



Snohomish County Council

Committee: Planning & Community Development **Analyst:** Ryan Countryman
ECAFs: 2022-0200, 0198, 0206, 0207, 0205, 0208, and 0209 **Date:** March 1, 2022
Proposal: Proposed Motions 22-090, -092, -095, -096, -097, -098, and -099

Consideration

Proposed Motions 22-090, -092, -095, -096, -097, -098, and -099 all relate to the next periodic update of Snohomish County's Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan (GMACP), a project called the 2024 Update. Planning and Development Services (PDS) is the lead department for the 2024 Update. The proposed motions would refer formal requests from the County Council to PDS directing the department to study specific changes to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), official zoning map, and policies in the General Policy Plan (GPP) during the alternatives analysis for the 2024 Update. The proposed motions are thus "referral motions" because they do not directly enact anything.

Background and Analysis

Direction to study something does not assure adoption. It only means that PDS will study the potential impacts of the ideas contained in the motions and make recommendations back to the County Council in 2024 once the impact analysis is complete. This impact analysis will result in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 2024 Update. Publication of a Draft EIS (DEIS) studying three alternatives will be a major milestone along the way.

- Alternative 1 will only make baseline changes required in the plan and minor housekeeping updates. It would include the lowest overall growth projections, keeping within the amount possible under current plans.
- Alternative 2 will closely match unincorporated Snohomish County's part of the Vision 2050 plan adopted by Puget Sound Regional Council. It would focus on changes inside the current Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) to accommodate the higher levels of growth expected in Vision 2050.
- Alternative 3 will include most of the changes in Alternative 2 along with additional changes such as UGA expansions that might be necessary to accommodate a higher level of growth than studied in Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 will include study of the map and policy changes in the referral motions. PDS may also study some parts of the referral motions in Alternative 2.

After publication the DEIS, there will be a formal comment period where the public, outside agencies and other parties provide input to PDS on the alternatives. This input will likely include some entirely new ideas and ways to combine parts of the three alternatives. PDS will then prepare a Preferred Alternative. This will likely be a hybrid of the alternatives but may also include some new ideas. The Snohomish County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the Preferred Alternative and forward its recommendation to the County Council upon completion of the hearing. At the same time, the Executive branch will either recommend that the County Council approve the Planning Commission's recommendation, or the Executive might provide its own separate Executive Recommendation to the County Council.

PDS will have prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) by the time that the Planning Commission recommendation and potential Executive Recommendation make it to the County Council. Council will then consider the recommendation(s) and hold a public hearing. Council can make amendments to the recommendations if the amendments are within the scope of the FEIS.¹

The referral motions direct PDS to study the proposed policies and map changes through the process described above. The resulting FEIS and recommendations will then provide the County Council with the necessary background to make informed decisions about the specific ideas proposed in the motions. This will happen the Council considers the total package of map and policy amendments as part of adopting the new plan and FEIS in 2024.

Referral motions are not the only source of input to PDS on what potential changes the alternatives need to study. The docketing process allows agencies and individuals to propose map and policy amendments for consideration in the alternatives as well. On March 2, 2022, the County Council will continue its hearing to decide which docket requests to place on the final docket for study in the alternatives. That hearing – for Motion 21-147, approving the Final List of Amendments to the GMACP And GMA Development Regulations for Docket XXI – has 24 individual docket applications proposing map amendments. Ten (10) of these overlap with amendments proposed by referral motions. For processing reasons, ***it is not recommended that overlapping docket and referral motions both proceed***. Instead, either the docket application or the referral motion should move forward. If a docket application proposes a map amendment that is part of an amendment in a referral motion that the County Council would like to see studied, then Council could pass the referral motion instead of including that docket proposal on the final list of amendments for the docket. This would mean that EIS studies the same changes, but as part of a larger County Council initiative instead of as a docket proposal. Another option would be for the Council to move a docket application forward and then to direct staff to revise the affected referral motion before acting on the referral motions.

Four of the referral motions include map amendments that overlap with docket applications under consideration on March 2. The following table summarizes these overlaps.

¹ The County Council may also adopt changes outside the scope of the FEIS, but to do this would first require preparation of a Supplemental EIS.

Referral Motion	Affected Area	Docket Application(s)	Description of Overlap
22-090	Southwest County UGA	SW8, SW9, SW13, SW14, SW15 and SW16	Motion 22-090 proposes to expand the UGA eastward, generally using a utility corridor as the new boundary. This boundary includes all of SW8, SW9, SW14, SW15 and SW16 and properties not under consideration in the docket. The boundary would include only the west part of SW13. All docket proposals here are requested by private parties.
22-092	Darrington UGA	DR1	Motion 22-092 includes part of the northward UGA expansion requested by the Town of Darrington.
22-095	Lake Stevens UGA	LS3 and LS4	Motion 22-095 overlaps with two UGA expansions proposed by the City of Lake Stevens. The motion includes part of the proposed expansion near Sunnyside Blvd in LS3 and part of the proposed expansion along SR-9 in LS4.
22-098	Maltby UGA	MALT1	Motion 22-098 would expand the UGA to include all of the MALT1 expansion proposed by Vangemert plus an adjacent site owned by Northshore School District. The motion also includes additional expansions in other parts of Maltby that are not under consideration in the docket.

Current Proposal

Summary and Scope: The referral motions would direct PDS to study certain FLUM, zoning and policy proposals in the 2024 Update environmental analysis and request recommendations back to the County Council from PDS and the Planning Commission.

Fiscal Implications: None

Deadlines: No mandated deadlines; however, the March 2 continuation of the docket hearing is a process and timing consideration.

Handling: Normal

Executive Recommendations: To be determined in 2024 after completion of analysis of the 2024 Update alternatives.

Request: Staff reports for individual referral motions request movement to General Legislative Session (GLS) for consideration. This staff report addresses a broader process question and requests discussion during Planning and Community Development Committee about how the County Council would like to sequence actions on the referral motions relative to the March 2 continuation of the docket hearing. This may affect when consideration of the referral motions occurs at GLS.