

Countryman, Ryan

From: Rachael Markle <rmarkle@shorelinewa.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 02, 2015 1:50 PM
To: Countryman, Ryan
Subject: RE: Point Wells GPP

Hi Ryan,
Thanks for checking in. You are correct, Shoreline still objects to JP-3.
Sincerely,
Rachael Markle

From: Countryman, Ryan [mailto:ryan.countryman@snoco.org]
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2015 2:32 PM
To: Rachael Markle
Subject: FW: Point Wells GPP

Hi Rachael,

I am forwarding this email as an FYI regarding how I asked our consultant to describe two of Snohomish County's Joint Planning Policies in the DEIS for Point Wells. Steve Cohn represented Shoreline during the development of these policies (2009 to 2011) and lodged objections to the phrasing that became JP-3. I think this was before your time as City Planning Director. If you think we should be characterizing Shoreline's position differently, please let me know.

Have a great weekend!

Ryan Countryman

From: Countryman, Ryan
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2015 2:22 PM
To: Ding, Jeff (jd Ding@eaest.com)
Subject: Point Wells GPP

Hi Jeff,

Following up on your voicemail: I found the version of the GPP to which the Point Wells submittal is vested (see attached).

Since this email will eventually be disclosed and there is potential for confusion regarding GPP version control, I'm going to add some caveats here that don't really matter to the work that you are doing but which may pre-emptively answer questions that the public may have:

1. There was another update to the GPP that went into effect in January 2011 and Point Wells is technically vested to that version; however, that update was to recognize some updated school district capital facilities plans (CFPs). EIS analysis of school impacts from Point Wells will be based on the most recent CFPs (i.e. those completed in 2014), so the differences between the August 2010 and January 2011 GPPs are immaterial to Point Wells.
2. The first caveat would not be necessary if Snohomish County maintained a complete GPP compilation after every update, but we do not. The changes for January 2011 are stored as separate files and I am choosing to send this existing a single compilation because it will be easier to use when compiling the plans & policies chapter of the DEIS.
3. Actions related to Point Wells but not included in the 2011 submittal documents will be subject to the policies and regulations in effect at the time that new actions are applied for. For example, the now out-of-date annexation policies in this August 2010 GPP will not be used to evaluate a future annexation proposal. Rather, a future annexation will be evaluated according to the policies in effect when and if an annexation is applied for. In other words, actions not included in the submittal will be evaluated on the basis of the current GPP.

Related to caveat #3, I said in the September 17 conference call that a policy from the Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) should be included in the plans & policies chapter too. I never followed up on that statement and there are actually two relevant CPPs from the Joint Planning section that I am copying below. It should be noted that the City of Shoreline is a non-voting observer to the Snohomish County Tomorrow process that develops the CPPs (because there is no portion of the city currently in Snohomish County). Shoreline participated in the discussions leading to these two policies and objected to the language in JP-3.

JP-1 Coordination of county and municipal planning particularly for urban services, governance, and annexation is important. Interlocal agreements for this purpose are encouraged pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperation Act (chapter 39.34 RCW). These agreements should emphasize the importance of early and continuous public participation, focus on decision-making by elected or other appropriate officials, and review the consistency of comprehensive plans with each other and the Growth Management Act, where applicable. Appendix F provides an illustrative list of issues that could be considered appropriate for Interlocal Agreements.

JP-3 In the event of a proposed annexation of unincorporated lands in Snohomish County by a city or special district with no incorporated or district territory currently located in Snohomish County, an interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and any jurisdiction determined necessary by the County shall be in place, consistent with CPP JP-1 and Appendix F. This agreement shall be in effect before the city or district submits a Notice of Intent to Annex to the State Boundary Review Board (BRB) of Snohomish County or, if not subject to BRB review, prior to approval of the annexation to the city or special district.

Have a great weekend!

Ryan