

Governance Alternatives Study

Sammamish Plateau

for

King County, Washington

Prepared By
Henderson, Young & Company
and
Kraght Snell, P.S.

Final Report
August 10, 1998

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
CONCLUSION	1
WHAT THIS STUDY IS (AND ISN'T) ABOUT	1
USING THE GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY	2
STUDY AREA	3
INTRODUCTION	4
PURPOSE AND HISTORY OF STUDY	4
WHAT THIS STUDY IS (AND ISN'T) ABOUT	6
STUDY AREA	9
FORMAT OF STUDY	11
METHODOLOGY	11
ASSUMPTIONS	13
ISSAQUAH ANNEXATION VS. UNINCORPORATED KING COUNTY	16
LEVELS OF SERVICE	16
TAX, FEE AND CHARGE RATES	24
TOTAL ANNUAL COST OF PROPERTY TAXES FOR MEDIAN-PRICED HOME	28
TOTAL ANNUAL COST OF SELECTED BUSINESS TAXES AND LICENSES	29
COMPARISON OF ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS PER CAPITA	30
COMPARISON OF ANNUAL CAPITAL COSTS PER CAPITA	35
REDMOND ANNEXATION VS. UNINCORPORATED KING COUNTY	38
LEVELS OF SERVICE	38
TAX, FEE AND CHARGE RATES	46
TOTAL ANNUAL COST OF PROPERTY TAXES FOR AVERAGE HOME	50
COMPARISON OF TOTAL ANNUAL COST OF SELECTED BUSINESS TAXES AND LICENSES	51
COMPARISON OF ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS PER CAPITA	52
COMPARISON OF ANNUAL CAPITAL COSTS PER CAPITA	57
APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF GOVERNANCE OPTIONS	61
INCORPORATION	61
ANNEXATION	61
ROLE OF KING COUNTY BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD IN ANNEXATIONS AND INCORPORATIONS	66
APPENDIX B: KING COUNTY COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES RELATED TO ANNEXATION AND INCORPORATION	70
APPENDIX C: KING COUNTY POLICIES AND PROGRAMS RELATED TO ANNEXATION AND INCORPORATION	72
I. THE ANNEXATION AND INCORPORATION PROCESS	72
II. ADOPTED ANNEXATION AND INCORPORATION POLICIES	72
III. POTENTIAL ANNEXATION AREA PROGRAM	73
IV. 1997 PAA AND ANNEXATION AND INCORPORATION WORK PROGRAM: CURRENT STATUS	73
APPENDIX D: ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY	75
APPENDIX E: ANNEXATION POLICIES OF CITIES OF REDMOND AND ISSAQUAH	79
ISSAQUAH	79
REDMOND	83

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Conclusion

We compared two governance alternatives for the Sammamish Plateau, annexation and remaining unincorporated, and we conclude that it is not possible to identify a clearly preferable alternative. Specifically, we compared unincorporated King County to Issaquah (to reflect annexation of the Plateau south of S.E. 8th Street to the City of Issaquah). We also compared unincorporated King County to Redmond (to reflect annexation of the Plateau north of S.E. 8th Street to the City of Redmond). We did not study the alternative of incorporating a new city, since that is the subject of a different study.

We compared the governance alternatives of the subject areas in 72 different ways, including levels of service, taxes and charges, and expenditures per capita. The results are mixed, with a city doing better than the unincorporated service provider on a number of variables, while other variables show the County (or a special district) doing the better job. On several of the variables there was no difference, or the results were mixed among different measures of the same variable.

There is an old saying, "beauty is in the eye of the beholder." As a result of our research and analysis, we conclude that the best governance alternative is also "in the eye of the beholder" as determined by each reader's priorities among the 72 variables reported in this study.

What This Study Is (and Isn't) About

This is a study of governance alternatives for the Sammamish Plateau. It provides information about the differences and similarities of two governance alternatives: annexation or remaining unincorporated. It describes the levels of service, taxes, fees, and government expenditures that a resident of the Sammamish Plateau would expect (1) if they annexed to the nearest city, or (2) if they remain unincorporated.

This study is *not* any of the following:

- a rebuttal of, or response to, the study of the financial feasibility of a potential new City of Sammamish prepared for the Boundary Review Board,
- a study of the desirability or feasibility of annexation from the viewpoint of the cities of Issaquah and Redmond,
- a comparison of the two cities to which the Plateau could be annexed (Issaquah and Redmond),
- a calculation of the cost or time required to bring annexed areas up to the level of service currently provided by annexing cities, or
- an analysis of causes of variations in levels of service and costs of service among the local governments.

A discussion of these caveats is included in the Introduction to this study.

Using the Governance Alternatives Study

This study of governance alternatives for the Sammamish Plateau can be used in the following context.

Goal of This Report

The purpose of the study is to provide neutral, objective information from which anyone interested in governance options can make informed judgments about the governance of the Sammamish Plateau.

How to Use This Report

First, read the Introduction to understand the methods and assumptions, and to learn what the study is and isn't about.

Second, refer to the chapter that pertains to the area where you live. The Issaquah chapter, beginning on page 16, is for people living *south* of S.E. 8th Street. The Redmond chapter, beginning on page 38, is for people living *north* of S.E. 8th Street.

Third, review the tables of data that compare the annexation (City) option to the unincorporated (County and District) option. The accompanying text explains each indicator. The information is organized in sections in the following order: (1) levels of service, (2) tax, fee and charge rates, (3) typical tax costs, and (4) expenditures per capita.

When to Use This Report

This report is intended to be used during the period between July 21, 1998, and November 3, 1998. This is the period of public discussion and deliberation about the governance choices available to residents of the Sammamish Plateau. The period formally begins with the public hearing of the Boundary Review Board and ends with the election on the incorporation alternative.

Study Area

The area included in this Governance Alternatives study is the Sammamish Plateau, an area generally east of Lake Sammamish, south of Redmond, north of Issaquah, and inside the Urban Growth Boundary (somewhat west and south of Redmond-Fall City Road). The Sammamish Plateau is shown on the map on page 10.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and History of Study

Most people receive a variety of services from local governments¹. In the State of Washington, local government services are provided by general purpose governments (counties and cities) or special districts when the general purpose government does not provide the service. The most widely occurring special districts provide water, sewer, fire, or schools.

In general, the highest density development in urban areas occurs in cities, while somewhat lower density development occurs in unincorporated areas of urban areas of counties, and the lowest density development occurs in rural areas of counties. Another generalization is that city governments provide "urban" levels of service in higher density development that occurs in urban areas, and "rural" levels of service are typically provided by county governments and special districts to lower density development that occurs outside urban areas. However, between these two "models" are unincorporated areas inside urban growth boundaries². As these "urban" unincorporated areas increase in development density they often desire to become part of a municipality. This can be achieved by incorporation of a new city, or by annexation to an existing city³.

The concept of urban services for urban areas is a central feature of Washington's Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A), adopted in 1990. One interpretation of GMA states "that which is urban is municipal." Hence, the idea of municipal status for urban areas is consistent with, and supportive of, the Growth Management Act (GMA).

One of the requirements of the Growth Management Act is the creation and formal adoption of countywide planning policies that help guide and implement GMA. The countywide planning

¹ The most notable exceptions are military bases, federal lands, and Indian reservations.

² Urban growth boundaries are established under the Growth Management Act by counties, in collaboration with cities. Areas inside the boundaries can develop at higher densities, and are to be provided "urban" levels of service. Areas outside the boundaries are to be protected from higher density development. They are for such "rural" purposes as agriculture, forest products, and conservation lands.

policies created by King County and its cities include several guidelines concerning annexation and incorporation⁴. In response to GMA and the countywide planning policies, King County has established its own policies and a "Potential Annexation Area Program" to implement the GMA, Countywide and County comprehensive plan policies concerning annexation and incorporation⁵.

Another motivating force for incorporation or annexation is to achieve more local control. City councils, whether newly incorporated or annexing city, represent smaller groups of citizens, giving residents/voters the feeling that the council is closer to the people, and more responsive to local issues. There are a few realities of the 1990s that somewhat offset the local control issue. For example, laws and court cases require cities to achieve affordable housing goals and to allow adult entertainment in cities. One of the "strongest" local control issues, land use, is limited to control over applications that are submitted after incorporation or annexation (and after adoption by the city of its own land development regulations). As a practical matter, large portions of the undeveloped land on the Sammamish Plateau is already approved for development under County regulations that cannot be significantly altered by a city governing the plateau. Notwithstanding these limitations, local control is a powerful incentive for many people who are considering incorporation or annexation.

In 1997, a group of residents of the Sammamish Plateau in King County filed the necessary papers to begin the process of incorporating a new city: "Sammamish." The Plateau is generally east of Lake Sammamish, south of Redmond, north of Issaquah, and inside the Urban Growth Boundary that is somewhat west and south of Redmond-Fall City Road. The portion of the Plateau that is proposed for incorporation is shown on the map on page 10.

Washington law establishes a specific response to a request for incorporation. A State agency within King County known as the Boundary Review Board receives the petition for incorporation, and arranges for hearings and research to be conducted in order to determine the feasibility of the proposed incorporation.

³ The legal basis and procedures for incorporation and annexation are described in Appendix A.

⁴ The full text of relevant Countywide Planning Policies is presented in Appendix B.

⁵ A description of the County's policies and its Potential Annexation Area Program are presented in Appendix C.

In addition to this "required" response, the King County Executive requested, and the King County Council authorized⁶ a separate study of "governance alternatives" in order to provide information about the Sammamish Plateau (1) annexing to the cities of Redmond and Issaquah, or (2) remaining unincorporated⁷. The County's decision to conduct this Governance Alternatives study is based, in part, on specific requests received from residents of the Sammamish Plateau. The purpose of the study is to provide neutral, objective information from which anyone interested in governance options can make informed judgments about the governance of the Sammamish Plateau.

In October 1997 the County invited proposals from consultants to conduct the study, and in November 1997 selected and hired Henderson, Young & Company, assisted by Kraght Snell, P.S., to prepare the Governance Alternatives study.

What This Study Is (and Isn't) About

This is the study of governance alternatives for the Sammamish Plateau. It provides information about the differences and similarities of two governance alternatives: annexation or remaining unincorporated. It describes the levels of service, taxes, fees, and government expenditures that a resident of the Sammamish Plateau would expect (1) if they annexed to the nearest city, or (2) if they remain unincorporated. The annexation alternative is based on the assumption that the Sammamish Plateau would be divided at SE 8th Street. The area to the north would be annexed to Redmond, and the area to the south would be annexed to Issaquah.

There are a number of other, related topics that are beyond the scope of this study. The following are explanations of the ways in which the study is focused on the two specific alternatives described above:

- This study is *not* a rebuttal of, or response to, the study of the financial feasibility of a potential new City of Sammamish prepared for the Boundary Review Board.

⁶ A copy of Ordinance 12769 authorizing this study of governance alternatives is contained in Appendix D.

⁷ King County acknowledges that remaining unincorporated is only a short-term option, and that County Comprehensive Plan policies, Countywide Planning Policies and the Growth Management Act contemplate municipal status for areas inside the urban growth boundary.

The financial feasibility study for the Boundary Review Board is concerned with the specific question: "Is the proposed City of Sammamish financially feasible?" This study of Governance Alternatives is not concerned with the accuracy or validity of the Financial Feasibility study. Indeed, some readers may conclude that all the governance options (incorporation, annexation, or remaining unincorporated) have merit, and that there is not a clear "winner," nor an obvious "loser." Ultimately, the purpose of both studies is to provide neutral, objective information from which readers can make informed judgments about the governance of the Sammamish Plateau. Information on the financial feasibility of a new City of Sammamish is available in the study prepared for the Boundary Review Board by ECONorthwest (May 29, 1998). Information on the legal process for incorporation is presented in Appendix A of this study.

- This study is *not* a study of the desirability or feasibility of annexation from the viewpoint of the cities of Issaquah and Redmond.

Such a study would consider whether or not the cities should annex the Sammamish Plateau. In some instances, an area may cost more to serve than the revenue it would produce if it were annexed into a particular city. Conversely, some annexations are advantageous to cities because they produce more money than the cost of providing public facilities and services. This study does not determine whether either of these scenarios is true for either city (Issaquah or Redmond⁸), nor does it provide any analysis of the net benefit or cost to either city.

- This study is *not* a comparison of the two cities to which the Plateau could be annexed (Issaquah and Redmond).

This study makes direct comparisons between the County and each City, but not between the two cities. This is because the governance alternatives are assumed to be annexation to a specific city, or remain unincorporated. It is assumed that neither city would annex the entire Sammamish Plateau, therefore it serves no purpose to compare the two cities.

- This study is *not* a calculation of the cost or time required to bring annexed areas up to the level of service currently provided by annexing cities.

This study assumes that the annexing city will provide the annexed area with levels of service comparable to those provided to the residents and businesses in the existing city limits. In general, the cost and time required to equalize levels of service will vary depending on many factors, including (1) the difference between the city's level of service and that of the unincorporated area, (2) the revenue generated by the unincorporated area, (3) the city's reserves, and (4) the ability of the unincorporated area to obtain a "seat" on the city council. An analysis of these, and other relevant variables is beyond the scope of this study. Furthermore, it may not be feasible for a city to provide its level of service for annexed areas. This could occur if a city is experiencing growth within its pre-annexation boundaries that exceeds its ability to sustain its level of service, or if the annexed area is significantly deficient in infrastructure and does not have the financial base to underwrite a significant portion of the cost of eliminating the deficiency.

- This study is *not* an analysis of causes of variations in levels of service and costs of service among the local governments.

This study makes direct comparisons between the County and each City, and reports the differences in each pairwise comparison. There are many potential explanations for such differences. A partial list includes (1) anomalies occurring in the year for which data was reported (1997), (2) policies of particular governments to devote greater resources than other governments for particular services or facilities, (3) differences in tax base and other resources, (4) different management style, (5) different administrative costs, (6) relative success in obtaining intergovernmental revenue, and (7) relative acceptance of or resistance to taxes, fees, and debt.

⁸ In April 1997, the City of Redmond used its new Cost of Growth Model to analyze the cost of annexing part of the Sammamish Plateau.

An examination of the causes of variance would consist of (a) thorough compilation of anecdotal explanations, and/or (b) a multi-variate statistical analysis. Such research is beyond the scope of this study.

Study Area

The area included in this Governance Alternatives study is the Sammamish Plateau, an area generally east of Lake Sammamish, south of Redmond, north of Issaquah, and inside the Urban Growth Boundary (somewhat west and south of Redmond-Fall City Road). The Sammamish Plateau is shown on the map on page 10.

The study area is somewhat larger than the proposed City of Sammamish, in that it includes the unincorporated area south of the proposed City and north of the City of Issaquah. This area must be included in the annexation alternative in order for the City of Issaquah to "reach" the southern half of Sammamish without leapfrogging or creating an unincorporated island of Klahanie and adjacent areas.

Map of Study Area to be inserted at this point in the study

Format of Study

This report begins with an executive summary and an introduction describing the purpose, history, methodology and assumptions. The body of this report is presented in two sections:

- Annexation to Issaquah vs. Remain Unincorporated: uses 72 indicators of level of service, tax, fee and charge rates, costs to typical homes and businesses, and expenditures per capita to compare City of Issaquah to King County and the special districts that provide water, sewer and fire protection services to the part of the Sammamish Plateau south of S.E. 8th Street.
- Annexation to Redmond vs. Remain Unincorporated: the same indicators are used to compare the City of Redmond to King County and the special districts that provide water, sewer and fire protection services to the part of the Sammamish Plateau north of S.E. 8th Street.

Each of the two sections (Issaquah and Redmond) follow the same format and sequence to present the following comparisons of the city to the County and special districts:

- Levels of Service: compares the services based on key measures of service for law enforcement, fire, roads, water, sewer, parks, human services, and land use regulation.
- Tax, Fee and Charge Rates: compares the rates of property taxes, business taxes, utility taxes, franchise fees, and development fees.
- Annual Cost to Average Homes compares the annual cost of taxes and fees charged to a median-priced house.
- Annual Expenditures Per Capita compares the annual average spending on law enforcement, fire, roads, water, sewer, parks, human services, and land use regulation services and capital improvements.

Methodology

This study is designed to make pairwise comparisons between annexation (to Redmond or Issaquah) and remaining unincorporated (in King County). The key to the study was the selection of the variables used to compare the governance alternatives. The variables were selected by the

consultant, after conferring with staff of each local government (county, cities, and special districts). The variables we selected for this study meet our criteria:

- Readily understandable by citizens
- Data is readily available from the providers of services and facilities
- Each variable accurately portrays the service or facility

This study of governance alternatives for the Sammamish Plateau considered 72 variables: 25 level of service variables, 19 tax and fee rate variables, 10 annual cost variables, 9 operating cost per capita variables, and 9 capital cost per capita variables.

We have developed and used indicators of local services for over 20 years, and we are acutely aware of the limitations of such measures. For example, the indicators tend emphasize quantity as opposed to quality. Some measures are better at capturing quality than others. For example, criminal investigations per 1,000 population measures the quantity of work, but used comparatively it suggests some qualitative difference between law enforcement agencies, or at least between the communities they serve. By comparison, park acres per 1,000 population says nothing about the design, use, maintenance, enjoyment, or programming that make such sites more (or less) desirable places for recreation or leisure time.

Another limitation of service indicators is that they tend to be ratios of services or facilities to population, but not to employment. This is primarily because (1) relatively few indicators have been developed based on employment, and (2) data measuring existing and future employment is more difficult to obtain than population data. The absence of employment-driven indicators has substantially greater impact on areas with high ratios of employment to population (i.e., Redmond) than on areas with very low ratios (i.e., the Sammamish Plateau). At a minimum, the data showing expenditures per capita will appear higher than they really are for services that have significant use and/or benefit to employees and employers (i.e., police and fire) because the cost is being reported as though it was allocated only among the population whereas it should be allocated among the population *and* employees. Further complicating the issue is the volume of

visitors, customers, clients, patients, and others who use and/or benefit from public services and facilities, but for whom there is no reliable estimate of the numbers of such individuals, nor the proportion of service benefits that are attributable to them.

An important consideration is that we focused on variables for services and facilities that have the potential to change as a result of changes in governance. We did not develop variables for services and facilities that probably would not change under different forms of governance (i.e., schools, library, correctional facilities, courts, animal control, etc.).

The data we use in this study is taken directly from reports, records, studies, and financial documents of King County, the cities of Issaquah and Redmond, Fire District 10, the Northeast Sammamish Water District and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District.

Assumptions

This section of our report describes the assumptions we have made in conducting our research, preparing our analysis, and writing this report. Understanding the assumptions of a study is as important as understanding the findings and conclusions of the study. Assumptions are the *caveats emptor* of analyses, and must be understood and taken seriously by readers and users of studies.

Annexation Levels of Service, Taxes, and Expenditures

We assume that Issaquah and Redmond will provide the same services and charge the same taxes to the Plateau as they provide/charge to residents and businesses in the existing city limits of each city. Therefore, we assume that properties on the Sammamish Plateau that are *south* of S.E. 8th Street receive the same level of service, pay the same taxes and fees, and receive the same expenditures per capita as the City of Issaquah. Similarly, we assume that properties that are *north* of S.E. 8th Street will receive the same services, taxes, and expenditures as the City of Redmond.

We recognize that it may not be possible for a City to provide the same level of service to an annexed area. This may be due to peculiarities of the annexation area (i.e., exceptional distance

from existing city services and the absence of previous infrastructure investment in the area) or changes in the city's level of service situation in that growth within the existing city limits has outstripped the city's ability to sustain its "existing" level of service for its own residents. An analysis of these, and other relevant explanations is beyond the scope of this study.

Remaining Unincorporated Levels of Service, Taxes, and Expenditures

We assume that King County and special districts providing water, sewer and fire protection will continue to provide the same services, charge the same taxes and fees, and make the same level of expenditures on the Plateau as they currently provide/charge residents and businesses on the Plateau.

Services or Facilities That Do Not Change as a Result of Annexation

We have analyzed only those services and facilities that could change as a result of a change in governance. These include: law enforcement, fire protection and emergency medical services, roads, stormwater, water, sewer, parks, human services, and land use regulation.

We have excluded the following services and facilities that would not change as a result of annexation:

- Animal Control: King County
- Correctional Facilities: King County
- Courts: King County
- Library: King County Library System (special district)
- Schools: Issaquah School District and Lake Washington School District
- Solid Waste: Private hauler contracts (with minimum termination notice of 7 years)

It is theoretically possible for a city to provide all of the services and facilities listed above, except schools. We have omitted these services and facilities because the cities of Issaquah and

Redmond have chosen to use the providers listed above, and the cities have no current plans to change governance of the listed services and facilities.

We also assume that the cities of Issaquah and Redmond will not change the services and facilities that they currently provide. Specifically, neither city has plans to contract any of its services to the County or special districts. The only known exception is the current discussions between Issaquah and Fire District 10 regarding possible consolidation of fire service. Those discussions are not complete at the time that this study was completed, therefore it is not possible to forecast the impact of such consolidation on the governance alternative of annexing the south Plateau to Issaquah.

Annexation Plans of Cities

We assume that it is possible for the Plateau to annex to Issaquah and Redmond. Both cities have adopted policies concerning annexation in their comprehensive plans⁹. We are aware that Redmond has expressed reservations about annexation of the Plateau, and Issaquah has indicated that its annexation plans for the central Plateau are probably long-range (i.e., 20 years).

⁹ Full text of Issaquah and Redmond policies are presented in Appendix E.

ISSAQUAH ANNEXATION VS. UNINCORPORATED KING COUNTY

Levels of Service

The tables in this section list key indicators of the levels of service of law enforcement, fire protection and emergency medical services, roads, storm drainage, water, sewer, parks, human services, and land use regulation. Each indicator is reported for the City of Issaquah and King County.

Law Enforcement

Dispatched Calls for Service per Officer: Lower number of calls per officer mean that the officer has more time to spend per call, and more time between calls for preventive patrol. Data provided by City of Issaquah Police Department and King County Sheriff's Office.

Response Time - Emergency Calls: Data for each jurisdiction represents average elapsed time between dispatch of a unit and arrival of officer(s) at scene of incident. Data for Issaquah is for the current city limits, and data for King County is for the Sammamish Plateau. King County Sheriff emergency calls are defined as "critical" (event posing obvious danger to life of officer/citizen and felony crimes in progress), or "Priority 1" (requires immediate police action such as silent alarms, injury accidents, disturbances involving weapons, etc.). The County's classification of "Critical" and "Priority 1" are similar to, but not identical to the city's "emergency" call. A lower response time means that an officer(s) arrives more quickly at the scene of an incident to provide emergency services, which is particularly critical when the incident poses danger to the life of a citizen or an officer.

Response Time - Non Emergency Calls: Data for each jurisdiction represents average elapsed time between dispatch of a unit and arrival of officer(s) at scene of incident. Data for Issaquah is for the current city limits, and data for King County is for the Sammamish Plateau. King County Sheriff non-emergency calls are defined primarily as "Priority 2" (prompt dispatch to less critical

situations such as verbal disturbances, shoplifting, audible alarms, etc.), or “Priority 3” (routine dispatch for which time is not a crucial factor (burglary, vandalism, theft, etc.). The County's classification of "Priority 2" and "Priority 3" are similar to, but not identical to the city's "non-emergency" call.

Criminal Investigations per 1,000 Population: Part 1 Crimes include criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Data for Issaquah and King County comes from "1996 Crime in Washington State" published by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs. Lower numbers indicate fewer crimes being investigated per 1,000 population.

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Issaquah	King County
Law Enforcement		
Dispatched Calls for Service per Officer	640	730
Response Time: Emergency Calls	3.5 min	Critical = 2.6 min Priority 1 = 9.5
Response Time: Non-Emergency Calls	23.0 min.	Priority 2 = 20.7 min Priority 3 = 37.5 min
Criminal Investigations per 1,000 Population (Part 1 Crimes)	75.9	38.4

Emergency Medical Services

Average Response Time - Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Calls: Generally, an initial response time of 5-6 minutes (or lower) for EMS calls (Basic/Advanced Life Support) is optimum for life threatening incidents. Data for each jurisdiction represents average elapsed time between dispatch of a unit and arrival of emergency medical personnel at the scene of an incident. Emergency medical services for the unincorporated Sammamish Plateau are provided primarily by Fire District #10, although Fire District 27 serves 680 acres in the Trossach/High Country area east of

Beaver Lake. Data for Fire Districts 10 and 27 is for the entire area of each District because data is not available for the Plateau portion of either District. District 10 serves 210 square miles, which causes a slower average response time for the District as a whole. Data for Issaquah responses to ALS and BLS calls are the same because data is not available to distinguish the response times for the two types of calls. ALS responses in the City of Issaquah are provided by a unit from the City of Bellevue's Fire Department.

Fire Protection

Average Response Time - Structure Fire and Non-Fire Call: Generally, an initial response time of 5-6 minutes (or lower) for structure calls is optimum for life threatening fire incidents. Data for each jurisdiction represents average elapsed time between dispatch of a unit and arrival of fire suppression personnel at the scene of the incident. Fire protection for the unincorporated Sammamish Plateau is provided by Fire District #10. Data for Fire District #10 is for the entire District because data is not available for the Plateau portion of the District. The district serves 210 square miles, which causes a slower average response time for the District as a whole.

Insurance Fire Rating. Data provided by City of Issaquah Fire Department and Fire Districts #10 and 27. The Insurance Fire Rating is defined and determined nationally by the Insurance Services Office (ISO). The numerical rating represents the effectiveness of fire suppression services within a specific geographic area (e.g., municipality or fire district). Ratings are on a scale of 1 - 10, with 1 the best, and 10 the worst. A lower number generally corresponds to lower insurance premiums for the fire insurance portion of property damage insurance. A significant portion of the rating is attributable to the water supply system (which is outside the control of the fire service agency).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE		
	Issaquah	Fire District #10	Fire District #27
Emergency Medical Service			

Average Response Time (ALS)	3.9 min	8.0 min	15.7 min
Average Response Time (BLS)	3.9 min	6.0 min	8.4 min
Fire Protection			
Average Response Time Structure Fire	4.5 min	6.0 min	8.9 min
Insurance Fire Rating (Lower = Better)	6	5	5

Water Supply and Distribution

All indicators: Municipal water supply data was provided by the City of Issaquah and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. The significant variance in water pressure pounds per square inch (PSI) ranges reflect differences in the (1) types of water users (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial, etc.), and (2) geographic location of water users (e.g., elevation, distance from supply, etc.).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Issaquah	King County (Water Districts)
Public Works:		
Water Supply/Distribution		
Average Water Pressure (PSI) per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU)	30-120 PSI	30-115 PSI (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)
Average Monthly Cost of Water per ERU	\$ 15.00	\$14.00 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)

Sewer Collection and Treatment

Average Monthly Cost of Sewer Service per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU): Cost data was provided by the City of Issaquah and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. Monthly

costs include both sewer treatment (METRO) and collection systems (City of Issaquah and the districts serving the unincorporated Sammamish area of King County).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Issaquah	King County
Sewer Treatment/Collection		
Average Monthly Cost of Sewer Service per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU)	\$ 29.56	\$30.60 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)

Stormwater Drainage

Stormwater Design Standard: Generally, stormwater design standards represent flooding prevention thresholds (e.g., 100 year/24 hour storm) for individual geographic basins in order to (1) provide for adequate drainage in new construction to maintain passable roads in large storms and prevent damage to structures, and (2) maintain stormwater collection systems in order to minimize damage during storms. Typically, design standards will vary from basin to basin.

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Issaquah	King County
Stormwater Drainage		
Stormwater Design Standard	Varies by Geographic Area	Area Specific

Roads/Streets Maintenance

Years Between Overlays or Resurfacing: This indicator shows the frequency of major maintenance of roads and streets. If other considerations are equal (i.e., road base material and condition), a more frequent schedule of overlay will provide "better" road surfaces. Data was provided by City of Issaquah and King County (for unincorporated Sammamish area).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Issaquah	King County
Roads and Streets Maintenance		
Years Between Overlays or Resurfacing	10-15	12-15: arterials 15-25: local streets

Roads/Streets Congestion

Traffic Congestion Standard (A-F) for Arterial Streets: The traditional methods for evaluating and determining the level of service (LOS) for a roadway are documented in the Highway Capacity Manual. Generally, the level of service is rated on a scale from “A” to “F”, much like academic grading. LOS “A” through “C” implies free flow traffic with minimal delays, while LOS “D” and “E” imply unstable traffic flow with significant delays. LOS “F” implies forced unstable traffic flow with the potential for substantial delays.

The levels of service (LOS) for traffic congestion for many incorporated cities and unincorporated areas within King County are measured within transportation districts or service areas, and are applied to specific road segments or traffic intersections. Generally, in the more urbanized areas within King County, the LOS for traffic congestion typically ranges from “D” to “E”, while the LOS in rural areas ranges from “C” to “D”.

The City of Issaquah and King County use different methods to determine road congestion, therefore no data is reported for this indicator.

Parks and Recreation

Park Land (Active vs. Passive) Acres per 1,000 Population: Data was provided by the parks departments for the City of Issaquah and King County (unincorporated Sammamish area). The level of service for each jurisdiction represents the current inventory (1997) of park acres divided by each jurisdiction’s population (1997). Higher numbers mean more park acres per 1,000 population.

Active park acres for the City of Issaquah represent the LOS for fully developed parks in the City, and for King County reflect active park acres for East Sammamish Park, Northeast Sammamish Park, Pine Lake Park, and 10 acres of Klahanie Park. Passive park acres for the City of Issaquah represent the combined LOS for passive parks and open space in the City, and for King County reflect 40 passive park acres for Klahanie Park. It should be noted that the current inventory of active/passive parks acres does not include any parks outside the jurisdiction that may be used by area residents, including major regional parks provided by the County (Marymoor, Section 36, and Cougar Mountain parks). Specifically, the acres attributed to King County includes only those parks located within the geographic boundaries of the Sammamish Plateau study area (north of Issaquah and south of Redmond).

Trails Miles per 1,000 Population: Data was provided by the parks departments for the City of Issaquah and King County (unincorporated Sammamish area). The level of service for each jurisdiction represents the current inventory (1997) of trail miles divided by the jurisdiction’s population (1997). Higher numbers mean more trail miles per 1,000 population. The current inventory of miles of trails for the City of Issaquah include both recreational and urban trails. The current inventory of miles of trails for the unincorporated King County Sammamish area include both improved and unimproved trails

Sports Facilities (Athletic Fields and Swimming Pools) per 1,000 Population: Data was provided by the parks departments for the City of Issaquah and King County (unincorporated Sammamish area). The level of service for each jurisdiction represents the current inventory (1997) of the number of sports facilities divided by the jurisdiction’s population (1997). Higher numbers mean more sports facilities per 1,000 population. The current inventory of athletic fields for the King County Sammamish area does not include facilities planned for Section 36 that will serve the Sammamish Plateau study area (north of Issaquah and south of Redmond).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Issaquah	King County

Parks and Recreation:		
Park Land		
Active Park Acres per 1,000 Population	6.24	1.21
Passive Park Acres per 1,000 Population	65.04	1.03
Trails		
Miles per 1,000 Population	1.66	0.57
Sports Facilities		
Athletic Fields per 1,000 Population	1.04	N/A
Swimming Pools per 1,000 Population	0.1	0.026

Human Services Activities

Expenditures per 1,000 Population: This LOS is calculated by dividing the dollar amount of each jurisdiction's Human Services Department's operating budget (1997) by the jurisdiction's current population (1997). Higher numbers mean more support for human service programs.

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Issaquah	King County
Human Services Activities:		
Expenditures per 1,000 Population	\$19,740	\$10,000

Land Use Regulation

Employees per 1,000 Population: This LOS is calculated by dividing the number of Land Use Regulation Department employees of each jurisdiction (1997) by the jurisdiction's current population (1997). To some extent, a higher LOS suggests that more employees per 1,000 population contributes to (1) lower turnaround time required for processing permits and/or (2) more time available per employee to assist the public.

Permit Processing Turnaround Time (Days): Data was provided by the City of Issaquah and King County (unincorporated Sammamish area). The City of Issaquah and King County LOS

represents turnaround time for both major (e.g., large commercial/multi-family buildings, etc.) and minor (e.g., tenant improvements, basic house plan single family residence, etc.) construction projects. Fewer days means faster response to applicants.

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Issaquah	King County
Land Use Regulation:		
Employees per 1,000 Population	2.08	0.59
Major Permit Processing Turnaround Time (days)	120 days	130 days
Minor Permit Processing Turnaround Time (days)	10 days	3 days

Tax, Fee and Charge Rates

The tables in this section list property taxes, business taxes and development charges that would change in the event of annexation. Each tax, fee or charge is reported for the City of Issaquah and King County. The County’s data is based on its rates throughout the County (which are applied equally to the Sammamish Plateau). Lower rates of taxes and fees mean less cost to the property owner/consumer. Higher tax rates means more revenue for the government to pay for services and facilities, or to avoid higher rates of other taxes or fees.

Property Taxes

The table below lists the levy rates for property taxes that would change in the event of annexation. We exclude property tax rates for entities that would not change (i.e., school districts and library districts). According to State law, the City of Issaquah cannot levy a road tax and King County cannot levy a City tax. The amount of taxes paid by a median-priced home is presented in a subsequent table (see page 29). The source for levy rates is King County, Department of Assessments, which maintains current information for all areas.

RATES FOR TAXES, FEES AND CHARGES		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
TYPE OF TAX OR FEE	RATES (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Property Taxes (\$/\$1,000 assessed value)		
City	2.2724	not allowed
Road Levy	not allowed	1.7408
Fire District	0.0000	0.8897 - 1.6861
Hospital	0.0000	0 - 0.8267
Total	2.2724	2.6305 - 4.2536

Business and Occupation Taxes

Unincorporated King County is not authorized by Washington law to assess a Business and Occupation (B&O) tax. It assesses a yearly license fee to some types of business including amusement, entertainment, junk/used goods, and animal related. Annual licenses fees range from \$25.00 for pest control to \$1,000 for a promoter of charitable solicitations. License fees are not required for professional services. The basic rule of thumb is that if the County regulates the industry, there is a license fee requirement.

The City of Issaquah assesses a B&O tax of 0.1% on service related businesses. A 0.08% B&O tax is assessed on non-service businesses. An annual license fee of \$40.00 is required the first year of operation and \$30.00 thereafter. Issaquah contracts with King County to license kennels and shops. These businesses must pay City and County fees.

The data is based on interviews with Finance Departments and review of license applications.

TYPE OF TAX OR FEE	RATES	
	Issaquah	King County

Business & Occupation Taxes (% of gross receipts)	0.1% on services 0.08% on others	not allowed
Business Licenses	\$30/ business	varies by type of business

Utilities Taxes

Unincorporated King County residents do not pay utility taxes because the County is not authorized by State law to charge such taxes. The City of Issaquah provided its tax rates.

Franchise Tax

King County and the City of Issaquah charge cable television a five percent franchise tax.

TYPE OF TAX OR FEE	RATES (%)	
	Issaquah	King County
Utility Tax (% of gross receipts)		
Cable TV	0.0 %	not allowed
Electric	6.0 %	not allowed
Garbage	5.0 %	not allowed
Gas	6.0 %	not allowed
Sewer/Stormwater	0.0 %	not allowed
Telephone	6.0 %	not allowed
Water	5.0 %	not allowed
Franchise Taxes (% of gross receipts)		
Cable TV	5.0 %	5.0%

New Construction Building Permit Fees

The permit, mitigation, and impact fees for new construction are extremely complex and vary, depending on the building type, location, and development site. For comparison purposes, we have used some basic fee types and calculated the costs for a 2,500 square foot home with a 500

square foot attached garage. The sample home is of good quality and wood construction. For the City of Issaquah, transportation mitigation fees range between \$1,500-\$4,100 depending on the outcome of traffic analysis. King County charges a traffic mitigation fee based on a zone code. For the zone codes in the Plateau area, mitigation fees range between \$1,599-\$4,035.

TYPE OF TAX OR FEE	RATES (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Development Fees (2,500 sq. ft. home with 500 sq. ft. attached garage)		
Permit/Inspection/Review	2,756	2,654
Hourly Inspection Rate	47	95
Transportation Mitigation	2,800	2,495
Government Service Mitigation	1,917	none

Total Annual Cost of Property Taxes for Median-Priced Home

The first table below lists the annual cost for a median-priced house in the City of Issaquah and the unincorporated King County Sammamish Plateau. The source for the median house price calculation is "Experian", formally TRW.

MEDIAN HOUSING PRICE	COST PER MEDIAN-PRICED HOUSE (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
1st Quarter, 1998	289,900	295,000

Property Taxes

The table below lists the annual cost of property taxes to a median-priced house on the Plateau (median value = \$295,000) for taxes which would change in the event of annexation. Each annual cost of taxes is reported for the City of Issaquah and King County. The County's data is based on its rates throughout the County (which are applied equally to the Sammamish Plateau). According to State law, the City of Issaquah cannot levy a road tax and King County cannot levy a City tax. The source for levy rate is King County, Department of Assessments, which maintains current information for all areas.

COST OF SELECTED PROPERTY TAXES ON \$295,000 HOUSE		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
TYPE OF PROPERTY TAX	Issaquah	King County
City	670	not allowed
Road Levy	not allowed	513
Fire District	0	262 - 497
Hospital	0	0 - 244
Total	670	799 - 1,278

Total Annual Cost of Selected Business Taxes and Licenses

The table below lists the annual cost to selected businesses for business licenses and taxes. These are fees and taxes that would change in the event of annexation. Each annual cost of taxes, fees or charges is reported for the City of Issaquah and King County. The County's data is based on its rates throughout the County (which are applied equally to the Sammamish Plateau).

Considering the wide variety of fees, we developed the following hypothetical business models as the basis for comparing the financial impact on some types of businesses.

EXAMPLES OF BUSINESS TAXES		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
TYPE OF BUSINESS	BUSINESS TAX (ANNUAL \$)	
	Issaquah	King County
A. Two individuals who work together and offer residential cleaning services. Total revenue for 1998 is anticipated to be \$60,000.	90	0
B. A software developer who employs 20 individuals with 1998 anticipated revenues of \$10,000,000.	8,030	0
C. A tavern with eight employees. It hires a band for dancing on Friday and Saturday nights. Anticipated revenue in 1998 is \$1,000,000.	830	200
D. A pawnbroker with two employees. Anticipated revenue in 1998 is \$500,000.	430	500
E. A grocery store with 70 part- and full time employees with 1998 anticipated revenues of \$8,000,000.	6,430	0

Comparison of Annual Operating Costs per Capita

The tables in this section list annual operating costs per capita for law enforcement, fire protection and emergency medical services, roads, stormwater, water, sewer, parks, human services, and land use regulation. Each annual operating cost is reported for the City of Issaquah and King County. The County's data is based on its expenditures on the Sammamish Plateau, unless otherwise noted in the text preceding each table below. In the tables below, higher costs may translate into "better" service (i.e., greater quantity, quality, speed, customer service, etc.), or they

may indicate a public service that is less efficient. Smaller governments often have higher costs per capita because they have the same "fixed costs" (i.e., core staff and facilities) regardless of the size of the agency. These costs, when divided by small populations, produce higher costs per capita.

Law Enforcement

City of Issaquah operating cost data is taken from the City's 1997 Operating Budget. The operating cost data for the King County Sheriff's Department is based on the Department's cost of local law enforcement for the unincorporated area and contract cities. Operating costs for both entities exclude cost of correctional facilities and services. Total operating costs for each jurisdiction were divided by the respective service area populations in order to calculate the per capita cost (e.g., Issaquah service area population equals 9,610, and King County Sheriff Department service area population for unincorporated areas and contract cities equals 547,501).

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA OPERATING COSTS (1997)		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Law Enforcement	227.00	107.60

Fire Protection

Financial data for 1997 was researched from the 1997 operating budgets for the City of Issaquah and Fire Districts 10 and 27. Total operating costs for Issaquah were divided by the City population (9,610), costs for Fire District #10 were divided by its population (100,000) and costs for Fire District #27 were divided by its population (7,000) in order to calculate the per capita cost for each geographic area.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)		
	Issaquah	Fire District #10	Fire District #27
Fire Protection	164.56	89.68	63.16

Water Supply and Distribution

Operating cost data for 1997 was researched from the operating budgets for the City of Issaquah and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. Total operating costs for each jurisdiction were divided by the number of ERUs (equivalent residential units): Issaquah = 7,500 water ERUs, Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District = 13,600 ERUs.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Water Supply/Distribution	167.90	249.99 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)

Sewer Treatment/Collection

Cost data for 1997 was researched from the 1997 operating budgets for the City of Issaquah and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. Total operating costs for each jurisdiction were divided by the number of ERUs (equivalent residential units): Issaquah = 7,300 sewer ERUs, Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District = 7,162 ERUs.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Sewer Collection System	108.39	178.17 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)
Sewer Treatment (METRO)	214.34	212.73 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)

Storm Drainage

Stormwater costs are calculated per single family unit, unlike other costs in this section of the report which are calculated per capita. Cost data was provided by King County.

TYPE OF SERVICE	OPERATING COST PER SINGLE FAMILY UNIT (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Stormwater Drainage	106.65	85.02

Roads and Streets

Financial data for 1997 was researched from the City of Issaquah 1997 Operating Budget, and special budget estimates provided by the King County Transportation Department for the unincorporated Sammamish Plateau area. Total budget operating costs for Issaquah were divided by the City population (9,610), and King County Transportation Department costs for the Plateau were divided by its service area population (38,700) in order to calculate the per capita cost.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Roads and Streets	210.05	41.72

Parks and Recreation

Financial data for the City of Issaquah was researched from the City's 1998 Operating Budget. Total budget operating costs for Issaquah's Parks Department was divided by the City's population (9,610) in order to calculate the per capita cost. Financial data for King County was based on the County Parks Department's budget. The Department's budget was apportioned between regional facilities that serve the entire population and non-regional facilities that serve only the unincorporated area and cities that contract with the County for parks and recreational facilities. The non-regional portion of the budget (55%) was divided by the non-regional

population (primarily the unincorporated area) in order to calculate the per capita cost. The regional portion of the budget (45%) is excluded from the calculation because it serves the entire County and would not change in the event of annexation (or incorporation).

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Parks and Recreation:	268.09	20.70

Human Services Activities

Financial data for 1997 was researched from the City of Issaquah 1997 Operating Budget. The County's cost is based on the total countywide discretionary human services expenditures (both direct service and contract services). Total budget operating costs for Issaquah were divided by the City's population (9,160) in order to calculate the per capita cost. The County's operating cost was divided by the total County population.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Human Services Activities:	19.74 City + 10.00 County 29.74	10.00

Land Use Regulation

Operating cost data for 1997 was researched from the City of Issaquah 1997 Operating Budget, and King County Department of Development and Economic Services (DDES) budget (1997). Total budget operating costs for Issaquah were divided by the City's population (9,610) in order

to calculate the per capita cost. The County's operating cost was divided by the unincorporated King County population (432,084).

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Land Use Regulation:	132.60	52.76

Comparison of Annual Capital Costs per Capita

Comparison of infrastructure investments of the City of Issaquah and King County is much more difficult to interpret than the preceding comparisons of operating costs per capita. Capital expenditures vary dramatically from year to year in individual local governments. A better measure would be the current (replacement) value per capita of each infrastructure system. Such a calculation would require a complete inventory of each infrastructure system, and a method for determining its current (replacement) value. This data is not generally available from local governments.

Using readily available data, we calculated the annual capital costs per capita using time horizons in order to minimize the effect of fluctuations in local infrastructure needs and expenditures. For planned capital improvements, we divided the 6-year total cost by 6 years to calculate an annual average. The annual average was then divided by the population to determine the cost per capita per year. We performed a similar analysis of 5-year historical data. We also report 1-year actual expenditures for 1997.

Our analysis includes roads, parks and surface water, because they include very large capital costs funded by taxes. We do not analyze water or sewer capital costs because they tend to be funded by revenue bonds that are repaid by user fees. We do not analyze capital costs for public safety because the amounts are relatively modest (compared to the other types of public facilities) and they are subject to greater cyclical volatility than the other types of public facilities.

Roads

The City of Issaquah's planned capital costs are based on the City's 1999-2004 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). King County's planned capital costs are based on the County's 1998-2003 CIP. In addition, King County actual 1997 capital cost data, as well as 1993-1997 actual cost data were also used to show annual per capita costs for roads and streets. Costs may include grant revenues and/or participation by Washington's Department of Transportation. Annual capital costs for each jurisdiction were divided by each jurisdiction's service area populations in order to calculate the per capita cost. Significantly higher per capita costs for the City of Issaquah are due, in part, to major capacity road construction projects (e.g., I-90/Sunset Interchange, Southeast by-pass project).

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA CAPITAL COSTS		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
ROADS	PER CAPITA CAPITAL COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Planned Annual Average (6 yrs)	1,910.20	227.99
Historical Cost (1997)		152.32
Historical Annual Average (5 yrs)		86.08

Parks

The City of Issaquah's planned capital costs are based on the City's 1999-2004 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). King County's planned capital costs are based on the County's 1998-2003 CIP. In addition, King County actual 1997 capital cost data was also used to show annual per capita costs for parks. Annual capital costs for each jurisdiction were divided by each jurisdiction's service area populations in order to calculate the actual per capita cost. Significantly higher per capita costs for the City of Issaquah are due, in part, to major park land acquisition and development projects for active use parks, open space, and wetland areas. The County has significant capital expenditures that are not included below because they are at parks that are outside the study area, but which provide significant service to Plateau residents (i.e., Section 36 Park, Marymoor Park and Cougar Mountain Park).

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA CAPITAL COSTS		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
PARKS	PER CAPITA CAPITAL COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Planned Annual Average (6 yrs)	612.28	11.50
Historical Cost (1997)		138.20

Stormwater

The City of Issaquah's planned capital costs are based on the City's 1999-2004 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). King County historical CIP cost data (1993-1997) and 1997 year-end costs are used to show the level of expenditures made by the County in completing the majority of projects required to meet the Sammamish unincorporated area's need for retention and conveyance systems. As a result of the County's expenditures completing the needed facilities, it does not plan additional capital expenditures for stormwater control during the next 6 years. Annual capital costs for each jurisdiction were divided by each jurisdiction's service area populations in order to calculate the actual per capita cost.

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA CAPITAL COSTS		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
STORMWATER	PER CAPITA CAPITAL COST (\$)	
	Issaquah	King County
Planned Annual Average (6 yrs)	213.61	
Historical Cost (1997)	177.65	101.72
Historical Annual Average (5 yrs)		26.84

REDMOND ANNEXATION VS. UNINCORPORATED KING COUNTY

Levels of Service

The tables in this section list key indicators of the levels of service of law enforcement, fire protection and emergency medical services, roads, storm drainage, water, sewer, parks, human services, and land use regulation. Each indicator is reported for the City of Redmond and King County.

Law Enforcement

Dispatched Calls for Service per Officer: Lower number of calls per officer mean that the officer has more time to spend per call, and more time between calls for preventive patrol. Data is provided by the City of Redmond Police Department and King County Sheriff's Office.

Response Time - Emergency Calls: Data for each jurisdiction represents average elapsed time between dispatch of a unit and arrival of officer(s) at scene of incident. Data for Redmond is for the current city limits, and data for King County is for the Sammamish Plateau. King County Sheriff emergency calls are defined as "critical" (event posing obvious danger to life of officer/citizen and felony crimes in progress), or "Priority 1" (requires immediate police action such as silent alarms, injury accidents, disturbances involving weapons, etc.). The County's classification of "Critical" and "Priority 1" are similar to, but not identical to the city's "emergency" call. A lower response time means that an officer(s) arrives more quickly at the scene of an incident to provide emergency services, which is particularly critical when the incident poses danger to the life of a citizen or an officer.

Response Time - Non Emergency Calls: Data for each jurisdiction represents average elapsed time between dispatch of a unit and arrival of officer(s) at scene of incident. Data for Redmond is for the current city limits, and data for King County is for the Sammamish Plateau. The City of Redmond's calls tracking system does not distinguish between emergency and non-emergency

calls. King County Sheriff non-emergency calls are defined primarily as "Priority 2" (prompt dispatch to less critical situations such as verbal disturbances, shoplifting, audible alarms, etc.), or "Priority 3" (routine dispatch for which time is not a crucial factor (burglary, vandalism, theft, etc.). The County's classification of "Priority 1" and "Priority 2" are similar to, but not identical to the city's "non-emergency" call.

Criminal Investigations per 1,000 Population: Part 1 Crimes include criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Data for Redmond and King County comes from "1996 Crime in Washington State" published by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs. Lower numbers indicate fewer crimes being investigated per 1,000 population.

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	King County
Law Enforcement		
Dispatched Calls for Service per Officer	438	730
Response Time: Emergency Calls	4 min	Critical = 2.6 min Priority 1 = 9.5
Response Time: Non-Emergency Calls	N/A	Priority 2 = 20.7 min Priority 3 = 37.5 min
Criminal Investigations per 1,000 Population (Part 1 Crimes)	39.9	38.4

Emergency Medical Services

Average Response Time - Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Calls: Generally, an initial response time of 5-6 minutes (or lower) for EMS calls (Basic/Advanced Life Support) is optimum for life threatening incidents. Data for each jurisdiction represents average elapsed time between dispatch of a unit and arrival of emergency medical personnel at the scene of an incident. Emergency medical services for the unincorporated Sammamish Plateau are provided by Fire District #10.

Data for the City of Redmond is the average of responses in the City's entire service area of approximately 50 square miles which includes the City limits and contract service areas in Fire District #34. Data for Fire District #10 is for the entire District because data is not available for the Plateau portion of the District. The district serves 210 square miles, which causes a slower average response time for the District as a whole. Data for Redmond responses to ALS and BLS calls are the same because data is not available to distinguish the response times for the two types of calls. ALS responses in Redmond are provided by Evergreen Hospital on behalf of King County EMS.

Fire Protection

Average Response Time - Structure Fire and Non-Fire Call: Generally, an initial response time of 5-6 minutes (or lower) for structure calls is optimum for life threatening fire incidents. Data for each jurisdiction represents average elapsed time between dispatch of a unit and arrival of fire suppression personnel at the scene of the incident. Fire protection for the unincorporated Sammamish Plateau is provided by Fire District #10. Data for the City of Redmond is the average of responses in the City's entire service area of approximately 50 square miles which includes the City limits and contract service areas in Fire District #34. Data for Fire District #10 is for the entire District because data is not available for the Plateau portion of the District. The district serves 210 square miles, which causes a slower average response time for the District as a whole.

Insurance Fire Rating. Data provided by City of Redmond Fire Department and Fire District #10. The Insurance Fire Rating is defined and determined nationally by the Insurance Services Office (ISO). The numerical rating represents the effectiveness of fire suppression services within a specific geographic area (e.g., municipality or fire district). Ratings are on a scale of 1 - 10, with 1 the best, and 10 the worst. A lower number generally corresponds to lower insurance premiums for the fire insurance portion of property damage insurance. A significant portion of the rating is attributable to the water supply system (which is outside the control of the fire service agency).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	Fire District #10
Emergency Medical Service		
Average Response Time (ALS)	5.7 min	8.0 min
Average Response Time (BLS)	5.7 min	6.0 min
Fire Protection		
Average Response Time Structure Fire	5.7 min	6.0 min
Insurance Fire Rating (Lower = Better)	3	5

Water Supply and Distribution

All indicators: Municipal water supply data was provided by the City of Redmond, Northeast Sammamish Water and Sewer District and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. The significant variance in water pressure pounds per square inch (PSI) ranges reflect differences in the (1) types of water users (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial, etc.), and (2) geographic location of water users (e.g., elevation, distance from supply, etc.).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	King County (Water Districts)
Public Works:		
Water Supply/Distribution		
Average Water Pressure (PSI) per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU)	30-80 PSI	40-115 PSI (Northeast Sammamish Water and Sewer District) 30-115 PSI (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)
Average Monthly Cost of Water per ERU	\$ 16.47 per capita (ERU data not available)	\$22.83 (Northeast Sammamish Water and Sewer District)

		\$14.00 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)
--	--	--

Sewer Collection and Treatment

Average Monthly Cost of Sewer Service per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU): Cost data was provided by the City of Redmond and Northeast Sammamish Water and Sewer District and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. Monthly costs include both sewer treatment (METRO) and collection systems (City of Redmond and the districts serving the unincorporated Sammamish area of King County).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	King County
Sewer Treatment/Collection		
Average Monthly Cost of Sewer Service per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU)	\$ 25.85	\$35.10 (Northeast Sammamish Water and Sewer District) \$30.60 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)

Stormwater Drainage

Stormwater Design Standard: Generally, stormwater design standards represent flooding prevention thresholds (e.g., 100 year/24 hour storm) for individual geographic basins in order to (1) provide for adequate drainage in new construction to maintain passable roads in large storms and prevent damage to structures, and (2) maintain stormwater collection systems in order to minimize damage during storms. Typically, design standards will vary from basin to basin.

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	King County

Stormwater Drainage		
Stormwater Design Standard	Varies by Geographic Area	Area Specific

Roads/Streets Maintenance

Years Between Overlays or Resurfacing: This indicator shows the frequency of major maintenance of roads and streets. If other considerations are equal (i.e., road base material and condition), a more frequent schedule of overlay will provide "better" road surfaces. Data was provided by City of Redmond and King County (for unincorporated Sammamish area).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	King County
Roads and Streets Maintenance		
Years Between Overlays or Resurfacing	15-20	12-15: arterials 15-25: local streets

Roads/Streets Congestion

Traffic Congestion Standard (A-F) for Arterial Streets: The traditional methods for evaluating and determining the level of service (LOS) for a roadway are documented in the Highway Capacity Manual. Generally, the level of service is rated on a scale from "A" to "F", much like academic grading. LOS "A" through "C" implies free flow traffic with minimal delays, while LOS "D" and "E" imply unstable traffic flow with significant delays. LOS "F" implies forced unstable traffic flow with the potential for substantial delays.

The levels of service (LOS) for traffic congestion for many incorporated cities and unincorporated areas within King County are measured within transportation districts or service areas, and are applied to specific road segments or traffic intersections. Generally, in the more urbanized areas within King County, the LOS for traffic congestion typically ranges from "D" to "E", while the LOS in rural areas ranges from "C" to "D".

The City of Redmond and King County use different methods to determine road congestion, therefore no data is reported for this indicator.

Parks and Recreation

Park Land (Active vs. Passive) Acres per 1,000 Population: Data was provided by the parks departments for the City of Redmond and King County (unincorporated Sammamish area). The level of service for each jurisdiction represents the current inventory (1997) of park acres divided by each jurisdiction's population (1997). Higher numbers mean more park acres per 1,000 population.

Active park acres for the City of Redmond represent the LOS for fully developed parks in the City, and for King County reflect active park acres for East Sammamish Park, Northeast Sammamish Park, Pine Lake Park, and 10 acres of Klahanie Park. Passive park acres for the City of Redmond represent the combined LOS for passive parks and open space in the City, and for King County reflect 40 passive park acres for Klahanie Park. It should be noted that the current inventory of active/passive parks acres does not include any parks outside the jurisdiction that may be used by area residents, including major regional parks provided by the County (Marymoor, Section 36, and Cougar Mountain parks). Specifically, the acres attributed to King County includes only those parks located within the geographic boundaries of the Sammamish Plateau study area (north of Issaquah and south of Redmond).

Trails Miles per 1,000 Population: Data was provided by the parks departments for the City of Redmond and King County (unincorporated Sammamish area). The level of service for each jurisdiction represents the current inventory (1997) of trail miles divided by the jurisdiction's population (1997). Higher numbers mean more trail miles per 1,000 population. The current inventory of miles of trails for the City of Redmond include both recreational and urban trails. The current inventory of miles of trails for the unincorporated King County Sammamish area include both improved and unimproved trails

Sports Facilities (Athletic Fields and Swimming Pools) per 1,000 Population: Data was provided by the parks departments for the City of Redmond and King County (unincorporated Sammamish

area). The level of service for each jurisdiction represents the current inventory (1997) of the number of sports facilities divided by the jurisdiction's population (1997). Higher numbers mean more sports facilities per 1,000 population. The current inventory of athletic fields for the King County Sammamish area does not include facilities planned for Section 36 that will serve the Sammamish Plateau study area (north of Issaquah and south of Redmond).

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	King County
Parks and Recreation:		
Park Land		
Active Park Acres per 1,000 Population	3.16	1.21
Passive Park Acres per 1,000 Population	8.06	1.03
Trails		
Miles per 1,000 Population	0.40	0.57
Sports Facilities		
Athletic Fields per 1,000 Population	0.28	N/A
Swimming Pools per 1,000 Population	0.0	0.026

Human Services Activities

Expenditures per 1,000 Population: This LOS is calculated by dividing the dollar amount of each jurisdiction's Human Services Department's operating budget (1997) by the jurisdiction's current population (1997). Higher numbers mean more support for human service programs.

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	King County
Human Services Activities:		
Expenditures per 1,000 Population	\$12,860	\$10,000

Land Use Regulation

Employees per 1,000 Population: This LOS is calculated by dividing the number of Land Use Regulation Department employees of each jurisdiction (1997) by the jurisdiction's current population (1997). To some extent, a higher LOS suggests that more employees per 1,000 population contributes to (1) lower turnaround time required for processing permits and/or more time available per employee to assist the public.

Permit Processing Turnaround Time (Days): Data was provided by the City of Redmond and King County (unincorporated Sammamish area). The City of Redmond and King County LOS represents turnaround time for both major (e.g., large commercial/multi-family buildings, etc.) and minor (e.g., tenant improvements, basic house plan single family residence, etc.) construction projects. Fewer days means faster response to applicants.

TYPE OF SERVICE	LEVEL OF SERVICE	
	Redmond	King County
Land Use Regulation:		
Employees per 1,000 Population	1.05	0.59
Major Permit Processing Turnaround Time (days)	120 days	130 days
Minor Permit Processing Turnaround Time (days)	5 days	3 days

Tax, Fee and Charge Rates

The tables in this section list property taxes, business taxes and development charges that would change in the event of annexation. Each tax, fee or charge is reported for the City of Redmond and King County. The County's data is based on its rates throughout the County (which are applied equally to the Sammamish Plateau). Lower rates of taxes and fees mean less cost to the

property owner/consumer. Higher tax rates means more revenue for the government to pay for services and facilities, or to avoid higher rates of other taxes or fees.

Property Taxes

The table below lists the levy rates for property taxes that would change in the event of annexation. We exclude property tax rates for entities that would not change (i.e., school districts and library districts). According to State law, the City of Redmond cannot levy a road tax and King County cannot levy a City tax. The amount of taxes paid by a median-priced home is presented in a subsequent table (see page 51). The source for levy rates is King County, Department of Assessments, which maintains current information for all areas.

RATES FOR TAXES, FEES AND CHARGES		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
TYPE OF TAX OR FEE	RATES	
	Redmond	King County
Property Taxes (\$/\$1,000 assessed value)		
City	2.2984	not allowed
Road Levy	not allowed	1.7408
Fire District	0- 0.1062	0.8897- 1.6861
Hospital	0- 0.4342	0 - 0.8267
Total	2.2984 - 2.8388	2.6305 - 4.2536

Business and Occupation Taxes

Unincorporated King County is not authorized by Washington law to assess a Business and Occupation (B&O) tax. It assesses a yearly license fee to some types of business including amusement, entertainment, junk/used goods, and animal related. Annual licenses fees range from \$25.00 for pest control to \$1,000 for a promoter of charitable solicitations. License fees are not

required for professional services. The basic rule of thumb is that if the County regulates the industry, there is a license fee requirement.

The City of Redmond assesses a business license based on employee head count. The 1998 rates are \$65.00 per employee. Also, the City has license fees for businesses requiring some regulation, (e.g., dance halls, amusement, or pawn brokers, etc.). Redmond contracts with King County to license pet kennels and shops and taxicabs. These businesses must pay City and County fees.

The data is based on interviews with Finance Departments and review of license applications.

TYPE OF TAX OR FEE	RATES	
	Redmond	King County
Business & Occupation Taxes (% of gross receipts)	none	not allowed
Business Licenses	\$65/ employee	varies by type of business

Utilities Taxes

Unincorporated King County residents do not pay utility taxes because the County is not authorized by State law to charge such taxes. The City of Redmond provided its tax rates.

Franchise Tax

King County charges a 5% franchise tax to cable television. The City of Redmond does not have separate franchise taxes.

TYPE OF TAX OR FEE	RATES (%)	
	Redmond	King County
Utility Tax (% of gross receipts)		
Cable TV	5.5 %	not allowed
Electric	5.5 %	not allowed
Garbage	5.5 %	not allowed
Gas	5.5 %	not allowed
Sewer/Stormwater	0.0 %	not allowed
Telephone	5.5 %	not allowed
Water	0.0 %	not allowed
Franchise Taxes (% of gross receipts)		
Cable TV	none	5.0%

New Construction Building Permit Fees

The permit, mitigation, and impact fees for new construction are extremely complex and vary, depending on the building type, location, and development site. For comparison purposes, we have used some basic fee types and calculated the costs for a 2,500 square foot home with a 500 square foot attached garage. The sample home is of good quality and wood construction. King County charges a traffic mitigation fee based on a zone code. For the zone codes in the Plateau area, mitigation fees range between \$1,599-\$4,035. The City of Redmond has set fees for each of its seven impact districts. The fee for the impact district closest to the Plateau is \$1,240.

TYPE OF TAX OR FEE	RATES (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Development Fees (2,500 sq. ft. home with 500 sq. ft. attached garage)		
Permit/Inspection/Review	2,400	2,654
Hourly Inspection Rate	42	95
Transportation Mitigation	1,240	2,495
Government Service Mitigation	1,556	None

Total Annual Cost of Property Taxes for Average Home

The first table below lists the annual cost for a median-priced house in the City of Redmond and the unincorporated King County Sammamish Plateau. The source for the median house price calculation is "Experian", formally TRW.

MEDIAN HOUSING PRICE	COST PER MEDIAN-PRICED HOUSE (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
1st Quarter, 1998	214,950	295,000

Property Taxes

The table below lists the annual cost of property taxes to an average house on the Plateau (median value = \$295,000) for taxes which would change in the event of annexation. Each annual cost of taxes is reported for the City of Redmond and King County. The County's data is based on its rates throughout the County (which are applied equally to the Sammamish Plateau). According to State law, the City of Redmond cannot levy a road tax and King County cannot levy a City tax. The source for levy rate is King County, Department of Assessments, which maintains current information for all areas.

COST OF SELECTED PROPERTY TAXES ON \$295,000 HOUSE		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
TYPE OF PROPERTY TAX	Redmond	King County
City	678	not allowed
Road Levy	not allowed	513
Fire District	0 - 31	262 - 497
Hospital	0 - 128	0 - 244
Total	678 - 837	775 - 1,254

Comparison of Total Annual Cost of Selected Business Taxes and Licenses

The table below lists the annual cost to selected businesses for business licenses and taxes. These are fees and taxes that would change in the event of annexation. Each annual cost of taxes, fees or charges is reported for City of Redmond and King County.

The County's data is based on its rates throughout the County (which are applied equally to the Sammamish Plateau).

Considering the wide variety of fees, we developed the following hypothetical business models as the basis for comparing the financial impact on some types of businesses.

EXAMPLES OF BUSINESS TAXES		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
TYPE OF BUSINESS	BUSINESS TAX (ANNUAL \$)	
	Redmond	King County
A. Two individuals who work together and offer residential cleaning services. Total revenue for 1998 is anticipated to be \$60,000.	130	0
B. A software developer who employs 20 individuals with 1998 anticipated revenues of \$10,000,000.	1,300	0
C. A tavern with eight employees. It hires a band for dancing on Friday and Saturday nights. Anticipated revenue in 1998 is \$1,000,000.	788	200
D. A pawnbroker with two employees. Anticipated revenue in 1998 is \$500,000.	214	500
E. A grocery store with 70 part- and full time employees with 1998 anticipated revenues of \$8,000,000.	4,550	0

Comparison of Annual Operating Costs per Capita

The tables in this section list annual operating costs per capita for law enforcement, fire protection and emergency medical services, roads, stormwater, water, sewer, parks, human services, and land use regulation. Each annual operating cost is reported for the City of Redmond and King County. The County's data is based on its expenditures on the Sammamish Plateau, unless otherwise noted in the text preceding each table below. In the tables below, higher costs may translate into "better" service (i.e., greater quantity, quality, speed, customer service, etc.), or they

may indicate a public service that is less efficient. Smaller governments often have higher costs per capita because they have the same "fixed costs" (i.e., core staff and facilities) regardless of the size of the agency. These costs, when divided by small populations, produce higher costs per capita.

Law Enforcement

City of Redmond operating cost data is taken from the City's 1997-98 Biennial Operating Budget. The operating cost data for the King County Sheriff's Department is based on the Department's cost of local law enforcement for the unincorporated area and contract cities. Operating costs for both entities exclude cost of correctional facilities and services. Total 1997 operating costs for each jurisdiction were divided by the respective service area populations in order to calculate the per capita cost (e.g., Redmond service area population equals 41,500, and King County Sheriff Department service area population for unincorporated areas and contract cities equals 547,501).

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA OPERATING COSTS (1997)		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Law Enforcement	189.70	107.60

Fire Protection

Financial data for 1997 was researched from the City of Redmond Biennial 1997-1998 Operating Budget and Fire District #10. Total 1997 operating costs for Redmond were divided by the City of Redmond population (41,500), and costs for Fire District #10 were divided by its service area population (100,000) in order to calculate the per capita cost for each geographic area.

	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)
--	---------------------------------------

TYPE OF SERVICE	Redmond	King County
Fire Protection	202.79	89.68

Water Supply and Distribution

Operating cost data for 1997 was researched from the City of Redmond Biennial 1997-1998 Operating Budget, and 1997 operating budgets from Northeast Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District, and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. Total 1997 operating costs of each jurisdiction were divided by the number of ERUs (equivalent residential units) of the appropriate entity, except for the City of Redmond, which does not have an ERU count.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Water Supply/Distribution	196.30 per capita (ERU data not available)	202.19 (Northeast Sammamish Water and Sewer District) 249.99 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)

Sewer Treatment/Collection

Cost data for 1997 was researched from the City of Redmond Biennial 1997-1998 Operating Budget, and 1997 operating budgets from Northeast Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District, and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. Total 1997 operating costs of each jurisdiction were divided by the number of ERUs (equivalent residential units) of the appropriate entity, except for the City of Redmond, which does not have an ERU count.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
		98.87 (Northeast

Sewer Collection System	56.29 per capita (ERU data not available)	Sammamish Water and Sewer District 178.17 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)
Sewer Treatment (METRO)	131.37 per capita (ERU data not available)	229.20 (Northeast Sammamish Water and Sewer District) 212.73 (Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District)

Stormwater Drainage

Stormwater costs are calculated per single family unit, unlike other costs in this section of the report which are calculated per capita. Cost data was provided by King County.

TYPE OF SERVICE	OPERATING COST PER SINGLE FAMILY UNIT (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Stormwater Drainage	72.00	85.02

Roads and Streets

Financial data for 1997 was researched from the City of Redmond Biennial 1997-1998 Operating Budget and special budget estimates provided by the King County Transportation Department for the unincorporated Sammamish Plateau area. Total 1997 budget operating costs for Redmond were divided by the City of Redmond population (41,500), and King County Transportation Department costs were divided by the service area population (38,700) in order to calculate the per capita cost.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County

Roads and Streets	65.50	41.72
-------------------	-------	-------

Parks and Recreation

Financial data for 1997 for the City of Redmond was researched from the City's 1997-98 Biennial Operating Budget. Total 1997 operating costs for Redmond's Parks Department was divided by the City's population (41,500) in order to calculate the per capita cost. Financial data for King County was based on the County Parks Department's budget. The Department's budget was apportioned between regional facilities that serve the entire population and non-regional facilities that serve only the unincorporated area and cities that contract with the County for parks and recreational facilities. The non-regional portion of the budget (55%) was divided by the non-regional population (primarily the unincorporated area) in order to calculate the per capita cost. The regional portion of the budget (45%) is excluded from the calculation because it serves the entire County and would not change in the event of annexation (or incorporation).

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Parks and Recreation:	106.53	20.70

Human Services Activities

Financial data for 1997 was researched from the City of Redmond Biennial 1997-1998 Operating Budget. The County's cost is based on the total countywide discretionary human services expenditures (both direct service and contract services). Total 1997 budget operating costs for Redmond were divided by the City's population (41,500) in order to calculate the per capita cost. The County's operating cost was divided by the total County population.

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Human Services Activities:	12.86 City + 10.00 County	10.00

	22.86	
--	-------	--

Land Use Regulation

Operating cost data for 1997 was researched from the City of Redmond Biennial 1997-1998 Operating Budget, and King County Department of Development and Economic Services (DDES) budget (1997). Total 1997 budget operating costs for Redmond were divided by the City's population (41,500) in order to calculate the per capita cost. . The County's operating cost was divided by the unincorporated King County population (432,084).

TYPE OF SERVICE	PER CAPITA OPERATING COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Land Use Regulation:	78.03	52.76

Comparison of Annual Capital Costs per Capita

Comparison of infrastructure investments of the City of Redmond and King County is much more difficult to interpret than the preceding comparisons of operating costs per capita. Capital expenditures vary dramatically from year to year in individual local governments. A better measure would be the current (replacement) value per capita of each infrastructure system. Such a calculation would require a complete inventory of each infrastructure system, and a method for determining its current (replacement) value. This data is not generally available from local governments.

Using readily available data, we calculated the annual capital costs per capita using time horizons in order to minimize the effect of fluctuations in local infrastructure needs and expenditures. For planned capital improvements, we divided the 6-year total cost by 6 years to calculate an annual average. The annual average was then divided by the population to determine the cost per capita per year. We performed a similar analysis of 5-year historical data. We also report 1-year actual expenditures for 1997.

Our analysis includes roads, parks and surface water, because they include very large capital costs funded by taxes. We do not analyze water or sewer capital costs because they tend to be funded by revenue bonds that are repaid by user fees. We do not analyze capital costs for public safety because the amounts are relatively modest (compared to the other types of public facilities) and they are subject to greater cyclical volatility than the other types of public facilities.

Roads

The City of Redmond's planned capital costs are based on the City's 1997-2002 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). King County's planned capital costs are based on the County's 1998-2003 CIP. In addition, King County actual 1997 capital cost data, as well as 1993-1997 actual cost data were also used to show annual per capita costs for roads and streets. Costs may include grant revenues and/or participation by Washington's Department of Transportation. Annual capital costs for each jurisdiction were divided by each jurisdiction's service area populations in order to calculate the per capita cost. As the table shows, per capita costs for the City of Redmond and King County are fairly comparable.

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA CAPITAL COSTS		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
ROADS	PER CAPITA CAPITAL COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Planned Annual Average (6 yrs)	131.99	227.99
Historical Cost (1997)	268.10	152.32
Historical Annual Average (5 yrs)		86.08

Parks

The City of Redmond's planned capital costs are based on the City's 1997-2002 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). King County's planned capital costs are based on the County's 1998-2003 CIP. In addition, City of Redmond and King County actual 1997 capital cost data was also used to show annual per capita costs for parks. Annual capital costs for each jurisdiction

were divided by each jurisdiction's service area populations in order to calculate the actual per capita cost. Both methods for calculating costs for parks show that per capita costs between jurisdictions are very comparable. The County also has significant capital expenditures that are not included below because they are at parks that are outside the study area, but which provide significant service to Plateau residents (i.e., Section 36 Park, Marymoor Park and Cougar Mountain Park).

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA CAPITAL COSTS		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
PARKS	PER CAPITA CAPITAL COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Planned Annual Average (6 yrs)	34.47	11.50
Historical Cost (1997)	123.57	138.20

Stormwater

The City of Redmond's planned capital costs are based on the City's 1997-2002 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). King County historical CIP cost data (1993-1997) and 1997 year-end costs are used to show the level of expenditures made by the County in completing the majority of projects required to meet the Sammamish unincorporated area's need for retention and conveyance systems. As a result of the County's expenditures completing the needed facilities, it does not plan additional capital expenditures for stormwater control during the next 6 years. Annual capital costs for each jurisdiction were divided by each jurisdiction's service area populations in order to calculate the actual per capita cost.

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA CAPITAL COSTS		
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY		
STORMWATER	PER CAPITA CAPITAL COST (\$)	
	Redmond	King County
Planned Annual Average (6 yrs)	22.03	

PUBLIC SERVICES PER CAPITA CAPITAL COSTS
SAMMAMISH GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY

Historical Cost (1997)	20.48	101.72
Historical Annual Average (5 yrs)		26.84

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF GOVERNANCE OPTIONS

INCORPORATION

The State of Washington, through the provisions of Chapter 35 and 35A RCW provide for the creation of new cities through a petition process initiated by residents of the area proposed to be incorporated. RCW 35.02.030 requires that the petition:

- (1) Indicate whether the proposed city or town shall be a non-charter code city operating under Title 35A RCW, or a city or town operating under Title 35 RCW;
- (2) Indicate the form or plan of government the city or town is to have;
- (3) Set forth and particularly describe the proposed boundaries of the proposed city or town;
- (4) State the name of the proposed city or town;
- (5) State the number of inhabitants therein;
- (6) Pray the city or town be incorporated.

The process set out in the incorporation statutes for initiating incorporation is shown in Figure A-1. In 1994 the legislature adopted SHB 2176 which changed the process for handling of petitions (see steps 3 & 4 in Figure A-1). The bill also provided a priority process for competing annexations and incorporations, whereby annexations initiated within 90 days of the start of the incorporation process would have priority over the incorporation effort.

ANNEXATION

Annexation may be a preferred alternative when formation of a city is not financially viable, or when, even though cityhood is possible, the annexing city can provide more or better quality services than a city on its own could provide.

Annexation is appropriate if the unincorporated area is satisfied that the annexing city can and will provide the services it needs. The decision may also be influenced by whether the annexing area can get a seat on the city council. Figure A-2 sets out the basic approaches to annexation.

It should be noted that cities can be organized pursuant to two different statutes. "Non-code cities" are generally those organized prior to 1967 pursuant to RCW Title 35. In 1967 the legislature provided a new, more flexible incorporation option. Cities organized under the new statute (RCW Title 35A) are called code cities. Older cities could opt to reorganize under the new statute. Bothell, Lake Forest Park and Kirkland have all exercised this option.

FIGURE A-1

INCORPORATION PROCESS

STEP 1:

INTERESTED PERSONS OR GROUPS DETERMINE BOUNDARIES TO BE PROPOSED FOR NEW CITY, FORM OF GOVERNMENT PROPOSED, ETC. AS PRESCRIBED IN RCW 35.02.030 (above)

STEP 2:

PROponents FILE NOTICE OF THE PROPOSAL WITH COUNTY LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY. LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY ADVISES BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD OF NOTICE (SHB 2176, SECTION 1), PAY \$100 FILING FEE

STEP 3:

BRB HOLDS PRELIMINARY HEARING ON THE PROPOSAL WITHIN 30 DAYS OF STEP 2 (SHB 2176, SEC. 1)

STEP 4:

ON DAY AFTER MEETING IN STEP 3, AUDITOR ASSIGNS PETITION A NUMBER. PROponents MUST FINALIZE LEGAL DESCRIPTION TO BE USED ON PETITION AT THAT TIME. (SHB 2176, SECTION 2)

STEP 5:

PROponents SEEK SIGNATURES; MUST HAVE 10% OF REGISTERED VOTERS SIGNED NO LATER THAN 180 DAYS (OR NEXT BUSINESS DAY) AFTER PRELIMINARY MEETING IN STEP 2 (RCW 35.02.020 A)

STEP 6

WITH SIGNATURES COMPLETED, PROponents FILE FORMAL NOTICE OF INTENTION TRIGGERING THE BRB REVIEW PROCESS

STEP 7

BRB DECIDES WHETHER TO INVOKE JURISDICTION WITHIN 45 DAYS OF RECEIPT OF FORMAL NOTICE OF INTENTION

STEP 8

IF BRB INVOKES JURISDICTION, IT HOLDS HEARINGS, CONDUCTS NECESSARY STUDIES, AND MAKES A RECOMMENDATION ABOUT THE PROPOSAL. THE BRB MAY AMEND BOUNDARIES PURSUANT TO STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS AND CRITERIA (RCW 36.93.010 et seq., as amended by SHB 2176) AS PART OF ITS APPROVAL.

STEP 9

COUNTY LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY SETS ELECTION DATE AT NEXT SPECIAL ELECTION HELD AT LEAST 60 DAYS AFTER BRB ACTION.(RCW 35.02.078 as amended by SHB 2176)

FIGURE A-2

ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF ANNEXATION TO CITIES

(RCW 35.13, 35A.14)

- A. CITY MAY INITIATE AN ANNEXATION BY PETITIONING FOR AN ELECTION IN THE PROPOSED AREA- POTENTIAL BRB REVIEW (RCW 35.13.015)
- B. ELECTION MAY BE INITIATED BY PETITION OF EQUIVALENT OF 20 % OF REGISTERED VOTERS; POTENTIAL BRB REVIEW (RCW 35.13.020 ET SEQ.)

IF CITY AGREES TO ANNEXATION, ISSUE IS THEN VOTED UPON
TAKES 50% TO PASS
TAKES 60% IF CITY HAS REQUIRED THE ANNEXING AREA TO ASSUME ITS EXISTING INDEBTEDNESS
- C. PETITION BY OWNERS OF PROPERTY CONSTITUTING 60% OF THE ASSESSED VALUATION (AV) OF THE PROPOSED ANNEXATION AREA (FOR CODE CITIES), OR 75% OF AV (FOR NON CODE CITIES).
- D. 10 ACRES OR \$800,000 - SIMPLE PETITION BY OWNER- NO REVIEW (RCW 35.13.172)

ROLE OF KING COUNTY BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD IN ANNEXATIONS AND INCORPORATIONS

Although the title of the King County Boundary Review Board (BRB) suggests that it is a county agency, the BRB for King County and all other counties with populations of 210,000 was created directly by the Legislature. The applicable statutes are codified in Chapter 36.93 RCW. The statute specifies that counties with a population of one million or more have an eleven member BRB, appointed as follows:

- 3 persons appointed by the governor
- 3 persons appointed by the county appointing authority
- 3 persons appointed by the mayors of the cities and towns located within the county, and
- 2 persons shall be appointed by the board from nominees of special districts in the county.

The Boundary Review Board's task is to review certain annexations to cities and special purpose districts, incorporations of new cities, and the creation of new special purpose districts. The cases over which the BRB has jurisdiction are set out in Chapter 36.93.090 RCW, as follows:

The board may review any such proposed actions pertaining to:

- (1) The:
 - (a) Creation, incorporation, or change in the boundary, other than a consolidation, of any city, town, or special purpose district;
 - (b) consolidation of special purpose districts, but not including consolidation of cities and towns; or
 - (c) dissolution or disincorporation of any city, town or special purpose district, except that a board may not review the dissolution or disincorporation of a special purpose district which was dissolved or disincorporated pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 36.96 RCW: PROVIDED, That the change in the boundary of a city or town arising from the annexation of contiguous city or town owned property held for a public purpose shall be exempted from the requirements of this section; or
- (2) The assumption by any city or town of all or part of the assets, facilities, or indebtedness of a special purpose district which lies partially within such city or town; or
- (3) The establishment of or change in the boundaries of a mutual water and sewer system or separate sewer system by a water district pursuant to Chapter 57.08.065 RCW or Chapter 57.40 RCW, as now or hereafter amended; or

(4) The establishment of or change in the boundaries of a mutual sewer and water system or separate water system by a sewer district pursuant to Chapter 56.20.015 RCW or Chapter 56.36 RCW, as now or hereafter amended; or

(5) The extension of permanent water or sewer service outside of its existing corporate boundaries by a city, town, or special purpose district.

Certain exemptions from BRB jurisdiction are also set out in Chapter 36.93.105 RCW.

While the Board is authorized to review any of the above actions, it does not formally do so unless one of the following occurs within forty-five days of the filing of a notice of intention by the jurisdiction proposing the action:

- Five board members request review (with significant exceptions)
- Any governmental unit affected requests review
- A petition requesting review is filed and signed by 5% of the registered voters in the area, or the owners of 5% of the assessed valuation in the area.
- A majority of the board members concur with a request from 5% of the registered voters residing within 1/4 mile of the proposed action

The objectives of the BRB are set out in Chapter 36.93.180 RCW, which reads as follows:

Chapter 36.93.180 RCW Objectives of boundary review board. The decisions of the boundary review board shall attempt to achieve the following objectives:

- (1) Preservation of natural neighborhoods and communities;
- (2) Use of physical boundaries, including but not limited to bodies of water, highways, and land contours;
- (3) Creation and preservation of logical service areas;
- (4) Prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries;
- (5) Discouragement of multiple incorporations of small cities and encouragement of incorporation of cities in excess of ten thousand population in heavily populated urban areas;
- (6) Dissolution of inactive special purpose districts;
- (7) Adjustment of impractical boundaries;
- (8) Incorporation as cities or towns or annexation to cities or towns of unincorporated areas which are urban in character; and
- (9) Protection of agricultural and rural lands which are designated for long term productive agricultural and resource use by a comprehensive plan adopted by the county legislative authority.

The Boundary Review Board statute also provides also provides guidelines for the BRBís to use in pursuing the state objectives as follows:

Chapter 36.93.170 RCW Factors to be considered by board - Incorporation proceedings exempt from state environmental policy act. In reaching a decision on a proposal or an alternative, the board shall consider the factors affecting such proposal, which shall include, but not be limited to the following:

(1) Population and territory; population density; land area and land uses; comprehensive plans and zoning, as adopted under Chapter 35.63, 35A.63, or 36.70 RCW; comprehensive plans and development regulations adopted under chapter 36.70A RCW; applicable service agreements entered into under chapter 36.115 or 39.34 RCW; applicable interlocal annexation agreements between a county and its cities; per capita assessed valuation; topography, natural boundaries and drainage basins, proximity to other populated area; the existence and preservation of prime agricultural soils and productive agricultural uses; the likelihood of significant growth in the area and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas during the next ten years; location and most desirable future location of community facilities;

(2) Municipal services; need for municipal services; effect of ordinances, governmental codes, regulations and resolutions on existing uses; present cost and adequacy of governmental services and controls in area; prospects of governmental services from other sources; probable future needs for such services and controls; probable effect of proposal or alternative on cost and adequacy of services and controls in area and adjacent area; the effect on the finances, debt structure, and contractual obligations and rights of all affected governmental units; and

(3) The effect of the proposal or alternative on adjacent areas, on mutual economic and social interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county.

The provisions of Chapter 43.21C RCW, State Environmental Policy, shall not apply to incorporation proceedings covered by Chapter 35.02 RCW.

The BRB is also to act consistent with the Growth Management Act, particularly with regard to the Urban/Rural line. (Chapter 36.93.157 RCW) In other words, the BRB cannot allow the annexation or incorporation of rural areas.

Notably, the GMA also contemplates the demise of the BRB in King County, as follows:

Chapter 36.93.230 RCW Power to disband boundary review board. When a county and the cities and towns within the county have adopted a comprehensive plan and consistent development regulation is pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 36.70A RCW, the county may, at the discretion of the county legislative authority, disband the boundary review board in that county.

As a practical matter, this would not occur until all of the urban areas were included in negotiated Potential Annexation Areas, so that the need for the BRB might be obviated.

The BRB, then, has potential jurisdiction over the incorporation and annexation alternatives, and may also play a role in the Status Quo alternatives with regard to changes to any of the special purpose districts, such as the Northshore Utility District or Fire District 16.

APPENDIX B: KING COUNTY COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES RELATED TO ANNEXATION AND INCORPORATION

3. Joint Planning and Urban Growth Areas around Cities

The Growth Management Act requires each County to designate Urban Growth Areas, in consultation with cities. Within the Countywide Urban Growth Area, each city will identify land needed for its growth for the next 20 years. Although the Growth Management Act does not explicitly equate Urban Growth Areas with municipal annexation areas, the Urban Growth Areas around cities may be considered potential expansion areas for cities.

- FW-13 Cities are the appropriate provider of local urban services to Urban Areas either directly or by contract. Counties are the appropriate provider of most Countywide services. Urban services shall not be extended through the use of special districts without the approval of the city in whose potential annexation area the extension is proposed. Within the Urban Area, as time and conditions warrant, cities should assume local urban services provided by special purpose districts.
- LU-31 In collaboration with adjacent counties and cities and King County, and in consultation with residential groups in affected areas, each city shall designate a potential annexation area. Each potential annexation area shall be specific to each city. Potential annexation areas shall not overlap. Within the potential annexation area the city shall adopt criteria for annexation, including conformance with Countywide Planning Policies, and a schedule for providing urban services and facilities within the potential annexation area. This process shall ensure that unincorporated urban islands of King County are not created between cities and strive to eliminate existing islands between cities.
- LU-32 A city may annex territory only within its designated potential annexation area. All cities shall phase annexations to coincide with the ability for the city to coordinate the provision of a full range of urban services to areas to be annexed.
- LU-33 Land within a city's potential annexation area shall be developed according to that city's and King County's growth phasing plans. Undeveloped lands adjacent to that city shall be annexed at the time development is proposed to receive a full range of urban services. Subsequent to establishing a potential annexation area, infill lands within the potential annexation area which are not adjacent or which are not practical to annex shall be developed pursuant to interlocal agreements between the County and the affected city. The interlocal agreement shall establish the type of development allowed in the potential annexation area and standards for that development so that the area is developed in a manner consistent with its future annexation potential. The interlocal agreement shall specify at a minimum the applicable zoning, development standards, impact mitigation, and future annexation within the potential annexation area.

LU-34 Several unincorporated areas are currently considering local governance options. Unincorporated Urban Areas that are already urbanized are within a city's potential annexation area are encouraged to annex to that city in order to receive urban services. Where annexation is inappropriate, incorporation may be considered.

Development within the potential annexation area of one jurisdiction may have impacts on adjacent jurisdictions.

LU-35 A jurisdiction may designate a potential impact area beyond its potential annexation area in collaboration with adjacent jurisdictions. As part of the designation process the jurisdiction shall establish criteria for the review of development proposals under consideration by other jurisdictions in the impact area.

RF-4 Each city with a potential annexation area shall enter into an interlocal agreement with the County for defining service delivery responsibilities. A financing plan for investments in the annexation areas shall be included in the interlocal agreement for capital facilities and service delivery. Level-of-service standards and financial capacity should be considered for each area, together with density issues and phasing of developments.

RF-5 In order to transition governmental roles so that the cities become the provider of local urban services and the County becomes the regional government providing Countywide and rural services, unincorporated Urban Growth Areas are encouraged to annex or incorporate within the 20-year timeframe of these Policies. To achieve this goal, all cities that have identified potential annexation areas shall enter into interlocal agreements with King County that includes a plan for development standards and financing of capital and operating expenditures during the period prior to annexation.

APPENDIX C: KING COUNTY POLICIES AND PROGRAMS RELATED TO ANNEXATION AND INCORPORATION

King County has a number of adopted policies and programs which consider annexations and incorporations in light of the State's Growth Management Act requirements. The following information is intended to clarify King County's role as a local government in annexation or incorporation of unincorporated areas within of the Urban Growth Boundary and provide information to assist the public in making thoroughly informed decisions about governance.

I. The Annexation and Incorporation Process

The annexation and incorporation process is a **citizen driven process**. Washington State law requires that the residents of a community initiate both annexation and incorporation proposals. The Boundary Review board acts on specific proposals according to RCW 35.02 and 36.93.

II. Adopted Annexation and Incorporation Policies

State law requires the development of **countywide planning policies** that establish a framework to develop and adopt consistent comprehensive plans in both the County and suburban cities. In 1994, King County Council and the suburban cities of King County adopted and ratified the Countywide Planning Policies. Relevant policies are attached and are summarized below.

- The policies require each city to adopt, in consultation with residential groups in the affected area, a potential annexation area. (LU-31)
- Within a potential annexation area, cities must adopt criteria for annexation and a schedule for providing urban services and facilities. (LU-31)
- One goal of the relevant policies is elimination of unincorporated urban islands between cities.(LU-31)
- Urbanized areas that fall within a city's potential annexation area are encouraged to annex to that city in order to receive urban services. Where annexation is inappropriate, incorporation may be considered. (LU-34)
- Unincorporated areas are encouraged to annex or incorporate with the 20-year timeframe of the Countywide Planning Policies. (RF-5)
- Each city with a potential annexation area shall enter into an interlocal agreement with the County for defining service delivery responsibilities. (RF-4)

The **King County Comprehensive Plan** incorporates the vision described by the Countywide Planning Policies and uses it to guide growth and development for residents of the unincorporated

area. The Plan emphasizes a planning process to ensure delivery of appropriate levels of service to urban areas and the transition from County government to city government through the annexation and incorporation process. Relevant Comprehensive Plan policies are summarized below.

- Policy U-302 directs King County to favor annexation over incorporation within the Urban Growth Area. Incorporations should be supported only when annexation is not appropriate and when the formation of new cities is necessary to assure adequate facilities and services for growth consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan Countywide Planning Policies.
- King County will not support annexations or incorporations that apply zoning to maintain or create permanent, low-density residential areas.

The King County Comprehensive Plan defines Potential Annexation Area (PAA) as the area the city is expected to annex within the next 20 years and calls for interlocal agreements between the city and the County to address timing, transition, and service issues in the PAA.

III. Potential Annexation Area Program

King County has a **Potential Annexation Area (PAA) Program** to address the requirements of the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) and the Comprehensive Plan. The components of this program are summarized below.

- A PAA is an area in unincorporated King County adjacent to a city that is expected to annex to the city and to which the city is expected to provide services and utilities with the next two decades.
- Cities will propose PAA boundaries and the County will officially designate them.
- The regional issues and services which King County will be responsible for after annexation will be identified as will the local issues and services which the city will be responsible for upon annexation.
- Strategies will be developed for the funding for local and regional services and for the transition of responsibility for local issues and services from the County to the city.
- Cities will self-select into the County's PAA Program dependent upon declaration of a PAA supported by an adopted Comprehensive Plan and agreement with neighboring cities where appropriate.
- The collaborative process between city and County will result in one interlocal agreement defining the boundaries of a city's PAA and a second interlocal agreement addressing the delivery of services in the PAA.

IV. 1997 PAA and Annexation and Incorporation Work Program: Current Status

In 1996, King County wrote to cities with PAAs asking to begin work on setting PAA boundaries and reaching agreement on service delivery questions. Several King County cities have indicated

interest in beginning the process but no agreements have been finalized as of March, 1997. King County and Issaquah have completed work on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which lays out the outstanding issues between the two jurisdictions and establishes a schedule for resolving them and completing the boundary agreement. King County staff is also working with the rural cities of Carnation, Duvall, North Bend, and Snoqualmie. The remaining cities with PAAs have issues to resolve or changes to Comprehensive Plans to complete before negotiating agreements with King County. Although the designation of PAAs is required by the CPPs and GMA, there is no penalty for cities which do not work with the County to formally designate a PAA.

In the event that a new city is created in an area that a neighboring city might declare as part of its PAA area, King County would:

- work with the existing jurisdiction to establish new PAA boundaries, and
- begin a PAA process with the new city as soon as practical and appropriate.

King County's role during the incorporation process is to support and provide information about County services, expenditures and revenue to the consultant preparing the Fiscal Feasibility Study.

After incorporation occurs, King County works very closely with the new city to assist in the delivery of urban services by contract in areas where the city does not wish to find outside contractors. This support includes assistance in identifying the community's preferred service levels, writing contracts for services where appropriate and, in general, assisting the new city with the nuts and bolts of incorporation.

APPENDIX D: ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING GOVERNANCE ALTERNATIVES STUDY

APPENDIX E: ANNEXATION POLICIES OF CITIES OF REDMOND AND ISSAQUAH

Issaquah

Policy L-5.1 Coordination

- 5.1.1 Sphere of Influence: Develop an interlocal agreement with Redmond establishing the, school district boundary of SE 8th Street as the boundary of each city's sphere of influence lines.
- 5.1.2 Regional Funding: Proactively coordinate with regional jurisdictions and agencies to ensure that regional funding priorities do not overlook the needs of Issaquah.
- 5.1.3 Regional Facilities-. Identify and allow for the siting of essential public facilities. Cooperate with adjacent jurisdictions during the siting and development of regional facilities.

Policy L-5.2 Potential Annexation Areas:

- 5.2.1 Establishment of Potential Annexation Areas: The following areas are designated as within the City's Potential Annexation Areas: East Lake Sammamish Parkway, East Cougar Mountain. Issaquah 69. Greenwood Point, and the South Plateau. (Ord 2162; 1997)
- 5.2.2 Interlocal Agreements for PAAs: Establish an interlocal agreement with King County regarding the development of land within the City's Potential Annexation Areas which defines the potential land use, zoning, growth phasing, urban services, design standards, impact mitigation requirements, and conformance with the Countywide Planning Policies. For those PAAs which are largely undeveloped, annexation to the City should be encouraged prior to development review and permitting within the County. However, if the development commences prior to annexation to the City, the interlocal shall require that the development review and permit approval for subsequent projects within these undeveloped areas be done by the City.
- 5.2.3 Establishment of Potential Impact Areas: The following areas are designated as within the City's Potential Impact Areas. Issaquah Creek Basin (south of I- ' 90), Issaquah School District. the area of the East Sammamish Plateau which is bordered by Inglewood Hill road to the north, the UGA to the east and is adjacent to the Issaquah School District's northern boundary. These areas affect the City. and as such, the City shall establish review criteria for the review of development proposals under consideration. A PIA/PAA

development review process has been established in the City/County Memorandum of Understanding (Ord. 2162, 1997)

Policy L-5.3 Annexation, Concurrency and Consistency:

- 5.3.1 Primarily undeveloped PAAs: Primarily undeveloped land in the City's PAA should be annexed prior to or concurrently with development review and permitting in order to receive the full range of City services and ensure compatibility with City standards and development regulations.
- 5.3.2 Primarily developed PAAs: Primarily developed land in the City's PAA shall be annexed with a schedule for providing urban services and facilities within an established time frame, as determined by the, City through the annexation process. A plan for implementing City standards and development regulations shall also be established through the annexation process.
- 5.3.3 All PAAs: When the annexation process and development review process are occurring concurrently, urban services should be provided prior to occupancy of new development at the City's level of service (LOS). In addition, a schedule and financing plan to correct existing service deficiencies should be defined through the annexation process; Transportation deficiencies should be addressed within six years from the time of annexation.
- 5.3.4 Urban Growth Areas: Annexation should be required before extending City utilities, except extensions outside the City may be made in response to a health emergency or threat to the City aquifer.
- 5.3.5 General Phasing: The City shall develop a general growth phasing plan by identifying areas for growth for the next 10 and the next 20 years when necessary urban services can be provided. Specific guidelines and time frame to define phasing of each individual annexation include:
 - 5.3.5.1 Cooperation and coordination of the City's ability to provide services and/or the annexation areas ability to work with the City for the provision of urban services, and mitigation of LOS impacts on urban services, the transportation and utility system and other infrastructure;
 - 5.3.5.2 Existing service deficiencies and resources needed to correct those deficiencies in each area;
 - 5.3.5.3 Future service deficiencies based on the 20 year population and employment projections and land capacity;
 - 5.3.5.4 Existing and potential density of the area;
 - 5.3.5.5 The, City's or County's ability to protect the existing critical areas and/or aquifer;
 - 5.3.5.6 Natural boundaries as they relate to service provision and/or the protection of critical areas and/or aquifer protection; and

5.3.5.7 The potential to acquire, create or enhance parks and open space.

Policy L-5-4 Annexation Phasing Criteria.-recognize that these criteria, which include but are not limited to the following, will be used as guidelines for annexation and as a basis for implementing specific phasing of annexations:

5.4.1 Service Provision - Boundaries:

5-4.1.1 Boundaries of annexation areas should be drawn according to the geographic and fiscal ability of the City to provide services.

5.4.1.2 , The, proposed area should be part of logical, orderly growth for the City and should avoid irregular boundaries..

5.4.2 Service Provision - Fair Share-. The proposed annexation area should be able to pay its determined fair share of required services based on an evaluation of the City's existing and future. population, as identified in the Comprehensive Plan, assessed valuation of property and any other pertinent factors. This evaluation should be included in a capital improvements fiscal analysis of the PAA and its relationship to the City.

5.4.3 Provide Community Solutions: The annexation area should help meet necessary residential or commercial/industrial expansion needs of the City and, in some cases provide solutions to other community concerns such as aquifer protection or the efficient provision of public services. Annexation can also provide for parks and other community amenities and allow for a variety of housing to meet the community's needs.

5.4.4 Comprehensive Plan Consistency: The area should be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan, or be able to become consistent in a mutually agreed upon time frame, in order to be similar to the existing City in character.

5.4.5 Control Development Impacts to Community: Annexation should provide the ability for the City to control impacts of development whether the area has been developed or is largely undeveloped, including, but not limited to:

5.4-5.1 land use including density, design, signage, landscaping and open space provisions;

5.4.5.2 surface and groundwater (wellhead protection and aquifer recharge area):

5.4.5.3 critical areas and natural resources:

5.4.5.4 parks and recreation

5.4.5.5 utilities;

5.4.5.6 transportation;

5.4.5.7 housing;

5.4.5.8 schools; and

5.4.5.9 economic vitality.

- 5.4.6 Mutual Benefit for City and Annexation Residents: Annexation should provide mutual benefit to City residents and the annexation area to: enhance the provision of the items listed in the above criteria; to lessen impacts to all of the items listed in above criteria (5.4.5): manage impacts. and provide local representation.

Policy L-5.5 Land Use Code- The Land Use Code should:

- 5.5.1 Continue.-to permit quarry and mining operations in the Industrial Zoning District of the City. ensure that other existing quarry and mining operations and natural resource industries are permitted through annexation to the City, ensure that the mineral resource potential of property within the Intensive Commercial District may be realized through pre-development activities (for example, clearing, grading and site preparation), and ensure adequate reclamation and enhancement of the site once such activities cease; (Ord. No. 2111, 1996)
- 5.5.2 Establish minimum and maximum densities or comparable zoning for designated urban lands in the City's PAAs. Attainment of densities may be limited by environment or physical constraints;
- 5.5.3 Discourage the provision of interim infrastructure or services in designated urban areas in the City's PAAs such as community drain fields and water systems or individual wells and septic systems;
- 5.5.4 Consider phasing mechanisms and/or incentives to promote the timely and logical progression of development in the City's PAAs to ensure service provision according to the City's level of service. Priority should be given to the development of vacant land and the infill and redevelopment of land located in or adjacent to areas with available infrastructure capacity or services.

Policy L-5.6 Cooperation: Foster cooperation with all affected parties during the annexation process by:

- 5.6.1 Responding to community initiatives for annexation;
- 5.6.2 Informing property owners in annexation areas and City residents of the potential benefits, obligations and requirement which may be imposed prior to and as a result of annexation;
- 5.6.3 Working with annexation proponents to develop annexation boundaries which follow logical community and geographic boundaries;

- 5.6.4 Coordinating with adjacent jurisdictions, property owners within an annexation area and special purpose districts to ensure the efficient provision of urban services during the annexation transition period.

Redmond

C. Annexation

The King County Countywide Planning Policies require cities to designate Potential Annexation Areas in collaboration with King County and adjacent counties and cities and in consultation with the residents and property owners in the affected areas. The Potential Annexation Area Map, shows the areas in which Redmond shall consider annexations. The map includes areas characterized by urban development or planned for urban development and adjacent to existing urban areas.

As urban and suburban areas develop, local residents often seek greater local control of land use, capital improvements and other policies through either annexation to an adjoining city or incorporation as a new city- The Growth Management Act provides that cities are the preferred providers of urban services and that urban development is to take place within cities. Therefore, areas developing at densities that require urban services should either annex to cities or become new cities.

A-14 Redmond should annex the property within the Potential Annexation Area when property owners or residents propose annexations that are consistent with the policies of Section G of this chapter. Redmond should actively encourage annexations of properties that are islands within the city, where an area is needed to provide public facilities or extend them efficiently, or where the area will help meet community needs for various uses.

If the site specific criteria in Section G of this Chapter are met, Redmond will consider annexing land south to SE Eighth Street when requested by property owners or residents. The east Sammamish Plateau is included in Redmond’s 20 Year Service Area, but annexation requests can be considered immediately. To help the City make decisions related to annexation requests on the Sammamish Plateau, Redmond will prepare a study of fiscal impacts of annexing the Plateau and issues related to the provision of public services.

A-15 When requested by property owners or residents, Redmond should annex property within the Urban Growth Area on the Sammamish Plateau south to SE Eighth Street The study required in policy A-16 shall be completed before annexing areas on the Sammamish Plateau.

A-16 When property owners or residents express interest in annexing properties or when the City decides such a study would be valuable, Redmond should conduct a study to (a) determine the fiscal impacts of annexing the part of the Plateau north of SE Eighth Street and within the Urban Growth Area, (b) establish conditions for annexing this part of the Plateau, and (c)

recommend whether the Plateau should continue to be in the 20-Year Service Area (see policy A-38).

A-17 Redmond should provide available information on the advantages of annexation to citizens on the East Sammamish Plateau.

One of the purposes of designation Potential Annexation Areas is to encourage the efficient delivery of public services and public facilities to these areas.

Redmond will plan to provide efficiently for urban services within the Urban Growth Area that Redmond has chosen to annex.

A-18 Redmond should be the long-term provider of urban services for those urban areas within Redmond's Potential Annexation Area.

The Potential Annexation Areas are cooperatively negotiated between the affected cities and the county. Efficient service delivery requires that once Potential Annexation Areas are agreed to, cities should not compete to annex areas within Potential Annexation Areas. The Sammamish Plateau is the only area within Redmond's Potential Annexation Area that could logically become a separate jurisdiction. Other annexation areas are already within Redmond's service area or most closely related to Redmond. Because these areas most closely relate to Redmond, annexing to another city or incorporating as a separate city would be inefficient.

A-19 Other than on the Sammamish Plateau, new cities shall not be incorporated within Redmond's Potential Annexation Area. No city other than Redmond shall annex property within Redmond's Potential Annexation Area.

The following policies encourage the development of appropriate and consistent plans and development regulations for the Potential Annexation Area. Consistent plans will reduce uncertainty for property owners and promote the integration of the Potential Annexation Area into the City of Redmond.