The City Council may act on items listed on this agenda, or by consensus give direction for future action. The Council may also add and take action on other items not listed on this agenda.

Location: Bonney Lake Justice & Municipal Center, 9002 Main Street East, Bonney Lake, Washington.

I. Call to Order: Mayor Neil Johnson

II. Roll Call:
Elected Officials: Mayor Neil Johnson, Jr., Deputy Mayor Dan Swatman, Councilmember Mark Hamilton, Councilmember Donn Lewis, Councilmember Randy McKibbin, Councilmember Katrina Minton-Davis, Councilmember James Rackley, and Councilmember Tom Watson.

III. Agenda Items:
A. Presentation: Dr. Sara Johnson – Sumner School District (No advance materials).
B. Presentation: D. M. Disposal – Automated Garbage Collection (No advance materials).
D. Council Open Discussion

G. Discussion: Cancellation of November 11, 2014 Meeting for the Veterans Day Holiday.

IV. Executive Session: Pursuant to RCW 42.30.110, the City Council may hold an executive session. The topic(s) and the session duration will be announced prior to the executive session.

V. Adjournment

For citizens with disabilities requesting translators or adaptive equipment for listening or other communication purposes, the City requests notification as soon as possible of the type of service or equipment needed.
I. CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Neil Johnson, Jr. called the Workshop to order at 5:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:
Administrative Services Director/City Clerk Harwood Edvalson called the roll. In addition to Mayor Johnson, elected officials attending were Deputy Mayor Dan Swatman, Councilmember Mark Hamilton, Councilmember Donn Lewis, Councilmember Randy McKibbin, Councilmember Tom Watson, and Councilmember James Rackley. Councilmember Katrina Minton-Davis was absent.

Councilmember McKibbin moved to excuse Councilmember Minton-Davis. Councilmember Watson seconded.

Motion approved 6 - 0.

Staff members in attendance were City Administrator Don Morrison, Assistant Chief of Police Kurt Alfano, Chief Financial Officer Cherie Gibson, Public Works Director Dan Grigsby, Community Development Director John Vodopich, Senior Planner Jason Sullivan, City Attorney Kathleen Haggard, Administrative Services Director/City Clerk Harwood Edvalson, and Administrative Specialist II Renee Cameron.

The Council, Mayor and staff entered into a Closed Session prior to the presentation of the Agenda Items, due to the fact that the Sumner School District Representatives advised that they would be arriving late to the Workshop for the presentation. The Closed Session occurred prior to the Agenda Items.

III. CLOSED SESSION: Pursuant to RCW 42.30.140(4)(b), the Council adjourned, by consensus, to a Closed Session at 5:32 p.m. for 20 minutes to discuss labor negotiations. At 6:00 p.m. the Closed Session was extended for an additional 5 minutes. The Council returned to chambers at 6:10 p.m. No action was taken.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS:

A. Presentation: Sumner School District - Park & Rec Program and the Interlocal Agreement.

Tim Thomsen, Sumner School District Recreation Director, and Rich Hanson, Manager of the Sumner School District Recreation Department presented a PowerPoint presentation of the Sumner School District’s Parks and Recreation Department and spoke regarding the Interlocal Agreement between the City of Bonney Lake, City of Sumner and the Sumner School District. He would like the School District to continue to work and collaborate with the City for the needs of the community. Mayor Johnson provided clarification of the School District’s use, per the Interlocal Agreement, of the fields at Allan Yorke Park, or any other City park. Mr. Thomsen said the District would also be interested in expanding any branches available for use of other park facilities located within the City of Bonney.
Lake. City Administrator Morrison asked about any concerns of the District’s
Superintendent or the Board, and Mr. Thomsen advised that the Board and Dr. Johnson are
pleased with the programs the recreation department is providing. Council and Mr.
Thomsen and Mr. Hanson had discussion about the YMCA project, other City parks,
funding, the needs of the community, and assistance the City could provide. No action was
taken on this item as it was for information purposes only.

B. Council Open Discussion.

Communities for Families Meeting. Councilmember Watson said he attending the
Communities for Families Meeting on October 2nd where a Good Samaritan Behavioral
Health speaker directed a fun experience with two big balls of yarn to show understanding
of those in attendance how everyone intertwined to assist in helping those in need.

Sumner Liquor Store Compliance Check. Councilmember Watson said Sumner Police
Department did a liquor store compliance check with all of their liquor stores and they had
100% compliance and all of the stores received an award.

National Substance Abuse Prevention Month - October. Councilmember Watson
advised that October is National Substance Abuse Prevention Month, so wanted to make
everyone aware of that.

Homeless Families. Councilmember Watson said there are currently 110-120 families in
the Bonney Lake area that are homeless. Some local churches were able to help a local
families secure a mobile home to move into with assistance in dropping the price to be able
to make it work for the family.

Take the Plunge – Exodus House. Councilmember Watson said with Lake Tapps being
drained early the Exodus House will not be holding the Take the Plunge Against Domestic
Violence event in 2014. However, Exodus House is asking the Mayor, Council, and City
Directors to instead make a $20.00 contribution this year.

Sumner High School Community Event Dinner. Councilmember Watson said the
Sumner High School is having a community event dinner on December 13th at the main
gym to help out for the holidays and food.

Sumner/Bonney Lake Drugs Free Coalition Meeting. Councilmember Watson said the
Sumner and Bonney Lake Drugs Free Coalition is meeting October 13th at 1:30

Prairie Ridge Families. Prairie Ridge is having a lot of activities happening. He said
there are approximately 150 families a week coming to get food out in the Prairie Ridge
area and the local churches and local groups are assisting weekly for those in need.

Public Works Staff for Parks Related Activities/Maintenance. Councilmember Watson
expressed concern about the need for additional staff to assist with parks maintenance
during parks related activities and would like to consider adding to the budget for additional
staff. Mayor Johnson commented his concerns and the need for funding of an additional
full-time position.

Midtown Park Development. Councilmember Watson spoke moving forward with a
plan, as they discussed at the retreat, regarding a pavilion at Midtown Park/WSU Forest for
gatherings, weddings, school activities which would include a road and parking lot. Mayor Johnson said he recalls that Council has also discussed a plan for the WSU Forest/Midtown Park and Allan Yorke Park. He believes the budget needs to include a plan to have it going and can then include appropriate staffing to incorporate the entire plan. He said the City and Council have to be smart about the capital improvement projects they wish to move forward with.

**Park Commission – City Arborist.** Councilmember Hamilton spoke regarding establishment of the Park Commission and their discussion regarding trees located on public lands. He spoke with how the Park Commission can work with the City’s Park staff/arborist. He said the City of Bonney Lake is a Tree City USA and he would like to see the City arborist speak with and work with the Park Commission to work with the Forest Program for the City.

**Milotte Wildlife Film Festival.** Councilmember Hamilton reminded Council of the Annual Milotte Wildlife Film Festival to be held on Saturday, October 18th, at the Justice & Municipal Center. ‘Waterbirds’ and ‘Chimpanzee’ will be the films shown this year, and Bill Waller from the Jane Goodall Institute will be making a presentation, and he said the Audubon Society will also be in attendance. He invited everyone to attend.

**White River’s Communities Families First Coalition.** Councilmember Lewis said the White River’s Families First Coalition met on September 22nd at the Buckley Fire Station, which also focused on the homeless population in the Buckley, Carbonado, and plateau areas. He said the next meeting will be October 27th.

**School Crossing Crosswalk.** Councilmember Lewis spoke regarding the cross walks in his neighborhood and he was pleased to see the new solar panel in front of Bonney Lake High School and it will provide a much safer area for the students traveling to and from school.

**Parks Improvements.** Deputy Mayor Swatman said he supports Councilmember Watson’s concerns with parks improvements to Midtown Park/WSU and other parks and he hopes to have a plan come forward to get it on the ground. He believes funding is available to do some projects.

**186th Corridor Road Improvements.** Deputy Swatman spoke regarding the project to extend 186th out to Veterans Memorial Drive. City Administrator Morrison spoke regarding the additional costs to proceed with those improvements. Councilmember Lewis agreed that it should be done now.

**Raymond Public Access Easement.** Deputy Swatman spoke regarding the Raymond property and the private property and easement. City Administrator Morrison advised that he and the City Attorney prepared a draft letter and response to the Raymond’s attorney and will advise the Council as to the response to the Raymond’s attorney. There was discussion among the Council, Mayor, and City Administrator regarding the Raymond Public Access Easement and whether the issue at hand is now between two private property owners. There was discussion regarding the intent of the City of what they envisioned tying it in with the Fennel Creek Trail. Mayor Johnson said discussion is good and a solution will need to be resolved as is appropriate for the City and the property owners.

The minutes were approved with minor corrections and forwarded to the October 14, 2014 Meeting for action.

D. **Discussion: AB14-103 – Resolution 2404 – Comprehensive Plan Update – Community Character Element (Land Use, Community Character and Housing).**

Senior Planner Jason Sullivan summarized the Agenda Bill for this item, as well as the Administrative Briefing Memo as contained in the agenda packet. Councilmember McKibbin addressed some corrections he would like clarified in the update. Mr. Sullivan clarified the City’s strategy for defining areas as “centers,” and the purpose for it in anticipation of future grants through the Puget Sound Regional Council. Deputy Mayor Swatman commented about some of his concerns if and when the City annexes that area and not rezone it for residential purposes. Mr. Sullivan addressed Deputy Mayor Swatman’s concerns about protecting agricultural lands and the County’s TDR program. Deputy Mayor Swatman questioned the purpose of the primary and secondary gateways of the City and how they were designated. This item was forwarded to the October 14, 2014 Meeting for a Full Council Issue discussion and then action.

V. **ADJOURNMENT:**

At 7:25 p.m., Councilmember Watson moved to adjourn the Council Workshop. Councilmember Lewis seconded the motion.

Motion to adjourn approved 6 - 0.

Harwood Edvalson, MMC
City Clerk

Neil Johnson, Jr.
Mayor

Items presented to Council at the October 7, 2014 Workshop:

- Tim Thomesen, Parks and Recreation Director, Sumner School District - *PowerPoint Presentation*.

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, all documents submitted at City Council meetings and workshops are on file with the City Clerk. For detailed information on agenda items, please view the corresponding Agenda Packets, which are posted on the city website and on file with the City Clerk.
I. CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Neil Johnson, Jr. called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

A. Flag Salute: Mayor Johnson led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Roll Call: Administrative Services Director/City Clerk Harwood Edvalson called the roll. In addition to Mayor Johnson, elected officials attending were Deputy Mayor Dan Swatman, Councilmember Mark Hamilton, Councilmember Donn Lewis, Councilmember Randy McKibbin, Councilmember Katrina Minton-Davis, Councilmember James Rackley, and Councilmember Tom Watson.

Staff members in attendance were City Administrator Don Morrison, Public Works Director Dan Grigsby, Community Development Director John Vodopich, Chief Financial Officer Cherie Gibson, Police Chief Dana Powers, Administrative Services Director/City Clerk Harwood Edvalson, City Attorney Jay Schulkin, Records & Information Specialist Susan Haigh, and Senior Planner Jason Sullivan.

C. Announcements, Appointments and Presentations:

1. Announcements:

   Mayor Johnson said that the City was notified that Accountant Terrina Marchant received her 10-year Professional Financial Officer award. He congratulated her on the accomplishment, and said it is important for staff to have training and recognition.

2. Appointments: None.

3. Presentations:


      Mayor Johnson read the proclamation aloud and invited Joe O’Neil, Executive Director for Exodus Housing, to speak. Mr. O’Neil said it is the 20th anniversary for Exodus Housing, and explained their programs and services for families in the area. He encouraged citizens to support local nonprofits and thanked the City for their support of DV awareness. He noted the “Take the Plunge” event was cancelled in 2014 due to Lake Tapps being drained very low this year.

D. Agenda Modifications:

   Deputy Mayor Swatman moved to add item AB-123 – Resolution 2416 – A Resolution Of The City Council Of The City Of The Bonney Lake, Pierce County, Washington, Authorizing The Mayor To Sign A Professional Services Agreement With Summit Law Group For Labor Relations Services, to the agenda as Full Council Issues, Item D. Councilmember Lewis seconded the motion.

   Motion to modify the
II. PUBLIC HEARINGS, CITIZEN COMMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE:
   A. Public Hearings: None.
   B. Citizen Comments: None.
   C. Correspondence: None.

III. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS:
   A. Finance Committee/Committee of the Whole: Deputy Mayor Swatman said the Committee met as the Committee of the Whole 5:30 p.m. earlier in the evening and discussed personnel updates; the City’s official newspaper (forwarded for action); an Emergency Medical Services (EMS) agreement with Pierce County (forwarded for action); setting the Public Hearing for the Ad Valorem property tax levy (on the current agenda for action); an ordinance for non-represented staff salaries; and an agreement for labor relations services (added to the current agenda for action).
   B. Community Development Committee: Councilmember Lewis said the Committee met on October 7, 2014 and discussed speed limit signs at Bonney Lake High School; flashing crosswalk signs; and parking and access issues at the Fennel Creek trail head. The Committee forwarded proposed Ordinance D13-141 to the current agenda for action.
   C. Economic Development Committee: Councilmember Minton-Davis said the Committee met earlier in the afternoon and heard a presentation of the BlueBeam program by the Building Inspector, and previewed the 3rd quarter report from staff. She said these items will be presented to the Full Council at the next Workshop.
   D. Public Safety Committee: Councilmember Watson said the Committee has not met since the last Council Meeting.
   E. Other Reports: None.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA:
   A. Approval of Minutes: September 16, 2014 Workshop and September 23, 2014 Meeting.
   B. Approval of Accounts Payable and Utility Refund Checks/Vouchers: Accounts Payable checks/vouchers #69625-69659 (including wire transfer #20140907) in the amount of $82,052.98.
      Accounts Payable check/voucher #69660 for utility customer refund in the amount of $122.22.
      Accounts Payable checks/vouchers #69661-69700 (including wire transfer #'s 20140908, 20140909, and 2014091701) in the amount of $293,941.20.
      Accounts Payable checks/vouchers #69701-69729 for utility customer refunds in the amount of $2464.83.
      Accounts Payable check/voucher #69730 in the amount of $66,368.43.
      Accounts Payable checks/voucher #69731-69758 in the amount of $591,419.28.
      Accounts Payable check/voucher #69759 for AR deposit refund in the amount of $471.04.
      Accounts Payable checks/voucher #69760-69763 in the amount of $4,331.72.
      Voids: Check #64961 – replaced with check #69628. Check #66129 – replaced with check #69628. Check #66485 – replaced with
check #69656. Check #69551 – replaced with check #69713. Check #68941 – replaced with check #69675.

C. Approval of Payroll: Payroll for September 1st–15th, 2014 for checks #31983-32006 including Direct Deposits and Electronic Transfers is $502,000.09. Payroll for September 16th-30th, 2014 for checks #32007-32037 including Direct Deposits and Electronic Transfers is $756,980.73.

Councilmember Rackley moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Councilmember Watson seconded the motion.

Consent Agenda approved 7 – 0.

V. FINANCE COMMITTEE ISSUES: None.

VI. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ISSUES: None.

VII. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ISSUES: None.

VIII. PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE ISSUES: None.

IX. FULL COUNCIL ISSUES:

Councilmember Watson moved to approve Ordinance 1493. Councilmember Lewis seconded the motion.

Ordinance 1493 [D14-131] approved 7 – 0.

B. AB14-103 – Resolution 2404 – A Resolution Of The City Council Of The City Of Bonney Lake, Pierce County, Washington, Expressing The Intent To Adopt A Community Development Element.

Councilmember Watson moved to approve Resolution 2404. Councilmember Lewis seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Swatman recognized staff members and Planning Commissioners for their work developing this element of the Comprehensive Plan. Mayor Johnson thanked Senior Planner Sullivan for his efforts. Councilmember Rackley said he didn’t think it could be done in the time frame, and congratulated Mr. Sullivan.

Resolution 2404 approved 7 – 0.

C. AB14-139 – A Motion Of The City Council Of The City Of Bonney Lake, Pierce County, Washington, Setting A Public Hearing At 5:30 P.M., Or As Soon Thereafter As Possible, During The Regular Council Workshop Of November 4, 2014 To Consider Revenue Sources And Possible Property Tax Increases Before Setting The Ad Valorem Property Tax Rate For 2015 (Proposed Ordinance D14-142).
Councilmember Watson moved to approve motion AB14-139. Councilmember Rackley seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Swatman explained that the proposed ordinance is the property tax levy for 2015, and the hearing gives the public a chance to speak on the issue of property tax rates.

**Motion AB14-139 approved 7 – 0.**

D. AB14-123 – Resolution 2416 – A Resolution of The City Council Of The City Of Bonney Lake, Authorizing The Mayor To Sign A Professional Services Agreement With Summit Law Group For Labor Relations Services. Added to the agenda by Agenda Modifications.

Councilmember Watson moved to approve Resolution 2416. Councilmember Rackley seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Swatman said he fully supports this agreement to provide valuable resources during negotiations. Mayor Johnson thanked Human Resources Manager Jenna Richardson for her work putting this agreement together for negotiations this year and in the future.

**Resolution 2416 approved 7 – 0.**

X. **EXECUTIVE SESSION:** None.

XI. **ADJOURNMENT:**

At 7:15 p.m., Councilmember Lewis moved to adjourn the Council Meeting. Councilmember Watson seconded the motion.

**Motion to adjourn approved 7 – 0.**

---

Harwood Edvalson, MMC
City Clerk

Neil Johnson, Jr.
Mayor

Items presented to Council at the October 14, 2014 Meeting:

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, all documents submitted at City Council meetings and workshops are on file with the City Clerk. For detailed information on agenda items, please view the corresponding Agenda Packets, which are posted on the city website and on file with the City Clerk.
City of Bonney Lake, Washington
City Council Agenda Bill (AB)

Department/Staff Contact: Community Development/
Jason Sullivan – Senior Planner

Meeting/Workshop Date: October 21, 2014
Agenda Bill Number: AB14-121

Agenda Item Type: Discussion

Ordinance/Resolution Number: 2415

Councilmember Sponsor:

Agenda Subject: CPP Amendments Related to Potential Annexation Areas

Full Title/Motion:

Administrative Recommendation:

Background Summary:
The proposed amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) would replace the County’s current designating of “urban service areas” with Potential Annexation Areas to identify areas within the urban growth area that could be annexed by a city or town in Pierce County. The amendments encourage a more coordinated strategy to facilitate the annexation of areas within designated urban growth areas. These amendments have been approved by the Pierce County Council following approval recommendations from both the Pierce County Regional Council (PCRC) and the Growth Management Coordinating Committee (GMCC). In order for this amendment to the CPP to become effective it must be ratified by 60 percent of the jurisdictions in Pierce County representing 75 percent of the total population by either executing an inter-local agreement or by taking no legislative action to disapprove the proposed amendment by December 21, 2014.

Attachments: Resolution 2415, City Administration Briefing Memo, and Planning Commission Recommendation Memo,
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RESOLUTION NO. 2415

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BONNEY LAKE, PIERCE COUNTY, WASHINGTON, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH PIERCE COUNTY FOR CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES AS RECOMMENDED BY THE PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL COUNCIL

The City Council of the City of Bonney Lake, Washington, does hereby resolve that the Mayor is authorized to sign the attached Interlocal attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein by this reference.

PASSED by the City Council this ________ day of ______________ 2014.

________________________________
Mayor Neil Johnson, Jr.

AUTHENTICATED:

Harwood T. Edvalson, MMC, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________
Kathleen J. Haggard, City Attorney
RESOLUTION 2415
EXHIBIT A

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT
AMENDMENTS TO THE PIERCE COUNTY
COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES

This agreement is entered into by and among the cities and towns of Pierce County and Pierce County. This agreement is made pursuant to the provisions of the Interlocal Cooperation Act of 1967, Chapter 39.34 RCW. This agreement has been authorized by the legislative body of each jurisdiction pursuant to formal action and evidenced by execution of the signature page of this agreement.

BACKGROUND:

A. The Pierce County Regional Council (PCRC) was created in 1992 by interlocal agreement among the cities and towns of Pierce County and Pierce County. The organization is charged with responsibilities, including: serving as a local link to the Puget Sound Regional Council, promoting intergovernmental cooperation, facilitating compliance with the coordination and consistency requirements of the Growth Management Act (Chapter 36.70A RCW) and the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (Chapter 47.80 RCW), and developing a consensus among jurisdictions regarding the development and modification of the Countywide Planning Policies.

B. The Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies provide for amendments to be adopted through amendment of the original interlocal agreement, or by a new interlocal agreement. The Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies may be amended upon the adoption of amendments by the Pierce County Council and ratification by 60 percent of the jurisdictions in Pierce County representing 75 percent of the total Pierce County population as designated by the State Office of Financial Management at the time of the proposed ratification.

C. A demonstration of ratification shall be by execution of an interlocal agreement or the absence of a legislative action to disapprove a proposed amendment.

D. A jurisdiction shall be deemed as casting an affirmative vote if it has not taken legislative action to disapprove a proposed amendment within 180 days from the date the Pierce County Council formally authorizes the Pierce County Executive to enter into an interlocal agreement.

E. The Pierce County Regional Council formally authorized the Pierce County Executive to enter into an interlocal agreement on June 24, 2014.
F. The amendment incorporates new policies that set criteria and a process for the formal recognition of areas that serve as important centers within Pierce County communities. This formal recognition may be used in future countywide project evaluations.

G. The Pierce County Regional Council recommended adoption of the proposed amendment on October 17, 2013.

PURPOSE:

This agreement is entered into by the cities and towns of Pierce County and Pierce County for the purpose of ratifying and approving the attached amendment to the Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies (Exhibit A).

DURATION:

This agreement shall become effective upon execution by 60 percent of the jurisdictions in Pierce County, representing 75 percent of the total Pierce County population as designated by the State Office of Financial Management at the time of the proposed ratification. This agreement will remain in effect until subsequently amended or repealed as provided by the Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies.

SEVERABILITY:

If any of the provisions of this agreement are held illegal, invalid, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions shall remain in full force and effect.

FILING:

A copy of this agreement shall be filed with the Secretary of State, Washington Department of Commerce, the Pierce County Auditor, and each city and town clerk.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this agreement has been executed by each member jurisdiction as evidenced by the signature page affixed to this agreement.
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

AMENDMENTS TO THE PIERCE COUNTY

COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES

Signature Page

The legislative body of the undersigned jurisdiction has authorized execution of the Interlocal Agreement, Amendments to the Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF

This agreement has been executed by City of Bonney Lake

BY: ____________________________________________
    Mayor Neil Johnson, Jr.

DATE: __________________________________________

Approved as to Form:

BY: ____________________________________________
    Kathleen J. Haggard, City Attorney

Approved:

BY: ____________________________________________
    (Pierce County Executive)
EXHIBIT A

Proposed Amendment
to the
Pierce County Countywide Planning
Addressing

Potential Annexation Areas
And Annexation
COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICY ON URBAN GROWTH AREAS,
PROMOTION OF CONTIGUOUS AND ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT
AND PROVISION OF URBAN SERVICES TO SUCH DEVELOPMENT

Background - Requirements of Growth Management Act

The Washington State Growth Management Act has as planning goals the encouragement of development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner [RCW 36.70A.020(1)], the reduction of sprawl (i.e., the inappropriate or premature conversion of undeveloped land into low-density development) [RCW 36.70A.020(2)], and the provision of adequate public facilities and services necessary to support urban development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use (without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards) [RCW 36.70A.020(12)] as planning goals.

The Growth Management Act further requires (1) that the County designate an "urban growth area" (UGA) or areas within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth shall occur only if it is not "urban" in character; (2) that each municipality in the County be included within an UGA; (3) that an UGA include territory outside of existing municipal boundaries only if such territory is characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to territory that is already characterized by urban growth. [RCW 36.70A.110(1); for definition of "urban growth" see RCW 36.70A.030(17).]

The designated UGAs shall be of adequate size and appropriate permissible densities so as to accommodate the urban growth that is projected by the State Office of Financial Management to occur in the County for the succeeding 20-year period. While each UGA shall permit urban densities, it shall also include greenbelt and open space areas [RCW 36.70A.110(2)].

As to the timing and sequencing of urban growth and development over the 20-year planning period, urban growth shall occur first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have existing public facility and service capacities to service such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources [RCW 36.70A.110(3)]. Urban government services shall be provided primarily by cities, and it is not appropriate that urban governmental services be extended to or expanded in rural areas except in those limited circumstances shown to be necessary to protect basic public health and safety and environment, and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development [RCW 36.70A.110(4)].

The Growth Management Act Amendments expressly require that countywide planning policies address the implementation of UGA designations [RCW 36.70A.210(3)(a)], the promotion of contiguous and orderly development, the provision of urban services to such development [RCW
36.70A.210(3)(b)], and the coordination of joint county and municipal planning within UGAs [RCW 36.70A.210(3)(f)].

**VISION 2040 Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs)**

VISION 2040 calls for a more efficient, sustainable, and strategic use of the region’s land. It identifies urban lands as a critical component to accommodate population and employment growth in a sustainable way. VISION 2040 calls for directing development to the region’s existing urban lands, especially in centers and compact communities, and limiting growth on rural lands. The Regional Growth Strategy found in VISION 2040 allocates 93 percent of the region’s future population growth and 97 percent of its employment growth into the existing urban growth area. Cities are divided into four distinct groups: Metropolitan Cities, Core Cities, Large Cities, and Small Cities. An additional geography is Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas. VISION 2040 recognizes that unincorporated urban lands are often similar in character to cities they are adjacent to, calling for them to be affiliated with adjacent cities for joint planning purposes and future annexation.

VISION 2040 recognizes that compact development creates vibrant, livable, and healthy urban communities that offer economic opportunities for all, provide housing and transportation choices, and use our resources wisely. The Multicounty Planning Policies support the effective use of urban land and include provisions that address brownfield and contaminated site clean-up, the development of compact communities and centers with pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented locations and a mix of residences, jobs, retail, and other amenities, and the siting of facilities and major public amenities in compact urban communities and centers.

VISION 2040 recognizes that centers provide easy access to jobs, services, shopping, and entertainment. With their mix of uses and pedestrian-friendly design, they can rely less on forms of transportation that contribute to air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. VISION 2040 identifies 27 regional growth centers. These places play an important role as locations of the region’s most significant business, governmental, and cultural facilities. The 18 cities that have one or more regional growth centers are expected to accommodate a significant portion of the region’s residential growth (53 percent) and employment growth (71 percent).

VISION 2040 calls for local jurisdictions with regional growth centers to adopt housing and employment targets for each center. Eight regional manufacturing/industrial centers have also been designated. These are locations for more intensive commercial and industrial activity. Both regional growth centers and regional manufacturing/industrial centers are focal points for economic development and transportation infrastructure investments. Subregional centers, including downtowns in suburban cities and other neighborhood centers, also play an important role in VISION 2040’s Regional Growth Strategy. These, too, are strategic locations for concentrating jobs, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. VISION 2040 calls for each of the region’s cities to develop
one or more central places as compact mixed-use hubs for concentrating residences, jobs, shops, and community facilities.

Urban services addressed in VISION 2040 include wastewater and stormwater systems, solid waste, energy, telecommunications, emergency services, and water supply. An overarching goal of VISION 2040 is to provide sufficient and efficient public services and facilities in a manner that is healthy, safe, and economically viable. Conservation is a major theme throughout VISION 2040. The Multicounty Planning Policies address increasing recycling and reducing waste and encouraging more efficient use of water, low-impact development techniques, and renewable and alternative energy. The Multicounty Planning Policies also address siting of public facilities and the appropriateness and scale of particular public services.

VISION 2040 calls for jurisdictions to invest in facilities and amenities that serve centers and restrict urban facilities in rural and resource areas. The Multicounty Planning Policies also discourage schools and other institutions serving urban residents from locating outside the urban growth area.

**Principles of Understanding Between Pierce County and the Municipalities in Pierce County**

While following the goals and regulations of the Growth Management Act, Pierce County and the municipalities in Pierce County will strive to protect the individual identities and spirit of each of our cities and of the rural areas and unincorporated communities.

Further agreements will be necessary to carry out the framework of joint planning adopted herein. These agreements will be between the County and each city and between the various cities.

The services provided within our communities by special purpose districts are of vital importance to our citizens. Consistent with the adopted regional strategy, these districts will be part of future individual and group negotiations under the framework adopted by the County and municipal governments.

While the Growth Management Act defines sewer service as an urban service, Pierce County currently is a major provider of both sewer transmission and treatment services. The County and municipalities recognize that it is appropriate for the County and municipalities to continue to provide sewer transmission and treatment services.

The County recognizes that unincorporated lands within UGAs are often Potential Annexation Areas for cities. Although annexation is preferred, these are also areas where incorporation of new cities could occur. The County will work with existing municipalities and emerging communities to make such transitions efficiently. The identification of “Potential Annexation Areas” (PAAs) is intended to serve as the foundation for future strategies to annex areas within the urban growth area. A Potential Annexation Area refers to an unincorporated area within the designated urban growth area which a
city or town has identified as being appropriate for annexation at some point in the future. A Potential Annexation Area designation does not obligate a jurisdiction to annex an area within a defined timeline. It is the County’s authority, in consultation with cities and towns, to adopt the urban growth area(s), and identify individual Potential Annexation Areas.

In order to promote logical, orderly, and systematic annexations of the urban growth area(s), the County in partnership with cities and towns, should establish joint planning agreements and annexation plans prior to expanding or adding to existing PAAs. Creation of new PAAs prior to the annexation of existing PAAs may directly impact Pierce County government and its service obligations, and may undermine the transition of existing unincorporated lands into cities and towns.

The County encourages cities and towns to annex land within its respective PAAs. The County recognizes cities and towns may not have a financial incentive to annex areas that will require more expenditures than the revenue produced through property or sales tax. Jurisdictions need to be creative in identifying potential financial incentives, in addition to establishing partnerships to overcome the financial obstacles. As a means to allocate resources, the County should prioritize the PAAs, with the highest being unincorporated “islands” between cities and towns. Pierce County shall support future annexations for areas in which a joint planning agreement exists between the County and appropriate city or town.

At the same time, annexations and incorporations have direct and significant impacts on the revenue of County government, and therefore, may affect the ability of the County to fulfill its role as a provider of certain regional services. The municipalities will work closely with the County to develop appropriate revenue sharing and contractual services arrangements that facilitate the goals of GMA.

The Countywide Planning Policies are intended to be the consistent "theme" of growth management planning among the County and municipalities. The policies also spell out processes and mechanisms designed to foster open communication and feedback among the jurisdictions. The County, and the cities and towns, will adhere to the processes and mechanisms provided in the policies.

**Growth Targets**

The Regional Growth Strategy set forth in VISION 2040 provides guidance for the distribution of future population and employment growth through the year 2040 within the Central Puget Sound Region. This strategy, in combination with the Office of Financial Management’s population forecasts, provides a framework for establishing growth targets consistent with the requirements of the Growth Management Act. Consistent with VISION 2040, these growth targets are the minimum number of residents, housing units, or jobs a given jurisdiction is planning to accommodate within the appropriate planning horizon and are informational tools integrated into local land use plans to assist in formulating future residential and employment land needs. These targets are to be developed
through a collaborative countywide process that ensures all jurisdictions are accommodating a fair share of growth.

Achievement of the future envisioned by VISION 2040 will be challenging. Jurisdictions in some regional geographies will likely be planning for growth targets that are above or below the policy direction set by the Regional Growth Strategy because they are on a front- or back-loaded growth trajectory toward 2040. In other regional geographies, recent growth has been at such significant odds with the policy direction set by the Regional Growth Strategy (such as recent growth in unincorporated urban Pierce County from 2000 to 2007 has already accounted for more than half of the 40-year growth allocation), that the 2040 goal will likely be exceeded. In such cases, jurisdictions are asked to set growth targets as close to VISION 2040 as reasonably possible in an effort to “bend the trend” of future growth to more closely conform to the Regional Growth Strategy. If a jurisdiction’s adopted target is lower or higher than expected from a straight-line application of the Regional Growth Strategy, certification by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) will be based on the actions and measures taken or proposed to be put in place to bend the trend, not just on an assessment of the adopted targets.

It is recognized that some of the urban growth areas in existence prior to the adoption of VISION 2040 may contain more potential housing and employment capacity based upon zoning, allowed density, land division patterns, and other factors than is needed to accommodate the growth target of the associated geography. In many cases, these urban growth areas have been in existence for a decade or more, contain existing development patterns, which are urban in character, and are served by sanitary sewer and other urban infrastructure. These areas are largely expected to remain within the urban growth area consistent with their urban character. Expansion of the urban growth area boundaries that do not comply with provisions in the Amendments and Transition section of these policies is acknowledged to be inconsistent with CPPs and is strongly discouraged.

**Centers**

Centers are to be areas of concentrated employment and/or housing within UGAs which serve as the hubs of transit and transportation systems. Centers and connecting corridors are integral to creating compact urban development that conserves resources and creates additional transportation, housing, and shopping choices. Centers are an important part of the regional strategy (VISION 2040) for urban growth and are required to be addressed in the Countywide Planning Policies. Centers will become focal points for growth within the County's UGA and will be areas where public investment is directed.

Centers are to:
- be priority locations for accommodating growth;
- strengthen existing development patterns;
- promote housing opportunities close to employment;
• support development of an extensive multimodal transportation system which reduces dependency on automobiles;
• reduce congestion and improve air quality; and
• maximize the benefit of public investment in infrastructure and services.

VISION 2040, the adopted regional growth strategy, identifies several centers as an integral feature for accommodating residential and employment growth. The strategy describes Regional Growth Centers, and other centers that may be designated through countywide processes or locally. Regional Growth Centers once regionally designated are located either in Metropolitan Cities, or in Core Cities. VISION 2040 also identifies Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, which consist primarily of manufacturing and industrial uses. Pierce County has five Regional Growth Centers and two Manufacturing/Industrial Centers that have been adopted into the regional growth strategy. Pierce County Regional Growth Centers are located in Tacoma, which is a Metropolitan City, and in Lakewood and Puyallup, which are Core Cities.

Regional Growth Centers in the Metropolitan City
Tacoma Central Business District
Tacoma Mall

Regional Growth Centers in Core Cities
Lakewood
Puyallup Downtown
Puyallup South Hill

Currently there are no designated Countywide Centers.

Manufacturing/Industrial Centers are areas where employee- or land-intensive uses will be located. These centers differ from Regional Growth Centers in that they consist of an extensive land base and the exclusion of non-manufacturing or manufacturing-supportive uses is an essential feature of their character. These areas are characterized by a significant amount of manufacturing, industrial, and advanced technology employment uses. Large retail and non-related office uses are discouraged. Other than caretakers' residences, housing is prohibited within Manufacturing/Industrial Centers. However, these centers should be linked to high density housing areas by an efficient multimodal transportation system. The efficiency of rail and overland freight to markets is the critical element for manufacturers and industries located in these centers.

The designated Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, within Pierce County are as follows:

Manufacturing / Industrial Centers
Frederickson
Port of Tacoma
Within Pierce County, a limited number of additional centers may be designated through amendment of the Countywide Planning Policies consistent with the process below.

Designated centers may vary substantially in the number of households and jobs they contain today. The intent of the Countywide Planning Policies is that Regional Growth Centers become attractive places to live and work, while supporting efficient public services such as transit and being responsive to the local market for jobs and housing.

The Countywide Planning Policies establish target levels for housing and employment needed to achieve the benefit of a center. Some centers will reach these levels over the next twenty years, while for others the criteria set a path for growth over a longer term, providing capacity to accommodate growth beyond the twenty year horizon.

**County-Level Centers Designation Process**

The County and any municipality in the County that is planning to include a Metropolitan City Center, Regional Growth Center, Countywide Center or Manufacturing / Industrial Center within its boundaries shall specifically define the area of such center within its comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan shall include policies aimed at focusing growth within the center and along corridors consistent with the applicable criteria contained within the Countywide Planning Policies. The County or municipality shall adopt regulations that reinforce the center’s designation.

No more often than once every two years, the Pierce County Regional Council (PCRC) shall invite jurisdictions with centers already adopted in their comprehensive plan that seek to be designated as centers in the Countywide Planning Policies to submit a request for such designation. Said request shall be processed in accordance with established procedures for amending the Countywide Planning Policies.

Each jurisdiction seeking to have a center designated in the Countywide Planning Policies shall provide the PCRC with a report demonstrating that the proposed center meets the minimum criteria for designation together with a statement and map describing the center, its consistency with the applicable Countywide Planning Policies, and how adopted regulations will serve the center.

Transit services shall be defined in the broadest sense and shall include local and regional bus service, rail where appropriate, vanpool, carpool, and other transportation demand measures designed to reduce vehicle trips.
The minimum designation criteria to establish a candidate center by type are as follows:

**Metropolitan City Center**
- Area: up to 1-1/2 square miles in size;
- Capital Facilities: served by sanitary sewers;
- Employment: a minimum of 25 employees per gross acre of non-residential lands with a minimum of 15,000 employees;
- Population: a minimum of ten households per gross acre; and
- Transit: serve as a focal point for regional and local transit services.

**Regional Growth Center**
- Area: up to 1-1/2 square miles in size;
- Capital Facilities: served by sanitary sewers;
- Employment: a minimum of 2,000 employees;
- Population: a minimum of seven households per gross acre; and
- Transit: serve as a focal point for regional and local transit services.

**Countywide Center**
- Area: up to one square mile in size;
- Capital Facilities: served by sanitary sewers;
- Employment: a minimum of 1,000 employees;
- Population: a minimum of 6 households per gross acre; and
- Transit: serve as a focal point for local transit services.

**Manufacturing / Industrial Center**
- Capital Facilities: served by sanitary sewers;
- Employment: a minimum of 7,500 jobs and/or 2,000 truck trips per day; and
- Transportation: within one mile of a state or federal highway or national rail line.

The minimum criteria report and statement shall be reviewed by the Growth Management Coordinating Committee (GMCC) for consistency with Countywide Planning Policies, the Transportation Coordination Committee (TCC) for consistency with transportation improvements plans of WSDOT, and with Pierce Transit’s comprehensive plan. The coordinating committees shall provide joint recommendation to the PCRC.

Once included in the Countywide Planning Policies, the jurisdiction where a center is located may go on to seek regional designation of the center from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) in accordance with its established criteria and process.
In order to be designated a Regional Growth Center the center should meet the regional criteria and requirements including those in VISION 2040, the regional growth, economic and transportation strategy as may be amended and designated by the Puget Sound Regional Council.

After county-level designation occurs within the Countywide Planning Policies and until regional-level designation by the PSRC occurs the center shall be considered a “candidate” Regional Growth Center.

Each jurisdiction which designates a Regional Growth Center shall establish 20-year household and employment growth targets for that Center. The expected range of targets will reflect the diversity of the various centers and allow communities to effectively plan for needed services. The target ranges not only set a policy for the level of growth envisioned for each center, but also for the timing and funding of infrastructure improvements. Reaching the target ranges will require careful planning of public investment and providing incentives for private investments.

Three candidate regional centers have been included into the Countywide Planning Policies. One of the candidate centers is a Regional Growth Center and the other two candidate centers are an Industrial/Manufacturing Center.

**Candidate Regional Centers**
- University Place – Candidate Regional Growth Center
- South Tacoma – Candidate Industrial/Manufacturing Center
- Sumner-Pacific – Candidate Industrial/Manufacturing Center

**Urban Growth Outside of Centers**

A variety of urban land uses and areas of growth will occur outside of designated centers but within the UGA. Local land use plans will guide the location, scale, timing, and design of development within UGAs. The UGA will be where the majority of future growth and development will be targeted. Development should be encouraged which complements the desired focus of growth into centers and supports a multimodal transportation system. For example, policies which encourage infill and revitalization of communities would help to achieve the regional and statewide objectives of a compact and concentrated development pattern within urban areas. The Countywide Planning Policies provide guidance for development and the provision of urban services to support development within the UGA.

**Satellite Cities and Towns**

The cities and towns in the rural areas are a significant part of Pierce County's diversity and heritage. They have an important role as local trade and community centers. These cities and towns are the appropriate providers of local rural services for the community. They also contribute to the variety
of development patterns and housing choices within the county. As municipalities, these cities and towns provide urban services and are located within the County's designated UGA. The urban services, residential densities and mix of land uses may differ from those of the large, contiguous portion of the UGA in Pierce County.

**Countywide Planning Policy**

**UGA-1.** The County shall designate the countywide urban growth area and Potential Annexation Areas within it, in consultations between the County and each municipality.

1. County referral of proposed urban growth area and Potential Annexation Area designations to the Pierce County Regional Council (PCRC).

1.1 The PCRC may refer the proposed designations to the Growth Management Coordinating Committee (GMCC), or its successor entity for technical advice and for a report.

1.1.2 The PCRC may conduct public meetings to review the proposed designation and, at such meetings, may accept oral or written comments and communications from the public.

1.1.3 At the conclusion of its review and analysis, the PCRC shall make a recommendation to the County and to the municipalities in the County.

1.2 Once adopted by the County, the urban growth area and Potential Annexation Area(s) designations shall not be changed except in accordance with the Countywide Policy on “Amendments and Transition.”

1.2.1 A jurisdiction shall not be required to modify existing urban growth area boundaries or Potential Annexation Areas in order to reduce the residential or employment capacity to conform to adopted growth targets reflecting VISION 2040’s Regional Growth Strategy. Jurisdictions shall, however, consider the adopted growth targets when updating their local comprehensive plans.

1.2.2 Growth targets are the minimum number of residents, housing units, or jobs a given jurisdiction is planning to accommodate within the appropriate planning horizon and are to be developed through a collaborative countywide process that ensures all jurisdictions are accommodating a fair share of growth. These targets are informational.
tools integrated into local land use plans to assist in formulating future residential and employment land needs.

UGA-2. The following specific factors and criteria shall dictate the size and boundaries of urban growth areas:

2.1 Size

2.1.1 Urban growth areas must be of sufficient size to accommodate the urban growth projected to occur over the succeeding 20-year planning period taking into account the following:

a. land with natural constraints, such as critical areas (environmentally- sensitive land);

b. agricultural land to be preserved;

c. greenbelts and open space;

d. New Fully Contained Communities pursuant to RCW § 36.70A.350;

e. maintaining a supply of developable land sufficient to allow market forces to operate and precluding the possibility of a land monopoly but no more than is absolutely essential to achieve the above purpose;

f. existing projects with development potential at various stages of the approval or permitting process (i.e., the "pipeline");

g. land use patterns created by subdivisions, short plats or large lot divisions;

h. build-out of existing development and areas which are currently only partially built out;

i. follow existing parcel boundary lines.

2.1.2 The County, and each municipality in the County, shall cooperatively develop and propose objective standards and criteria to disaggregate the State Office of Financial Management's Countywide growth forecasts and VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy forecasts for the allocation of projected population to the County and municipalities, taking into account the availability and concurrency of public facilities and services with the impact of development, as well as the VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy.

2.1.3 The County shall use a consistent countywide targeting process for allocating population and employment growth consistent with the regional vision, including establishing:
a. local employment targets,
b. local housing targets based on population projections, and
c. local housing and employment targets for each designated regional growth center.

2.2 Boundaries

2.2.1 The following shall be considered in determining the location of urban growth area boundaries:
a. geographic, topographic, and manmade features;
b. public facility and service availability, limits and extensions;
c. jurisdictional boundaries including special improvement districts;
d. location of designated natural resource lands and critical areas;
e. avoidance of unserviceable islands of County land surrounded by other jurisdictional entities;
f. destination 2030 urban/rural line and PSCAA burn ban line.

Phasing of Development within the Urban Growth Area

2.3 The County and each municipality in the County shall seek to direct growth as follows:
a. first to cities and towns, centers and urbanized areas with existing infrastructure capacity;
b. second to areas that are already urbanized such that infrastructure improvements can be easily extended; and
c. last to areas requiring major infrastructure improvements.

2.3.1 Capital facilities plans shall identify existing, planned, and future infrastructure needs within Urban Growth Areas.

2.3.2 The County and each municipality in the County should identify appropriate levels of service and concurrency standards that address schools, sewer, water, and parks.

2.3.3 The County and each municipality in the County shall identify appropriate levels of service and multimodal concurrency standards that address roads.

2.4 The urban growth area in unincorporated portions of the County shall be limited to the following:

2.4.1 build-out of existing partially developed areas with urban services;
2.4.2 new fully contained communities;
2.4.3 redevelopment corridors.

2.5 The County's urban growth area may be extended to allow for build-out of newly developed areas only if development capacity within Potential Annexation Areas and growth in the areas identified in Policy 2.4 is determined to be inadequate to meet total population and employment projections consistent with the other policies set forth herein.

2.6 Encourage efficient use of urban land by maximizing the development potential of existing urban lands, such as advancing development that achieves zoned density.

2.7 The urban growth area in existence prior to the adoption of VISION 2040 may contain capacity beyond that needed to accommodate the growth target per regional geography for the succeeding 20-year planning period based upon existing zoning designations, allowed density, existing land division patterns, and similar factors. It is permissible for such areas to continue to be designated as urban growth areas. Expansion of these urban growth area boundaries is acknowledged to be inconsistent with the CPPs and strongly discouraged if the urban growth area expansion is not in accordance with policy AT-2.3.

UGA-3. Potential annexation areas shall be designated through the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan in consultation with cities and towns.

3.1 A city or town shall first identify a Potential Annexation Area(s) within its respective Comprehensive Plan;

3.2 Potential Annexation Area boundaries shall be determined with consideration for the following additional factors;

3.2.1 the VISION 2040 document, including Multicounty Planning Policies;
3.2.2 the carrying capacity of the land considering natural resources, agricultural land and environmentally-sensitive lands;
3.2.3 population, housing, and employment projections;
3.2.4 financial capabilities and urban services capacities;
3.2.5 consistency and compatibility with neighborhood, local and regional plans;
3.2.6 the existing land use and subdivision pattern;
3.2.7 property access and ownership.
3.3 Potential Annexation Areas should not overlap or leave unincorporated urban islands between cities and towns.

3.3.1 Future requests to establish a new Potential Annexation Area shall not result in an overlap with an existing Potential Annexation Area or create islands between cities and towns.

3.3.2 Cities and towns with existing Potential Annexation Area overlaps should work toward resolving the existing overlaps.

3.4 The urban service areas and satellite urban growth areas as designated through the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan as of June 30, 2013 shall be recognized as designated Potential Annexation Areas.

3.4.1 Urban service area designations approved by the Pierce County Council through its 2013 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle shall be recognized as a Potential Annexation Area.

3.4.2 Boundaries of the Potential Annexation Areas should not split parcels. Efforts should be put forth to resolve split parcels prior to the initial designation of Potential Annexation Areas.

Annexation within the Urban Growth Area

UGA-4. Pierce County, in conjunction with its cities and towns, shall establish a strategy for future annexations within the urban growth area.

4.1 Annexation is preferred over incorporation within the urban growth area.

4.2 The Potential Annexation Areas as identified in the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan shall be the foundation to an annexation strategy.

4.2.1 Cities and towns are allowed to annex territory only within their adopted Potential Annexation Area as identified in the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan.

4.2.2 Annexation of an area should be phased to coincide with a city or town’s ability to coordinate the provision of a full range of urban services to the areas proposed for annexation.

4.3 The County and its cities and towns should proactively coordinate the annexation of unincorporated areas within the urban growth area that are within each respective city or town’s Potential Annexation Area.
4.3.1 The County and each city and town should work towards the establishment of annexation plans and joint planning agreements, with an exception for lands associated with Joint Base Lewis McChord and Camp Murray.

4.3.1.1 A joint planning agreement is to serve as a mechanism where the County or a city can, prior to notice of annexation, identify potential objections and resolutions.

4.3.1.2 An annexation plan should identify a potential schedule for annexation of areas with a city or town.

4.3.2 The County should explore and implement financial incentives for a city or town to annex areas associated with its respective Potential Annexation Area.

4.3.2.1 Financial incentives may include the establishment of a County level grant fund to assist in financial challenges a city or town may have in annexing an area.

4.3.2.2 Financial incentives may include the elimination or reduction in a fee associated with a County service to a city or town in exchange for annexing an area.

4.3.3 The County, and cities and towns, should explore potential partnerships in grant funding opportunities to overcome obstacles associated with annexing specific areas.

4.3.4 Cities and towns should recognize the financial impacts experienced by the County when annexation only encompasses commercial or greenfield areas and avoids existing residential development.

4.3.4.1 Cities and towns are encouraged to include a mix of existing commercial, residential, and greenfield areas, where appropriate, in future annexation proposals.

4.4 The County should prioritize the adopted Potential Annexation Areas for annexation.

4.4.1 The County’s highest priority should be Potential Annexation Areas representing unincorporated “islands” between cities and towns; and,
4.4.2 The County shall support annexation for areas in which a joint planning agreement exists between the County and appropriate city or town.

Note: The policy numbers/citations for all policies that follow will need to be changed.
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Community Development Department
Briefing Memorandum

Date : October 1, 2014
To : Don Morrison – City Administrator
From : Jason Sullivan – Senior Planner
Re : Countywide Planning Policies Amendments – Potential Annexation Area

PURPOSE:
The purpose of the memorandum is to brief City Administration on an upcoming City Council item related to proposed amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) regarding annexation policies and the establishment of Potential Annexation Areas (PAAs). This item is schedule for the October 21, 2014 City Council Workshop under AB14-121.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Draft Resolution 2415

BACKGROUND:
The Pierce County Regional Council (PCRC), on October 17, 2013, recommended that Pierce County approve amendments to the CPPs related to annexation policies. The first step in the ratification process was the adoption of Ordinance No. 2014-17s by the Pierce County Council on June 24, 2014 signifying the County’s approval the amendments and authorizing the Pierce County Executive to execute inter-local agreements with the cities and towns of Pierce County to ratify the proposal.

In order for these amendments to the CPPs to become effective it must be ratified by 60 percent of the jurisdictions in Pierce County representing 75 percent of the total population by either executing an inter-local agreement or by taking no legislative action to disapprove the proposed amendment by December 21, 2014.
The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed amendments at the September 17, 2014 Planning Commission meeting and voted to recommend that the City Council approve resolution 2415 authorizing the Mayor to sign the inter-local agreement ratifying the amendments to the CPPs.

**DISCUSSION:**

The proposed amendments to the CPPs address annexation policies within Pierce County. The primary change was the establishment of PAAs which refer to unincorporated areas within the designated urban growth area of a city or town identified as being appropriate for annexation at some point in the future. These areas had been previously identified as “urban service areas.” The term “urban service area” created some confusion as utilities designate service areas which encompass the areas that are provided services and may or may not be located within the urban growth area. Whereas, “urban service areas” was used by Pierce County only to denote areas within the urban growth area that could be annexed by a city.

Areas identified as an “urban service area” for a specific city or town at the conclusion of Pierce County’s 2013 amendment cycle will be relabeled as PAAs. The amendments encourage a more coordinated strategy to facilitate the annexation of areas within designated urban growth areas. This strategy encompasses:

- Encouraging joint planning agreements and annexation plans for existing areas affiliated with cities and towns;
- Limiting cities and towns to the annexation of territory only within their adopted PAA;
- Exploring and establishing financial incentives to encourage annexation of unincorporated urban areas;
- Exploring potential partnerships between the County and cities/towns in grant funding opportunities to overcome annexation obstacles;
- Encouraging cities and towns to include a mix of existing commercial, residential, and vacant areas, if appropriate, in future annexation proposals;
- Identifying unincorporated “islands” between cities and towns as the County’s highest priority for annexation; and
- Ensuring that PAAs are identified in a city’s or town’s comprehensive plan; and
- County support of annexation if a joint planning agreement has been signed with the respective city or town.
Memo

Date: September 17, 2014
To: Mayor and City Council
From: Grant Sulham, Planning Commission Chair
Re: Countywide Planning Policies Amendments – Potential Annexation Areas

The proposed amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) would replace the County’s current designating of “urban service areas” with Potential Annexation Areas to identify areas within the urban growth area that could be annexed by a city or town in Pierce County. The amendments encourage a more coordinated strategy to facilitate the annexation of areas within designated urban growth areas. This strategy encompasses:

- Encouraging joint planning agreements and annexation plans for existing areas affiliated with cities and towns;
- Limiting cities and towns to the annexation of territory only within their adopted PAA;
- Exploring and establishing financial incentives to encourage annexation of unincorporated urban areas;
- Exploring potential partnerships between the County and cities/towns in grant funding opportunities to overcome annexation obstacles;
- Encouraging cities and towns to include a mix of existing commercial, residential, and vacant areas, if appropriate, in future annexation proposals;
- Identifying unincorporated “islands” between cities and towns as the County’s highest priority for annexation; and
- Ensuring that PAAs are identified in a city’s or town’s comprehensive plan; and
- County support of annexation if a joint planning agreement has been signed with the respective city or town.

At the September 17, 2014 meeting, the Planning Commission consider the proposed modifications to the CPPS and voted 5-0-0 to recommend that the City Council pass Resolution 2415 authorizing the Mayor to sign the inter-local agreement ratifying the proposed amendments to the CPPs.