4:1 Program Review—Joint Team of KC RA Organizations [*]—Recommendations

Category	Requirement	Existing Policy	IJT Recommended Policy	Joint Team Recommendations—Comments / Rationale
Administrative	Applied for via a set process.	Site-specific map amendment process through a Hearing Examiner.	Executive/ Council Process.	We support the IJT recommendation, because the IJT is most familiar with the process.
Minimum Density	New urban area must meet a minimum density.	4 units per acre.	8 units per acres.	We support the IJT recommendation, as it increases housing units and may make the new urban housing more affordable.
Cascading 4:1s	Silent.	Not mentioned.	Disallow past or future 4:1 projects to cascade or leapfrog on one another.	We support the IJT recommendation, a there are areas where the urban portion of a 4:1 is not fully buffered, so another 4:1 should not be allowed to cascade—4:1 is intended to be a permanent line between urban and rural.
UGA Boundary Baseline	4:1s must be adjacent to and buffer the UGA.	4:1s must be alongside the 1994 original UGA area boundary.	No recommendation.	We recommend using the combined 1994 UGB and the JPA UGB where it exists. The JPA UGB is the UGB that Snoqualmie, North Bend and Black Diamond recognize/use and the 1994 UGB in these cities no longer has any meaning. Not using the JPA UGB would mean no opportunity for 4:1 to buffer the UGA in portions of these cities. We do not support using the current UGA, as it includes 4:1 projects, negotiated 4:1s, and miscellaneous places like road abandonments where the boundary is neither the 1994 or JPA UGA.
Non- Residential Use of 4:1	Non- Residential use of 4:1 is not allowed.	Non-Residential use of 4:1 is not allowed.	Continue to disallow Non-Residential use in 4:1 projects.	We support the IJT recommendation. The majority of approved 4:1 projects have been less than 30 housing units, which could not support commercial. By definition, 4:1 is on the <i>outside</i> of the UGA and Commercial, Institutional, and Industrial are trip generators that would draw traffic out to the edge of the UGA.
Location of Open Space	Open Space must be adjacent to and buffer the new Urban and require Fee Simple dedication.	Unclear since several 4:1 projects have been approved with off site open space, TDRs and other variations.	Require at least half the open space to be located on the site. Require the new urban be fully buffered from surrounding rural, resource, and sensitive lands. Allow remaining open space to be off-site but require it be located adjacent to a portion of the UGB.	We support the IJT recommendation, as it provides for completely buffering the new urban with dedicated open space and a second option, if the full 4:1 is not available adjacent to the new urban, as this would buffer other unbuffered parts of the UGA.

4:1 Program Review—Joint Team of KC RA Organizations [*]—Recommendations

Category	Requirement	Existing Policy	IJT Recommended Policy	Joint Team Recommendations—Comments / Rationale
Type of Open Space Dedication	Open Space requires fee simple dedication.	Unclear since some 4:1 projects have been approved with TDRs as a variation.	Allow the use of TDR's to meet the open space off-site requirement but require they be adjacent to the UGA boundary. Determine which option to use through the tri-party agreement process.	We have concerns here. This does <u>not</u> provide the public with a fee simple dedication of Open Space. It does remove urban potential and buffer the UGB without County ownership and maintenance requirements. We are very cautious about use of TDRs due to the outcome of the Reserve at Covington project which we do <u>not</u> support.
Annexation	Annexation is not required. (Note: 1/3 of the approved and built 4:1s have not been annexed).	When a 4:1 is adjacent to a City, the City must add it to their POA as a condition of approval.	None at this point.	We support either solution—allow without annexation to get more land protected or wait for annexation because the County doesn't want more urban unincorporated areas. With 65% of the UGA already buffered, completing the 35% is challenging. Much of that adjoins Fairwood (unincorporated urban) whose UGB is not adjacent to a city. Thus, any 4:1 projects would be unlikely if annexation is required, so the line would remain unbuffered.
SB 5593 Exchanges			None at this point.	We strongly do <u>not</u> support such Exchanges. King County already has 65% of the UGB buffered through 4:1s, JPAs based on 4:1 principles and other dedicated Open Space. We have the 4:1 program to accommodate other changes to the UGB and the 5593 exchanges risk a jagged UGB with no buffering.
Flexibility		Some flexibility has been applied in many approved 4:1s.	None at this point.	In general, flexibility is a problem. Many of the approved 4:1s have flexible conditions like the Reserve at Covington allowing all TDRs for the Open Space—which we do <u>not</u> support. The overriding goal must continue to be to fully meet the scope and intent of the 4:1 program should some modification be considered on some projects to be determined during the review process. We are very cautious about the use of flexibility, but recognize it sometimes may be necessary to achieve a good project. However, any approved flexibility options should be equal to or greater than direct on-site 4:1 in conservation and UGA buffer enhancement

[*] Joint Team of King County Rural Area UACs / UAAs/ Organizations: Enumclaw Plateau Community Association (EPCA), Friends of Sammamish Valley (FoSV), Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council (GMVUAC), Green River Coalition (GRC), Green Valley/Lake Holm Association (GV/LHA), Hollywood Hill Association (HHA), Soos Creek Area Response (SCAR), Upper Bear Creek Unincorporated Area Council (UBCUAC), and Vashon-Maury Island Community Council (VMCC) and Rural Area Technical Consultants: Mike Birdsall (Transportation), Ken Konigsmark (Growth Management Act), Terry Lavender (Conservation Futures, 4:1, and TDRs), and Doug McClelland (Forestry and FPDs).