

# GMVUAC August 22, 2018

## Special Meeting Minutes

### **Meeting Called to Order - 6:59 pm**

#### **Members Present:**

Steve Hiester	Hank Haynes
Peter Rimbo	Rhys Sterling
Adam Sterling	Susan Harvey
Celia Parker	Warren Iverson
Paul Schultz	Mike Thompson
Luke Hansen	Lorraine Blacklock
Stephen Deutschman (Dutch)	

#### **Members Absent:**

Sue Neuner (proxy to Steve)  
LarKen Buchanan (no proxy)

#### **Public Comment Period:**

(Discussion on whether to allow public comment, agreed to hear comments but can only take action on subject of Special Meeting)

Adrian Medved: Issue with marijuana grow operation on 200th Avenue, King County (KC) issued a permit, we appealed it to a hearing examiner, they got the permit but the examiner conditioned it on the operator acquiring a clean air permit by August 1, 2018. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (CAA) posted it for public comment, the permit is vested for a 1,000 square foot greenhouse, but the proposal is for 11 13,500 square foot greenhouses, total 15,000 covered. KC Department of Permitting and Environmental Review conducted a site visit, KC informed the operator that KC code for a grow operation in RA zoning must be in a hard-sided greenhouse, etc. Jake Tracy is the project manager, I sent him an e-mail that the proposal will not meet the code, sent more e-mails, no response yet, but they can work to come into compliance. Can GMVUAC do something?

Peter: I recommend contacting Ty Peterson at DPER if no response soon. Try to set up a meeting, if nothing works, then we can try to contact.

Adrian Medved: The CAA public comment period closes September 7, but the operator would have had 4 years to comply otherwise.

Peter: Please keep in contact with me.

## **Council Business:**

### **King County Comprehensive/Subarea Plan Update: Peter Rimbos**

Lorraine moved to adopt Peter's proposed comments without discussion (not seconded)

Peter: The reason for this meeting is that in early spring KC Executive submitted a proposal to change the cycle for reviewing the comprehensive plan. There's now a major update every 4 years with minor updates every year, proposal switches to an 8-year cycle and would reorder how subarea plans are done, Community Service Areas (CSAs) as well. I talked to Ivan Miller with the Executive's office to set up a meeting last Tuesday, 8 GMVUAC members and many from Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council (UAC) attended, Ivan went through the comparison matrix of the proposed Striker from KC Councilwoman Kathy Lambert's Planning, Rural Service and Environment (PRE) Committee. No staff could attend, but Ivan answered our questions. We decided to put our comments together, next I can modify, send it out to other UACs, and try to get it to the PRE Committee in a week. Their next meeting is September 4. We would be trying to provide comments for the whole rural area, other UACs might want to make tweaks, so I would need permission from the council to incorporate those, similar to our other combined efforts in the past.

Steve: This type of review should be higher priority as it sets Growth Management policies for the whole area.

Peter: Comprehensive Plan reviews are high priority, but no policies per se in this, mostly just timing and priorities.

Susan: It's diluting our role in process.

Rhys: This is in response to the state Growth Management Act (GMA) being changed to an 8-year cycle.

Peter: But municipalities can do it more frequently, other cities do it every 6 years. The docket process is not changing.

Rhys: Also please identify where other UACs agree.

Peter: Four Creeks' comments mostly have to do with subarea planning, Hollywood Hills Association's comments are about agricultural areas and urban growth districts, and Green Valley/Lake Holm Association and Friends of Bass Lake will probably agree with us.

Celia: Question about item number 3, Striker would allow the carryover of outstanding issues, why don't we want that?

Susan: Could have something not carried forward and lose track of the issue.

Peter: The Executive's proposal and the Striker both agree on including midpoint review at the 4-year mark, same as annual review plus a little more, would look at critical issues, I'm concerned about midpoint issues.

Steve: If something is shot down, then it's not outstanding.

Dutch: Loopholes in process? Might let things die in committee, like the asphalt plant moratorium?

Steve: Striker wants to change midpoint reviews to 2 years, if not resolved then cannot carry over?

Peter: It's an 18-month process now, the annual review for docket items has a time limit, but I don't know how long. All agree on items 1 and 2? (Yes) Item 3 discussion, any objections? (No) Item 4, Striker wants to add consideration of urban growth area (UGA) amendments at midpoint, we don't want to open the door to allow changes in.

Eddie Jorgensen (Four Creeks UAC): Striker 2-year midpoint or the Executive 4-year midpoint? (2 year)

Mike: Under your comments, would UGA update be every 4 years? Don't agree, too much going on with growth to not allow updates.

Peter: UGA updates would only be every 8 years, many potential annexation areas (PAAs) within UGA, also no major reason to move UGA boundaries, this is a problem in Woodinville with wine tasting, etc.

Warren: PAAs wouldn't have to wait 8 years.

Mike: If only 8 years, then cities might attempt to extend UGA boundaries farther just in case?

Peter: Not much of an issue, few cities want to annex PAAs, no tax benefit.

Eddie Jorgensen: UGAs are shrinking not expanding? Problems can be fixed with docket items, such as properties split in half along UGA lines.

Peter: If it's a minor map change, it should be allowed in the Docket.

Susan: Not in favor of the 8 year cycle, it's a long time, must beef up subarea plans first, cities take away land bit by bit, need to define plans now.

Peter: Subarea plans are not affected by the 8-year cycle, for comprehensive plan only, PAAs are urban areas just not yet incorporated.

Steve: UGA boundaries are already drawn, there are no PAAs outside of UGAs.

Hank: Renton tried to annex Maple Valley Heights twice in the 1990s.

Peter: The first comprehensive plan was in 1994, that effort was shut down. Anybody disagree? (No) Item 5, Striker would nix data requirements, but we want data. Nobody disagrees? One UAC included words on item 3, also added some under item 7.

Rhys: Just want our comments to be consistent with the views of other UACs.

Peter: Item 7 on the Striker, we don't want to allow carryover, we agree with manageable work plans, updating subarea plans to address critical needs, but only so long as notice is given. Just disagree with carryover.

Warren: Would also like local area meetings.

Susan: Whose emergent needs? Developers? Who decides?

Peter: Our comment replaces emergent with "critical" and defines it. Any opposed? (No) Item 8, changing transmittal time, all agree. Item 9, Docket items, now submitted on June 30, must be acted on by December, we make comments on those. All agree. Would give 1 month less time to respond for the Executive, but no problem. Objections? (No). We will set up a Docket item page on our website. Item 10, all agree. Item 11, adjusting dates, administrative, all agree. Item 14, Striker adds 3 bullets, we agree with the Executive's proposal, don't agree with allowing substantive changes on interim updates, agree with

- bullet 2, local services, and agree with bullet 3, but reducing redundancies must not get rid of explanatory text that is helpful for us.
- Susan: I want to ensure transparency in the new Local Services Department.
- Peter: Now the comprehensive plan goes through the Executive, but with the new department, I don't want there to be another layer, especially if that's DPER. The new department should not run it, but only be involved in major updates.
- Mike: Add "only" to modify major updates.
- Susan: Although this is not the final version, this is just Kathy's version of the Striker, others in the Committee could change the language.
- Peter: The PRE Committee will discuss, other Committee members can change, but we must submit something now.
- Rhys: They can change something on the spot with the Striker. Our comments will only go to the Committee, we will only know in October what will be going to the full KC Council.
- Peter: Items 15, 16, 17 all agree. Item 18, subarea plans, got comments from Gwendolyn High with Citizens Alliance to Reach Out and Engage (CARE), the Renton Highlands PAA folks.
- Steve: Same comment as item 7, change "emergent" to "critical."
- Peter: And add local meetings. Item 22, subarea plans in the comprehensive plan, they first acted on the Vashon Island plan, Ivan Miller said it was lot of work for 1 subarea plan, this item sets up the schedule, some must wait until 2026. The Executive proposal adds 2 subareas, total of 11 potential subarea plans. Our comment, based on CARE's concerns, is that PAAs must go first before they get gobbled up by cities, our list puts PAAs next, CSAs after, in a random order. Other comments from UACs are included, could propose to have PAAs with higher concerns address subarea plans first.
- Susan: Would disagree with item 18, subarea plans should be pulled out of the comprehensive plan, should be separate, all must be dealt with in the next 2-3 years, we have a right to participate, decisions are being made now in favor of developments, no power or representation, they're not dealing with us on key issues.
- Peter: Subarea plans are not part of the comprehensive plan. I also propose getting rid of my suggested list. The schedule was set in the 2016 major update, but we should just propose that PAAs be prioritized, but no list. Cities decide many issues, having a subarea plan helps planning, but cannot counter cities. The problems are real, but our system does not address them.
- Rhys: We should take out prioritization, I like the idea of a citizens group. The order of priority must be based on consistent, relevant criteria, county must have sufficient resources to do, need citizen input.
- Peter: My understanding is that there is citizen input now, but we can add language about more involvement, can ask about criteria for ordering.
- Eddie Jorgensen: North Highline is where White Center is, it was moved up on the priority list under social justice criteria.
- Rhys: Just use language you proposed.

Peter: Item 23, I will take out the list, then add language about criteria. I now disagree with my own comments.

Mike: All subarea plans should be finished by the next major update in 2023.

Rhys: They should be kept together, make a suggestion and just tell them to do it.

Peter: We can suggest a minimum of 2 per year, all by 2024.

Warren: Vashon took a long time and failed, no way they'll accomplish all in 6 years.

Peter: Vashon failed, but they had a new planner, special needs as an island, and other unforeseen problems, also worked a lot with the community. Item 26 says that DPER is the lead on subarea planning, DPER is in charge but works with the Executive's office, I suggest agreeing with the bullet points but change that the Executive is in a dual role with DPER.

Mike: Executive should be in charge, DPER in subordinate role.

Susan: Wondering about the new Local Services Department and DPER. Are they the same in this Striker?

Peter: DPER probably means Local Services as well, suggest changing from dual role to having the Executive's Office of Performance, Strategy, and Budget (PSB) be in charge, but we agree with the other bullets in the Striker. Item 27, we agree with the Striker, but CARE has several comments.

Rhys: Where should the new subarea planners be added? DPER or PSB?

Paul: Should be in PSB.

Steve: Should just be consistent with our other comments.

Peter: Other UAC comments suggest adding more contract people at the beginning to start work on the subarea plans. Item 29, would change to be consistent with our comments on items 26, 27, and 29. Item 31, midpoint, change to be consistent with earlier comments, same for items 32-34. Next is item 36.

Susan: Which is a demonstration project. What is it?

Peter: We're not commenting on policies, just the process cycles at this point.

Rhys: Earmark that, we can discuss it later.

Peter: We disagree with the dates, and we will include the comments added by other UACs. Objections? (No) Item 40, same as item 36. Item 41, already discussed dates. Item 43, dates again, same as items 44 and 45. Item 46 is about adding industrial zoning changes, we oppose. Item 47 we disagree with because of the 2-year update, bullet point on orphan roads was inserted by the PAAs. Orphan roads are when cities don't want to take care of the roads near their boundaries. Items 48 and 49 also involve date changes.

Edie Jorgensen: Orphan roads are usually not resolved, many times roads are left with the county, Boundary Review Board has the authority to take care of them, but not always exercised. We should direct them to resolve those issues.

Peter: We agree with the Striker, except for the 2-year part. Done. Next we need to vote to give me license to make minor changes. No time for another meeting, I should get comments from other UACs, but we can't vote by e-mail.

Rhys: Would it be a joint UAC letter? (Yes)

Peter moved for authority to make changes to the comment matrix if within basic GMVUAC policy and consistent with the comments approved tonight, Hank seconded.

**Motion passed**

Peter: What if a UAC provides comments different from our positions? We can't vote again.

Rhys: Just include both positions on the final matrix.

Adam: No vote on submission? Or will Peter just keep the comments on his computer?

Peter moved to clean up the comment matrix according to the feedback received, write a cover letter, and submit both to the proper individuals by next Thursday, Hank seconded.

**Motion passed**

Chair adjourned.

**Meeting Adjourned - 9:07 pm**