

**Evaluation Matrix
GMPC Member Proposed Amendments**

Topic	Sponsor	Amendment	Effect (per Sponsor)	Comments/Concerns	Rural Area UAC/UAA/ Org Recommendations
Framework	Lambert	NEW POLICY: “FW-X Support fiscal sustainability of Rural Areas. Rural Areas provide an overall benefit for all residents of King County and strategies to fund infrastructure and services in Rural Areas may be needed to support a defined rural level-of-service.”	“This new policy would acknowledge that the Rural Area provides benefits to both urban and rural residents of King County and that investments may be needed to support infrastructure and services in the Rural Area in order to continue to provide those benefits.”	Urban services should not be sited in the Rural Area. There is no desire for “strategies to fund infrastructure and services in Rural Areas.” Finally, we do not recognize what is meant by a “defined rural level-of-service.”	<u>REJECT</u>
Environment	Lambert	REPLACE WITH: “ EN-6 Locate development in a manner that minimizes impacts to natural features. Promote the use of innovative environmentally sensitive development practices, including design, materials, construction, and on-going maintenance.”	“This amendment would replace Proposed Countywide Planning Policy EN-6 with the language used Multicounty Planning Policy-EN-6 in VISION 2050. This amendment would help to clarify the meaning of environmentally sensitive development practices in this policy context.” [THIS IS A TYPO, IT’S ACTUALLY MPP EN-5]	The policy EN-6 that Ms. Lambert wants to change states: “ EN-6 Locate development and <u>supportive infrastructure</u> in a manner that minimizes impacts to natural features through the use of environmentally sensitive development practices that take into account design, materials, construction, and ongoing maintenance.” She proposes removing what we have underlined above, as well as adding “(p)romote” instead of actually requiring such practices as is implied in policy EN-6.	<u>REJECT</u>

**Evaluation Matrix
GMPC Member Proposed Amendments**

Topic	Sponsor	Amendment	Effect (per Sponsor)	Comments/Concerns	Rural Area UAC/UAA/ Org Recommendations
Public Facilities	Lambert	ADD TO PF-20 : “Site new schools, institutions, and other community facilities and services that serve rural residents in a manner that considers equity, reduces congestion and vehicle miles traveled, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions for residents in the rural area.”	“Add language to PF-20 that school siting should also consider climate change goals in a manner consistent with other CPPs.”	This is a backdoor way to site new schools in the Rural Area that primarily serve urban students under the guise of trying to meet climate change goals. However, siting new schools in the Rural Area actually would have more of an impact on climate change than would the few additional miles driven by rural students traveling to and from urban-sited schools. We again call for the following VISION 2050 policy be added here or PF-21): “MPP-PS-5 Do not provide urban services in rural areas. Design services for limited access when they are needed to solve isolated health and sanitation problems, so as not to increase the development potential of the surrounding rural area.”	<u>REJECT</u>
Rural Area (Development Patterns)	Larson	ADD TO: “ DP-11 When Master Planned Developments are permitted in Cities adjacent to 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 mitigate.”	“The beneficial clarifying effect of this amendment is twofold. (1) Impacts to rural areas caused by master-planned growth within all adjacent UGA’s could be addressed and mitigated and (2) All cities adjacent to (and not just islands within) rural areas would be required to make similar and equitable contributions.”	We proposed this several times in our submitted detailed comments throughout the process and are happy to see Snoqualmie Mayor Larson agrees.	<u>STRONGLY SUPPORT</u>

**Evaluation Matrix
GMPC Member Proposed Amendments**

Topic	Sponsor	Amendment	Effect (per Sponsor)	Comments/Concerns	Rural Area UAC/UAA/ Org Recommendations
	Lambert	CHANGES DP-17 : <i>“Allow expansion of the Urban Growth Area only if at least one of the following criteria is met:...”</i> by removing the third requirement that dedicated permanent Open Space be <i>“onsite.”</i>	<i>“This amendment would retain the existing language in Policies DP-17 and DP-18 related to Four to One program Urban Growth Area expansions. This is consistent with the adopted King County Comprehensive Plan and King County Code. This amendment retains the technical changes made in the 2021 Countywide Planning Policy update.”</i>	We do not agree with this rationale. The <i>“onsite”</i> requirement for dedicated Open Space should be retained.	<u>REJECT</u>
	Lambert	MULTIPLE CHANGES TO DP-18 .	<i>“This amendment would retain the existing language in Policies DP-17 and DP-18 related to Four to One program Urban Growth Area expansions. This is consistent with the adopted King County Comprehensive Plan and King County Code. This amendment retains the technical changes made in the 2021 Countywide Planning Policy update.”</i>	We disagree with <u>all</u> the proposed changes in subparagraphs a) thru d) here, which include infrastructure in the Rural Area, pre-annexation development, non-contiguous to the UGA parcels, etc.	<u>REJECT</u>

**Evaluation Matrix
GMPC Member Proposed Amendments**

Topic	Sponsor	Amendment	Effect (per Sponsor)	Comments/Concerns	Rural Area UAC/UAA/ Org Recommendations
	Lambert	ADD TO DP-17 b) 1) : <i>"In some cases, such as for provision of affordable housing or for protection of properties eligible as high conservation value properties, adjustments to the four-to-one ratio may be approved;..."</i>	<i>"This amendment would allow for the four-to-one ratio to be adjusted for the provision of affordable housing or preservation of high conservation value properties." Citation: King County Charter, Section 897 High Conservation Value Properties.</i>	The proposed amendment is unwise as it would weaken the 4:1 program by allowing multiple adjustments. Further, the citing of the KC Charter implies it supports such a change, but actually it only defines High Conservation Value Properties and says nothing about the 4:1 Program.	<u>REJECT</u>

**Evaluation Matrix
GMPC Member Proposed Amendments**

Topic	Sponsor	Amendment	Effect (per Sponsor)	Comments/Concerns	Rural Area UAC/UAA/ Org Recommendations
<p>Growth Targets (Development Patterns)</p>	<p>Mclrvin</p>	<p>ADD TO DP-13 a new paragraph d): <i>“Ensure each jurisdiction accepts growth targets that are commensurate with their role in the Regional Growth Strategy; Specifically, that Metro, Core, and High-Capacity Transit Communities accept growth targets that at a minimum accommodate the lowest end of the range provided by the County, and that Cities, Towns, and Urban Unincorporated Areas accept growth targets that do not exceed the maximum of the highest end of the range provided by the County during the countywide process;”</i></p>	<p><i>“The proposed amendment would work to provide parameters for setting growth targets. The ranges provided by the County are based on data and facts. For many jurisdictions the low and high ends of their ranges were very different, for others there was not as much difference. The process to allocate targets across geographies leaves room for each jurisdiction to identify what growth they are prepared to plan for, but the proposed amendment essentially provides sideboards to the process. Cites which have Growth Centers and thus are provided preference for federal transportation funding should be accepting at least the minimum growth target. High Capacity Transit Communities will be receiving similar significant transit investments. On the flip side of this amendment Cities and Towns should not exceed their high range population allocation number.”</i></p>	<p>This is in direct agreement with the detailed comments we provided on Growth Targets.</p>	<p><u>STRONGLY SUPPORT</u></p>

**Evaluation Matrix
GMPC Member Proposed Amendments**

Topic	Sponsor	Amendment	Effect (per Sponsor)	Comments/Concerns	Rural Area UAC/UAA/ Org Recommendations
Housing and Capital Investments	Lambert	For Policy H-3 ADDS: "public" in front of "capital investments"; For Policy H-19 ADDS: "public" in front of "land disposition policies" and in front of "capital investments"; ADDS: "large-scale" in front of "private investments" and REMOVES "infrastructure" from "private investments."	<i>"This amendment would clarify the actors in and targets of the proposed housing policies..."</i>	It appears this calls for there to be <u>no</u> requirements—including infrastructure—on private investment, only on public investment. <u>If so</u> , then the Public pays for everything.	<u>REJECT</u>