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RESOLUTION OF THE PUGET SOUND COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
ADOPTING THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, the elected officials of the Puget Sound Council of Governments committed themselves in March, 1975, to substantially revise the Interim Regional Development Plan adopted in 1971; and

WHEREAS, the Puget Sound Council of Governments was subsequently decentralized in 1976, into four Subregional Councils; and

WHEREAS, the Puget Sound Council of Governments intends to work with the Subregional Councils in evaluating existing and future public policies and decisions which either directly or indirectly affect growth in the four-county area, and this joint effort has produced (a) the generalized and advisory Goals and Policies for Regional Development together with amendment procedures, adopted in February, 1977, and is producing (b) the separate plans of the four Subregional Councils; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Regional Development Plan details the above approach and acts as an "index" to both the Goals and Policies for Regional Development and the plans of the Subregional Councils, and indicates the specific ties between these programs and those of other agencies and includes simple procedures for raising specific issues for debate and resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Development Plan has been endorsed by each of the member Subregional Councils;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Puget Sound Council of Governments formally approve the problem-solving approach and policies contained in the Regional Development Plan, as amended from time to time, as a basis for raising, debating and taking action on the growth aspects of public policies and programs.

January 25, 1979
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The Regional Development Plan is a growth management approach which consists of Regional Goals and Policies, Subregional Plans for the King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish County areas, a conflict resolution process, and linkages to other planning activities. The Regional Goals and Policies reflect current, shared commitments of local governments to make balanced, responsible decisions on (a) public matters affecting the overall pattern of physical development and change in the region, and (b) to distinguish these from other public matters individually affecting (and reserved to) the jurisdictions of the four subregional areas.

The four Subregional Plans vary in style and content in reflecting a unique set of problems, priorities and needs determined jointly by local officials in each county-wide subregion. This variety must be understood in light of two central facts:

1) In principle, each subregional plan is consistent with the Regional Goals and Policies. Indeed, the latter were representative of local concerns subsequently included in Subregional Plans and served as a point of departure in their development.

2) The decentralized approach enables each subregional council to deal directly and concretely with issues in its subregion. The result is both more specificity and more commitment on the part of local governments to each Subregional Plan than would be possible given a uniform regionwide approach.

Where Subregional Plans remain silent on issues or policies dealt with in the Regional Goals and Policies, the latter are used to guide subregional as well as regional decision-making. Where, in specific cases, subregional policies appear to conflict with another subregion's or regional goals and policies, procedures are spelled out here and in PSCOG by-laws for resolving such conflicts.
Both the Regional Goals and Policies and the Subregional Plans are regarded as living, working documents to assist local officials in making complex decisions. They thus provide for evaluation, feedback, and amendment in the light of use and of new issues, functional plans and studies, or simply the reassessment of ongoing concerns.

Given the scope of the Regional Development Plan, the authority of PSCOG, the complexity of institutions and issues, and the ongoing nature of public decision-making, this plan does not internalize all planning. Rather, it attempts to provide coordination among many planning and decision-making processes. Moreover, the plan's implementation depends upon a variety of intergovernmental programs. Therefore, these linkages among plans and programs are spelled out as a part of this document.

In addition to providing coordination, the RDP intends to raise policy issues in non-technical terms so that they can be discussed and decided in legislative forums. This intention is reinforced by the structure of PSCOG with its four subregional councils, created under interlocal agreement. It is this structure which underlies the format of the Regional Development Plan.
CHAPTER II
THE REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

A. WHAT IT IS

1. Introduction. The RDP provides a guide and a process for growth management. It is a set of policies and a policy-making process designed to help elected officials make decisions locally on those complex public growth issues that affect more than one jurisdiction. The RDP assists local officials in evaluating the growth impacts of public spending and regulation. The RDP is also designed to assist local officials to modify "implicit" policies--incentives and disincentives--that affect private growth-related decisions. These implicit policies include direct and indirect subsidies, regulations, pricing policies, and tax structures. An example is taxation and service charges assessed against farmlands which can force conversion to higher intensity uses.

2. Content. The RDP reflects the subregional structure of PSCOG and therefore consists of four basic elements. These are:

(a) Regional Goals and Policies, some of which are explicitly expanded and interpreted by the SRC's in their plans, and some of which are not. In either case they recognize a significant deliberative and decision-making role for the local legislative bodies with respect to both goals and the means for achieving chosen goals (See Chapter III);

[NOTE: The Goals and Policies pose questions, in effect indicating what information is needed to evaluate pending public and private actions. Modeling efforts--such as the AAM or other models used by other agencies--will facilitate issue identification and can illustrate policy options, but will be clearly subordinate to the deliberative and legislative process. The SRC's provide forums for developing answers to the questions posed by the Goals and Policies and for making the implied tradeoffs.]
(b) The four freestanding subregional council (SRC) plans (See Chapter IV);

[NOTE: The RDP assumes a decentralized legislative/Administrative process which addresses the specific causes of specific problems in the SRC forums as these forums: (1) develop the means for achieving chosen goals and (2) debate the goals or the underlying issues themselves.

The Goals and Policies portion of the RDP provides an overall framework for making judgments and tradeoffs in major policy areas or functional plans of regional significance.]

(c) A method for flagging significant regional level conflicts between the SRC goals, federal programs, or the public and private sectors, and for assuring that these are addressed (see Chapter V);

[NOTE: In addition to the SRC's, other forums would include inter-SRC meetings, special task forces, or joint meetings of existing committees...whose work will be accepted to the extent they limit themselves to well-defined concrete issues (e.g., drainage problems between King and Snohomish Counties, inter-related water resources issues, etc.).]

(d) Linkages to other planning activities (see Chapter VI);

[NOTE: The RDP and SRC plans are concerned with the side effects of decisions made in COG and SRC issue areas on other closely-related issue areas not assigned to the PSCOG and SRC's (and vice-versa). The RDP proposes to deal with these closely-related issues by identifying the contact points specifically, and then developing specific solutions jointly with agencies and actors responsible for these other programs or actions.]

3. Scope. The scope of the RDP is defined by the interlocal agreement constituting PSCOG (pursuant to the State Interlocal Cooperation Act, R.C.W. 39.34). That agreement represents a joint commitment by the member local governments to undertake (a) "continuous, cooperative regional development; (b) land use; (c) housing; and (d) transportation planning" on interjurisdictional issues.
These four subject areas constitute the basic focus of the RDP. The Interlocal Agreement, however, further recognizes PSCOG's authority and purpose:

"To maintain an ongoing planning system and coordinate actions so that we may make the best use of our land, air, water and energy resources; overcome the problems of waste and pollution."

Interjurisdictional developmental issues are dealt with continuously and cooperatively within the COG/SRC structure and the processes outlined in the RDP.

B. **WHY IT IS BEING DONE**

1. **Introduction.** The RDP is being done to provide a way of evaluating and acting on the areawide and local aspects of inter­jurisdictional public policy questions. Local elected officials intend to make decisions which are tailored to specific circumstances as well as mandated federal standards. Complex public issues must be sorted out, and specifically addressed by those elected to make the many implied trade-offs which are not made in the market. This will be done in a manner which allows prompt treatment of new issues and which, therefore, does not pretend to eliminate in advance all such difficulties through integrated planning.

2. **Objectives.** Specifically, the RDP is being done:

(a) To institute an ongoing and targeted problem-solving approach for applying regional and subregional goals and policies at the subregional level to issues of development, land use, housing and transportation (and this is to be done in a manner which does not generate new problems);

(b) To coordinate public decision-making by (1) clarifying the relationships among the several participating agencies of the COG and the SRC's, and between all of these and the private sector; and (2) maintaining communication and cooperation with other agencies and the private sector on issues closely related to regional development, land use, transportation and housing; and

(c) To satisfy federal statutory requirements in those cases where federal funding is used to assist local programs or where local jurisdictions are participating in national programs.
The major objective is to protect the personal rights of citizens from the otherwise unexamined secondary consequences of public and private actions, and where conflicting rights must be balanced, to provide a forum and a process for doing this.

3. Concerns. Five concerns for making the necessary trade-offs guided the initial development of the Regional Goals and Policies: costs, equity, resources, quality of life, and intergovernmental relations --

a. Cost: Consideration of all of the marginal costs and benefits (present and future) to both the public sector and the private sector of public and private actions or policies (implicit and explicit) affecting regional development, land use, housing and transportation.

b. Equity: A just distribution of costs and benefits to all persons (including members of future generations) caused by specific public actions, consistent with the prior and personal rights of all individual citizens.

c. Resources: Recognition of the relationships between environmental resources in making the tradeoffs involved in any public program, together with a recognition that "resources" involve both the personal right to property as well as the cumulative rights of individuals as members of the broader society.

d. Quality of Life:
The aspects of this region's natural and manmade environment that make it a desirable place to live. A principal concern is the prevention and correction of specific abuses (adverse secondary impacts) caused by public and private actions.

e. Intergovernmental Relations: Recognition of the "federated" governmental structure and the respective responsibilities of each level of government and the rights and obligations of citizens, with particular attention paid to the impacts of state and federal programs and policies on the options, capabilities and decisions of local governments.
C. HOW IT IS USED

The RDP consists of both a "plan" and a process for resolving those issues involving more than one SRC. The plan is the four Subregional Plans and the Goals and Policies, which represent the shared commitments of the SRC's and their member governments. The process includes both the subregional structure and procedures established in PSCOG's by-laws and specific measures for dealing with inter-SRC and intergovernmental issues. The decisions of the COG, Subregional Councils and other agencies impact and are impacted by each other. The ongoing roles of decision-makers acting on different bodies must be clearly understood. These roles and responsibilities are outlined below.

1. Public Agencies. The purpose of the government is to maintain conditions ensuring that people can freely and responsibly meet their own needs either individually or in voluntary groups in ways not involving unnecessary public control or expense. Acting at different levels, the government furthers the public good by acting as an arbiter between particular interests, rather than as a servant of any or several particular groups or interests. Where public programs are proper, it should see that these are provided at the lowest level possible while also recognizing the systemic nature of many public issues.
(a) Executive Board

Role

- To "coordinate" SRC actions to best meet public needs and to address those regional issues which have been identified as such by the Executive Board or which have been handed up by the SRC's (as provided in the by-laws); to use the SRC's to tailor federal programs to local issues and circumstances, and to suggest changes to those federal programs or amend the RDP and SRC plans based on the findings of the SRC's, local jurisdictions or other forums in the public and private sectors.

- As appropriate, to cooperate with other agencies dealing with issues either affecting or affected by decisions on development related to land use, housing and transportation.

RDP Responsibilities

- To provide information which can help local jurisdictions, other agencies and the private sector to understand the long-range regional consequences of specific public policies and of private actions. To conduct modeling efforts which help elected officials to apply agreed principles to local issues in a manner impacted by SRC review and policies.

The RDP process is supported by PSCOG's and the SRC's informational and analytical work, which are designed to be flexible enough to deal with both specific and systemic aspects of any issue. Information and analysis are available where and when decisions must be made. At the same time, they should identify future options or longer-term problems that ought not or cannot be foreclosed at present.

- To flag specific issues which are not handled by the SRC's or which involve more than one SRC and have not been dealt with by other means (such as joint meetings or task forces), and to prioritize those assigned to the PSCOG and to budget resources to resolving them.

- After SRC review, to act on the annual budget, the regional transportation plan, prospectus, transportation improvement program, transportation systems program, the RDP, A-95's and EIS's of regional significance.

(b) Subregional Councils

Role

- To act as the primary planning organizations of PSCOG and to provide forums for debate among locally elected officials on regional development, land use, housing and transportation issues which: (1) are local but affect citizens of several jurisdictions; (2) are interlocal; (3) involve higher levels of government.
The process for developing policy direction at the SRC level is that of isolating real problems, identifying causes, assembling appropriate parties (joint meetings), and developing alternative public programs where appropriate, or corrections to past programs (especially as these interact in unforeseen ways) which are judged to actually solve the problem identified.

RDP Responsibilities

- To ensure that the PSCOG work program is built in part around land use, housing and transportation issues and priorities identified by the SRC's; to review the PSCOG annual budget, regional transportation plan, prospectus, transportation improvement program, transportation system program, the RDP, A-95's and EIS's of regional significance.

- To actively review any assumptions used in modeling exercises associated with federal funding or regulations (AAM), and to ensure that other models and analytical work are also subordinated to the independent critique of legislative bodies (the tradeoffs are to be made explicit and then made by those elected to make such decisions).

- To use the RDP as a checklist of criteria when directly addressing growth-related issues affecting the rights of citizens in their respective areas, and when appropriate amend the SRC plan or suggest amendments to the RDP.

- To (1) review and prepare advisory A-95 comments on requests for federal aid and environmental impact statements submitted from within their respective areas and to use this opportunity to review and amend SRC and RDP policies in light of concrete cases, and to (2) review and help develop other federal programs, policies or regulations on issues identified as "regional" by the Executive Board and which are related to land use, transportation and housing--such as the Regional Investment Strategy--which significantly affect the citizens in this area, either directly or indirectly.

(c) Local Governments

Role

- To handle all local issues locally and in a manner which does not impose unreasonable burdens on the private sector or on adjoining jurisdictions.

- To deal with specific interlocal issues in the appropriate forums, and as appropriate to submit interlocal issues to the SRC's which have been established for this purpose by interlocal agreement (for regional development, land use, housing and transportation issues).
• To review local "implicit" policies which might be contributing to sprawl: tax structures which might discourage rehabilitation, or accelerate sprawl, administrative delays in permit processing which contribute to front-end costs, etc.

• To "detail" policies and "implement" goals set elsewhere, but also to play a key role in evaluating and modifying these policies, especially as they must be balanced against other often-conflicting policies of specialized federal agencies.

RDP Responsibilities

• To take into account the Regional Development Plan in local planning and decision-making.

• To participate actively in the SRC planning and amendment process, to endorse the structure and results of this process as a vehicle for resolving intergovernmental and interjurisdictional issues, and as appropriate, to incorporate SRC (advisory) recommendations into local day-to-day decision-making.

• To provide (1) feedback to the SRC's on the impacts of growth management; (2) a clear understanding of the relationship between the findings of local growth management studies, purposes served, plans adopted and regulations used to carry out the plan (avoid charges of arbitrariness or use of unreasonable means to achieve otherwise proper goals); and (3) explicitness including maps to assist clear conclusions on what can and cannot be done by the private sector. (The need for explicitness must be tempered in some way with the uncertainty of the trends, conditions and forecasts underlying the maps and related controls.)

• To apply regional and subregional goals and policies to the review of federal grant requests (A-95).

(d) Local Special Purpose and School Districts

Role

• To avoid unilateral actions affecting land use, transportation and housing which are inconsistent with local plans and SRC policies.

RDP Relationships

• To use the SRC as a forum or to meet jointly or through task forces to keep general purpose governments informed—and to keep informed—when doing functional planning affecting more than one jurisdiction.
(e) Federal and State Agencies

Role

- To recognize the additional burdens carrying out federal mandates place on local governments (and the private sector).

- To ensure that their respective (countercyclical) fiscal programs aimed at aggregate or specific "needs," do not aggravate an inflation problem which is itself a major cause of instability, private sector uncertainty, wage inflation and the related local fiscal crisis.

- To assist in "growth management" through a coherent federal policy (including but not limited to grant assistance), but also to review existing "implicit" federal policies which also affect urban, suburban and rural areas by distorting market decisions and which often override explicit policy positions. Federal Urban Policy now calls for such "urban impact statements."

Examples of implicit policies include: monetary policy as this deflects private investment into a limited range of activities providing a greater rate of return than the rate of inflation, such as real estate speculation; fiscal and regulatory programs which can tend to displace private investment into alternative program areas rather than augmenting it; and tax structures which in times of inflation are especially burdensome to jurisdictions or private firms operating on inelastic revenue/profit sources.

RDP Relationships

- To recognize the SRC structure which has been instituted under the State Interlocal Cooperation Act. Top-down coordination often tends to reduce intergovernmental efforts particularly on complex issues where there can be more than one correct answer. The SRC structure is tending to rebuild local analytical approaches to local issues and the desired rapport among the officials of local governments and of the SRC's themselves after a decade of categorical "problem-solving."

2. Private Associations. Personal and community needs should be supplied in ways which do not impose unreasonable costs on third parties. This will reduce the pressure for public regulations of abuses and the possibility of widening government operation or control of the function itself. The non-governmental "sector" should work in
a cooperative manner with public agencies to meet real public needs in a manner which does not directly result in inordinate demands for new publicly-funded services possibly duplicating physical facilities already in existence.

(a) To review the SRC plans and the RDP and to offer comments at the issue-oriented forums these "plans" promote. This will help ensure that the results of public actions on complex issues are truly in the public interest.

An example of information which the private sector might help in preparing is: is there a point at which "containment" begins to simply shift costs from the public to the private sector (e.g., housing costs).

(b) To practice self-regulation within the various professions (active in the physical development process) to minimize abuses which might invite intervention by public bodies (and expanding public programs and expenses).

(c) To inform public officials active in local government, the SRC's and higher levels, of conditions and especially implicit public policies which influence private decisions in a manner deemed undesirable in priorities or plans produced by the RDP process. Such implicit policies often tend to override adopted public policies.

(d) Working through a myriad of markets, to continue to make the tradeoffs among scarce resources through individual decisions, but in a manner not damaging to the public good.
CHAPTER III
REGIONAL GOALS AND POLICIES

A. INTRODUCTION

The Puget Sound Council of Governments adopted the Goals and Policies for Regional Development (GPRD) in February, 1977. The aim of the GPRD is to provide a framework within which officials can deal with the opportunities and problems of growth management that involve more than a single jurisdiction. The GPRD is a policy guide and as such is distinguished from traditional comprehensive plans which present an end-state picture of the future. The GPRD offers the advantage of adaptability to changing conditions and of giving specific attention to specific issues.

Following the GPRD approach, and using its goals and policies as a point of departure, each of the SRC's has developed its own Subregional Plan (see Chapter 4). The GPRD remains in force, but is also subject to future detailing and amendment, based in part on the ongoing SRC efforts. The three basic elements of the GPRD are summarized below.

B. PURPOSE

The GPRD proposes five concerns which should be considered in evaluating growth-related issues: costs, equity, resources, quality of life and intergovernmental relations (see Chapter 2 of this RDP). The intent is to address locally-identified problems through an accountable decision process and in a manner which preserved a significant role for all levels of government.

The PSCOG and the Subregional Councils are to serve as forums for dealing with real issues. The advisory GPRD and this ongoing process are to be used for:

(a) grant coordination;
(b) recognizing local as well as national issues, and subordination of plan administration to legislative decision-making;
(c) providing a basis for evaluating the broader implications of community decisions;
(d) providing for A-95 reviews; and
(e) providing a "framework" for ongoing issue analysis and policy planning at the subregional level.
C. GOALS AND POLICIES

The Goals and Policies articulate a "containment" policy which seeks to reduce sprawl while providing for more complete utilization and renovation of existing capital investments. This intention is defined in several categorized policy statements, each identifying a specific problem area, a goal and several policies. The policy categories are: activity centers, agriculture, economics, housing, natural environment and amenities, public services, transportation, intergovernmental relations, fiscal, and social. The GPRD deals directly with problems, or issue areas, and has resulted in the drafting of several issue papers. The focus of the GPRD (and of the SRC plans) is primarily on finding solutions to real problems, and secondarily on the coordination of categorical grant programs.

Following is a summary of the regional goals:

1. Activity centers - concentrate regional service, shopping, employment, governmental, recreational and cultural activities in existing urban centers where investments in transportation and public services have already been made.

2. Agriculture - develop and implement policies to sustain agriculture.

3. Economy - encourage a broad range of economic opportunities for all citizens.

4. Housing - assure adequate housing with maximum locational choice for all households in the region by:

(a) encouraging each jurisdiction to promote increased housing opportunities for a broad range of income levels.

(b) encouraging the creation and/or maintenance of sound viable neighborhoods and revitalization of declining neighborhoods.

(c) balancing housing and available community support facilities and service.

(d) coordinating housing planning of local, regional, state and federal agencies to more efficiently distribute housing resources and eliminate duplication and overlap.
5. Natural environment and amenities -
   (a) maintain the natural beauty and livability of the region through sensitive treatment of nature in development.
   (b) maintain sufficient quantities of recreation and open space land.
   (c) mitigate natural disasters by guiding urban growth to minimize natural disaster hazards to person, property and community welfare.
   (d) work toward the elimination of air, water and noise pollution.

6. Public services - minimize the cost of future growth by encouraging maximum use of existing public services before expanding to new areas.

7. Transportation - provide mobility for people and goods and coordinate transportation services to maximize use of existing facilities.

8. Federal-state-local relations - advocate a change in methods by which federal and state governments share resources and responsibilities with local governments; this change is for the purpose of recognizing more fully that local governments have primary responsibility to establish local priorities.

9. Fiscal - achieve a local revenue base capable of meeting demonstrated need while minimizing unequal burdens on taxpayers and limiting industrial and business space to projected needs.

10. Social - coordinate growth management decisions with the provision of health, education and public safety services.

D. REVIEW AND AMENDMENT PROCEDURES

This section of the GPRD provides for an ongoing decision-process which both applies the goals and policies and supplements them. The GPRD outlines six administrative parts: basic principles, determination of whether an issue is of regional significance, procedures for reviewing issues, amendments to the GPRD, periodic evaluation of the GPRD and other specific COG actions. Some of this material has been qualified by the more recent PSCOG by-laws which define all issues as being subregional initially, and by the aggressive role assumed by the Subregional Councils.
CHAPTER IV
SUBREGIONAL PLANS

A. SUMMARY OF THE KING SUBREGIONAL PLAN

1. Purpose. The purpose of the King Subregional Council plan is to provide a county-wide guide to growth management decisions which will be adopted and implemented locally. The plan will also serve as a guide for regional actions or recommendations on A-95 reviews, population forecasts and for discussions on specific issues. The plan recognizes the desirability of guiding the location and timing of growth rather than the absolute amount of growth. The plan seeks to promote utilization of land areas previously committed to development and existing facility systems.

2. Policies and Implementation Guidelines. The cornerstone of the King Subregional Council plan is the policies which focus on five major subject areas: phased growth, activity centers, transportation, public utilities, and intergovernmental coordination. Each policy is supported by suggested implementation guidelines. The guidelines amplify the meaning and intent of the policies and aid in their interpretation.

   a. The phased growth policies embody the principles for the location and timing of development outside of and as a corollary to the activity centers. These principles include full utilization of existing investments in public services, supply and demand for land, natural hazards and environmentally sensitive areas.

   b. The activity center policies propose local designation of activity centers as concentrations of commerce, employment, and housing and encourage public expenditures and local land use decisions to reinforce designated activity centers.

   c. The transportation policies address the type, location and priority of transportation improvements directly associated with the land use decisions. The central policies of the transportation section are to use transportation facilities and services to support publicly-adopted land use policies, and recommend a priority order for project development of transportation facilities and services.
d. The public utility policies encourage mutually supportive land use and public services decisions by all service providers. They encourage full utilization of existing water and sewer services, conservation of land resources, economies in capital expenditures, and improved relationships between utility and land use planning.

e. The intergovernmental coordination policies are designed to promote mechanisms which avoid or minimize land use or development problems which occur among governments and affect more than one jurisdiction.

3. Review and Amendment Procedure. The King Subregional Council plan provides a framework for local and areawide decisions and for further investigation, debate, issue identification and policy evolution. The web of development decisions and public policy influences is extremely complex. Few assumptions remain sacred; most are in need of continuing examination. The King Subregional Council plan is viewed as a living document. It must grow and change with the events and decisions which shape growth in the area. It should reflect, through the amendment process, growth management decisions made by local governments and policies and intergovernmental decisions forged in the Subregional Council.
B. KITSAP SUBREGIONAL URBAN CONCENTRATION CONCEPT

1. Origin and Purpose. The Kitsap Subregional Plan is a reflection of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan, adopted in August, 1977. All of the member jurisdictions in the county endorsed the general scope and concept of the County plan in a Subregional Council resolution (July, 1978).

The Kitsap subregion is undergoing a period of rapid growth and subsequent demand for public services and facilities. A county-wide, multi-jurisdictional plan reflecting community needs, citizen desires, and adequate protection of health, safety, and welfare of all county residents is necessary to accommodate this projected growth in a responsible manner. The Subregional Plan will serve as a basis for A-95 reviews coming before the Subregional Council as well as an overall guide for other local plans now being revised or developed by each of the cities and the Suquamish Tribe.

2. Concept. Concisely stated, the Urban Concentration Concept seeks to concentrate urban types and intensities of development in and around existing urban areas, where services exist or are soon to be provided. Conversely, rural areas should be developed with intensities and uses that do not require substantial public services and expenditures. The overall objective is to accommodate expected growth in a manner consistent with the following concerns:

(a) To preserve to the maximum extent feasible, the rural lifestyle and character of the county.

(b) To provide for all housing and lifestyle preferences and to ensure an adequate supply of affordable housing for all families and individuals.

(c) To provide urban services necessary to support the population (i.e., water, sewer, protection, social services, etc.) in the most cost-effective manner by concentrating development to maximize actual use of those services.

(d) To do the least amount of damage to the natural resources of the county.
The **Urban Concentration Concept** identifies conditions supporting development in urban designated areas, intermediate (growth) areas and rural (low-density) areas. Specific land use densities and types are left to local jurisdictions to determine. Only the overall concentration "concept" (and associated principles) is included in the Subregional Council plan.

The **Urban Concentration Concept** also includes policies covering natural resources, intergovernmental coordination, parks and open space, transportation, housing, community facilities and economic issues together with definition of terms used in the document.

While the County Plan contains a graphic illustration of policy, the SRC document does not specifically delineate policies in map form. The areas that fall into "urban" are primarily incorporated and need no general illustration. Areas in potential controversy at the edges of cities and the Tribal boundary are expected to be dealt with over time as local plans emerge and differences are resolved in actual cases.

3. **Implementation.** Kitsap County has been implementing the **Urban Concentration Concept** since August, 1977, for unincorporated areas. Since July, 1978, the SRC has used **Concept** policies in A-95 reviews. The SRC implementation program is aimed at key growth issues for which local assistance is requested. The 1979 work program, for example, includes efforts in annexation and water supply, both of which fall into this category.

4. **Review and Amendment.** The adoption resolution (KSRC 1-1978) states that when specific local comprehensive plans are approved or amended, the **Concept** will be reviewed for possible conflicts and amended, if necessary, by the Subregional Council. The **Concept** is expected to influence local and land use planning efforts to a considerable extent but it is recognized that some adjustments may be necessary as greater local land use planning detail is established in the future.
C. PIERCE COUNTYWIDE GROWTH CONCEPT AND POLICIES

1. Purpose. The purpose of the Concept is to help prepare public agencies for dealing with the urban service demands created by the addition of 150,000 new people expected to reside in Pierce County by the year 2000. Where and when these services are provided substantially affects the pattern of development and its public costs.

The Concept will guide public decisions regarding county-wide public services and will help determine the consistency of local decisions that impact county-wide services. "County-wide services" are those public services and facilities that should be planned and coordinated on a county-wide basis and include sewers, water, transit, highways, and major open space. Local public service decisions will continue to determine the location and extent of most public expenditures regarding future growth in the County. However, the Concept attempts to "cut across" jurisdictional boundaries to better deal with county-wide conflicts regarding major public services.

The Concept is a reflection of local community and city comprehensive plans and fully recognizes the many years of local effort and citizen involvement that has taken place to produce them. It helps assure that these local plans are not contradictory to one another or to county-wide aims. It is intended to provide an overall perspective of the county concerning where, in the collective eyes of all these local areas, it should be going.

2. The Countywide Growth Concept. The Concept is to make the most effective and efficient use of present public service investments prior to making major new growth-related commitments in "outlying" areas of Pierce County. To do this, the Concept calls for:

(a) Positive action to encourage new growth to locate in areas where public and private services already exist and have sufficient capacity;

(b) Discouraging urban development from locating in rural areas of the county where urban services cannot be conveniently provided in the foreseeable future and where rural activities, such as farming, should be permitted to survive;
(a) Expanding urban services in a phased and economically-timed fashion in growth (transitional) areas so that the magnitude of new development can be easily accommodated during the planning period (i.e., by the year 2000);

(d) Encouraging major shopping, business and cultural activities to locate in existing centers (in most cases, cities) rather than in stripped or scattered locations throughout the county;

(e) Preserving those elements of our natural environment that contribute to the high amenity standard of the area and that preserve future economic and social options (i.e., the future option to farm, as the activity becomes even more critical in the future);

(f) Assuring that public decisions are coordinated among local jurisdictions to assure a more uniform and collective response to common growth management concerns.

The Concept is illustrated by three maps showing general land use, centers of growth and conservation areas. The illustrations are not policies in and of themselves and defer to local plans and sources for detail and authority.

3. Implementation Program.

(a) Roles and responsibilities
The Concept is community wide as well as multi-jurisdictional. That is, it requires the mutual consent and cooperation of each government agency and affected group. Each government and group, therefore, has a role, and each local or special purpose plan has a place in the overall plan. These "roles" and "places" are described in the document.

(b) Program recommendations
The Concept establishes ten program recommendations which correspond to the overall theme for growth management. They are: (1) establishment of local growth rates; (2) establishment of a county-wide investment strategy; (3) achieving interlocal agreements that coordinate land use and utilities planning;
(4) establishment of conservation futures funding; (5) formalization of SRC review procedures (criteria and process); (6) seeking changes in state and federal laws and guidelines; (7) seeking funding assistance for special studies; (8) formalization of citizen access to the planning process; (9) increasing the proportionate share of park funds spent by federal and state funds in Pierce County vs. other counties in the region; and (10) seeking coordinated purchase of parks and open space.

(c) Review and amendment
The adoption resolution (PC-197801) calls for periodic review and amendment, if necessary; particularly in reference to emerging community and city comprehensive plans. No specific time period is prescribed for review.
D. SUMMARY OF THE SNOHOMISH SUBREGIONAL PLAN

1. Purpose and Format. The Snohomish Subregional Council has chosen to address growth issues by developing a land use plan for its subregion which emphasizes process over product, and which focuses directly on specific issues of current interjurisdictional interest (at the expense of comprehensiveness). It is to be a policy plan with problem, goal and policy statements loosely organized in a format similar to the PSCOG Goals and Policies for Regional Development. The plan is expected to be published in a single loose-leaf document which cites both regional and subregional policies under common issue headings. Plan elements adopted by the SRC will thereby include both specifically endorsed regional language as well as subregional language that expands or specifies the regional framework.

2. Policies. Housing is an issue area that has resulted in the formulation of new subregional policies. A problem statement, goals and several policies were drafted in a series of meetings held this past summer, but the Growth Policy Task Force chose to postpone recommendation of this element to the SRC until it had completed work on parallel elements. These include: (a) an Activity Centers Element; (b) one or two elements on services; and (c) probably a transportation element.

3. Institutional Framework and Process. Perhaps as important as the plan document itself, is the institutional framework and the set of procedures for airing interjurisdictional planning issues. In addition to the Subregional Council, two committees have been established to act through a third committee, the Growth Policy Task Force, in advising the SRC:

(a) the TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, composed of planning and engineering staff representatives of all member jurisdictions, meets monthly to consider an agenda parallel to that of the SRC but emphasizing technical issues. This body is also responsible for reviewing demographic estimates and forecasts.
(b) The CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE composed of interested citizens from all parts of the subregion meets monthly to consider SRC agenda items of interest to them, and to discuss and prepare recommendations to the SRC on these topics.

(c) the GROWTH POLICY TASK FORCE is made up of representatives of the SRC and both the Technical and Citizens Advisory Committees. It is directly responsible for recommending specific policy language to the SRC on issues selected by them. The SRC may adopt these policies as part of the Subregional Land Use Plan.

A policy issue discussion may be triggered in any of these groups, which then refers the question to the Growth Policy Task Force through its representative. The Task Force hammers out the draft policy language which is then reviewed by the other bodies before final consideration by the SRC.

An important and unique feature of this process is that the discussion of a particular issue need not necessarily lead to the adoption of formal policy language. (The issues were: county-wide water supply, agricultural preservation, and the growth implications of higher-priced energy.) The SRC was satisfied that the discussion alone was sufficient to meet the needs of interjurisdictional cooperation at this time. These issues may well be raised again in the future when specific policy agreements might be more appropriate. In the meantime, all the parties are kept abreast of one another's positions.

The objective of the process is to resolve interjurisdictional disputes and find solutions to common problems at the level of lowest necessary commitment. This produces an uneven and less-than-comprehensive set of policy statements, but the policies are more likely to be implemented because they directly reflect real commitments by member governments.
CHAPTER V

METHOD FOR RESOLVING REGIONAL LEVEL CONFLICTS

The Subregional structure of PSCOG provides the capacity to deal with complex issues in a manner which pinpoints the key problems for action by local elected officials. This "targeted" approach relies on both established and ad hoc forums, determined in each case by the nature of the issues at hand.

A. INTER-SRC ISSUES

In those cases where an issue affects more than one SRC, there are several cooperative approaches which can be used. These include:

1. Identification of the issues as "regional" by the Executive Board or referral of the issue to the Executive Board by any affected SRC (as provided in the PSCOG by-laws);

2. Joint meetings between the affected SRC's;

3. Referral of the issue to a task force created by the affected SRC's, with recommendations for resolution returned to each SRC by the task force. The task forces may be based upon existing SRC committees.

4. Joint meetings between the individual members of each SRC who are actually affected by the issue, (for example, the informal meeting of the SRC Chairmen prior to each Executive Board meeting).

B. FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS

Chapter II indicates the responsibilities of the federal and state agencies with respect to the RDP. Generally, the SRC's are free to raise issues by such means as commenting on draft federal and state guidelines or by identifying an issue as regional and referring it to the Executive Board for debate and further action. The intent is to carry out Policy 4 under the Intergovernmental Relations portion of the Regional Goals and Policies:
"Federal agencies, the Congress, state agencies or the legislature should define the local impact of federal or state programs/actions which may skew local priorities, impose unreasonable demands on the time and resources of local governments, or conflict with locally agreed growth management strategies."

C. PRIVATE SECTOR

Chapter II outlines the responsibilities of the private sector with respect to the RDP. Conflicts may be anticipated since the ongoing task is one of balancing rights and obligations with the purpose of preserving personal political and economic liberties while also protecting the public good. Cooperation, mediation and sharing of information is to be encouraged by the RDP framework, SRC forums and their subcommittees. Consistency and predictability in public policies (explicit and implicit) and actions should be matched by cooperation by the non-governmental sectors. Also, to the extent that mutual accommodations can be fostered, the need for litigation, as a conflict resolution process, can be reduced.

It is recognized that an overly structured approach designed in advance to deal with hypothetical future issues can often overburden and finally prevent fresh initiatives in problem areas. The decentralized SRC structure provides the opportunities for cooperation and encourages a creative exploration of specific issues by elected persons as distinguished from agencies. The need for elaborate structural solutions is diminished as attention is focused directly on issues (rather than structures) which from the outset are recognized to be many-sided.
CHAPTER VI
RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANNING AND PROGRAMS
FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The elected officials of the COG and SRC are concerned with the impacts that their decisions have on the programs of other agencies. They are also interested in identifying the impacts of other agency decisions on COG and SRC programs. The RDP proposes to identify specifically the contact points between agency programs and then to deal with specific issues through such means as joint meetings or task forces. The following table outlines how the SRC's and the COG are related to other agencies and programs. (Communication between government decision-makers and the market are provided for in Chapter II, Part C-2.)
### RDP Planning Efforts and Related Functional Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>COG/SRC Role</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation*</td>
<td>PSCOG with SRC review of TIP Amendments</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In King County the SRC is contracted by Metro to provide land use data for Transition IV. In addition, the PSCOG has memoranda of agreement with the State Highway Department and all of the transit operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing*</td>
<td>Local CDBG jurisdictions (PSCOG and local housing authorities are secondary)</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>PSCOG has agreements with 70 jurisdictions to participate in the RDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use*</td>
<td>Local jurisdictions</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>Each of the SRC's is producing a relatively freestanding plan, based on local objectives and the COG Goals and Policies; the relationship between COG and SRC plans are explained in the RDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Continuous, Cooperative Regional Development&quot; *</td>
<td>Lead Agency depends upon the program. Specific linkages with the COG/SRC structure are allowed for in the RDP and indicated in the entries below.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>The SRC is providing a forum to explore alternative proposals prepared by Seattle, Bellevue and King County. Major studies are the Seattle Comprehensive Water Supply Plan, the Mediated Agreement (see Snohomish County), the &quot;Level B&quot; Study (see Snohomish County), and the Joint Cedar-Snohomish Feasibility Study. As the wholesaler, Seattle works with 34 local purveyors supplying approximately 90 per cent of the water needs of the County. The BCC was established by King County to implement the Mediated Agreement. Everett and the Snohomish PUD §1 jointly own the countywide water supply system. The PUD is considering raising Culmback Dam for energy production. Everett is the water supply wholesaler and works through numerous local purveyors. Major studies are the &quot;Level B&quot; Study, the Joint Cedar-Snohomish Feasibility Study and the Mediated Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>(King SRC)</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tacoma is the wholesale water supplier, but approximately half of the need is supplied by ground water. The Tacoma supply is the Green River watershed located in King County. With the completion of Pipeline §5, Tacoma may serve southwestern King County (generally south of 272nd Street).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Basin Coordinating Council (BCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local jurisdictions and special districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Snohomish SRC)</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everett and Snohomish PUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Basin Coordinating Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local jurisdictions and special districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pierce SRC)</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local jurisdictions and special districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1**NOTE:** The four programs marked with an asterisk are assigned to PSCOG through Interlocal agreement.

2**NOTE:** The SRC's, indicated in parentheses, are not lead agencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>(Kitsap SRC) Kitsap PUD #1 Bremerton Local jurisdictions and special districts &lt;br&gt;(King SRC) Metro King County Local jurisdictions and special districts Snohomish SRC SNOMET Local jurisdiction and special districts (Pierce SRC) DOE Pierce County Local jurisdictions and special districts (Kitsap SRC) DOE Kitsap County Local jurisdictions and special districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRP</th>
<th>RPD</th>
<th>Work Program Agreement</th>
<th>SRC Forum and Plan</th>
<th>A-95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kitsap SRC)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap PUD #1 Bremerton Local jurisdictions and special districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(King SRC) Metro King County Local jurisdictions and special districts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish SRC SNOMET Local jurisdiction and special districts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pierce SRC) DOE Pierce County Local jurisdictions and special districts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kitsap SRC) DOE Kitsap County Local jurisdictions and special districts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**

With passage of the County Services Act in 1967, Kitsap County delegated water supply planning to PUD #1. The PUD drills wells (there are no major watersheds except for Bremerton's) and turns them over to the local purveyors. Recent attempts at coordination include consideration of applying HB 165.

Metro is designated as the areawide 208 agency for the Cedar-Green Basins. The 208 Plan was adopted in January (1978) and has been submitted to DOE and EPA for certification. The SRC was contracted to assist in forecasts, review interceptor extension criteria and institutional analysis. The Water Resources Committee continuously review the 201 Plans, the 215's, and the 208 Plan. Specific tasks are assigned to PSCOC in the 208 Plan and Interlocal Agreement. Metro is the wholesale sewerage agency, providing services to local retail agencies for most of the County.

King County and SNOMET were jointly designated as the 208 agency for the Snohomish Basin. The 208 Plan was adopted in November, 1977, and submitted to DOE and EPA for certification. The SRC served on the technical advisory committee and monitored the 208 Plan development under a memorandum of understanding.

King County has prepared a countywide sewerage plan under the State County Services Act (1967).

Jointly designated with King County as the 208 agency for the Snohomish Basin. (See above comment on King County and SNOMET.) The Snohomish SRC shares management responsibilities with a consortium of local governments in King County. SNOMET is the fiscal agent for the 208 management "agency."

In "undesignated" areas the 208 areawide plan is done by DOE, under the guidance of a statewide policy advisory committee.

The County operates under the 1967 State County Services Act. It has produced three water quality plans, plus an additional one for Gig Harbor. Retail services are provided by local jurisdictions and special districts.

In "undesignated" areas the 208 areawide plan is done by DOE under the guidance of a statewide policy advisory committee. The 1979 County Sewerage Plan provides guidance to the local districts, but is to be replaced by the Central Kitsap and Sinclair Inlet Facilities Plans as these are adopted. The facilities plans are based on the 1977 County land use plan. The County work program (Department of Community Development) is scheduled to update all other special district plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
<th>COG/SRC ROLE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>PSAPCA</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>The PSAPCA conducts air quality monitoring and regulation in the four-county region. Under an interagency agreement (1978), PSCOG provides land use, transportation, and regional development planning. The PSAPCA is lead agency for air quality maintenance planning and transportation control planning. The State DOT and DOE have some implementation responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>(King SRC)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>The Solid Waste element of the RIBCO Study has been adopted locally by several jurisdictions, with a number of specific amendments in many cases. King County is the designated Solid Waste Management Agency under state law. The SRC provides a forum for the local jurisdictions. The County is the Solid Waste Management Agency. The County is the Solid Waste Management Agency. The County is the Solid Waste Management Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Economic Development District (and the four overall countywide economic development committees)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>The EDD and PSCOG have signed an interlocal agreement assigning regional level lead agency responsibility over economic development to EDD, and land use, housing and transportation planning and information to the PSCOG. The Economic Development Council of Puget Sound has participated with PSCOG and the EDD in the preparation of the Regional Development Strategies, which offers the potential for private sector investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Puget Sound Health Systems Agency</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Local government representation on the HSA Board and planning coordination arrangements are specified in an agreement between local governments (including PSCOG) and the PSHSA. Arrangements include opportunity for local government review and comment on HSA plans, a conflict resolution process, and a joint A-95/HSA project review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Local School Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>