

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Ratification of Countywide Planning Policies Amendments
DEPARTMENT:	Planning and Development Services
PRESENTED BY:	Joseph W. Tovar, FAICP, Planning Director Miranda Redinger, Planner II

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

The issue before Council is the ratification by resolution of an amendment to the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPP's). The Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) approved and King County ratified on April 14, 2008 the following:

- Ordinance No. 16056, GMPC Motion No. 07-3 by the Growth Management Planning Council of King County recognizing the 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report and its findings.

Staff has researched and found that this amendment is not in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan or the Shoreline Municipal Code. This amendment was proposed in response to the Seattle-King County Association of Realtors 2004 appeal to the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board of the 2002 Buildable Lands Report. King County argued that the appeal was not timely in that the appeal must be received within 60 days of the submittal of the Buildable Lands report to the State. The Hearings Board ruled the appeal was timely because the County did not take legislative action to signify that the report was final and therefore beginning the 60 day appeal period. In response to the Board's decision, King County through the proposed amendment to the King County Countywide Planning policies is seeking to establish a clear appeal period for the Buildable Lands Report.

Although this amendment does not directly affect the City of Shoreline, the Framework Policies in the CPP's request ratification by local jurisdictions:

FW-1 STEP 9: Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies may be developed by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor, or by the Metropolitan King County Council, as provided in this policy. Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, not including amendments to the Urban Growth Area pursuant to Step 7 and 8 b and c above, shall be subject to ratification by at least 30 percent of the city and County governments representing 70 percent of the population in King County. Adoption and ratification of this policy shall constitute an amendment to the May 27, 1992 interlocal agreement among King County, the City of Seattle, and the suburban cities and towns in King County for the Growth Management Planning Council of King County.

This ratification shall be made within 90 days of the adoption date by King County; this 90-day deadline is July 11, 2008.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:

1. Ratify the amendments by adopting a Resolution 279.
2. Vote against ratification.
3. Take no action. If no action is taken by July 11, 2008 the amendments are assumed to be ratified by the City of Shoreline.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS:


- There are no direct financial impacts to the City.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Council adopt Resolution No. 279, thereby ratifying the amendment to the Countywide Planning Policies.

Approved By:

City Manager



City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Resolution No. 279

RESOLUTION NO. 279

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON,
RATIFYING THE AMENDMENT TO THE KING COUNTY
COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES,**

WHEREAS, on April 14, 2008 the Metropolitan King County Council approved and ratified Ordinance No. 16056, Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) Motion No. 07-3 recognizing the 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report and its findings, thereby adopting amendments to the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPP's); and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Framework Policy FW-1 Step 9 as outlined in the CPP's, all amendments become effective when ratified by ordinance or resolution by at least 30 percent of the city and county governments representing 70 percent of the population of King County; and

WHEREAS, it has been found that these amendments to the CPP's are not in conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan or the Shoreline Municipal Code, and do not affect the City of Shoreline;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. The amendment to the Countywide Planning Policies (Exhibit A) as adopted by King County is hereby ratified on behalf of the population of the City of Shoreline.

Mayor Cindy Ryu

ATTEST:

Scott Passey
City Clerk



King County

KING COUNTY

Signature Report

1200 King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

April 14, 2008

Ordinance 16056

Proposed No. 2008-0074.2

Sponsors Gossett

1 AN ORDINANCE ratifying for unincorporated King
2 County an action by the Growth Management Planning
3 Council to adopt the 2007 Buildable Lands Report; and
4 amending Ordinance 10450, Section 3, as amended, and
5 K.C.C. 20.10.030 and Ordinance 10450, Section 4, as
6 amended, and K.C.C. 20.10.040.

7
8 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

9 SECTION 1. Findings: The council makes the following findings:

10 A. The Growth Management Act ("GMA") requires King County and its cities to
11 implement a review and evaluation program, commonly referred to as "Buildable Lands"
12 and requires completion of an evaluation report every five years. The first King County
13 Buildable Lands Report ("BLR") was submitted to the state in 2002.

14 B. RCW 36.70A.215 establishes the required elements of that program to
15 include:

16 1. Annual data on land development; and

17 2. Periodic analyses to identify "land suitable for development" for anticipated
18 residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

19 C. Based on the findings of the five-year evaluation, a county or city may be
20 required to take remedial actions (i.e. reasonable measures) to ensure sufficient capacity
21 for growth needs and to address inconsistencies between actual development and adopted
22 policies and regulations.

23 D. The 2007 BLR contained data on:

- 24 1. Building permits and subdivision plats for the years 2001-2005;
25 2. Land supply and capacity as of 2006; and
26 3. Comparisons with growth targets established by the Growth Management
27 Planning Council (GMPC) in 2002 for the planning period 2001-2022.

28 E. The major findings of the 2007 BLR include the following:

- 29 1. Housing growth has been on track with twenty-two-year growth targets;
30 2. Densities achieved in new housing have increased compared to the previous
31 five years;
32 3. Commercial-industrial construction has continued despite the recession of
33 2001-2004; and
34 4. King County's Urban Growth Area, and each of four subareas of the county,
35 has sufficient land capacity to accommodate the residential and employment growth
36 forecasted by 2022.

37 F. While the GMA requires King County and its cities to implement a review and
38 evaluation program, as noted above, neither the GMA nor the Countywide Planning

39 Policies ("CPPs") establishes a requirement or a process for adoption of the BLR as an
40 amendment to the CPPs.

41 G. In August 2002, the King County BLR was submitted to the state prior to the
42 statutory deadline of September 1 for "completion" of the five-year evaluation. However,
43 in December, 2004, the Seattle-King County Association of Realtors filed a petition with
44 the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board ("the board") to appeal the
45 2002 BLR.

46 H. King County argued that the appeal of the BLR was untimely, falling outside
47 the sixty-day appeal period for GMA actions. The board ruled that the appeal was in fact
48 timely, since no legislative action had been taken to "adopt" the BLR that would have
49 defined a start and ending point for a sixty-day appeal period.

50 I. The board went on to state "... to establish a timeframe for appeals to the
51 Board, the completion of the BLR should be acknowledged through legislative action and
52 the adoption of a resolution or ordinance finding that the review and evaluation has
53 occurred and noting its major findings."

54 J. As a response to the board decision, GMPC staff recommended the GMPC
55 consider legislative action to:

- 56 1. Establish a clear appeal period for the BLR; and
57 2. Emphasize the recognition and authority of the 2007 BLR as the technical
58 basis for subsequent countywide policy decisions as well as local decisions that are
59 consistent with the countywide policy direction.

60 K. As a coordinated countywide GMA document, the BLR falls within the
61 purview of GMPC. FW1 Step 5(b) establishes the review and evaluation program

pursuant to RCW 36.70A.215, but does not specify a procedure for formal adoption. The CPPs do set forth a process whereby GMPC takes formal action on CPPs through:

1. A motion to recommend a CPP amendment for adoption by the King County Council; and

2. Ratification by at least thirty percent of the cities containing at least seventy percent of the population.

L. While the BLR is not a policy action, following an equivalent track for countywide action on the BLR appears to be the best vehicle for formalizing the "adoption" of the report through legislative action that represents the endorsement of both the county and cities.

M. The GMPC met on December 12, 2007 and voted to recommend to the King County Council, a motion (GMPC Motion 07-3) to adopt the 2007 Buildable Lands Report.

SECTION 2. Ordinance 10450, Section 3, as amended, and K.C.C. 20.10.030 are each hereby amended to read as follows:

A. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 Countywide Planning Policies attached to Ordinance 11446 are hereby approved and adopted.

B. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 12027.

C. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 12421.

D. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 and 2 to Ordinance 13260.

85 E. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
86 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 through 4 to Ordinance 13415.

87 F. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
88 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 through 3 to Ordinance 13858.

89 G. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
90 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14390.

91 H. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
92 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14391.

93 I. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
94 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14392.

95 J. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
96 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14652.

97 K. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
98 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 through 3 to Ordinance 14653.

99 L. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
100 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14654.

101 M. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
102 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14655.

103 N. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
104 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments 1 and 2 to Ordinance 14656.

105 O. The Phase II amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
106 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 14844.

107 P. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning

108 Policies are amended as shown by Attachments A, B and C to Ordinance 15121.

109 Q. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
110 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 15122.

111 R. The Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
112 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 15123.

113 S. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
114 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments A and B to Ordinance 15426.

115 T. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
116 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments A, B and C to Ordinance 15709.

117 U. Phase II Amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning
118 Policies are amended, as shown by Attachments A to this ordinance.

119 SECTION 3. Ordinance 10450, Section 4, as amended, and K.C.C. 20.10.040 are
120 each hereby amended to read as follows:

121 A. Countywide Planning Policies adopted by Ordinance 10450 for the purposes
122 specified are hereby ratified on behalf of the population of unincorporated King County.

123 B. The amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies adopted by Ordinance
124 10840 are hereby ratified on behalf of the population of unincorporated King County.

125 C. The amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies adopted by Ordinance
126 11061 are hereby ratified on behalf of the population of unincorporated King County.

127 D. The Phase II amendments to the King County 2012 Countywide Planning
128 Policies adopted by Ordinance 11446 are hereby ratified on behalf of the population of
129 unincorporated King County.

130 E. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
131 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 12027 are hereby ratified on behalf of the
132 population of unincorporated King County.

133 F. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
134 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 12421, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
135 population of unincorporated King County.

136 G. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
137 shown by Attachments 1 and 2 to Ordinance 13260, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
138 population of unincorporated King County.

139 H. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
140 shown by Attachment 1 through 4 to Ordinance 13415, are hereby ratified on behalf of
141 the population of unincorporated King County.

142 I. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
143 shown by Attachments 1 through 3 to Ordinance 13858, are hereby ratified on behalf of
144 the population of unincorporated King County.

145 J. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
146 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14390, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
147 population of unincorporated King County.

148 K. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
149 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14391, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
150 population of unincorporated King County.

151 L. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
152 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14392, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
153 population of unincorporated King County.

154 M. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
155 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14652, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
156 population of unincorporated King County.

157 N. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
158 shown by Attachments 1 through 3 to Ordinance 14653, are hereby ratified on behalf of
159 the population of unincorporated King County.

160 O. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
161 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14654, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
162 population of unincorporated King County.

163 P. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
164 shown by Attachment 1 to Ordinance 14655, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
165 population of unincorporated King County.

166 Q. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
167 shown by Attachments 1 and 2 to Ordinance 14656, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
168 population of unincorporated King County.

169 R. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
170 shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 14844, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
171 population of unincorporated King County.

172 S. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
173 shown by Attachments A, B and C to Ordinance 15121, are hereby ratified on behalf of
174 the population of unincorporated King County.

175 T. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
176 shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 15122, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
177 population of unincorporated King County.

178 U. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
179 shown by Attachment A to Ordinance 15123, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
180 population of unincorporated King County.

181 V. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as
182 shown by Attachments A and B to Ordinance 15426, are hereby ratified on behalf of the
183 population of unincorporated King County.

184 W. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies,
185 as shown by Attachments A, B and C to Ordinance 15709, are hereby ratified on behalf
186 of the population of unincorporated King County.

187 X. The amendments to the King County 2012 - Countywide Planning Policies, as

188 shown by Attachment A to this ordinance, are hereby ratified on behalf of the population
189 of unincorporated King County.
190


Ordinance 16056 was introduced on 3/10/2008 and passed by the Metropolitan King County Council on 4/14/2008, by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Ms. Patterson, Mr. Constantine, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Gossett and Mr. Phillips

No: 4 - Mr. Dunn, Ms. Lambert, Mr. von Reichbauer and Ms. Hague

Excused: 0

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON




Julia Patterson, Chair

ATTEST:



Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

APPROVED this 20 day of APRIL, 2008.



Ron Sims, County Executive

Attachments

A. Motion No. 07-3

RECEIVED
2008 APR 24 AM 11:13
KING COUNTY COUNCIL
CLERK

ATTACHMENT A

Dated 3-18-08

October 3, 2007

Sponsored By: Executive Committee

/cf

MOTION NO. 07-3

A MOTION by the Growth Management Planning Council of King County recognizing the 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report and its findings

WHEREAS, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.215, King County and its cities are required to implement a review and evaluation program, commonly referred to as the Buildable Lands program, and

WHEREAS FW-1 Step 5(b) of the Countywide Planning Policies requires a review and evaluation program consistent with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215, and

WHEREAS, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.215, the review and evaluation program shall encompass annual collection of data on urban and rural land use and development, critical areas, and capital facilities to the extent necessary to determine the quantity and type of land suitable for development, both for residential and employment-based activities, and

WHEREAS, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.215, the review and evaluation must 1) determine whether there is sufficient land suitable for development to accommodate population projections for the county by the state Office of Financial Management and subsequent allocations to cities pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110, 2) determine the actual density of housing and the actual density of land consumed for commercial and industrial uses, 3) based on the actual density of development, determine the amount of land needed for residential, commercial, and industrial uses for the remainder of the 20-year planning period, and

WHEREAS, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.215, King County and its cities are required to complete an updated evaluation report every five years with the next report due by September 2007, and

WHEREAS, King County and its cities have completed this review and evaluation and have published its findings in the 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report,

WHEREAS, the findings of the review and evaluation include the following:

- Housing growth has been on track with 22-year household growth targets;
- Densities achieved in new housing have increased, compared to the previous five years;
- Commercial and industrial construction has continued, despite the recession of 2001 - 2004;

DRAFT 9/14/07

- 1 -

1 King County's Urban Growth Area, and each of its four urban subareas, has
2 sufficient capacity to accommodate the residential and employment growth
3 forecasted by 2022,

4
5 THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY
6 HEREBY MOVES AS FOLLOWS:
7

- 8 1. The attached 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report is recognized as
9 final and complete in responding to the evaluation requirements of RCW
10 36.70A.215, and its findings are recognized as the basis for any future
11 measures that the county or cities may need to adopt in order to comply
12 with this section.
13
14 2. This motion shall be attached to the Countywide Planning Policies as an
15 appendix for future reference.
16
17 3. The attached 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report is recommended to
18 the Metropolitan King County Council and the Cities of King County for
19 adoption of a motion recognizing the completion of the Report and noting
20 its major conclusions.
21

22 ADOPTED by the Growth Management Planning Council of King County on October 3,
23 2007 in open session and signed by the chair of the GMPC.
24
25
26
27

28
29
30
31

Ron Sims, Chair, Growth Management Planning Council

32 Attachment:

- 33 1. 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report
34
35
36
37



King County

Metropolitan King County Council Growth Management and Natural Resources Committee

Revised Staff Report

Agenda Item:

Proposed Ord: 2008-0074 (ratifying GMPC Motion 07-3)

Name: Rick Bautista

Date: March 18, 2008

PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE ORDINANCE 2008-0074 RECEIVED A "DO PASS" RECOMMENDATION ON MARCH 18, 2008.

SUBJECT:

Substitute Ordinance ratifying the adoption of the 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report by the Growth Management Planning Council.

BACKGROUND:

The Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) is a formal body comprised of elected officials from King County, Seattle, Bellevue, the Suburban Cities, and Special Districts. The GMPC was created in 1992 by interlocal agreement, in response to a provision in the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requiring cities and counties to work together to adopt CPPs.

Under the GMA, the CPPs serve as the framework for each individual jurisdiction's comprehensive plan. This is to ensure countywide consistency with respect to land use planning efforts.

As provided for in the interlocal agreement, the GMPC developed and recommended the CPPs, which were adopted by the King County Council and ratified by the cities. Subsequent amendments to the CPPs follow the same process: recommendation by the GMPC, adoption by the King County Council, and ratification by the cities.

Amendments to the CPPs become effective when ratified by ordinance or resolution by at least 30% of the city and county governments representing at least 70% of the population of King County.

NOTE: A city is deemed to have ratified an amendment to the CPPs unless it has taken legislative action to disapprove within 90 days of adoption by King County.

SUMMARY:

Proposed Substitute Ordinance 2008-0074 would ratify GMPC Motion 07-3, which adopts and affirms the findings contained in the 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report as final and complete as the basis for any further measures that the county or cities may need to adopt in order to comply with in responding to the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215.

GMA Requirements

The GMA requires King County and its cities to implement a review and evaluation program, commonly referred to as "Buildable Lands" and requires completion of an evaluation report every 5 years. The first King County Buildable Lands Report (BLR) was submitted to the state in 2002.

RCW 36.70A.215 establishes the required elements of that program to include:

- o Annual data on land development, and
- o Periodic analyses to identify "land suitable for development" for anticipated residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Based on the findings of the 5-year evaluation, a county or city may be required to take remedial actions (i.e. reasonable measures) to ensure sufficient capacity for growth needs and to address inconsistencies between actual development and adopted policies and regulations.

The GMPC was briefed on the findings of the 2007 BLR in June and September 2007 and adopted the 2007 BLR in December 2007. The 2007 BLR contained data on:

- o Building permits and subdivision plats for the years 2001-2005,
- o Land supply and capacity as of 2006, and
- o Comparisons with growth targets established by the GMPC in 2002 for the planning period 2001-2022.

The major findings of the 2007 BLR include the following:

- o Housing growth has been on track with 22-year growth targets.
- o Densities achieved in new housing have increased compared to the previous five years.
- o Commercial-industrial construction has continued despite the recession of 2001-2004.
- o King County's Urban Growth Area, and each of four subareas of the county, has sufficient land capacity to accommodate the residential and employment growth forecasted by 2022.

Effect of GMPC Action

While the GMA requires King County and its cities to implement a review and evaluation program, as noted above, neither the GMA nor the CPPs establishes a requirement or a process for adoption of the BLR as an amendment to the CPPs.

In August 2002, the King County BLR was submitted to the State prior to the statutory deadline of September 1 for "completion" of the 5-year evaluation. However, in December, 2004, the Seattle-King County Association of Realtors filed a petition with the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board to appeal the 2002 BLR.

King County argued that the appeal of the BLR was untimely, falling outside the 60-day appeal period for GMA actions. The Hearings Board ruled that the appeal was in fact timely, since no legislative action had been taken to "adopt" the BLR that would have defined a start and ending point for a 60-day appeal period.

The Board went on to state "...to establish a timeframe for appeals to the Board, the completion of the BLR should be acknowledged through legislative action and the adoption of a resolution or ordinance finding that the review and evaluation has occurred and noting its major findings."

As a response to the Hearings Board decision, GMPC staff recommended the GMPC consider legislative action to:

- o Establish a clear appeal period for the BLR, and
- o Emphasize the recognition and authority of the 2007 BLR as the technical basis for subsequent countywide policy decisions as well as local decisions that are consistent with the countywide policy direction.

As a coordinated countywide GMA document, the BLR falls within the purview of GMPC. FW1 Step 5(b) establishes the review and evaluation program pursuant to RCW 36.70A.215, but does not specify a procedure for formal adoption. The CPPs do set forth a process whereby GMPC takes formal action on CPPs through:

- o A motion to recommend a CPP amendment for adoption by the King County Council, and
- o Ratification by at least 30% of the cities containing at least 70% of the population.

While the BLR is not a policy action, following an equivalent track for countywide action on the BLR appears to be the best vehicle for formalizing the "adoption" of the report through legislative action that represents the endorsement of both the county and cities.

ATTACHMENTS: None