

CPP Policy Concerns

Development Patterns—DP

1. We made this observation:

Although MPP-DP-34's "avoid(ing) new fully contained communities outside of the designated urban growth area" is prudent and the basis for the new policy, it must be recognized that cities on the urban fringe, which approve such massive master-planned developments (e.g., Black Diamond and Covington), cause very similar problems, especially on poorly maintained and continually underfunded County road networks.

Apparently, in response, this new Policy was added:

DP-11 When MPDs are permitted in Cities in the Rural Area, collaborate with King County during the development process so that impacts on surrounding Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands are avoided and mitigated.

While this is a good first step, it does not directly respond to our concern about cities on the urban fringe. We recommend the following addition (underlined) to the new DP-11 policy:

DP-11 When MPDs are permitted in Cities along the urban fringe of the UGA or in the Rural Area, collaborate with King County during the development process so that impacts on surrounding Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands are avoided and mitigated.

2. In DP-12c, our suggested addition of "roads" was left out. This key part of our infrastructure should be added.

3. Our following recommended additions to DP-47 were left out. These should be added.

d) Prohibit upzones; consider downzones if property owner requested. Establish clear criteria for all rural zoning categories to protect rural character and control rural development.

e) Reduce subsidies for rural development by adopting impact fees for transportation, fire facilities, and other public facilities that recover capital costs of serving development.

4. Our following recommended addition to DP-62 was left out (it was based on the guiding MPP-DP-44, which does address future residential uses). This should be added.

Prohibit redesignations of resource lands (forest, agriculture, mineral) to rural residential uses.

5. We recommended a new policy (at the end of the DP policies) consistent with a MPP-DP-52. This should be added.

DP-XX Develop, implement, and evaluate concurrency programs and methods that fully consider growth targets, service needs, and level-of-service standards. Focus level-of-service standards for transportation on the movement of people and goods instead of only on the movement of vehicles.

Transportation—T

1. Our following recommended addition on road capacity expansion in the Rural Area to T-2 was left out (it was meant to replace the 2nd sentence starting with "Where increased roadway expansion..."). This should be added.

Consistent with policies PF-1 and PF-X1 and the principle of concurrency in transportation planning at a regional level, coordinate the rate of future growth in small suburban cities to be concurrent with the provision of adequate capacity on state highways to serve the city-to-city traffic flows that follow.

2. Our following recommended new policy on Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT) was left out. This should be added.

T-8X Provide maximal support to climate change goals as well as better serve growth management purposes by replacing all existing impact mitigation and concurrency management standards and regulations with a new system based on vehicle-miles-of-travel (VMT) as the common basis for measurement of development impacts, mitigation, and multi-modal system capacity.

3. Our following recommended addition on enforcement of consistency of plans among adjacent jurisdictions (req'd by GMA) at the end of T-14 was left out. This should be added.

CPP Policy Concerns

with enforcement of continuity and consistency of plans among adjacent jurisdictions as required by GMA. Require consistency of city and county plans for routes connecting both areas.

Public Facilities—PF

1. Our following recommended *new* policy, consistent with **MPP-PS-5** was left out. **This should be added.**

PS-XX Do not provide urban services in rural areas. Design services for limited access when they are needed to solve isolated health & sanitation problems, so as not to increase development potential of the surrounding rural area.

2. Our following recommended addition to the end of **PF-23**, consistent with **MPP-PS-30** was left out. **This should be added.**

Do not locate regional capital facilities outside the urban growth area unless it is demonstrated that a non-urban site is the most appropriate location for such a facility.