENT SHEET 3

EXHIBIT # 3.6.3

Ordinance No. 21-059 (ECAAF 2021-0661)

FILE ORD 21-059**Amendment Name:** UGA Expansion Criteria (DP-2) in the Countywide Planning Policies**Brief Description:** Retaining Current Policy DP-2.e.10 as stated in the CPPs**Affected Ordinance Section:** Ordinance Section 1.D and Appendix A**Affecting:** Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County [Exec Version]**Existing Ordinance Recitals, Findings, or Sections to Add, Delete, or Modify:****A. Ordinance Page 8, Lines 18-24, delete Finding D.3.c:**

- c. DP-2 provides standards for UGA expansion and is amended to replace the term “churches” with the term “places of worship” to ensure the policy is inclusive. Further changes specify that proposed UGA expansion that is in response to a declaration by the County Executive or County Council that there is a critical shortage of affordable housing should be reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing to low and moderate income households.

**And insert:**

- c. DP-2 provides standards for UGA expansion and is amended to replace the term “churches” with the term “places of worship” to ensure the policy is inclusive. No other changes in this policy are warranted at this time. This is in part because additional changes related to affordable housing recommended by SCT and the County Executive were not prepared in consideration of House Bill 1220 (HB 1220) that was enacted by the Washington State Legislature making changes to the GMA related to housing, effective on July 25, 2021. Further consideration of policies in DP-2 by SCT members should take place after local governments have had a chance to receive guidance from the Washington State Department of Commerce on implementation of HB 1220 and had time to review local comprehensive plans and countywide planning policies for consistency with this update to GMA. Additionally, the proposed narrowing of DP-2 did not consider the full effects of the Covid pandemic and increased working from home. The impacts of these related issues are still evolving, creating a situation where the County Council wished to retain its greatest flexibility in responding to new trends.

**B. Appendix A: Countywide Planning Policies page 25, at Policy DP-2.e.10, delete:**

10. 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 is uncurable in a timely manner by the implementation of reasonable measures or other instrumentality reasonably available to the jurisdiction, and the expansion is reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing for low and moderate income households, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

**And Insert:**

10. 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 is uncurable in a timely manner by the implementation of reasonable measures or other instrumentality reasonably available to the jurisdiction, and the expansion is reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing.

**Council Disposition:** No Action

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## AMENDMENT SHEET 3a

EXHIBIT # 3.6.3A

Ordinance No. 21-059 (ECAAF 2021-0661)

FILE ORD 21-059**Amendment Name:** UGA Expansion Criteria (DP-2) in the Countywide Planning Policies**Brief Description:** Retaining Current Policy DP-2.e.10 as stated in the CPPs**Affected Ordinance Section:** Ordinance Section 1.D.3.c and Exhibit A**Affecting:** Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County [Exec Version]**Existing Ordinance Recitals, Findings, or Sections to Add, Delete, or Modify:****A. Ordinance Page 8, Lines 18-24, delete Finding D.3.c:**

- c. DP-2 provides standards for UGA expansion and is amended to replace the term “churches” with the term “places of worship” to ensure the policy is inclusive. Further changes specify that proposed UGA expansion that is in response to a declaration by the County Executive or County Council that there is a critical shortage of affordable housing should be reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing to low and moderate income households.

**And insert:**

- c. DP-2 provides standards for UGA expansion and is amended to replace the term “churches” with the term “places of worship” to ensure the policy is inclusive. No other changes in this policy are warranted at this time. This is in part because additional changes related to affordable housing recommended by SCT and the County Executive were not prepared in consideration of House Bill 1220 (HB 1220) that was enacted by the Washington State Legislature making changes to the GMA related to housing, effective on July 25, 2021. Further consideration of policies in DP-2 by SCT members should take place after local governments have had a chance to receive guidance from the Washington State Department of Commerce on implementation of HB 1220 and had time to review local comprehensive plans and countywide planning policies for consistency with this update to GMA. Additionally, the proposed narrowing of DP-2 did not consider the full effects of the Covid pandemic and increased working from home. The impacts of these related issues are still evolving, creating a situation where the County Council wished to retain its greatest flexibility in responding to new trends.

**B. Exhibit A: Countywide Planning Policies page 25, at Policy DP-2.e.10, delete:**

10. 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 is uncurable in a timely manner by the implementation of reasonable measures or other instrumentality reasonably available to the jurisdiction, and the expansion is reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing for low and moderate income households, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

**And Insert:**

10. 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 is uncurable in a timely manner by the implementation of reasonable measures or other instrumentality reasonably available to the jurisdiction, and the expansion is reasonably calculated to provide affordable housing.

**Council Disposition:** Mead Wright u approvedDate: 09/29/21

AMENDMENT SHEET 4

Ordinance No. 21-059 (ECAF 2021-0661)

**Amendment Name:** School Siting (PS-21) in the Countywide Planning Policies

**Brief Description:** Revising Proposed Policy PS-21

**Affected Ordinance Section:** Ordinance Section 1.D and Appendix A

**Affecting:** Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County [SCT Version]

**Existing Ordinance Recitals, Findings, or Sections to Add, Delete, or Modify:**

**A. Ordinance Page 21, Lines 18-24, delete Finding D.8.I:**

- I. New policy PS-21 provides direction to jurisdictions to work collaboratively to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities and ensure that school siting is consistent with comprehensive plans and the Regional Growth Strategy. The new policy is consistent with MPP-PS-26.

And insert:

- I. New policy PS-21 provides direction to jurisdictions to work collaboratively to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities and ensure that school siting is consistent with comprehensive plans including adopted capital facilities plans for each school district. Regional policy MPP-PS-26 does not mention the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS); therefore, referencing the RGS in PS-21 is not necessary for consistency between the countywide and multi-county planning policies.

**B. Appendix A: Countywide Planning Policies page 68, at Policy PS-21, delete:**

PS-21 The County and cities should work collaboratively with school districts to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities to meet the current and future community needs, consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, the regional growth strategy, and the growth targets in Appendix B.

And Insert:

PS-21 The County and cities should work collaboratively with school districts to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities to meet the current and future community needs. Considerations should include recent growth, 6-year projections of population and student enrollment growth, adopted comprehensive plans including capital facilities plans, and the growth targets in Appendix B.

**Council Disposition:** No Action

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## AMENDMENT SHEET 4a

## Ordinance No. 21-059 (ECAF 2021-0661)

**Amendment Name:** School Siting (PS-21) in the Countywide Planning Policies

**Brief Description:** Revising Proposed Policy PS-21

**Affected Ordinance Section:** Ordinance Section 1.D.8.I and Exhibit A

**Affecting:** Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County [SCT Version]

**Existing Ordinance Recitals, Findings, or Sections to Add, Delete, or Modify:**

**A. Ordinance Page 21, Lines 26-30, delete Finding D.8.I:**

- I. New policy PS-21 provides direction to jurisdictions to work collaboratively to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities and ensure that school siting is consistent with comprehensive plans and the Regional Growth Strategy. The new policy is consistent with MPP-PS-26.

And insert:

- I. New policy PS-21 provides direction to jurisdictions to work collaboratively to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities and ensure that school siting is consistent with comprehensive plans including adopted capital facilities plans for each school district. Regional policy MPP-PS-26 does not mention the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS); therefore, referencing the RGS in PS-21 is not necessary for consistency between the countywide and multi-county planning policies.

**B. Exhibit A: Countywide Planning Policies page 68, at Policy PS-21, delete:**

PS-21 The County and cities should work collaboratively with school districts to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities to meet the current and future community needs, consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, the regional growth strategy, and the growth targets in Appendix B.

And Insert:

PS-21 The County and cities should work collaboratively with school districts to plan for the siting and improvement of school facilities to meet the current and future community needs. Considerations should include recent growth, 6-year projections of population and student enrollment growth, adopted comprehensive plans including capital facilities plans, and the growth targets in Appendix B.

**Council Disposition:** Mead Wright u approved

Date: 09/29/21