

KC GMPC 4:1 Program Review / UGA Expansion Policies Recommendations
Joint Rural Area Organizations Team Comments / Rationale

Category	Issue	GMPC/IJT Recommendation	Joint Team of Rural Area Organizations— Comments / Rationale
Procedural	Include proposed procedural improvements to make it clearer how four-to-one program projects are applied for, reviewed, approved and monitored after approval.	No changes.	Agree.
UGA Boundary	<p>a. Should the four-to-one program require projects be contiguous with the 1994 urban growth area boundary, later adopted boundaries through subsequent joint planning processes between the county and cities, or some combination thereof ?</p> <p>Cascading or leapfrogging 4:1's ?</p>	<p>No agreement.</p> <p>Disallow cascading or leapfrogging 4:1's.</p>	<p>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.</p>
Reduced Ratio	<p>b. Should the four-to-one program allow reduced open space dedication if a proposal contains lands with high ecological value, such as lands that could provide for high-value floodplain restoration, riparian habitat or working resource lands ?</p>	Do not include a reduced ratio, nor a variable ratio.	Agree.

**KC GMPC 4:1 Program Review / UGA Expansion Policies Recommendations
Joint Rural Area Organizations Team Comments / Rationale**

Category	Issue	GMPC/IJT Recommendation	Joint Team of Rural Area Organizations— Comments / Rationale
Non-Contiguous	c. Should the four-to-one program allow for noncontiguous open space preservation ?	<p><u>Onsite</u>: (1) Require that at least half of the open space be located on the site and (2) Require that the new urban area be fully buffered from surrounding rural and resource lands.</p> <p><u>Offsite</u>: Allow the option for onsite and offsite Fee Simple dedication, offsite Transferable Development Rights easements, and onsite Tracts to be used to meet the open space requirement. Require that offsite conservation come from parcels that are located adjacent to the UGA boundary. Use the Tri-Party Agreement Process to determine and codify the approach.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Onsite</u>: Agree.</p> <p><u>Offsite</u>: Agree. The recommendation is that TDRs only be used for offsite open space, IF the UGA is fully buffered with on-site open space first. It appears this suggests that off-site conservation, including any TDRs, must be adjacent to the UGA boundary. We support the use of some TDRs, IF they meet this requirement.</p>
Facilities	d. Should the four-to-one program allow facilities, such as roads or stormwater, that serve the new urban area to be located in the Rural Area ?	<p>Continue to allow proposals that are not likely to be timely annexed and continue to require cities to agree to add the new urban land to their Potential Annexation Areas.</p> <p>For proposals adjacent to cities and towns, require annexation prior to any site development or permitting.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Agree.</p> <p>Agree. Require annexation, as the County doesn't want more urban unincorporated areas.</p>
Non-Residential	e. Should the four-to-one program allow nonresidential and multifamily residential projects ?	Disallow nonresidential uses in Four-to-One proposals. Continue to allow multifamily proposals.	<p style="text-align: center;">Agree.</p>
Annexation	f. Should the four-to-one program allow projects that are not likely to be annexed in a timely manner ?	<p>Continue to allow proposals that are not likely to be timely annexed and continue to require cities to agree to add the new urban land to their Potential Annexation Areas.</p> <p>For proposals adjacent to cities and towns, require annexation prior to any site development or permitting.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Agree.</p> <p>Agree. Require annexation, as the County doesn't want more urban unincorporated areas.</p>

**KC GMPC 4:1 Program Review / UGA Expansion Policies Recommendations
Joint Rural Area Organizations Team Comments / Rationale**

Category	Issue	GMPC/IJT Recommendation	Joint Team of Rural Area Organizations— Comments / Rationale
Natural Resource Lands	Ensure consistency regarding eligible natural resource lands	Consistent with the current language in the CPPs, amend the Comprehensive Plan and Code to disallow any natural resource lands from using the program.	Agree.
Affordable Housing	Revise affordable housing provisions to be more effective and current	Restructure affordable housing provisions to require affordable housing in most proposals, support home ownership, support long-term affordability, consistent with the County's inclusionary housing program.	Agree.
Minimum Density	Revise minimum urban density	Change the minimum urban density from 4 dwelling units per acre to 8 to increase housing supply.	Agree.
5593 Exchanges	Consider use of 5593 Exchanges	Do not authorize use of these exchanges and continue to rely on Four-to-One program for UGA expansions. Monitor the use of this program in other Counties and report back to GMPC in advance of 2029 Updates to Comprehensive Plans.	Agree. 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.