The City of
MAPLE VALLEY
1997 2007

P.O. Box 320 • 22035 SE Wax Road • Maple Valley, WA 98038
Phone: (425) 413-8800 • Fax: (425) 413-4282

December 26, 2007

Dept. of Development & Environmental Services
ATTN: Paul Reitenbach
900 Oakesdale Avenue SW
Renton, WA 98057-5212.

Hand Delivered on December 27, 2007

Re: City of Maple Valley Comments and Questions for the King County Comprehensive Plan Comment Period Concerning the Proposed "Maple Valley Summit Pit" Area Zoning Study (AZ-125) and Urban Growth Boundary Change

Dear Mr. Reitenbach:

Please accept this letter for purposes of the comment on the Proposed "Maple Valley Summit Pit" Area Zoning Study (AZ-125) and Urban Growth Boundary Change, related zoning amendments for the King County 2008 Comprehensive Plan Amendments due December 28, 2007.

The City of Maple Valley's Vision Statement states:

> *Maple Valley will be a well-planned City with a safe, healthy and aesthetically pleasing environment. A strong sense of community will develop through effective partnerships with community organizations, maintaining historic connections with the area's rural past, and embracing the positive aspects of modern technology. The community will be economically vital with quality education and recreation opportunities.*

The property known locally as the "Donut Hole" is unusual in that it is an unincorporated area of roughly 160 acres completely surrounded by the City of Maple Valley ("City"). Because the property has been designated rural, the City has been effectively prevented from planning for urban development of the property under the Growth Management Act (GMA). As a result, the City has been unable to thoroughly study impacts, adopt levels of service, or plan for development impacts that will inevitably take place in the surrounding community and on public facilities and services if the property is sold, if an urban zoning designation occurs, and if urban

Hole, the City of Maple Valley strongly urges King County to acknowledge that the City is the ultimate service provider for any redevelopment of the Summit Pit property, and as such, must be given the ability to jointly plan for and be involved in determining the land use designations, zoning, regulations, and ultimate development of the site. The City again strongly encourages the County to accept the City's offer to engage in a joint planning process.

The proposed change in land use and resultant increase in density to 45 times that currently planned for on the site is cause for a great deal of concern. The City agrees that if the property is designated "urban" it should also be designated for annexation into the City. However, the City's position is that significant changes to the designated land use and zoning density should only happen after a coordinated planning process occurs. The City's position at this time is that existing zoning should remain in effect, or a density of R-4 should be designated until such time as the property can be annexed into the City and/or the City and King County complete a joint planning process, with a mutually agreed land-use designation, as well as phasing provisions for development, and methods for accomplishing concurrency for the expected traffic impacts.

It is not arguable that the City will be the service provider for this site. We strongly believe that a thorough joint planning effort by the City and King County is vital before land use designations are changed and zoning regulations are enacted. Joint planning will ensure that the property is developed consistent with the City's vision statement and, more importantly, with the City's Comprehensive Plan. At a minimum, the GMA, King County Countywide Planning Policies (KCCPP), and the King County Comprehensive Plan require a joint planning effort. This will provide an opportunity for regulations to be developed with the City's mutual agreement - prior to vesting of any development on the property. For the County to act without a joint planning effort is contrary to the GMA. The County's current proposal also fails to comply with King County Ordinance No. 2007-15856 (authorizing the Executive, due to unique circumstances, to enter into negotiations with Yarrow Bay, Inc., for the direct sale of county-owned property known as Summit Pit).

An R-8 zoning designation, as proposed by the County, can realistically result in a density of up to 12 units per acre. Additionally, the Urban Planned Development (UPD) land use classification being sought by the County is likely to result in even higher densities. Planning to date has been at best inadequate, and at worse, nonexistent. The potential exists for the addition of 1,200 to 1,800 residential units and/or commercial uses on the Summit Pit property with the proposed new land use designation and zoning by the County. This quantity of growth will have profound impacts on the City's vision, goals, policies, levels of service, environment, economy, character, and quality of life. Planning in advance is essential.

The quantity of growth will seriously impact other service providers as well. For instance, the Covington Water District Comprehensive Water Plan does not contemplate providing water for this potential level of development. Likewise, the Soos Creek Sewer District Plan does not specifically contemplate the ability or infrastructure necessary to accommodate this type of land use and zoning. The Tahoma School District Capital Facilities Plan and enrollment projections have not addressed or planned for the inevitable school needs that would arise from such a dramatic increase in residential density. The King County Library system has expressed concerns about meeting the demands for its services. And, Puget Power, the natural gas and electric

provider for the area has not yet planned for the type of increased growth that will result from the county's proposed land use designation. While Puget Power has expressed to the City the need for additional facilities and is, in fact, planning a new substation – they could not confirm whether their existing or planned facilities could provide for this unanticipated growth within the City.

A refusal to plan jointly is not consistent with the GMA, the KCCPP, King County's adopted Comprehensive Plan, or King County Ordinance No. 2007-15856. The City urges King County to amend the classification of the site to an urban designation, but only after a thorough joint planning process has occurred, consistent with both the GMA and with Countywide Planning Policies. The City also urges the County to formally recognize the property as part of the City's Potential Annexation Area (PAA).

Request

The City requests that King County Executive Staff and, ultimately, the King County Council recommend the following in regards to the Summit Pit property:

1. Approve the "Urban" designation. Approve addition of the area to Maple Valley's PAA.
2. Deny the requested proposal for UPD designation, at least until such time as a coordinated joint planning or sub-area planning process is undertaken.
3. Deny the request to change the zoning text reducing the minimum site area for a UPD, at least until such time as the implications are thoroughly evaluated with respect to regulatory intent, planning goals and the viability of such a reduction.
4. Deny the request for R-8 zoning, at least until such time as a coordinated planning or sub-area planning process is undertaken.
5. Retain existing zoning or designate the minimum urban zoning density of R-4, at least until such time as the property can be annexed to the City, or until joint planning or a sub-area planning process is undertaken.

Analysis in Support of Request

The City has organized its comments on the proposal into four categories. The City of Maple Valley believes the following specific comments and questions posed by the City need to be addressed prior to proceeding with changes to the land use designation and zoning of the Summit Pit property. The four categories of comments are organized as follows:

1. the Countywide Planning Policies;
2. the King County Comprehensive Plan;
3. three areas of potential impact for planning prior to any use or zoning change; and
4. general comments about process and relevant factors for consideration.

Section 1. Countywide Planning Policies ("CPP")

1. FW-1, Steps 7 a., e., and i. Thus far, the County has not identified that this proposed amendment and reclassification is connected to the dedication of open space as contemplated in the CPPs FW-1, Steps 7 a., e., and i. It is imperative and necessary that

the County identify specifically which land is included in the proposed amendment and reclassification related to the Summit Pit property.

2. FW-1 Step 7 d. states:

> *Development on the land added to the Urban Growth Area under this policy shall be limited to residential development and shall be at a minimum density of four units to the acre. Proposals shall meet King County Comprehensive Plan density and affordable housing goals.*

With respect to the proposed Urban Planned Development (UPD) designation, which includes provisions for mixed use and commercial development, describe how the UPD designation related to the Summit Pit property satisfies FW-1 Step 7 d. It appears inconsistent.

3. FW-1 Step 7 i. states: *"Where applications are adjacent to city boundaries or potential annexation areas, King County shall consult with and solicit recommendations from the city."* Describe how the proposed applications related to the Summit Pit property satisfy FW-1 Step 7 i. Thus far, the County has had a general public review comment period, however, no meaningful consultation or solicitation of a City recommendation has occurred. The proposal is thus inconsistent with this policy.

4. FW-1 Step 7 k. 6. states that the criteria for evaluating a proposal shall include, among other criteria, the *"[a]bility to provide efficient urban governmental services to lands to be added to the Urban Growth Area."* Describe how the proposals related to the Summit Pit property satisfy FW-1 Step 7 k. 6. There has been no information disseminated or made available that would suggest there is an ability to provide efficient urban governmental services for such a dramatic change in land use and zoning, one that could result in a density 45 times that what has been currently planned for.

5. FW-1 Step 8 a., which reference LU-26, King County must consider *"the actual and projected progress of jurisdictions in meeting their adopted 20-year goals and targets of the number of households and employees per acre."* In truth, Maple Valley has already well exceeded these designated 20-year growth goals and targets. The need for additional urban land and/or increased density in Maple Valley simply does not exist and is not supported by policy or data from the coordinated countywide buildable lands analysis. The City requests that King County describe how the proposals related to the Summit Pit property satisfy Policy LU-26.

6. Policy LU-29 and LU-33.

> LU-29 states:
>
> *All jurisdictions shall develop growth phasing plans consistent with applicable capital facilities plans to maintain an Urban Area served with adequate public facilities and services to meet at least the six-year intermediate household and*

employment target ranges consistent with LU-67 and LU-68. These growth phasing plans shall be based on locally adopted definitions, service levels, and financing commitments, consistent with State Growth Management Act requirements. The phasing plans for cities shall not extend beyond their potential annexation areas. Interlocal agreements shall be developed that specify the applicable minimum zoning, development standards, impact mitigation and future annexation for the potential annexation areas.

LU-33 states:

Land within a city's potential annexation area shall be developed according to that city's and King County's growth phasing plans. Undeveloped lands adjacent to that city should be annexed at the time development is proposed to receive a full range of urban services. Subsequent to establishing a potential annexation area, infill lands within the potential annexation area which are not adjacent or which are not practical to annex shall be developed pursuant to interlocal agreements between the County and the affected city. The interlocal agreement shall establish the type of development allowed in the potential annexation area and standards for that development so that the area is developed in a manner consistent with its future annexation potential. The interlocal agreement shall specify at a minimum the applicable zoning, development standards, impact mitigation, and future annexation within the potential annexation area.

Policies LU-29 and LU-33 clearly support an active role for the City in determining the appropriate level of urban land use for the Summit Pit property through annexation prior to an urban zoning designation and/or via interlocal agreement to ensure consistency. These policies clearly support a coordinated approach and agreement on land use before it is designated. Thus far, the County has not been receptive to such an interlocal agreement, despite the City's request for joint planning and an offer of memorandum of agreement. An interlocal agreement for joint planning would seem particularly appropriate where such an extraordinary change is being considered. A similar process is demonstrated in the Snoqualmie SR18/I-90 Area Zoning Study (AZ 39). Here, an area had been designated for future review, subject to more intensive planning, and now is being proposed for Urban designation and PAA, again subject to specific interlocal agreements and joint planning to ensure intended outcomes.

The City requests that King County demonstrate how the proposals related to the Summit Pit property will satisfy Policies LU-29 and LU-33.

7. Policy LU-37 states:

The Growth Management Act requires that city and County comprehensive plans be coordinated and consistent with one another. Consistency is required "where there are common borders or related regional issues" (RCW 36.70A.100). Joint planning is fundamental to all the framework policies.

LU-37 states: *All jurisdictions shall cooperate in developing comprehensive plans which are consistent with those of adjacent jurisdictions and with the Countywide Planning Policies.*

The proposals, if adopted, will violate LU-37. If the County adopts the proposals as presented, the City and County Comprehensive plans will not be consistent with one another; nor will the County's Comprehensive Plan be consistent with other jurisdiction's planning documents. Thus far, no planning, including joint planning, has occurred.

Section 2. King County Comprehensive Plan

1. According to King County's Comprehensive Plan amendment policies, all such amendments should include the following elements:

   RP-307: Proposed amendments each calendar year shall be considered by the Metropolitan King County Council concurrently so that the cumulative effect of the proposals can be determined. All proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments should include the following elements:

   a. *A detailed statement of what is proposed to be changed and why;*

   b. *A statement of anticipated impacts of the change, including geographic area affected and issues presented;*

   c. *A demonstration of why existing comprehensive plan guidance should not continue in effect or why existing criteria no longer apply;*

   d. *A statement of how the amendment complies with the Growth Management Act's goals and specific requirements;*

   e. *A statement of how the amendment complies with the Countywide Planning Policies;*

   f. *A statement of how functional plans and capital improvement programs support the change; and*

   g. *Public review of the recommended change, necessary implementation (including area zoning if appropriate) and alternatives.*

The City recognizes that no recommendation or proposal has yet been forwarded to the County Council but, nevertheless, the City is of the opinion that the requirements referenced above have not been satisfied. The City requests that the County provide documentation related to all of the above elements, and if an element has not yet been met, please provide anticipated date(s) when the elements will be met and when supporting documentation will be provided to the City.

Moreover, the City finds that the proposed amendment, as currently written, will not likely satisfy all the above-listed policy requirements. The current proposal does not comply with the Countywide Planning Policies; there are no relevant functional plans or capital improvement programs supporting the proposed amendment and no alternatives have been proposed or considered.

2. King County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 2.(B.3) states:

> *While King County supports higher densities in the urban areas, increased densities that would be incompatible with existing neighborhoods or cause significant impacts on roads, services and the environment are discouraged. The following policies will guide decisions on application of densities and proposed rezones.*

The City requests that King County describe how the proposals related to the Summit Pit property satisfy King County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 2.(B.3).

3. King County Comprehensive Plan policy statement U-122 states:

> *King County shall not approve proposed zoning changes to increase density within the Urban Area unless:*
>
> a. *The development will be compatible with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood;*
>
> b. *Urban public facilities and services are adequate, consistent with adopted levels of service and meet GMA concurrency requirements, including King County transportation concurrency standards;*
>
> c. *The proposed density change will not increase unmitigated adverse impacts on environmentally sensitive areas, either on site or in the vicinity of the proposed development;*
>
> d. *The proposed density increase will be consistent with or contribute to achieving the goals and policies of this comprehensive plan, and subarea plan, if applicable; and*
>
> e. *The proposal is consistent with the adopted city comprehensive plan for the Potential Annexation Area where the rezone is located if the proposed density exceeds eight dwelling units per acre. If the city is not planning for urban densities and efficient land use patterns consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies, then this paragraph shall not apply.*

The current proposal will simultaneously designate the property as urban and rezone it to a density 45 times greater than existing zoning on the Summit Pit site and at a density approximately double that of the existing surrounding Maple Valley neighborhoods. The

community in general, as well as residents of surrounding neighborhoods, have expressed concern about the incompatibility of the proposed density with that of surrounding development and the potential impacts it will have on the character of existing neighborhoods. The proposal provides no detail to support compliance with this CPP, nor does it address the concerns regarding lack of compatibility. While the proposed zoning designation is R-8, the allowed density within the R-8 zone is greater than 8 units per acre, especially when combined with the UPD designation. The criteria in CPP U-122 requires that the proposal "be consistent with the adopted City Comprehensive Plan." Currently, thiscriteria cannot be supported due to its inconsistency with the City of Maple Valley's Comprehensive Plan. The City requests that King County describe how the proposals related to the Summit Pit property satisfy King County Comprehensive Plan policy statement U-122, specifically U-122(e).

4. King County Comprehensive Plan policy statement U-174 states:

> *Sites for potential Urban Planned Developments (UPDs) may be designated within the established Urban Growth Area to realize mutual benefits for the public and the property owner. Two UPD areas have been designated by the county: the Bear Creek UPD area, comprised of Redmond Ridge (formerly known as Northridge) UPD, Trilogy at Redmond Ridge (formerly known as Blakely Ridge) UPD, and the proposed Redmond Ridge East UPD and Cougar Mountain Village UPD. Future UPD sites in the Urban Growth Area shall be designated through a subarea planning process, or through a comprehensive plan amendment initiated by the property owner.*

Designating the site as a UPD is premature and should not even be considered until a subarea planning process is completed and such planning has concluded that a UPD designation is appropriate for this site. Additionally, the proposal necessitates a change in the County-required minimum site area from its current 200 acres to 100 acres, in order to qualify for consideration of a UPD. The UPD designation and requirements rely upon a large-scale site to achieve intended outcomes. Has such a 50-percent reduction in minimum site area been evaluated to determine if a UPD can even be achieved as envisioned by the County Comprehensive Plan and regulations? This particular site is further hindered by the presence of environmentally sensitive areas that include Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARA's) and slope-related designations and is significantly encumbered by electrical transmission lines and related easements. These conditions reduce the net developable area of the site. Have these conditions been considered in designation of the site for a UPD? Such a designation becomes even more questionable should the property be included in City's PAA since the City has no such comparable designation. Again, this land use designation is inconsistent with Maple Valley's Comprehensive Plan. Potential commercial development on the Summit Pit property could have profound impacts on intensive, ongoing City planning aimed at shaping the future of Maple Valley's commercial centers and nodes.

Additionally, without subarea planning or the consideration UPD designation on an area-wide, sub-regional or regional basis, the UPD designation of this site and the subsequent change in zoning text has components of illegal spot zoning. Lastly, while the City recognizes that a UPD may offer some generally desirable outcomes, thus far, there has been no convincing demonstration that the county's proposed designation will result in benefit to the public as characterized in U-174.

5. King County Comprehensive Plan policy statement U-116 states:

> *King County shall seek to achieve through future planning efforts over the next twenty years, an average zoning density of at least seven to eight homes per acre in the Urban Growth Area through a mix of densities and housing types. A lower density zone may be used to recognize existing subdivisions with little or no opportunity for infill or redevelopment.*

This policy is based on a desire to keep urban residential densities high enough to minimize Urban Growth Boundary expansion as a means to accommodate projected population growth and housing needs. King County's "Maple Valley Summit Pit Area Zoning Study," appears to have only considered this policy U-116 in connection with the proposed R-8 zoning. This raises the following two pertinent issues:

1) There is no demonstrated need to expand the Urban Growth Boundary. In fact, counties that have a bigger Urban Growth Boundary than is warranted by a Buildable Lands Analysis and population forecasts have found their UGA's invalidated by regional Growth Boards. Detailed and coordinated data collection and reporting through the King County and Surburban Cities Buildable Lands Analysis demonstrates that there is enough urban land to accommodate future population and projected housing and employment growth needs. Additionally, Maple Valley, and south King County in general, have demonstrated better performance in achieving housing targets than the rest of the county, resulting in further reduction of the need to expand the urban growth area in this region. Still, Maple Valley recognizes the illogical nature of the site as rural island and believes that an urban designation is appropriate; however, there has been no demonstrated need for R-8 zoning. This is especially true in light of the lack of appropriate joint planning to support the proposals.
2) Policy U-116 is expressed as a countywide average, and when reviewed in context with the remainder of applicable policies, cannot be the sole consideration in designating land use and zoning density. The dominant policy directive within the County Comprehensive Plan is to undergo coordinated planning to determine a land use and density consistent with the plans of the City and other service providers. Even this policy contemplates the need to consider lower densities in recognition of existing neighborhoods, which are developed at the lower average density of six units per acre.
3) The County has demonstrated through existing recommendations in the Coal Creek Parkway Area Zoning Study (AZ 45) that when circumstances and

conditions justify, an R-4 designation is appropriate. A similar review and consideration should occur with the Summit Pit property, especially given the lack of planning to date and size of the area being considered by re-designation and R-8 zoning.

Section 3. Potential Impacts

Transportation

To date, the information disseminated by King County to the public has not provided any forecasted transportation impacts associated with a foreseeable increase in traffic from 1200 – 1800 additional residential units, not to mention the potential commercial development allowable under the UPD designation. Neither King County's nor the City's transportation plans has contemplated whether Levels of Service (LOS) can be maintained at this level of density, or, what mitigation, capacity improvements, or methods would be utilized to ensure concurrency. There are also foreseeable impacts to State transportation facilities, specifically SR 169, SR 516, and Witte Road SE, a City arterial. At this time, it is unclear whether this level of growth-related transportation impacts has been considered within the State's Transportation Plans for state transportation facilities.

Based on the County's proposals, the City has prepared some preliminary PM peak hour traffic volume and distribution forecasts. These preliminary forecasts indicate that traffic on SR 516/Kent Kangley Road could be increased by thirty five percent. The forecasted increase for Witte Road SE is even higher and could reach up to fifty percent. The City's adopted 2005 Transportation Element as well as the adopted 2001 Witte Road Corridor Study do not suggest widening Witte road in order to construct additional travel lanes. This is mainly due to the topographic and environmental constraints along this road. Preliminary analysis of the proposed level of density for an urban land use designation with a zoning of R-8 indicates that such densities will degrade the City's adopted LOS. The City's capital facilities plans for transportation do not contemplate funding for the necessary improvements to public facilities that would be necessary to accommodate the impacts from this level of density. The City's capacity reserves associated with transportation concurrency will fail at this level of density. A foreseeable result is unavailability of roadway capacity and denial of development under the City's concurrency ordinance. Finally, improvements to State Highways would require approval from the Washington State Department of Transportation and must be consistent with the City's goals and policies as set forth in the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Parks and Recreation

Another example is the impact on City park facilities. The increased densities if this land is re-designated as urban, and rezoned to R-8 as the County has currently proposed, will result in higher demand for parks and potentially lower levels of service which is a clear conflict with City goals and objectives. There is already a deficit of such facilities and services in the City, in part resulting from the County's history of urban designations, resulting densities, and managing the surrounding urban areas prior to City incorporation.

The City's parks and recreation plans rely upon balancing a variety of planning, financing and regulatory strategies to maintain the community's level of service, goals and objectives. Financing strategies include park impact fees, property, utility and real estate excise taxes, and bonds. Regulatory methods include neighborhood scale recreation space dedication and facility improvements within developments. Overall, service and facility needs are based on the projections derived from population and housing estimates and plans. These estimates and plans have not as yet taken into account an increase in the housing and density engendered by the county's proposed rezone and land use change.

The City's robust growth during the recent past has intensified the need and urgency to provide expanded facilities and services. It also has increased the complexity and diversity of demands and the City's ability to meet them. Any substantial housing and density in excess of that currently planned for will substantially aggravate the challenges faced by the City in meeting these demands. The result will be higher demand and potentially lower levels of service which is a clear conflict with City goals and objectives. A strategy and planning framework must be developed to address financing, phasing, site acquisition, facilities construction and operations prior to implementation of any zoning changes. Consider the following, which is of great concern to the City: County regulatory standards are insufficient to maintain City levels of service for neighborhood-scale on-site recreation facilities.

Under County provisions recreation space requirements could be satisfied by 90 to 390 square feet of area per residential unit, resulting in 3.3 to 10.7 acres of recreation space for a 1,600-unit development. Under City standards and comparable R-8 zoning, the requirements would necessitate 100 to 435 square feet per unit (the low end could only be achieved in connection with a conditional use), resulting in 3.7 to 16 acres of recreation space. The difference between County and City standards could mean an average area deficit of 3 acres of recreation space necessary to maintain adopted levels of services in the City for park and recreation facilities. A deficit of 3 acres is a fairly substantial area considering site acquisition and facility development costs.

Environmental Conditions and Sensitive Areas

Much of the Summit Pit site contains areas designated as Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas and is in proximity to well-head protection areas that include public water systems owned by the City of Kent. The site falls within the Middle Green River watershed and drains to the Cranmar Creek Basin, a tributary to Soos Creek which in turn is a tributary to the Green River. There are also some limited areas of potential landslide and steep slope hazards on the site. It does not appear that any SEPA evaluation has been done to determine how these conditions and those downstream might be affected by such an increase in development intensity for the site. Some evaluation would need to be performed to understand the impacts that intensive urban development might have in the aquifer contributing to the watershed and water supply wells.

Also, the site is being used for maintenance purposes that include: storage and processing and bioremediation of vactor and street waste; storage and disposal of maintenance-related

construction wastes, including asphalt and street sweepings; and storage of salt and chemical de-icers and temporary storage of hazardous wastes such as paints and from debris cleanup. There are also potential environmental impacts associated with storage, maintenance, and fueling of vehicles and equipment. Lastly, it is currently unknown what impact the gravel mining has had on the site's ability to accommodate urban residential development. A thorough evaluation as to these historical and on-going uses is warranted to determine the effect on the property's ability to support high density residential development.

Social Services, Police and Government

Maple Valley has serious concerns how these types of public services would be impacted with increased un-planned growth not contemplated within the City's Comprehensive Plan. The City Maple Valley is the main funding agency for many local social service providers, including the Greater Maple Valley Community Center. Existing facilities and services are stretched to capacity and would not likely be able to support additional growth without a coordinated planning and funding. The same is true for City operational services and public safety (police) services.

Section 4. General Comments

1. The public information announcements of which the City is aware to date have not described the review process under the State Environmental Policy Act ("SEPA"). What is the anticipated SEPA process and schedule? What role does King County anticipate for the City of Maple Valley in the SEPA process? The City finds that developing and forwarding a recommendation, with such substantial change in land use and potential impacts, without the concurrent evaluation and consideration under SEPA, is short-sighted and inconsistent with the intent of SEPA. Have any alternatives even been considered?

   The County has published, advertised, and promoted the 2008 Comprehensive Plan Update schedules, public participation and comment periods, none of which mention the SEPA process. SEPA is supposed to play an integral role in the decision-making process, and review under SEPA is required and must be completed concurrent with amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. What is the timing and role of SEPA for the County's 2008 update?

2. RCW 36.70A.100 mandates that comprehensive plans must be coordinated, stating:

   > *The Comprehensive Plan of each county or city that is adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 shall be coordinated with, and consistent with, the comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 of other counties or cities with which the county or city has, in part, common borders or related regional issues.*

   The City requests that King County describe how the proposals satisfy state law – including RCW 36.70A.100 – with respect to the mandate that the King County

Comprehensive Plan and the City of Maple Valley Comprehensive Plan be coordinated, including all amendments made thereto?

3. King County Ordinance No. 2007-15856 also requires King County to consult with Maple Valley if the County considers amending the Comprehensive Plan designation of the Summit Pit Property. Section 4 of King County Ordinance No. 2007-15856 reads,

> *SECTION 4. If King County enters into a purchase and sale agreement for the Summit Pit property, and the county proceeds to consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan designation for the property, the county will consult with the city of Maple Valley on proposed uses for the property. While the county will make the decision about any amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan for the property, the city shall be entitled to participate in the planning process so its positions can be considered. It is the intent to have the Summit Pit property annexed to the city of Maple Valley, consistent with all state and local review processes.*

The King County Executive Office has met with City officials on numerous occasions, but the County has allowed no substantive consultation about the proposed uses for the property contained in the current proposal. As detailed in this letter, the comprehensive plan, zoning and UPD amendments currently proposed by King County are inconsistent with the City's and our citizens' interests. In making its proposal, the County has failed to comply with King County Ordinance No. 2007-15856.

4. The impacts of the proposed rezone and land use re-designation to Maple Valley's Comprehensive Plan are too numerous to list, and only a few have been mentioned in this letter. The cumulative impacts of such a large and unplanned land use change literally ripple through every element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. A significant planning and amendment effort will have to occur just to understand how such a change will affect existing conditions, analysis, forecasts and level of services of all elements within the Plan.

Summary

The City of Maple Valley urges King County to not act carelessly in a hasty recommendation and decision to designate an incompatible and inconsistent land use and zoning for this site. The City urges the County to embrace a joint planning effort for all proposals related to the Summit Pit property, as formally requested by the City. The City is confident that such a process will result in a joint recommendation for proposals that meet the letter and spirit of King County's County Wide Planning Policies, King County's Comprehensive Plan, the City's Comprehensive Plan, and state law. Such an approach is required under the Growth Management Act, and is also reasonable and appropriate, especially given that the ultimate service provider and eventual jurisdictional authority for the Summit Pit property is the City of Maple Valley.

Enclosed, please find related public comments received by the City, to date, concerning the County proposal and future of the site. The City forwards to King County these comments for review,

consideration, and response. Please feel free to contact the City's Director of Community Development, Ty Peterson, if you have any questions or if you need additional information. (425-413-8800 / ty.peterson@ci.maple-valley.wa.us)

Best Regards,

CITY OF MAPLE VALLEY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Enclosures: Written public comment received by the City of Maple Valley

cc: Anthony Hemstad, Maple Valley City Manager
Ron Sims, King County Executive
King County Council
King County Growth Management Planning Council
Suburban Cities Association
Leonard Bauer, Managing Director, Growth Management Services, Washington State Department of Community, Trade & Economic Development (CTED)
5th Legislative District Representatives: Senator Cheryl Pflug, Representative Jay Rodne, Representative Glenn Anderson
47th Legislative District Representatives: Senator Claudia Kauffman, Representative Geoff Simpson, Representative Pat Sullivan