



**DAYTON DRAFT 10/11/2016**

C:\Users\Karen\Documents\Comp Plan 2018\GMS-Periodic-Checklist 2016-8-1 draft.docx

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

*COM -Updated July 2014-Covers laws through 2012*

This checklist is intended to help cities that are fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to conduct the “periodic review and update” of comprehensive plans and development regulations required by [RCW 36.70A.130\(4\)](#). Cities can use the checklist to identify components of their comprehensive plan and development regulations that may need to be updated to reflect the latest local conditions or to comply with changes to the GMA since their last update.

This checklist includes components of the comprehensive plan and development regulations that are specifically required by the GMA. **Statutory requirements adopted since 2003 are emphasized in highlighted text** to help identify new components of the GMA that may not have been addressed in annual updates or other amendments outside of the required periodic update process. Cities within the Puget Sound Regional Council boundaries may want to use this checklist in tandem with [PSRC checklists](#). A separate checklist is available for counties. Expanded checklists (one for [Comprehensive Plans](#), one for [Development Regulations](#)) are also available, which include a more comprehensive list of related good ideas and things to consider.

### How to fill out the checklist

With the most recent version of your comprehensive plan and development regulations in hand, fill out each item in the checklist. Select the check box or type in the fields, answering the following questions:

**Is this item addressed in your current plan or regulations?** If YES, fill in the form with citation(s) to where in the plan or code the item is addressed. We recommend using citations rather than page numbers because they stay the same regardless of how the document is printed. If you have questions about the requirement, follow the hyperlinks to the relevant statutory provision or rules. If you still have questions, visit the [Commerce web page](#) or [contact a Commerce planner](#) assigned to your region.

**Is amendment needed to meet current statute?** Check YES to indicate a change to your plan or regulations will be needed. Check NO to indicate that the GMA requirement has already been met. Local updates may not be needed if the statute hasn’t changed since your previous update, if your city has kept current with required inventories, or if there haven’t been many changes in local circumstances. Check “Further Review Needed” if you are unsure whether the requirement has already been met or if the city is considering a review, but hasn’t yet decided.

**Is your city considering optional amendments?** Use this field to note areas where your city may elect to work on or amend sections of your plan or development regulations that are not required by the GMA.

### How to use the completed checklist

Commerce strongly encourages you to use the completed checklist to develop a [detailed work plan](#) (see Appendix B) for your periodic update. The checklist can be used to inform the contents of a city council resolution that defines what actions will be taken as part of the GMA periodic update.

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

## I. Required Comprehensive Plan Elements and Components

<b>1. A Land Use Element</b> that is consistent with countywide planning policies (CWPPs) and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a> .			
a. A <b>future land use map</b> showing city limits and urban growth area (UGA) boundaries. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.110(6)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-400(2)(d)</a> , <a href="#">WAC 365-196-405(2)(i)(ii)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	County considering Revised boundaries – may cause imbalance w/FC & I
b. <b>Consideration of urban planning approaches that increase physical activity.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1), Amended in 2005</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-405 (2)(j)</a> (j) Wherever possible, counties and cities should consider urban planning approaches that promote physical activity. Urban planning approaches that promote physical activity may include: (i) <u>Higher intensity residential or mixed-use land use designations to support walkable and diverse urban, town and neighborhood centers.</u> (ii) <del>Transit-oriented districts around public transportation transfer facilities, rail stations, or higher intensity development along a corridor served by high quality transit service.</del> (iii) Policies for siting or collocating public facilities such as schools, parks, libraries, community centers and athletic centers to place them <u>within walking or cycling distance</u> of their users. (iv) Policies <u>supporting linear parks and shared-use paths, interconnected street networks or other urban forms supporting bicycle and pedestrian transportation.</u> (v) <del>Policies supporting multimodal approaches to concurrency consistent with other elements of the plan.</del> (vi) Traditional or main street commercial corridors with street front buildings and limited parking and driveway interruption. (vii) Opportunities for promoting physical activity through these and other policies should be sought in existing as well as newly developing areas. <u>Regulatory or policy barriers to promoting physical activity for new or existing development should also be removed</u> or lessened where feasible.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Coordinate w/Health

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
c. <b>A consistent population projection throughout the plan</b> which should be consistent with the <a href="#">Office of Financial Management forecast</a> for the county or the county's sub-county allocation of that forecast. <a href="#">RCW 43.62.035</a> , <a href="#">WAC 365-196-405(f)</a> <b>CP 2015 Page 15 Also update P 64</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Need to draft proposal for Col. Co. & Revise pop info.
d. <b>Estimates of population densities and building intensities based on future land uses.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a> ; <a href="#">WAC 365-196-405(2)(i)</a> <b>CP 2015 Page 26-46</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Update to be consistent will UGA changes of county
e. Provisions for <b>protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
f. <b>Identification of lands useful for public purposes</b> such as utility corridors, transportation corridors, landfills, sewage treatment facilities, stormwater management facilities, recreation, schools, and other public uses. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.150</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-196-340</a> <b>Map needs to specifically identify</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	add any new Arterial Designations, need for Sewer system and UGA amendments
g. <b>Identification of open space corridors within and between urban growth areas</b> , including lands useful for recreation, wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.160</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-196-335</a> <b>Map needed to specifically identify</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
h. <i>If</i> there is an airport within or adjacent to the city: <b>policies, land use designations (and zoning) to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports.</b> [RCW 36.70A.510, <a href="#">RCW 36.70.547</a> , New in 1996] <i>Note:</i> The plan (and associated regulations) must be filed with the Aviation Division of WSDOT. <a href="#">WAC 365-196-455</a> <b>Page 86 – Address with County the need for new airport as listed in Community Objective # 7</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
i. <b><i>If</i></b> there is a Military Base within or adjacent to the jurisdiction employing 100 or more personnel: <b>policies, land use designations, (and consistent zoning) to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to military bases.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.530(3)</a> , New in 2004. See <a href="#">WAC 365-196-475</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	N/A

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
<p>j. Where applicable, a <b>review of drainage, flooding, and stormwater run-off</b> in the area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state.  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.70(1)</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-196-405(2)(c)</a>  <i>Note: <a href="#">RCW 90.56.010(26)</a> defines waters of the state.</i>  <i>WAC 365-196-405(2) (c) Counties and cities should estimate the extent to which existing buildings and housing, together with development or redevelopment of vacant, partially used and underutilized land, can support anticipated growth over the planning period. Redevelopment of fully built properties may also be considered.</i>  <i>(i) Estimation of development or redevelopment capacity may include:</i>  <i>(A) Identification of individual properties or areas likely to convert because of market pressure or because they are built below allowed densities; or</i>  <i>(B) Use of an estimated percentage of area-wide growth during the planning period anticipated to occur through redevelopment, based on likely future trends for the local area or comparable jurisdictions; or</i>  <i>(C) Some combination of (c)(i)(A) and (B) of this subsection.</i>  <i>(ii) Estimates of development or redevelopment capacity should be included in a land capacity analysis as part of a county-wide process described in <a href="#">WAC 365-196-305</a> and <a href="#">365-196-310</a> or, as applicable, <a href="#">WAC 365-196-315</a>.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) Page 40 Generic CO-E3 & Title 17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed  Address how & when under CIP	Estimates by Anderson Perry? Address County upstream development
<p>k. <b>Policies to designate and protect critical areas</b> including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat protection areas, frequently flooded areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, and geologically hazardous areas. In developing these policies, the city must have included the <b>best available science (BAS)</b> to protect the functions and values of critical areas, and give “<b>special consideration</b>” to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries.  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(5)</a>, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172</a>, BAS added in 1995.            See <a href="#">WAC 365-195-900</a> through -925, <a href="#">WAC 365-190-080</a></p> <p>WAC 365-195-915 (2) Counties and cities should include the best available science in determining whether to grant applications for administrative variances and exemptions from generally applicable provisions in policies and development regulations adopted to protect the functions and values of critical areas. Counties and cities should adopt procedures and criteria to ensure that the best available science is included in every review of an application for an administrative variance or exemption.</p> <p><i>Note: A voluntary stewardship program was created in 2011 as an alternative for protecting critical areas in areas used for agricultural activities. Counties had the opportunity to opt into this voluntary program before January 22, 2012. See <a href="#">requirements of the voluntary stewardship program</a>. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.700</a> through <a href="#">.904</a>.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) Page 40 CO E4-E9	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed REVIEW to assure BAS in variances.	Review by locals w/ expertise &/or planning staff
<p>l. <i>If forest or agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance are designated <b>inside city: a program authorizing Transfer (or Purchase) of</b></i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
<b>Development Rights.</b> RCW 36.70A.060(4), Amended in 2005	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<b>2. A Housing Element to ensure the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods and is consistent with relevant CWPPs, and RCW 36.70A.070(2).</b>			
a. <b>Goals, policies, and objectives</b> for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b) and WAC 365-196-410(2)(a) <b>P62 – P75 Housing &amp; Historic Elements</b> <b>Assure consistency w/CP &amp; regs - Hist Pres. 2016</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Yes
b. <b>An inventory and analysis</b> of existing and projected housing needs over the planning period. RCW 36.70A.070(2)(a) and WAC 365-196-410(2)(b) and (c) <b>Page 63 – update information</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Yes
c. <b>Identification of sufficient land for housing</b> , including but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, group homes, and foster care facilities. RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c) <b>Page 63</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Coordinate w/Columbia Co.
d. <b>Adequate provisions for existing and projected housing needs</b> for all economic segments of the community. RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d) and WAC 365-196-410 <b>Look at availability of lots/vacant lands</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
e. <b>If enacting or expanding an affordable housing program</b> under RCW 36.70A.540: identification of land use designations within a geographic area where increased residential development will assist in achieving local growth management and housing policies. RCW 36.70A.540, New in 2006. WAC 365-196-870 <b>Update background information P63-65</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed <b>update</b>	
f. Policies so that <b>manufactured housing</b> is not regulated differently than site built housing. RCW 35.21.684, 35.63.160, 35A.21.312, and 36.01.225, <b>Amended in 2004</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>P65</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

g. <i>If the city has a population of over 20,000: provisions for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) to be allowed in single-family residential areas.</i> RCW 36.70A.400, RCW 43.63A.215(3) <i>Under 20,000 pop, No Policy, 2013 Code Adopted allowing ADU's</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) DMC 11-03	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
--	--	--	--

**3. A Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element** to serve as a check on the practicality of achieving other elements of the plan, covering all capital facilities planned, provided, and paid for by public entities including local government and special districts, etc.; including water systems, sanitary sewer systems, storm water facilities, schools, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection facilities. Capital expenditures from Park and Recreation elements, if separate, should be included in the CFP Element. The CFP Element must be consistent with CWPPs, and RCW 36.70A.070(3), and include:

Policies or procedures to ensure <b>capital budget decisions are in conformity with the comprehensive plan.</b> RCW 36.70A.120 <i>In -CP P 51,CO-A3; CP P 52,CO-A7; CP P81, TIP confirm if changes needed</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
---	---	--	--

a. An <b>inventory</b> of existing capital facilities owned by public entities. RCW 36.70A.070(3)(a) and WAC 365-196-415(2)(a) <i>Add School, fire ... See below WAC 365-196-415</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
--	---	--	--

WAC 365-196-415 Capital facilities element.

... (2) Recommendations for meeting requirements.

(a) Inventory of existing facilities.

(i) Counties and cities should create an inventory of existing capital facilities showing locations and capacities, including the extent to which existing facilities have capacity available for future growth.

(ii) Capital facilities involved should include, at a minimum, water systems, sanitary sewer systems, storm water facilities, reclaimed water facilities, schools, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection facilities.

(iii) Capital facilities that are needed to support other comprehensive plan elements, such as transportation, the parks and recreation or the utilities elements, may be addressed in the capital facility element or in the specific element.

(iv) Counties and cities should periodically review and update the inventory. At a minimum this review must occur as part of the periodic update required by RCW 36.70A.130(1). Counties and cities may also maintain this inventory annually in response to changes in the annual capital budget.

b. <b>A forecast of needed capital facilities.</b> RCW 36.70A.070(3)(b) and WAC 365-196-415 (b) <i>Note: The forecast of future need should be based on projected population and adopted levels of service (LOS) over the planning period.</i> <i>Document pop &amp; needs to address Recent updates were made relative to water service, but incomplete due to delay of State approval.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
---	---	--	--

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

c. <b>Proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities.</b> RCW 36.70A.070(3)(c) and WAC 365-196-415 (3)(C) <b>Document need for facilities</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
d. <b>A six-year plan</b> (at least) identifying sources of public money to finance planned capital facilities. RCW 36.70A.070(3)(d) and RCW 36.70A.120 WAC 365-196-415 <b>Continue to update CIP</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
e. <b>A policy or procedure to reassess the Land Use Element</b> if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs. RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e) WAC 365-196-415(2)(d) <b>CP P 52 CO- A7 Need to assess schools, fire, etc.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

*Add reference on P 48 - The insurance protection class refers to a one to 10 ranking system used to measure the quality of a city's fire protection systems and policies. Houses in rural areas with limited fire-fighting services may receive a nine or 10. Locations in cities are usually among the higher classes. Each home's rating also changes based on its proximity to a fire hydrant. Roughly 50 percent of the classification depends on the quality of the fire department, while the water supply system counts for another 40 percent, according to IRMI. Fire alarms and communications make up the remaining 10 percent. Almost all insurance companies in the United States use this system when calculating rates.*

f. <i>If impact fees are collected:</i> <b>identification of public facilities on which money is to be spent.</b> RCW 82.02.050(4) WAC 365-196-850 <b>No Deferment of fees needed – NOT applicable.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <i>Unknown</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
---	---	--	--

RCW 82.02.050 Impact fees—Intent—Limitations. (Effective September 1, 2016.) ***PORTION CITED regarding deferment***

...city ... cannot rely solely on impact fees. ...

(3)(a)(i) Counties, cities, and towns collecting impact fees must, by September 1, 2016, adopt and maintain a system for the deferred collection of impact fees for single-family detached and attached residential construction. The deferral system must include a process by which an applicant for a building permit for a single-family detached or attached residence may request a deferral of the full impact fee payment. The deferral system offered ...must include one or more of the following options:

- (A) Deferring collection of the impact fee payment until final inspection;
- (B) Deferring collection of the impact fee payment until certificate of occupancy or equivalent certification; or
- (C) Deferring collection of the impact fee payment until the time of closing of the first sale of the property occurring after the issuance of the applicable building permit.

(ii) Counties, cities, and towns utilizing the deferral process required by this subsection (3)(a) may withhold certification of final inspection, certificate of occupancy, or equivalent certification until the impact fees have been paid in full. ...

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

<b>4. A Utilities Element</b> which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(4)</a> and includes:			
a. The <b>general location, proposed location and capacity</b> of all existing and proposed utilities. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(4)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-420</a> <b>Power, &amp; telecom. should have formal assessments.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<b>5. A Transportation Element</b> which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)</a> and includes:			
a. An <b>inventory</b> of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments, state-owned transportation facilities, and general aviation airports. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430(2)(c)</a> . <b>Minor changes may need to be referenced</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
b. Adopted <b>levels of service (LOS) standards</b> for all arterials, transit routes and highways. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B)</a> , New in 1997. <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
c. <b>Identification of specific actions to bring locally-owned transportation facilities and services to established LOS.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D)</a> , Amended in 2005. <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
d. A <b>forecast of traffic for at least 10 years</b> , including land use assumptions used in estimating travel. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i)</a> , <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(E)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</a> . <b>WSDOT &amp; RTPo Assistance</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
e. A <b>projection of state and local system needs</b> to meet current and future demand. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(F)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</a> <b>WSDOT &amp; RTPo Assistance – Impact of regional travel on city’s main st.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
f. <b>A pedestrian and bicycle component.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)</a> , Amended 2005 <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)</a> <b>CO –1.6 P 81, 82, 98 references – no map identifying existing, planned, &amp; alternatives</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

“Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles;”

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
g. A description of any existing and planned <b>transportation demand management (TDM) strategies</b> , such as HOV lanes or subsidy programs, parking policies, etc. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
h. An <b>analysis of future funding capability</b> to judge needs against probable funding resources. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)</a>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
i. A <b>multiyear financing plan</b> based on needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which serve as the basis for the 6-year street, road or transit program. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 35.77.010</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)</a> <span style="color: red;">Craig/ Trina – ongoing work</span>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
j. <i>If</i> probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs: a <b>discussion of how additional funds will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed</b> to ensure that LOS standards will be met. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(C)</a> ; <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430(2)(l)(ii)</a> <span style="color: red;">evaluate - no known LOS Issues</span>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
k. A <b>description of intergovernmental coordination efforts</b> , including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions and how it is consistent with the regional transportation plan. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(v)</a> ; <a href="#">WAC 365-196-430(2)(a)(iv)</a> <span style="color: red;">Coord. w/RTPO &amp; WSDOT</span>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<b>6. Provisions for siting essential public facilities (EPFs)</b> , consistent with CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.200</a> . This section can be included in the Capital Facilities Element, Land Use Element, or in its own element. Sometimes the identification and siting process for EPFs is part of the CWPPs.			
a. A <b>process or criteria for identifying and siting essential public facilities (EPFs)</b> . <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.200, Amended in 1997 and 2001]</a> <i>Notes:</i> EPFs are defined in <a href="#">RCW 71.09.020(14)</a> . Cities should consider <a href="#">OFM’s list of EPFs</a> that are required or likely to be built within the next six years. <a href="#">Regional Transit Authority facilities are included in the list of essential public facilities RCW 36.70A.200, amended 2010.</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-550(d)</a> <span style="color: red;">Evaluation should happen under plan update</span>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
b. Policies or procedures that ensure the <b>comprehensive plan does not preclude the siting of EPFs. RCW 36.70A.200(5)</b> <i>Note:</i> If the EPF siting process is in the CWPPs, this policy may be contained in the comprehensive plan as well. <a href="#">WAC 365-196-550(3)</a> <b>P45</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<b>7. Consistency is required by the GMA.</b>			
a. All plan elements must be <b>consistent with relevant county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and, where applicable, Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs), and the GMA.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.100</a> and <a href="#">210</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-400(2)(c)</a> , <a href="#">305</a> and <a href="#">520</a> <b>Review needed</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
b. All plan elements must be <b>consistent with each other.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070</a> (preamble). <a href="#">WAC 365-197-400(2)(f)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>Unknown</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
c. The plan must be <b>coordinated with the plans of adjacent jurisdictions.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.100</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-520</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>Unknown</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<b>9. Shoreline Provisions</b>			
Comprehensive plan acknowledges that for shorelines of the state, the goals and policies of the shoreline management act as set forth in <a href="#">RCW 90.58.020</a> are added as one of the goals of this chapter as set forth in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.020</a> without creating an order of priority among the fourteen goals. The goals and policies of the shoreline master program approved under <a href="#">RCW 90.58</a> shall be considered an element of the comprehensive plan. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.480</a> , <a href="#">WAC 365-196-580</a>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>SMP At Ecology for approval.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed <b>SMP to be approved early 2017</b>	
<b>1. Public participation, plan amendments and monitoring.</b> <b><i>Note:</i> House Bill 2834, passed in 2012, eliminates the requirement for cities planning under the GMA to report every 5 years on its progress in implementing its comprehensive plans.</b>			
a. <b>A process to ensure public participation in the comprehensive planning process. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.020(11)</a>, <a href="#">.035</a>, and <a href="#">.140</a>; <a href="#">WAC 365-196-600(3)</a></b> The process should address annual amendments (if the jurisdiction allows for them) [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(2)</a> , <b>Amended in 2006</b> ], emergency amendments [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(2)(b)</a> ], and may include a specialized periodic update process. Plan amendment processes may be coordinated among cities within a county [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(2)(a)</a> ] and should be well publicized.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>DMC 10 basic requirements</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed <b>Draft plan in progress</b>	

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
b. A process to assure that proposed <b>regulatory or administrative actions do not result in an unconstitutional taking of private property</b> . See <i>Attorney General's Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property</i> for guidance. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.370</a> <b>DMC 10 appeals, 17 – exceptions and Reasonable use, 11-variances</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

## II. Required Components of Development Regulations [WAC 365-196-810](#)

<p>2. <b>Regulations designating and protecting critical areas</b> are required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.170</a>, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a>.  <i>Note:</i> A voluntary stewardship program was created in ESHB 1886 (2011) as an alternative for protecting critical areas in areas used for agricultural activities. Counties may choose to opt into this voluntary program before January 22, 2012. Click <a href="#">here</a> for the requirements of the voluntary stewardship program.</p>			
a. <b>Classification and designation</b> of each of the five types of critical areas ( <i>wetlands, critical aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas</i> ), if they are found within your city. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.170</a> ; <a href="#">WAC 365-196-830(2)</a> <i>Note:</i> Senate Bill 5292 adopted in 2012 clarified that certain water-based artificial features or constructs are excluded from being considered part of a fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>DMC 17</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
b. Findings that demonstrate <b>Best Available Science (BAS)</b> was included in developing policies and development regulations to protect the function and values of critical areas. In addition, findings should document special consideration given to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> ; <a href="#">WAC 365-195</a> , <a href="#">WAC 365-195</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>DMC 17 &amp; adopting ord.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
c. Regulations that protect the functions and values of <b>wetlands</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-190-090</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

d. A <b>definition of wetlands</b> consistent with <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(21)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-190-090, WAC 173-22-035</a> <b>Review to assure compliance w/new definition</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) Need to check	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
e. <b>Delineation of wetlands</b> using the approved federal wetlands delineation manual and applicable regional supplements [RCW 36.70A.175, RCW 90.58.380 (1995) (2011)] <a href="#">WAC 173-22-035</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
f. Regulations that protect the functions and values of <b>critical aquifer recharge areas (“areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water” RCW 36.70A.030(5)(b))</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-190-100</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
g. Regulations to protect the <b>quality and quantity of ground water</b> used for public water supplies. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
h. Regulations that protect the functions and values of <b>fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-195-925(3), 365-190-130</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
i. Regulations that protect the functions and values of <b>frequently flooded areas</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-190-110, WAC 173-158-040</a> <b>Look at further protection / limit level. Impacting flooding on Patit Without harming environment – no net loss</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	TBD
j. Definition of “fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas” does not include such artificial features or constructs as irrigation delivery systems, irrigation infrastructure, irrigation canals, or drainage ditches that lie within the boundaries of and are maintained by a port district or an irrigation district or company. <b>New in 2012</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(5)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
k. Provisions to ensure <b>water quality and stormwater drainage regulations</b> are consistent with applicable Land Use Element policies. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a> <b>Discussion with Howard and assessment may be needed, or find existing analysis</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	TBD

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

(1) ... Where applicable, the land use element shall review drainage, flooding, and storm water run-off in the area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state, ...

<p>i. Regulation of <b>geologically hazardous areas</b> consistent with public health and safety concerns.  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(9)</a>, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a>  <a href="#">WAC 365-190-120</a></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<p>m. Provisions that allow “<b>reasonable use</b>” of properties constrained by presence of critical areas.  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.370</a>. See <i>Attorney General’s Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property</i> for guidance</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<p>n. <b>If your city is assuming regulation of forest practices as provided in RCW 76.09.240: forest practices regulations that protect public resources, require appropriate approvals for all phases of conversion of forest lands, are guided by GMA planning goals, and are consistent with adopted critical areas regulations.</b>  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.570, Amended in 2007, 2010</a> and <a href="#">RCW 76.09.240 Amended in 2007, 2010</a>  <i>Note: Applies only to counties fully planning under the GMA with a population greater than 100,000 and the cities and towns within those counties where a certain number of Class IV applications have been filed within a certain timeframe.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>N/A</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed <b>N/A</b>	
<p><b>11. Shoreline Master Program</b>          See Washington State <a href="#">Department of Ecology’s SMP Submittal Checklist</a></p>			
<p>a. <b>Zoning</b> is consistent with Shoreline Master Program (SMP) environmental designations.  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070</a>; <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.480</a>  <a href="#">WAC 365-196-580</a></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>SMP at Ecology</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<p>b. <b>If SMP regulations</b> have been updated to meet Ecology’s shoreline regulations: protection for critical areas in shorelines is accomplished solely through the SMP.  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.480(4), Amended in 2003 and 2010</a> and <a href="#">RCW 90.58.090(4)</a>. <a href="#">WAC 365-196-580</a></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>SMP at Ecology</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<p><b>12. The Zoning Code should contain the following provisions:</b></p>			

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

<p>a. <b>Family daycare providers</b> are allowed in areas zoned for residential or commercial uses. Zoning conditions should be no more restrictive than those imposed on other residential dwellings in the same zone, but may address drop-off and pickup areas and hours of operation.  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.450</a>, <a href="#">WAC 365-196-865</a></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>DMC 11-03.020</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<p>b. <b>Manufactured housing</b> is regulated the same as site-built housing. <a href="#">RCW 35.21.684</a>, <a href="#">35.63.160</a>, <a href="#">35A.21.312</a> and <a href="#">36.01.225</a>, <b>All Amended in 2004</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>DMC 11-03.050.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<p>c. <i>If</i> the city has a population over 20,000 <b>accessory dwelling units (ADUs)</b> are allowed in single-family residential areas.  <a href="#">RCW 43.63A.215(3)</a>  <b>DMC 11-03.030G.</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>allowed</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<p>m. <i>If</i> there is an airport within or adjacent to the city: zoning <b>that discourages the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports.</b>  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.510</a>, <a href="#">RCW 36.70.547</a>, New in 1996)  <i>Note:</i> The zoning regulations must be filed with the Aviation Division of WSDOT. <a href="#">WAC 365-196-455</a></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>N/A</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed <b>N/A</b>	
<p>n. <i>If</i> there is a Military Base within or adjacent to the jurisdiction employing 100 or more personnel: <b>zoning that discourages the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to military bases.</b>  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.530(3)</a>, <b>New in 2004.</b> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-475</a></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>N/A</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed <b>N/A</b>	
<p>o. Residential structures that are occupied by <b>persons with handicaps</b> must be regulated the same as a similar residential structure occupied by a family or other unrelated individuals. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.410</a>, <a href="#">WAC 365-196-860</a>  <b>DMC 11-03.020 allows group homes in residential zones &amp; DMC 11-04.020 commercial</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<p>p. Cities adjacent to I-5, I-90, I-405, or SR 520 and counties -- for lands within 1 mile of these highways -- must adopt regulations that allow electric vehicle infrastructure (EVI) as a use in all areas except those zoned for residential or resource use, or critical areas <b>by July 1, 2011.</b>  <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.695</a>, <b>New in 2009</b> <b>Does Dayton want a policy?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>N/A</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	TBD
<p>q. Development regulations of all jurisdictions must allow electric vehicle battery charging stations in all areas except those zoned for residential or resource use, or critical areas <b>by July 1, 2011.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.695</a>, <b>New in 2009</b>  <b>Update CC zone to specifically allow</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	TBD

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

13. Subdivision Code regulations			
a. Subdivision code is <b>consistent with and implements comprehensive plan policies</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(7)</a> and <a href="#">36.70A.040(4)(d)</a> , <a href="#">WAC 365-196-820</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Binding Site Plan
b. Code requires <b>written findings</b> documenting that proposed subdivisions provide appropriate provision under <a href="#">RCW 58.17.110(2)(a)</a> for: Streets or roads, sidewalks, alleys, other public ways, transit stops, and other features that assure safe walking conditions for students; potable water supplies [ <a href="#">RCW 19.27.097</a> ], sanitary wastes, and drainage ways (stormwater retention and detention); open spaces, parks and recreation, and playgrounds; and schools and school grounds. <a href="#">WAC 365-196-820(1)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	TBD
c. <b>Subdivision regulations may implement traffic demand management (TDM) policies</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) No ref.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
d. Preliminary subdivision approvals under <a href="#">RCW 58.17.140</a> are valid for a period of five, seven, or nine years. [ <a href="#">RCW 58.17.140</a> and <a href="#">RCW 58.17.170</a> . <b>Amended 2010 by SB 6544. Expires 2014.</b> <b>Amended 2012 by HB 2152</b> <i>Note: House Bill 2152, adopted by the Legislature in 2012, modified timelines. The preliminary plat approval is valid for: seven years if the date of preliminary plat approval is on or before December 31, 2014; five years if the preliminary plat approval is issued on or after January 1, 2015; and nine years if the project is located within city limits, not subject to the shoreline management act, and the preliminary plat is approved on or after December 31, 2007.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
14. Concurrency, Impact Fees, and TDM			
a. The <b>transportation concurrency</b> ordinance includes specific language that prohibits development when level of service standards for transportation facilities cannot be met. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
b. <i>If adopted: impact fee methods</i> are consistent with <a href="#">RCW 82.02.050 through 100</a> <i>Note: The timeframe for expending or encumbering impact fees has been extended to ten years. <a href="#">RCW 82.02.070</a> and <a href="#">RCW 82.02.080</a>, Amended in 2011. <a href="#">WAC 365-196-850</a></i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

	Addressed in current plan or regs? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments?
--	---	---	--

<b>If required by RCW 70.94.527: a commute trip reduction ordinance to reduce the proportion of single-occupant vehicle commute trips.</b> <b>RCW 70.94.521-551, Amended in 2006.</b> WAC 468-63 Note: WSDOT maintains a <a href="#">list of affected jurisdictions</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s) <b>N/A</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<b>N/A</b>
<b>15. Siting Essential Public Facilities (EPFs)</b>			
Regulations are consistent with Essential Public Facility siting process in countywide planning policies or city comprehensive plan, and <b>do not preclude the siting of EPFs.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.200(5)</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-550</a> <b>Review for telecom</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	TBD
<b>16. Project Review Procedures</b>			
<b>Project review processes integrate permit and environmental review</b> for: notice of application; notice of complete application; one open-record public hearing; allowing applicants to combine public hearings and decisions for multiple permits; notice of decision; one closed-record appeal. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.470</a> , <a href="#">RCW 36.70B</a> and <a href="#">RCW 43.21C</a> <a href="#">WAC 365-196-845</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
<b>17. General Provisions:</b> The GMA requires that development regulations be consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(7)</a> and <a href="#">.040(4)(d)</a> . Regulations should also include:			
a. A process for <b>early and continuous public participation</b> in the development regulation development and amendment process. <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.020(11)</a> , <a href="#">.035</a> , <a href="#">.130</a> and <a href="#">.140</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
b. A process to assure that proposed regulatory or administrative actions <b>do not result in an unconstitutional taking of private property.</b> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.370</a> , <a href="#">WAC 365-196-855</a> Note: See <a href="#">Attorney General's Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property</a> .	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

*This checklist covers the requirements of the Growth Management Act through the laws of 2012. It does not address related issues, or things that are not required but that are commonly found in comprehensive plans and the implementing regulations. It may be useful to look at the expanded checklists (one for comprehensive plans, one for development regulations) and the Growth Management Act Amendment Changes 1995-2012 (amended annually). For more information, please visit:*

<http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Services/localgovernment/GrowthManagement/Growth-Management-Planning-Topics/Pages/GMA-Periodic-Update.aspx>