AMENIO

Section 2. The County Council makes the following additional findings of fact:

- A. In 2007, PDS used timekeeping data to determine an average of 32.82 employee hours was spent per application on the preliminary processing of comprehensive plan docket applications, not including county-initiated amendments. Based on that analysis and employee hourly rates in 2007, which do not include overhead costs, the labor cost in 2007 of this service for an initial review of a comprehensive plan map amendment docket application was \$1.555.
- B. The County Council finds that the department's analysis of processing time for an initial review of a comprehensive plan map amendment docket application remains valid.
- C. The County Council takes note of an approximately 32% increase in employee hourly rates between 2007 and 2017 but, nevertheless, finds that a conservative application of fees for docket applications is appropriate and a \$1,555 fee rate for this initial review service on new, modified, or alternative docket proposals is fair and appropriate.
- D. Procedural Requirements.
 - 1. This ordinance is consistent with state law and chapter 30.73 SCC.
 - 2. The code amendments contained in this ordinance do not constitute development regulations. The amendments are considered procedural legislation and are exempt from Planning Commission review under SCC 30.73.040(2)(b).
 - 3. This action is considered procedural and is exempt from the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, review pursuant to WAC 197-11-800(19)(b) and SCC 30.61.030.
 - 4. The public participation process used in the adoption of this ordinance has complied with all applicable requirements of the GMA and the SCC.
- E. These amendments are consistent with the record.
- F. The code amendments are consistent with the requirements of the GMA and are guided by and supportive of the GMA planning goals found in RCW 36.70A.020 including: "(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts."
- Section 3. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, the County Council makes the following conclusions:
- A. The code amendments are consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the county's comprehensive plan.
- B. The code amendments are consistent with and comply with the procedural and substantive requirements of the GMA.

- C. The code amendments are consistent with Washington State law and the Snohomish County Code.
- D. The county has complied with all SEPA requirements in respect to this non-project action.

Section 4. The County Council bases its findings and conclusions on the entire record of the County Council, including all testimony and exhibits. Any finding, which should be deemed a conclusion, and any conclusion which should be deemed a finding, is hereby adopted as such

Section 5. Snohomish County Code Section 30.86.700, added by Amended Ordinance No. 07-108 on November 19, 2007, is amended to read:

30.86.700 DOCKETED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT FEES.

Pre-Application	\$0
Initial Review	\$1,555
Review of Modified or Alternative Docket Application under SCC 30.74.050(3)(c) or SCC 30.74.050(3)(d) ¹	<u>\$1,555</u>
Final Review	\$2,275
SEPA Review	See SCC 30.74.070

(1) A person who has submitted an application for a comprehensive plan map amendment will be notified by certified mail when the county council puts forth for consideration a modified or alternative proposal under SCC 30.74.050(3)(c) or SCC 30.74.050(3)(d) and that a fee is due. If the required fees remain unpaid after 30 days from the date an applicant receives a notice by certified mail that payment is due, the department shall discontinue action on the amendment, and the county council shall determine whether to provide additional time for the applicant to pay the fee or not further process the modified or alternative docket application.

Section 6. It is the intent of the County Council that this ordinance apply to any modified or alternative docket proposal under SCC 30.74.050(3)(c) or SCC 30.74.050(3)(d), including those that result from applications submitted under chapter 30.74 SCC for amendments to Snohomish County's comprehensive plan or development regulations that were pending as of the effective date of this ordinance.

Section 7. Severability. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is held to be invalid by the Growth Management Hearings Board ("Board"), or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance. Provided, however, that if any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is held to be invalid by the Board or a court of competent jurisdiction, then the section, sentence, clause or phrase in effect prior to the effective date of this ordinance shall be in full force and effect for that individual section, sentence, clause or phrase as if this ordinance had never been adopted.

PASSED this 4 th day of April, 2018.	
2 PASSED this 4 th day of April, 2018. 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 ATTEST: 12 13	SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL Snohomish County, Washington Vice-Council Chair
Clerk of the Council	
APPROVED () EMERGENCY () VETOED	DATE: 4/9/8
ATTEST: ora & Salmer	County Executive
Approved as to form only:	
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney	
	ATTEST: Clerk of the Council (APPROVED () EMERGENCY () VETOED ATTEST: Approved as to form only: