



**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**  
February 22, 2011, 7:00 p.m.  
Multipurpose Room/Council Chamber  
Burien City Hall, 400 SW 152<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Burien, Washington 98166

**This meeting can be watched live on Burien Cable Channel 21 or  
streaming live and archived video on [www.burienmedia.org](http://www.burienmedia.org)**

**1. ROLL CALL**

**2. AGENDA CONFIRMATION**

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT** Public comment will be accepted on topics not scheduled for a public hearing.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** February 8, 2011

**5. OLD BUSINESS**

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

- Presentation on the Countywide Planning Policies
- Review of Comprehensive Plan Checklists

**7. PLANNING COMMISSION  
COMMUNICATIONS**

**8. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**Future Agendas (Tentative)** March 8, 2011: Continued Review of Comprehensive Plan Checklists

Jim Clingan (Chair)  
Ray Helms

Planning Commissioners  
Nancy Tosta (Vice Chair)  
Rachel Pizarro

Greg Duff  
John Upthegrove

*City of Burien*

BURIEN PLANNING COMMISSION  
February 8, 2011  
7:00 p.m.  
Multipurpose Room/Council Chambers  
MINUTES

*To hear the Planning Commission's full discussion of a specific topic or the complete meeting, the following resources are available:*

- Watch the video-stream available on the City website, [www.burienwa.gov](http://www.burienwa.gov)
- Check out a DVD of the Council Meeting from the Burien Library
- Order a DVD of the meeting from the City Clerk, (206) 241-4647

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Jim Clingan called the February 8, 2011, meeting of the Burien Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Jim Clingan, chair; Greg Duff, Ray Helms, Rachel Pizarro, John Upthegrove

Absent: Nancy Tosta

Administrative staff present: Scott Greenberg, Community Development Department director; David Johanson, senior planner; Rocky Piro, Puget Sound Regional Council

**AGENDA CONFIRMATION**

**Direction/Action**

**Motion** was made by Commissioner Upthegrove, seconded by Commissioner Pizarro, and passed unanimously to approve the agenda for the February 8, 2011, meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Direction/Action**

Commissioner Pizarro asked that the spelling of her name be corrected under the heading "Roll Call" in the November 9, 2010, minutes. **Motion** was made by Chair Clingan, seconded by Commissioner Helms, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as corrected.

Commissioner Pizarro asked that the spelling of her name be corrected under the heading "Roll Call" in the November 16, 2010, minutes. **Motion** was made by Chair Clingan, seconded by Commissioner Duff, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as corrected.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Robbie Howell, 15240 20<sup>th</sup> Ave SW

Ms. Howell presented the commissioners with a letter and asked that it be included in the file of last year's proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment 2010-2.

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Scott Greenberg summarized the Planning Commission’s work program for 2011, which includes a first phase of a state-mandated major review and update of the city’s Comprehensive Plan. He then gave a brief explanation of the Growth Management Act; the City must comply with its 14 goals. Commissioner Helms asked questions about corridor plans and what constitutes a corridor. Commissioner Upthegrove asked if a member of the Planning Commission can suggest changes to the Comprehensive Plan and whether the member would have to go through the usual process including paying the required fee. He suggested waiving the fee for citizens to suggest changes to the Comprehensive Plan during the update period.

David Johanson gave a brief update of the status of the proposed Shoreline Master Program.

Rocky Piro, FAICP, program manager with the Puget Sound Regional Council, then gave the commissioners a presentation on local and regional planning, explaining the state planning goals, the role of the Puget Sound Regional Council and the Vision 2040 long-range regional strategy. He noted that the Vision 2040 document is available on the Puget Sound Regional Council website; there also is a series of 12 one-page summaries of key policy concepts available that are easier to read through than the entire document.

**Direction/Action**

Staff will provide the commissioners with three checklists – from the state, a list of changes to the Growth Management Act over the past 8 years; from PSRC, that it uses for its review of cities’ comprehensive plans; and from the Countywide Planning Policies. The commissioners will assist staff in completing the checklists by reviewing the City’s current Comprehensive Plan.

**PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

Commissioner Pizarro said she will be out of town Feb. 25 through March 12, so she will miss the March 8 meeting.

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Mr. Greenberg reported that the City has hired a new planner, Art Pederson. Mr. Johanson is now concentrating on long-range planning; Chip Davis was promoted to senior planner focusing on current planning. Mr. Pederson is filling Mr. Davis’ former position.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Direction/Action**

**MOTION** to adjourn was made by Commissioner Helms. The meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Clingan, chair  
Planning Commission



# Burien

*Washington, USA*

As we look into the future, we see the City of Burien as...

- ❖ a friendly community with well established neighborhoods and a small town atmosphere.
- ❖ a culturally diverse, safety-conscious, crime-free, and people-oriented community.
- ❖ a community that has established programs serving people of all ages.
- ❖ a community with an open, responsive, local government with active, informed citizens.
- ❖ a community with natural open spaces, neighborhood parks, paths, and trails.
- ❖ a community that has preserved and enhanced its historic and natural features, habitat areas, and air and water quality.
- ❖ a community with a local and regional transportation system that integrates cars, pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.
- ❖ a community with a thriving, attractive, and customer-friendly city center and business areas.
- ❖ a community with land use patterns that bring together individual, business and community goals.
- ❖ a model community with excellent police and fire services, outstanding schools, and quality community services and facilities.

**CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON  
MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** February 15, 2011  
**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Scott Greenberg, AICP, Community Development Director  
David Johanson, AICP, Senior Planner  
**SUBJECT:** 2011 Comprehensive Plan Update Scoping

---

---

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this memo is to provide the Planning Commission with rough drafts of the following documents;

- 1) Department of Commerce Comprehensive Plan update checklist
- 2) PSRC's Vision 2040 goals and policies in table format

Staff has prepared these tools to assist the City in determining the scope of the forthcoming comprehensive plan updates. The purpose of providing the Commission with the attached tools at this point in the process is to provide an early opportunity for the Commission to evaluate our existing comprehensive plan in the context of the Growth Management Act (GMA) and Vision 2040. A similar table will be provided at a later date for the Countywide Planning Policies (CPP's).

Secondarily, staff is asking the Commission to review the documents over the next couple of meetings to help ensure that no item has been overlooked. Although this review may seem tedious we believe it will be beneficial in that it will assist you in identifying the three following categories of possible changes as well as providing an opportunity for the Commission to become familiar with the regional and county planning plans, as well as our own comprehensive plan.

1. Updating to reflect/incorporate mandatory changes in State statutes, PSRC's Vision 2040 and King County Countywide Planning Policies.
2. Updating to reflect/incorporate optional changes in State statutes, PSRC's Vision 2040 and King County Countywide Planning Policies.
3. Updating to reflect/incorporate other locally desired changes.

The staff review has primarily focused on determining if there are mandatory changes needed, however we would like to hear if any members found a particular policy or idea that Burien should incorporate into our update scope. These tables are also being provided to other City departments undertaking the functional plan updates. With your input and the input of each city department, we should collectively have a very good start on establishing the comprehensive plan update scope.

**ACTION**

**No formal action is necessary** at your next meeting however staff is requesting comments and discussion.

**Attachments**

- 1) Department of Commerce Comprehensive Plan update checklist, PRELIMINARY
- 2) PSRC's Vision 2040 goals and policies in table format, PRELIMINARY





## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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 information, or to comply with changes to the GMA since their last update.

This checklist includes all components of the plan and regulations that are specifically required by the GMA, with new or amended statutory changes since 2003 emphasized in **highlighted text**. An expanded checklist (one for [comprehensive plans](#), one for [development regulations](#)) is available, which also includes related good ideas and recommendations. A [separate checklist](#) is available for counties. Cities within the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) boundaries may want to use this checklist in tandem with [PSRC checklists](#).

### 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 (place your cursor just before the yes/no box and then double click for check box option menu) or type in text 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. If you still have questions, visit the [Commerce Web page](#) or [contact the Commerce planner](#) assigned to your city.

**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.

**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 strictly required by the GMA.

### How to use the completed checklist

Growth Management Services strongly encourages that you send the complete checklist to Commerce with the [application for your update grant](#). Before you send it to Commerce, the checklist can be used to help write your proposed grant “Scope of Work,” which is part of your [grant application](#). The checklist can also help you develop a [detailed work plan](#) for your overall 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 update.

**This page intentionally left blank**

**(Used as spacer so checklist pages begin printing on top facing page)**

Jurisdiction Name:

## I. Required Comprehensive Plan Elements and Components (Sections 1 – 8)

1. Land Use Element - A Land Use Element that is consistent with county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and RCW 36.70A.070(1)	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. A <b>future land use map</b> showing city limits and urban growth area (UGA) boundaries. [RCW 36.70A.070(1) and RCW 36.70A.110(6)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Ord. 528, exhibit D. <span style="background-color: #90EE90;">(will need to update)</span> Pol. Lu 1.1 ref map LU-1 (pg. 2-5)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
b. <span style="background-color: #FFFF00;">Consideration of urban planning approaches that increase physical activity.</span> <span style="background-color: #FFFF00;">[RCW 36.70A.070(1), Amended in 2005]</span> <i>Note:</i> Approaches may include mixed use community centers, bicycle and pedestrian networks or other means to include physical activity in daily life. Look at publication for improvement ideas."Example Comp Plan Pol to Support Physical Active Communities, Sept 2007"	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Pol. LU 1.4 – mixed use Pol. LU 1.11 BU 1.5 (pg. 2-15) PO 1.1 (pg. 2-20) NQ 1.2 bul. 3, 6 NQ 1.5 (pg. 2-44) DB.1 "design" para 1 (2-47) DB 1.8 , 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17 SC 1.1, 1.16 Goal TR 4 MM.3 – 3.13 TR 7.1.1 PRO 3.3, 3.7, 3.8, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12,	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<span style="background-color: #90EE90;">CPPW/HEAL grant work to confirm and/or provide appropriate changes if necessary.</span>

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>1. Land Use Element</b> - A Land Use Element that is consistent with county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and RCW 36.70A.070(1)	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
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>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 4.2.3, (pg. 4-20) 4.5.3 (pg 4-47)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Amendments necessary to include North Highline.
d. <b>Estimates of population densities and building intensities based on future land uses.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(1)]</a> <i>Note: GMS suggests a table showing land use designations and implementing zoning as a projection of existing and projected development capacity.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 4.5.3 (pg. 4-47) See table 4.5-3 (employment) <b>is residential needed?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Combine 4.2.3 with 4.5.3 to meet RCW? <b>On hold for Legislature?</b>
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): EV 1.3 (pg 2-26) EV 2.4 (pg 2-28) EV 5 (pg 2-32) EV5.1, EV 5.2, 5.3 (pg. 2-32) EV 5.4 (pg. 2-33) ST 1 (pg 2-109) BMC 19.40.420 & 430	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	I don't think we have any wells. (none referenced in Chpt. 4 see pg. 4-26) Check with water districts.  There is a south KC groundwater management plan.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>1. Land Use Element</b> - A Land Use Element that is consistent with county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and RCW 36.70A.070(1)	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
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. [RCW 36.70A.150] <i>Note:</i> A timeline and budget for acquiring lands identified as useful for public purposes under RCW 36.70A.150 should be developed but should not be adopted as part of the comprehensive plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):  DB 1.11 (pg 2-50) does not identify specific land DB 1.15 (pg 2-51) Downtown Streetscape plan (pg 11). Downtown zoning standards include a bonus for needed right of way. 19.15.025.1. 19.47.030[2.a] links to DT streetscape plan and street standards. SC 1.1 (pg 2-59) Ped. And Bike Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Contract with other agencies to provide Water, Sewer ect.  <div style="background-color: #00FF00; padding: 2px;">             Is there mention in the surface water, transportation/bike and pedestrian plans. NERA has identified storm and roads???.           </div>
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. [RCW 36.70A.160]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Ord. 528, exhibit D. Pol. Lu 1.1 ref map LU-1 (pg. 2-5) Pol. EQ 1.2 (2-42) Pol. EV 4.7	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	No corridor connections are proposed. Map shows existing parks and open spaces.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>1. Land Use Element</b> - A Land Use Element that is consistent with county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and RCW 36.70A.070(1)	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
h. <b>If there is an airport within or adjacent to the city: policies, land use designations (and zoning) to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports.</b> [RCW 36.70.547, New in 1996] <i>Note: The plan (and associated regulations) must be filed with the Aviation Division of WSDOT.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Goal IN.1 (pg. 2-17) Pol. IN 1.1 (pg. 2-17) Pol SE 1.5 (pg. 2-24) BMC 19.15.070 19.15.030, 19.48	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
i. <b>If there is a Military Base within or adjacent to the jurisdiction employing 100 or more personnel: policies, land use designations, (and consistent zoning) to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to military bases.</b> [RCW 36.70A.530(3), New in 2004]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<b>Not applicable.</b>
j. Where applicable, <b>a 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. [RCW 36.70A.70(1)] <i>Note: RCW 90.56.010(26) defines waters of the state. Jurisdictions subject to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase 1 and Phase 2 should comply with all permit requirements.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): EV 1.3 (pg 2-26) ST 1.1 (pg. 2-109) ST 1.5 (pg. 2-110) Element 2.8 (pg. 2-109)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<b>Need to check Storm Plan for specific review and detailed recommendations.</b>  Status of NPDES permit??
k. <b>Policies to designate and protect critical areas</b> including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat protection areas, frequently flooded areas, critical	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<b>Source of best available science?</b>

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>1. Land Use Element</b> - A Land Use Element that is consistent with county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and RCW 36.70A.070(1)	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
<p>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. [RCW 36.70A.030(5), RCW 36.70A.172, BAS added in 1995] <i>Note:</i> See WAC 365-195-900-925</p>	<p>RE 1.2, 1.5            IN 1.1 Character Para            EV section starting on page 2-26 through 2-33            EV.1, EV 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 .....            EPF 2.3</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No                      <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Location(s):            EV 4 (all) but no specific mention of anadromous fisheries.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i></p>	<p style="background-color: #90EE90;">May need to add language regarding anadromous fisheries.</p>
<p>i. <span style="background-color: #FFFF00;">If forest or agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance are designated <i>inside</i> city: a program authorizing Transfer (or Purchase) of Development Rights.</span> [RCW 36.70A.060(4), Amended in 2005]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No                      <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Location(s):</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i></p>	<p><b><u>Not applicable.</u></b></p>
<b>2. A Housing Element</b> to ensure the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods and is consistent with relevant CWPPs, and RCW 36.70A.070(2).	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>2. A Housing Element</b> to ensure the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods and is consistent with relevant CWPPs, and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)</a> .	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
a. <b>Goals, policies, and objectives</b> for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): LU 1.4(pg 2-5) LU 1.11 Discussion(pg 2-6) RE.1(pg 2-8) NQ 1.8 (pg 2-44) DB 1.25 (pg 2-56) 2.4 Housing Element (pg 2-64) CF 7.9 (pg 2-123)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
a. <b>An inventory and analysis</b> of existing and projected housing needs over the planning period. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(2)(a)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 4.7.2 (pg. 4-52) see 4-55 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, comparable rent affordability.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<div style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 2px;">Needs to be updated?</div>
b. <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. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Table 4.5-2 (pg. 4-49) "buildable lands/ Growth Targets"	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<div style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 2px;">Will need to be updated, use landuse inventory work.</div>

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>2. A Housing Element</b> to ensure the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods and is consistent with relevant CWPPs, and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)</a> .	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
c. <b>Adequate provisions for existing and projected housing needs</b> for all economic segments of the community. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): HS 2.1 (2-68) BMC 19	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Analysis needed to show how all economic segments.
d. <b>If enacting or expanding an affordable housing program under RCW 36.70A.540:</b> identification of land use designations within a geographic area where increased residential development will assist in achieving local growth management and housing policies <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.540, New in 2006]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	<b>Not applicable.</b>
e. <b>Policies so that manufactured housing is not regulated differently than site built housing.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 35.21.684, 35.63.160, 35A.21.312, and 36.01.225, Amended in 2004]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): HS 1.10 a (pg. 2-65)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Need DOC clarification if current policy is OK.
f. <b>If the city has a population of over 20,000: provisions for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) to be allowed in single-family residential areas.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.400, RCW 43.63A.215(3)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): HS 1.10, 1.11 (pg 2-65) BMC 19.17.070	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>3. A Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element</b> 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 <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(3)</a> , and include:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
a. Policies or procedures to ensure <b>capital budget decisions are in conformity with the comprehensive plan.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.120]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 2.9 Capital facilities (pg 2-116) TR 1.1.6, 1.1.7 (pg 2-71)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	May need to develop/enhance internal procedures to ensure consistency with plan.
b. An <b>inventory</b> of existing capital facilities owned by public entities. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(3)(a)]</a> <i>Note:</i> The inventory should include references to facility plans, include a brief summary of the plans, indicate location of facilities, and show where systems currently have unused capacity. Public services and facilities are defined in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(12 and 13)</a> .	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Chapter 3.0	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Needs updating and references to owned facilities and facility plans.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>3. A Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element</b> 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 <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(3)</a> , and include:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
c. <b>A forecast of needed capital facilities.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(3)(b)]</a> <i>Note:</i> The forecast of future need should be based on projected population and adopted levels of service (LOS) over the planning period. This section should consider sufficiency of water rights, sewage treatment, and other needed public facilities to support the plan's projected 20-year growth. It may also consider system management or demand management strategies to meet forecast need.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Coordination with districts may be necessary to confirm.
d. <b>Proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(3)(c)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Inventory needed along with integration with Capital Facilities Plan.
e. A <b>six-year plan</b> (at least) identifying sources of public money to finance planned capital facilities. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(3)(d)]</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.120</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): CF 3.2 (pg 2-118) references budget Chapter 3.0 Capital Improvement Program Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Need an updated chapter 3.0 CIP. Next year? Once land use, transportation, stormwater and park plans are done?

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>3. A Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element</b> 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 <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(3)</a> , and include:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
f. A <b>policy or procedure to reassess the Land Use Element</b> if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): CF 3.6, 3.7 (pg 2-118)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	May need something here.
g. <i>If impact fees are collected:</i> <b>identification of public facilities on which money is to be spent.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 82.02.050(4)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC Table 19.35-1 (Traffic) Ord no. 493.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	
<b>4. A Utilities Element</b> which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(4)</a> and includes:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>4. A Utilities Element</b> which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(4)</a> and includes:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
a. The <b>general location, proposed location and capacity</b> of all existing and proposed utilities. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(4)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	The city contains many special districts that provide water, sewer, electric ... may need to update based on current district plans.
<b>5. A Transportation Element</b> which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)</a> and includes:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
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>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Highways (pg 4-9) 4.8 Transportation (pg 4-59)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Transportation Master Plan to address.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>5. A Transportation Element</b> which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)</a> and includes:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
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]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): TR 1.1.2, 1.1.3 (pg 2-70) Table 4.8-3	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Updates to table needed.
c. Identification of specific actions to bring locally-owned transportation facilities and services to established LOS. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D)</a> , Amended in 2005]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): TR 1.1.6? (pg 2-71)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	I don't believe we are deficient in LOS. We may need an updated inventory. See forecast below.
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>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Need new forecast based on new growth targets and buildable lands info.
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>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	TMP to address. Will need information from state. Is this on hold for budget reasons?

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>5. A Transportation Element</b> which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)</a> and includes:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
f. <b>A pedestrian and bicycle component.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii), Amended 2005]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): TR 5 (pg 2-78 through 2-82) MM 3.1 (pg 2-79)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	
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>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): TR 1.1.5 (pg 2-70) TR 1.2.4 (pg 2-72) TR 4.1.5 (pg 2-77) TR 4.6 (pg 2-78)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	TMP to update/enhance.
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> .	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	TMP to update

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>5. A Transportation Element</b> which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)</a> and includes:	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
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> ]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	<span style="background-color: #00FF00;">CIP needs updating.</span>
j. <i>If 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.</i> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(C)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	TMP/CIP
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>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	TMP to update.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<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.	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
a. <b>A 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>Note:</i> EPFs include those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, state or regional transportation facilities, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities (SCTFs) 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): EPF 2.1, 2.2 (pg 2-124) BMC 19.17.110 (SCTF's)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	No projects in Burien in OFM's list (09-15 enacted facility plan)
b. Policies or procedures that ensure the <b>comprehensive plan does not preclude the siting of EPFs.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.200(5)]</a> <i>Note:</i> If the EPF siting process is in the CWPPs, this policy may be contained in the comprehensive plan as well.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): EPF 2.9, 2.10 (pg 2-126)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>7. Consistency</b> is required by the GMA.	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</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> [RCW 36.70A.100 and 210] <i>Note:</i> GMS suggests CWPPs be referenced in each element, or be appended to the plan to clearly show consistency. Some jurisdictions use a table.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):  LU 1.9 (pg 2-6) 3 <sup>rd</sup> runway only LU 1.11 (pg 2-6) downtown HS 1.14 (pg 2-66) coordinate affordable housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Table for MPP done in rough form.  <span style="background-color: #00FF00;">Need to complete a CWPP table.</span>
b. All plan elements must be <b>consistent with each other.</b> [RCW 36.70A.070 (preamble)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	How to show?
c. The plan must be <b>coordinated with the plans of adjacent jurisdictions.</b> [RCW 36.70A.100] <i>Note:</i> Adjacent jurisdictions should be provided with proposed plan and SEPA documentation.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Need copies of Seattle, Sea-Tac, Normandy Park and DesMoines. Drafts of plan amendments to be sent to neighboring jurisdiction along with SEPA documents.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

8. Public participation, plan amendments and monitoring.	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. <b>A process to ensure public participation in the comprehensive planning process.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.020(11), .035, and .140]</a> The process should address annual amendments (if the jurisdiction allows for them) <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.130(2), Amended in 2006]</a> , 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Need to prepare based on 1) what needs to be updated and 2) what the city would like to update.
b. A process to assure that proposed <b>regulatory or administrative actions do not result in an unconstitutional taking of private property.</b> See <a href="#">Attorney General's Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property</a> for guidance. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.370]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Review and coordination with City Attorney.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

### II. Required Components of Development Regulations (Sections 9 – 16)

9. Regulations protecting critical areas are required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> . <b>Note:</b> Critical area regulations may not be amended to affect agricultural activities prior to July 1, 2010. [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007</a> ]	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
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> ]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	May need more work on fish and wildlife habitat areas, definitions and mapping.
b. Findings that demonstrate <b>Best Available Science (BAS)</b> was included in developing regulations to protect the function and values of critical areas. In addition, findings should document special consideration to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries. [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> ] <i>Note:</i> Relevant sources of best available science (BAS) should be documented in the record, together with specific findings that are accurate and explanatory. If the CAO departs from the science-based recommendations, the rationale, risk, and measures to limit the risk should also be documented. [ <a href="#">WAC 365-195-915</a> ]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Memo from Adolfson, dated 9/23/03 Mention of anadromous fish.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>9. Regulations protecting critical areas</b> are required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> . <b>Note:</b> Critical area regulations may not be amended to affect agricultural activities prior to July 1, 2010. [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007</a> ]	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
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>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.310 - 330	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	No large scale agricultural activities in Burien.
d. A <b>definition of wetlands</b> consistent with <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(21)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.10.580, 585, 590, 595	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<span style="background-color: #00FF00;">Consistent?</span>
e. <b>Delineation of wetlands</b> using the state Department of Ecology's <a href="#">Washington State Wetland Identification and Delineation Manual</a> . <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.175 (1995)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.10.580, 595	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<span style="background-color: #00FF00;">Need to include Appendix 8-C?</span>

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>9. Regulations protecting critical areas</b> are required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> . <b>Note:</b> Critical area regulations may not be amended to affect agricultural activities prior to July 1, 2010. [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007</a> ]	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
f. Regulations that protect the functions and values of <b>critical aquifer recharge areas</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.420, 430	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	
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> <i>Notes:</i> The GMA requires the land use element to achieve this goal. This may require complementary changes to development regulations such as zoning, and/or could be met through critical aquifer recharge area provisions. For water quantity, regulations may include limits on impervious surfaces, or encourage water conservation measures.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.420, 430 BMC 19.15 (use zone charts) impervious surface and building coverage requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>9. Regulations protecting critical areas</b> are required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> . <b>Note:</b> Critical area regulations may not be amended to affect agricultural activities prior to July 1, 2010. [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007</a> ]	<b>Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?</b>	<b>Changes needed to meet current statute?</b>	<b>Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)</b>
h. Regulations that protect the functions and values of <b>fish and wildlife habitat areas</b> . <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.380, 390, 400, 410	<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> <i>Note:</i> Consider consistency with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements for the National Flood Insurance Program and State floodplain management provisions.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.240-280 BMC 15.55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
j. 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> ] <i>Note:</i> The GMA states that where applicable, the land use element of the comprehensive plan should provide guidance for corrective action to mitigate or cleanse discharges that pollute water of the state. This may require complementary changes to development regulations such as stormwater management; clearing and grading; or low impact development ordinances.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC Chapter 13.10	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

<b>9. Regulations protecting critical areas</b> are required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(2)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172(1)</a> . <b>Note:</b> Critical area regulations may not be amended to affect agricultural activities prior to July 1, 2010. [ <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007</a> ]	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
k. Regulation of <b>geologically hazardous areas</b> consistent with public health and safety concerns. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.030(9), RCW 36.70A.060(2) and RCW 36.70A.172(1)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.290	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	
l. Provisions that allow “ <b>reasonable use</b> ” of properties constrained by presence of critical areas. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.370]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.070[4]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	
m. <i>If your city is assuming regulation of forest practices as provided in</i> <a href="#">RCW 76.09.240: forest practices regulations</a> 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. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.570, Amended in 2007 and RCW 76.09.240 [Amended in 2007]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Not applicable, there are no forest lands within the city jurisdictional boundary.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

10. Shoreline Master Program See Washington State <a href="#">Department of Ecology's SMP Submittal Checklist</a>	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. <b>Zoning</b> is consistent with Shoreline Master Program (SMP) environmental designations. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.480]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	SMP updates are underway
b. <b>If SMP regulations</b> have been updated to meet Ecology's shoreline regulations adopted in 2003: protection for critical areas in shorelines is accomplished solely through the SMP. The SMP protections for critical areas provide a level of protection at least equal to that provided by the critical areas ordinance. <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.480(4), Amended in 2003]</a> and <a href="#">RCW 90.58.090(4)</a> .	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	SMP will adopt CAO by reference but specifically excludes the reasonable use provision as required by DOE guidelines.
11. The Zoning Code should contain the following provisions:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

11. The Zoning Code should contain the following provisions:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
<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></p> <p><i>Note:</i> Family daycare provider means a child daycare provider who regularly provides child daycare for not more than 12 children in the provider's home in the family living quarters. <a href="#">[RCW 74.15.020(1)(f)]</a></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No                      <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Location(s):            BMC 19.15.005.3 (SFR Zones)            BMC 19.15.010.5 (MFR Zones)            BMC 19.15.015.3            BMC 19.15.020.3            BMC 19.15.025.6            BMC 19.15.035.5            BMC 19.15.040.6            BMC 19.15.045.4            BMC 19.15.050.4            BMC 19.15.055.5            BMC 19.15.060.1.B</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i></p>	<p>BMC 19.15.065(SPA-3)            Does not specifically list "family day care" as an allowed use, does allow day care center.</p>
<p>b. <b>Manufactured housing</b> is regulated the same as site-built housing. <a href="#">[RCW 35.21.684, 35.63.160, 35A.21.312 and 36.01.225, All Amended in 2004]</a></p> <p><i>Note:</i> A local government may require that manufactured homes (1) are new, (2) are set on a permanent foundation, and (3) comply with local design standards applicable to other homes in the neighborhood; but may not discriminate against consumer choice in housing.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No                      <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Location(s):            BMC 19.10.135 reference to factory-assembled structure.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes  <input type="checkbox"/> No  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i></p>	<p><b>Consider adding consistent terminology to definition.</b></p>

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

11. The Zoning Code should contain the following provisions:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
c. <i>If the city has a population over 20,000 accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are allowed in single-family residential areas.</i> <a href="#">[RCW 43.63A.215(3)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.17.070[2]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
d. <i>If there is an airport within or adjacent to the city: zoning that discourages the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports.</i> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70.547, New in 1996]</a> <i>Note: The zoning regulations must be filed with the Aviation Division of WSDOT.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.15.070	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	RS-A and Industrial land zoned in the south (Ord. 528, zoning map)
e. <i>If there is a Military Base within or adjacent to the jurisdiction employing 100 or more personnel: zoning that discourages the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to military bases.</i> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.530(3), New in 2004]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Not applicable.

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

11. The Zoning Code should contain the following provisions:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
f. Residential structures that are occupied by <b>persons with handicaps, and group care for children that meet the definition of “familial status”</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, RCW 70.128.140, RCW 49.60.222-225]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.10.160, Family (combined with) BMC 19.10.115, Dwelling Unit (references the term “family”)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

12. Subdivision Code regulations	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. Subdivision code is <b>consistent with and implements comprehensive plan policies.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.030(7) and 36.70A.040(4)(d)]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<div style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 2px;">             Subdivision update should consider these requirements           </div>

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

12. Subdivision Code regulations	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
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.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Subdivision update should consider these requirements.
c. <b>Subdivision regulations may implement traffic demand management (TDM) policies.</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)]</a> <i>Note:</i> Examples may include requiring new development to be oriented towards transit streets, pedestrian-oriented site and building design, and requiring bicycle and pedestrian connections to street and trail networks.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Subdivision update should consider these requirements.
13. Concurrency, Impact Fees, and TDM	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

13. Concurrency, Impact Fees, and TDM	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
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> <i>Note:</i> Concurrency is required for transportation, but may also be applied to other facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 18.70.070 See TR 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 (pg 2-70)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	<div style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 5px;">             All sections in 18.70 should be amended and updated.              Current LOS in comp plan is not reflected in BMC.           </div>
b. <i>If adopted:</i> <b>impact fee methods</b> are consistent with <a href="#">RCW 82.02.050 through 100</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.35	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
c. <div style="background-color: #FFFF00; padding: 2px;">If required by <a href="#">RCW 70.94.527</a>: a <b>commute trip reduction</b> ordinance to reduce the proportion of single-occupant vehicle commute trips. <a href="#">[RCW 70.94.521-551, Amended in 2006]</a></div> <i>Note:</i> WSDOT maintains a <a href="#">list of affected jurisdictions</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC Chapter 10.60 (Ord. 498)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

14. Siting Essential Public Facilities (EPFs)	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. 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>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 19.15.005.12(SFR) 19.15.010.14(MFR) 19.15.025.10(DC) 19.15.035.12(CC) 19.15.040.13(CR) 19.15.050.17(I) 19.15.055.11(SPA-1) 19.15.065.11(SPA-3) 19.15.070.15(SPA-4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Not sure.
15. Project Review Procedures	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. <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, RCW 36.70B and RCW 43.21C]</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.65.065[2] BMC 19.65.070[2] BMC 19.65.075[2]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

## Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

16. General Provisions: The GMA requires that development regulations be consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan. [RCW 36.70A.030(7) and .040(4)(d).	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. A process for <b>early and continuous public participation</b> in the development regulation development and amendment process. [RCW 36.70A.020(11),.035, .130 and .140]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.65.015 BMC 19.65.080[1 & 3.A]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Public Hearing with the PC prior to consideration by City Council.
b. A process to assure that proposed regulatory or administrative actions <b>do not result in an unconstitutional taking of private property.</b> [RCW 36.70A.370] <i>Note: See Attorney General's Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	NOT SURE WHAT IS REQUIRED. There is an appeal process and review criteria but none specifically address taking directly.

	<b>MULTICOUNTY PLANNING POLICY EXERPTS FROM VISION 2040</b>	PRELIMINARY City Review/Comments
<b>MPP-G-1</b>	Coordinate planning efforts among jurisdictions, agencies, and federally recognized Indian tribes where there are common borders or related regional issues, to facilitate a common vision.	PSRC
<b>MPP-G-2</b>	Update countywide planning policies, where necessary, prior to December 31, 2010, to address the multicounty planning policies in VISION 2040.	KC
<b>MPP-G-3</b>	Monitor implementation of VISION 2040 to evaluate progress in achieving the regional growth strategy, as well as the environment, development patterns, housing, economy, transportation, and public services provisions.	PSRC
<b>MPP-G-4</b>	Explore new and existing sources of funding for services and infrastructure, recognizing that such funding is vital if local governments are to achieve the regional vision.	PSRC
<b>MPP-G-5</b>	Identify and develop changes to regulatory, pricing, taxing, and expenditure practices, and other fiscal tools within the region to implement the vision.	PSRC
	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP GOALS AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will safeguard the natural environment by meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.</i>	
<b>MPP-En-1:</b>	Develop regionwide environmental strategies, coordinating among local jurisdictions and countywide planning groups.	PSRC
<b>MPP-En-2:</b>	Use integrated and interdisciplinary approaches for environmental planning and assessment at regional, countywide and local levels.	PSRC/KC/City
<b>MPP-En-3:</b>	Maintain and, where possible, improve air and water quality, soils, and natural systems to ensure the health and well-being of people, animals, and plants. Reduce the impacts of transportation on air and water quality, and climate change.	<b>City</b> EV 1.2, 1.3, 2.2 (pg 2-26) EV 4, 4.1, 4.4 (2-30)
<b>MPP-En-4:</b>	Ensure that all residents of the region, regardless of social or economic status, live in a healthy environment, with minimal exposure to pollution.	<b>City</b> EV 2 (2-27) ED 5.2 (2-129)
<b>MPP-En-5:</b>	Locate development in a manner that minimizes impacts to natural features. Promote the use of innovative environmentally sensitive development practices, including design, materials, construction, and on-going maintenance.	<b>KC/City</b> CAO addresses impacts and development practices. What is innovative? Promote? EV 1.5 Clustering
<b>MPP-En-6:</b>	Use the best information available at all levels of planning, especially scientific information, when establishing and implementing environmental standards established by any level of government.	PSRC/KC
<b>MPP-En-7:</b>	Mitigate noise caused by traffic, industries, and other sources.	All-City includes screening of mechanical equipment in DT design standards, landscaping requirements and through SEPA review. Could include in street standards.

	<b>EARTH AND HABITAT GOALS AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will preserve the beauty and natural ecological processes of the Puget Sound basin through the conservation and enhancement of natural resources and the environment.</i>	
<b>MPP-En-8:</b>	Identify, preserve, and enhance significant regional open space networks and linkages across jurisdictional boundaries.	PSRC EV 4.7 (2-31)
<b>MPP-En-9:</b>	Designate, protect, and enhance significant open spaces, natural resources, and critical areas through mechanisms, such as the review and comment of countywide planning policies and local plans and provisions.	PSRC
<b>MPP-En-10:</b>	Preserve and enhance habitat to prevent species from inclusion on the Endangered Species List and to accelerate their removal from the list.	KC/City OS 1.2 (2-107) EV 4.3 (2-31)
<b>MPP-En-11:</b>	Identify and protect wildlife corridors both inside and outside the urban growth area.	PSRC/ KC EQ 1.2(2-42)
<b>MPP-En-12:</b>	Preserve and restore native vegetation to protect habitat, especially where it contributes to the overall ecological function and where invasive species are a significant threat to native ecosystems.	KC /City-adopt a park program, CAO and vegetation management standards. EV 3.3, 4.8, 6.3 (2-31)
	<b>WATER QUALITY GOALS AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will meet or do better than standards established for water quality. The quality of the water flowing out of the region — including Puget Sound — should be as good as or better than the quality of water entering the region.</i>	
<b>MPP-En-13:</b>	Maintain natural hydrological functions within the region’s ecosystems and watersheds and, where feasible, restore them to a more natural state.	PSRC/City – could be proactive in restoration efforts. Stormwater standards encourage infiltration. EV 6, 6.1 (2-33) ST 2.1 (2-109)
<b>MPP-En-14:</b>	Restore — where appropriate and possible — the region’s freshwater and marine shorelines, watersheds, and estuaries to a natural condition for ecological function and value.	PSRC/ KC /City – SMP has a restoration component, city has and will continue to restore beach at Seahurst Park in 2011. EV 2.2 (2-27) SMP-CON 24, 30, 31, 32, (2-14) SMP-REST all (2-16)
<b>MPP-En-15:</b>	Reduce the use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers to the extent feasible and identify alternatives that minimize risks to human health and the environment.	PSRC/KC/ City – SMP contains policies and regulations None in comp plan
<b>MPP-En-16:</b>	Identify and address the impacts of climate change on the region’s hydrological systems.	PSRC
	<b>AIR QUALITY GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The overall quality of the region’s air will be better than it is today.</i>	
<b>MPP-En-17:</b>	Maintain or do better than existing standards for carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulates.	PSRC EV 2.6 (2-28)
<b>MPP-En-18:</b>	Reduce levels for air toxics, fine particulates, and greenhouse gases.	PSRC

<b>MPP-En-19:</b>	Continue efforts to reduce pollutants from transportation activities, including through the use of cleaner fuels and vehicles and increasing alternatives to driving alone, as well as design and land use.	PSRC/KC/City – TR 1.1.8 (2-71) TR 7.1.3 (2-83) City has purchased hybrid vehicles and subsidizes ORCA cards for employees. Could modify or add to existing policy to be more consistent.
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE GOAL AND POLICIES</b>		
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will reduce its overall production of harmful elements that contribute to climate change.</i>	
<b>MPP-En-20:</b>	Address the central Puget Sound region’s contribution to climate change by, at a minimum, committing to comply with state initiatives and directives regarding climate change and the reduction of greenhouse gases. Jurisdictions and agencies should work to include an analysis of climate change impacts when conducting an environmental review process under the State Environmental Policy Act.	PSRC SU .3 (2-131)
<b>MPP-En-21:</b>	Reduce the rate of energy use per capita, both in building use and in transportation activities.	PSRC SU 3.1, 3.2 (2-132) City could offer incentives for meeting industry accepted standards (such as LEED, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design)
<b>MPP-En-22:</b>	Pursue the development of energy management technology as part of meeting the region’s energy needs.	PSRC
<b>MPP-En-23:</b>	Reduce greenhouse gases by expanding the use of conservation and alternative energy sources and by reducing vehicle miles traveled by increasing alternatives to driving alone.	City policy?
<b>MPP-En-24:</b>	Take positive actions to reduce carbons, such as increasing the number of trees in urban portions of the region.	PSRC/County EV 2.10 (2-28) SC 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.9, 1.10 (2-59) City is a tree city.
<b>MPP-En-25:</b>	Anticipate and address the impacts of climate change on regional water sources.	PSRC
<p><b>LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIONS</b></p> <p><b>Environmental Planning: En-Action-11</b> Local jurisdictions, with assistance from the Puget Sound Regional Council, will expand their efforts to conduct environmental planning, specifically to incorporate a more comprehensive systems approach to ecological considerations. The Regional Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assist with information on system approaches, such as landscape-scale analysis and adaptive management principles</li> <li>- Provide guidance on how to incorporate region wide environmental planning initiatives — such as the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) process — into local comprehensive plans</li> <li>- Develop a system of map overlays to enhance a systems approach to environmental planning</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-term / MPP-En-2</li> <li>• Results and Products: <i>expanded ecological assessment in the preparation of local plans</i></li> </ul>		

	<b>URBAN LANDS GOALS AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will promote the efficient use of land, prevent urbanization of rural and resource lands, and provide for the efficient delivery of services within the designated urban growth area.</i>	
<b>MPP-DP-1:</b>	Provide a regional framework for the designation and adjustment of the urban growth area to ensure long-term stability and sustainability of the urban growth area consistent with the regional vision.	PSRC
<b>MPP-DP-2:</b>	Encourage efficient use of urban land by maximizing the development potential of existing urban lands, such as advancing development that achieves zoned density.	PSRC & City LU 1.4, 1.6, 1.11 (2-5) DB 1.26 (2-56)
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region, countywide planning bodies, and local jurisdictions will work together to set population and employment growth targets consistent with the regional vision.</i>	
<b>MPP-DP-3:</b>	Use consistent countywide targeting processes for allocating population and employment growth consistent with the regional vision, including establishing: (a) local employment targets, (b) local housing targets based on population projections, and (c) local housing and employment targets for each designated regional growth center.	PSRC & County
<b>MPP-DP-4:</b>	Accommodate the region's growth first and foremost in the urban growth area. Ensure that development in rural areas is consistent with the regional vision.	PSRC
	<b>REGIONAL GROWTH CENTERS GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will direct growth and development to a limited number of designated regional growth centers.</i>	
<b>MPP-DP-5:</b>	Focus a significant share of population and employment growth in designated regional growth centers.	PSRC & City DB 1.1, DB 1.21 (2-54), DB 1.26
<b>MPP-DP-6:</b>	Provide a regional framework for designating and evaluating regional growth centers.	PSRC
<b>MPP-DP-7:</b>	Give funding priority — both for transportation infrastructure and for economic development — to support designated regional growth centers consistent with the regional vision. Regional funds are prioritized to regional growth centers. County-level and local funding are also appropriate	PSRC, County & City? — Should funding be directed toward our center?
	<b>REGIONAL MANUFACTURING/INDUSTRIAL CENTERS GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	N/A- The city does not contain a regional manufacturing/industrial center
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will continue to maintain and support viable regional manufacturing/industrial centers to accommodate manufacturing, industrial, or advanced technology uses.</i>	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-8:</b>	Focus a significant share of employment growth in designated regional manufacturing/industrial centers.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-9:</b>	Provide a regional framework for designating and evaluating regional manufacturing/industrial centers.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-10:</b>	Give funding priority — both for transportation infrastructure and for economic development — to support designated regional manufacturing/industrial centers consistent with the regional vision. Regional funds are prioritized to	N/A

	regional manufacturing/industrial centers. County-level and local funding are also appropriate to prioritize to these regional centers.	
	<b>OTHER CENTERS GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>Subregional centers, such as those designated through countywide processes or identified locally, will also play important roles in accommodating planned growth according to the regional vision. These centers will promote pedestrian connections and support transit-oriented uses.</i>	
<b>MPP-DP-11:</b>	Support the development of centers within all jurisdictions, including town centers and activity nodes.	PSRC & City See DP-5 above
<b>MPP-DP-12:</b>	Establish a common framework among the countywide processes for designating subregional centers to ensure compatibility within the region.	PSRC & County
<b>MPP-DP-13:</b>	Direct subregional funding, especially county-level and local funds, to centers designated through countywide processes, as well as to town centers, and other activity nodes.	PSRC, County & City City does not have a CIP policy supporting this.
	<b>COMPACT URBAN COMMUNITIES POLICIES</b>	
<b>MPP-DP-14:</b>	Preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods and create vibrant, sustainable compact urban communities that provide diverse choices in housing types, a high degree of connectivity in the street network to accommodate walking, bicycling and transit use, and sufficient public spaces.	City Captured in a number of policies throughout plan, land use, community character and transportation.
<b>MPP-DP-15:</b>	Support the transformation of key underutilized lands, such as brownfields and greyfields, to higher density, mixed-use areas to complement the development of centers and the enhancement of existing neighborhoods.	City LU 1.6 (2-6) could be adjusted Goal PH.1 (2-25) and CC 1.1 (3-35) is close as well.
	<b>CITIES IN RURAL AREA POLICIES</b>	
<b>MPP-DP-16:</b>	Direct commercial, retail, and community services that serve rural residents into neighboring cities and existing activity areas to prevent the conversion of rural land into commercial uses.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-17:</b>	Promote transit service to and from existing cities in rural areas.	N/A
	<b>UNINCORPORATED URBAN GROWTH AREA GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>All unincorporated lands within the urban growth area will either annex into existing cities or incorporate as new cities.</i>	
<b>MPP-DP-18:</b>	Affiliate all urban unincorporated lands appropriate for annexation with an adjacent city or identify those that may be feasible for incorporation. To fulfill the regional growth strategy, annexation is preferred over incorporation.	City (shown on Figure 2-AN 1.1, pg 2-40)
<b>MPP-DP-19:</b>	Support joint planning between cities and counties to work cooperatively in planning for urban unincorporated areas to ensure an orderly transition to city governance, including efforts such as: (a) establishing urban development standards, (b) addressing service and infrastructure financing, and (c) transferring permitting authority.	County
<b>MPP-DP-20:</b>	Support the provision and coordination of urban services to unincorporated urban areas by the adjacent city or, where appropriate, by the county as an interim approach.	PSRC, County, City AN 1.4 (2-40)

	<b>RURAL LANDS GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	N/A
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will permanently sustain the ecological functions, resource value, lifestyle, and character of rural lands for future generations by limiting the types and intensities of development in rural areas.</i>	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-21:</b>	Contribute to improved ecological functions and more appropriate use of rural lands by minimizing impacts through innovative and environmentally sensitive land use management and development practices.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-22:</b>	Do not allow urban net densities in rural and resource areas.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-23:</b>	Avoid new fully contained communities outside of the designated urban growth area because of their potential to create sprawl and undermine state and regional growth management goals.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-24:</b>	In the event that a proposal is made for creating a new fully contained community, the county shall make the proposal available to other counties and to the Regional Council for advance review and comment on regional impacts.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-25:</b>	Use existing and new tools and strategies to address vested development to ensure that future growth meets existing permitting and development standards and prevents further fragmentation of rural lands.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-26:</b>	Ensure that development occurring in rural areas is rural in character and is focused into communities and activity areas.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-27:</b>	Maintain the long-term viability of permanent rural land by avoiding the construction of new highways and major roads in rural areas.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-28:</b>	Support long-term solutions for the environmental and economic sustainability of agriculture and forestry within rural areas.	N/A
	<b>RESOURCE LANDS GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	N/A
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will conserve its natural resource land permanently by designating, maintaining, and enhancing farm, forest, and mineral lands.</i>	
<b>MPP-DP-29:</b>	Protect and enhance significant open spaces, natural resources, and critical areas.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-30:</b>	Establish best management practices that protect the long-term integrity of the natural environment, adjacent land uses, and the long-term productivity of resource lands.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-31:</b>	Support the sustainability of designated resource lands. Do not convert these lands to other uses.	N/A
<b>MPP-DP-32:</b>	Ensure that resource lands and their related economic activities are not adversely impacted by development on adjacent non-resource lands.	N/A
	<b>REGIONAL DESIGN GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will use design to shape the physical environment in order to create more livable communities, better integrate land use and transportation systems, and improve efforts to restore the environment.</i>	
<b>MPP-DP-33:</b>	Identify, protect and enhance those elements and characteristics that give the central Puget Sound region its identity, especially the natural visual resources and positive urban form elements.	City Too broad to directly attribute to a Burien policy.
<b>MPP-DP-34:</b>	Preserve significant regional historic, visual and cultural resources including public views, landmarks, archaeological sites, historic and cultural landscapes,	City HT 1.1, 1.4 (2-24)

	and areas of special character.	
<b>MPP-DP-35:</b>	Develop high quality, compact urban communities throughout the region's urban growth area that impart a sense of place, preserve local character, provide for mixed uses and choices in housing types, and encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.	City LU 1.4 (2-5), LU 1.11(2-6), BU 1.5(2-15), VQ 1.1(2-41), NQ 1.5, 1.7, 1.8(2-44), NP 1.1, 1.2(2-45), RC 1.1 (2-46), DB 1.2, 1.8(2-49), SC 1.1(2-59),HS.1 (2-64), TR 1.1.5 (2-70)
<b>MPP-DP-36:</b>	Provide a wide range of building and community types to serve the needs of a diverse population.	City LU.1 (2-5), HS.1 (2-64)
<b>MPP-DP-37:</b>	Support urban design, historic preservation, and arts to enhance quality of life, improve the natural and human-made environments, promote health and well-being, contribute to a prosperous economy, and increase the region's resiliency in adapting to changes or adverse events.	City HT 1.1, 1.2, 1.4(2-34) VQ 1.1, 1.2(2-41) DB 1.9, 1.10(2-50) ED 3.6, 6.1 (2-128)
<b>MPP-DP-38:</b>	Design public buildings and spaces that contribute to a sense of community and a sense of place.	City DB 1.12 (2-51)
<b>MPP-DP-39:</b>	Identify and create opportunities to develop parks, civic places and public spaces, especially in or adjacent to centers.	City PRO 1.5 (2-92) PRO 1.7, 1.8(2-98)
<b>MPP-DP-40:</b>	Design transportation projects and other infrastructure to achieve community development objectives and improve communities.	City TR 1.5(2-74) TR 4.1, 4.1.6(2-77), TR 4.2, 4.3(2-78), MM 3.1, 3.5, 3.6, 3.9(2-79)
<b>MPP-DP-41:</b>	Allow natural boundaries to help determine the routes and placement of infrastructure connections and improvements.	City TR 1.5 (2-74)
<b>MPP-DP-42:</b>	Recognize and work with linear systems that cross jurisdictional boundaries — including natural systems, continuous land use patterns, and transportation and infrastructure systems — in community planning, development, and design.	City EV 4.6 (2-31) CC 1.3 (2-36) TR 2.3 (2-74) TR 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4(2-76) PRO 5.3 (2-106) ST 1.5(2-110) CF 5.9, 7.6(2-120)
	<b>THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region's communities will be planned and designed to promote physical, social, and mental well-being so that all people can live healthier and more active lives.</i>	
<b>MPP-DP-43:</b>	Design communities to provide an improved environment for walking and bicycling.	City MM.3(2-78) MM 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13(2-79)
<b>MPP-DP-44:</b>	Incorporate provisions addressing health and well-being into appropriate regional, countywide, and local planning and decision-making processes.	City Health Grant work to inform possible changes that may be needed.

<b>MPP-DP-45:</b>	Promote cooperation and coordination among transportation providers, local governments, and developers to ensure that joint- and mixed-use developments are designed to promote and improve physical, mental, and social health and reduce the impacts of climate change on the natural and built environments.	City Health Grant work to inform possible changes that may be needed.
<b>MPP-DP-46:</b>	Develop and implement design guidelines to encourage construction of healthy buildings and facilities to promote healthy people.	City Health Grant work to inform possible changes that may be needed.
<b>MPP-DP-47:</b>	Support agricultural, farmland, and aquatic uses that enhance the food system in the central Puget Sound region and its capacity to produce fresh and minimally processed foods.	City N/A- possibly some SMP related policies?
<b>INNOVATIVE TECHNIQUES POLICIES</b>		
<b>MPP-DP-48:</b>	Encourage the use of innovative techniques, including the transfer of development rights, the purchase of development rights, and conservation incentives. Use these techniques to focus growth within the urban growth area (especially cities) to lessen pressures to convert rural and resource areas to more intense urban-type development, while protecting the future economic viability of sending areas and sustaining rural and resource-based uses.	City PH 1.1 (2-25)
<b>MPP-DP-49:</b>	Support and provide incentives to increase the percentage of new development and redevelopment — both public and private — to be built at higher performing energy and environmental standards.	City Possible opportunity, research will be needed to determine incentive options. Do have incentives for Multi-Family design components (19.15.025), but not for energy and/or environmental standards.
<b>MPP-DP-50:</b>	Streamline development standards and regulations for residential and commercial development, especially in centers, to provide flexibility and to accommodate a broader range of project types consistent with the regional vision.	City Urban infill SEPA exemption available per BMC 14.10.040.
<b>INCOMPATIBLE LAND USES POLICIES</b>		
<b>MPP-DP-51:</b>	Protect the continued operation of general aviation airports from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.	City RE 1.2(2-8), EV 4.10 (2-32), HT 1.5(2-35), NP 1.3(2-45), PRO 4.4(2-105)
<b>MPP-DP-52:</b>	Protect military lands from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.	N/A – no military lands
<b>MPP-DP-53:</b>	Protect industrial lands from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.	May need something here, but there is a conflict in that Burien protects residential neighborhoods. May need to understand PSRC's definition of "industrial lands". RM 1.5(2-62), IN 1.3, 1.4(2-19)

<b>CONCURRENCY POLICIES</b>		
<b>MPP-DP-54:</b>	Develop concurrency programs and methods that fully consider growth targets, service needs, and level-of-service standards. Focus level-of-service standards for transportation on the movement of people and goods instead of only on the movement of vehicles.	<b>City</b> TR 1.2.1(2-71) BMC 19.35 (Transportation impact fees) BMC 19.70 (Public Facilities) Could include schools and parks.
<b>MPP-DP-55:</b>	Address nonmotorized, pedestrian, and other multimodal types of transportation options in concurrency programs — both in assessment and mitigation.	<b>City</b> Should include a policy to ensure consistency with this policy, modify TR 1.2.1 to include.
<b>MPP-DP-56:</b>	Tailor concurrency programs for centers and other subareas to encourage development that can be supported by transit.	<b>City</b> Due to its size the traffic impact fee applies city wide and includes the center.
<b>LOCAL ACTIONS</b>		
<p><b>Identification of Underused Lands: DP-Action-16</b> Local jurisdictions should identify underused lands (such as brownfields and greyfields) for future redevelopment or reuse.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-term / MPP-DP-15</li> <li>• Results and Products: <i>inventory of underused land</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Center Plans: DP-Action-17</b> Each city with a designated center shall develop a subarea plan for the designated regional growth center and/or the manufacturing/industrial center.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-to mid-term / MPP-DP-5, 8</li> <li>• Results and Products: <i>subarea plan</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Mode Split Goals for Centers: DP-Action-18</b> Each city with a designated regional growth center and/or manufacturing/industrial center shall establish mode split goals for these centers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term / MPP-DP-43, MPP-T-23, 24</li> <li>• Results and Products: <i>mode split goals for each designated center</i></li> </ul>		
<b>HOUSING POLICIES</b>		
<b>Housing diversity and affordability:</b>		
<b>MPP-H-1:</b>	Provide a range of housing types and choices to meet the housing needs of all income levels and demographic groups within the region.	<b>City</b> HS.1 (2-64)
<b>MPP-H-2:</b>	Achieve and sustain — through preservation, rehabilitation, and new development — a sufficient supply of housing to meet the needs of low-income, moderate-income, middle-income, and special needs individuals and households that is equitably and rationally distributed throughout the region.	<b>City</b> BU 1.5 (2-15) HS 1.5, 1.8, 1.10, 1.11, 1.18 (2-64) HS 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 (2-68)
<b>MPP-H-3:</b>	Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals.	<b>City</b> HS 2.1(2-68)
<b>Jobs-housing balance:</b>		
<b>MPP-H-4:</b>	Develop and provide a range of housing choices for workers at all income levels throughout the region in a manner that promotes accessibility to jobs and	<b>City</b> HS.1(2-64)

	provides opportunities to live in proximity to work.	
	<b>Centers housing:</b>	
<b>MPP-H-5:</b>	Expand the supply and range of housing, including affordable units, in centers throughout the region.	City HS 1.10 (2-65), not much in Comp Plan on expansion of housing supply.
<b>MPP-H-6:</b>	Recognize and give regional funding priority to transportation facilities, infrastructure, and services that explicitly advance the development of housing in designated regional growth centers. Give additional priority to projects and services that advance affordable housing.	PSRC
	<b>Best housing practices:</b>	
<b>MPP-H-7:</b>	Encourage jurisdictions to review and streamline development standards and regulations to advance their public benefit, provide flexibility, and minimize additional costs to housing.	City HS 1.16, 1.19, 2.3(2-67)
<b>MPP-H-8:</b>	Encourage the use of innovative techniques to provide a broader range of housing types for all income levels and housing needs.	City HS 1.20 (2-67)
<b>MPP-H-9:</b>	Encourage inter-jurisdictional cooperative efforts and public-private partnerships to advance the provision of affordable and special needs housing.	PSRC/City? The City could explore this?
	<b>BUSINESS GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region's economy prospers by supporting businesses and job creation.</i>	
<b>MPP-Ec-1:</b>	Support economic development activities that help to retain, expand, or diversify the region's businesses. Target recruitment activities towards businesses that provide family-wage jobs.	City ED 3.3(2-128) We do not use the term "family wage jobs", use "well paying jobs".
<b>MPP-Ec-2:</b>	Foster a positive business climate by encouraging regionwide and statewide collaboration among business, government, education, labor, military, workforce development, and other nonprofit organizations.	City ED 1.1(2-127) but it lacks recognition of state and regional collaboration, captured to some degree in discussion following the overall mission statement (2-127)
<b>MPP-Ec-3:</b>	Support established and emerging industry clusters that export goods and services, import capital, and have growth potential.	City ED 4.3(2-128), lacks the notion of importing capital and exportation of goods.
<b>MPP-Ec-4:</b>	Leverage the region's position as an international gateway by supporting businesses, ports, and agencies involved in trade related activities.	PSRC/City We could give incentives for these kinds of uses?
<b>MPP-Ec-5:</b>	Foster a supportive environment for business startups, small businesses, and locally owned businesses to help them continue to prosper.	City ED 3.3, 3.5(2-128)
<b>MPP-Ec-6:</b>	Ensure the efficient flow of people, goods, services, and information in and through the region with infrastructure investments, particularly in and connecting designated centers, to meet the distinctive needs of the regional economy.	PSRC
<b>MPP-Ec-7:</b>	Encourage the private, public, and nonprofit sectors to incorporate environmental and social responsibility into their practices.	All

<b>PEOPLE GOAL AND POLICIES</b>		
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region's economy prospers by investing in all of its people.</i>	
<b>MPP-Ec-8:</b>	Promote economic activity and employment growth that creates widely shared prosperity and sustains a diversity of family wage jobs for the region's residents.	PSRC/City
<b>MPP-Ec-9:</b>	Ensure that the region has a high quality education system that is accessible to all of the region's residents.	PSRC/City
<b>MPP-Ec-10:</b>	Ensure that the region has high quality and accessible training programs that give people opportunities to learn, maintain, and upgrade skills necessary to meet the current and forecast needs of the regional and global economy.	PSRC/City
<b>MPP-Ec-11:</b>	Address unique obstacles and special needs — as well as recognize the special assets — of disadvantaged populations in improving the region's shared economic future.	PSRC/City
<b>MPP-Ec-12:</b>	Foster appropriate and targeted economic growth in distressed areas to create economic opportunity for residents of these areas.	PSRC, County, City ED 3.2(2-128), NERA is distressed as a result of noise generated by the Airport.
<b>MPP-Ec-13:</b>	Support the contributions of the region's culturally and ethnically diverse communities in helping the region continue to expand its international economy.	PSRC/City
<b>MPP-Ec-14:</b>	Sustain and enhance arts and cultural institutions to foster an active and vibrant community life in every part of the region.	PSRC/City
<b>PLACES GOAL AND POLICIES</b>		
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region's economy prospers through the creation of great central places, diverse communities, and high quality of life that integrates transportation, the economy, and the environment.</i>	
<b>MPP-Ec-15:</b>	Ensure that economic development sustains and respects the region's environmental quality.	All + City ED.5 (2-129)
<b>MPP-Ec-16:</b>	Utilize urban design strategies and approaches to ensure that changes to the built environment preserve and enhance the region's unique attributes and each community's distinctive identity in recognition of the economic value of sense of place.	City LU 1.6(2-6) SE 1.4(2-24) VQ.1, VQ 1.2, 1.5, NQ 1.1, 1.8(2-41) RC 1.1(2-46), DB.1 "Design" (2-47) DB 1.6, 1.8(2-49)
<b>MPP-Ec-17:</b>	Use incentives and investments to create a closer balance between jobs and housing, consistent with the regional growth strategy.	All + City Urban infill exemption, public investment in downtown amenities, buildings and transit.
<b>MPP-Ec-18:</b>	Concentrate a significant amount of economic growth in designated centers and connect them to each other in order to strengthen the region's economy and communities and to promote economic opportunity.	City DB 1.1, 1.21(2-49)
<b>MPP-Ec-19:</b>	Maximize the use of existing designated manufacturing and industrial centers by focusing appropriate types and amounts of employment growth in these areas and by protecting them from incompatible adjacent uses.	N/A

<b>MPP-Ec-20:</b>	Provide an adequate supply of housing with good access to employment centers to support job creation and economic growth.	City HS 1.3(2-64) Could use a more definitive policy statement regarding housing being encouraged in downtown/urban center.
<b>MPP-Ec-21:</b>	Recognize the need for employment in cities in the rural areas and promote compatible occupations (such as, but not limited to, tourism, cottage and home based businesses, and local services) that do not conflict with rural character and resource-based land uses.	N/A
<b>MPP-Ec-22:</b>	Support economic activity in rural and natural resource areas at a size and scale that is compatible with the long-term integrity and productivity of these lands.	N/A
	<b>MAINTENANCE, MANAGEMENT, AND SAFETY GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>As a high priority, the region will maintain, preserve, and operate its existing transportation system in a safe and usable state.</i>	
<b>MPP-T-1:</b>	Maintain and operate transportation systems to provide safe, efficient, and reliable movement of people, goods, and services.	City Trans goal (2-70) TR 1(2-70), TR 1.3(2-72), TR 1.5, 1.6.1(2-74), TR 4.1.1(2-77)
<b>MPP-T-2:</b>	Protect the investment in the existing system and lower overall life-cycle costs through effective maintenance and preservation programs.	City MM 3.11, 3.12(2-81), TR 8.2(2-82) nothing specific on maintenance of entire system.
<b>MPP-T-3:</b>	Reduce the need for new capital improvements through investments in operations, pricing programs, demand management strategies, and system management activities that improve the efficiency of the current system.	PSRC/County/City
<b>MPP-T-4:</b>	Improve safety of the transportation system and, in the long term, achieve the state's goal of zero deaths and disabling injuries.	All + City TR 2.1.1(2-74), it does not match state goal.
	<b>Sustainable Transportation</b>	
<b>MPP-T-5:</b>	Foster a less polluting system that reduces the negative effects of transportation infrastructure and operation on the climate and natural environment.	All + City TR 1.1.5 (2-70), TR 1.5(2-74) TR 6.1(2-82) TR 7.1.3(2-83) TR 7.2, 7.2.1(2-83)
<b>MPP-T-6:</b>	Seek the development and implementation of transportation modes and technologies that are energy-efficient and improve system performance.	All + City TR 4.1.5(2-77) MM 3.1, 3.2, 3.3(2-79), 3.6 (2-80) TR 7.1(2-82)
<b>MPP-T-7:</b>	Develop a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to human health.	All + City No direct goal or policy. MM 3.12(2-81) TL 3.1(2-82), TR 7.1.1(2-83)
<b>MPP-T-8:</b>	Protect the transportation system against disaster, develop prevention and recovery strategies, and plan for coordinated responses.	All + City No direct goal or policy.
	<b>SUPPORTING THE GROWTH STRATEGY GOAL AND</b>	

	<b>POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The future transportation system will support the regional growth strategy by focusing on connecting centers with a highly efficient multimodal transportation network.</i>	
	<b>Coordination</b>	
<b>MPP-T-9:</b>	Coordinate state, regional, and local planning efforts for transportation through the Puget Sound Regional Council to develop and operate a highly efficient, multimodal system that supports the regional growth strategy.	PSRC
<b>MPP-T-10:</b>	Promote coordination among transportation providers and local governments to ensure that joint- and mixed-use developments are designed in a way that improves overall mobility and accessibility to and within such development.	City TR 3, TR 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4,(2-76) TR 4.1(2-77), TR 4.2, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7(2-78)
	<b>Centers and Compact Communities</b>	
<b>MPP-T-11:</b>	Prioritize investments in transportation facilities and services in the urban growth area that support compact, pedestrian- and transit-oriented densities and development.	All + City Transportation Vision (2-70) TR 4.1.6 (2-77) TR 4.3(2-78) No direct policy on prioritizing pedestrian and transit oriented investments.
<b>MPP-T-12:</b>	Give regional funding priority to transportation improvements that serve regional growth centers and regional manufacturing and industrial centers.	PSRC
<b>MPP-T-13:</b>	Make transportation investments that improve economic and living conditions so that industries and skilled workers continue to be retained and attracted to the region.	PSRC
<b>MPP-T-14:</b>	Design, construct, and operate transportation facilities to serve all users safely and conveniently, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users, while accommodating the movement of freight and goods, as suitable to each facility's function and context as determined by the appropriate jurisdictions.	All + City TR 1(2-70) TR 1.3, 1.3.3(2-72) TR 1.5(2-74) MM.3, MM 3.1(2-78), MM 3.5(2-79)
<b>MPP-T-15:</b>	Improve local street patterns — including their design and how they are used — for walking, bicycling, and transit use to enhance communities, connectivity, and physical activity.	City MM 3.1, 3.5(2-79), MM 3.6, 3.9(2-79), MM 3.12, 3.13 TL 3.2 (2-82)
<b>MPP-T-16:</b>	Promote and incorporate bicycle and pedestrian travel as important modes of transportation by providing facilities and reliable connections.	City MM 3.1, 3.5(2-79), MM 3.12, 3.13 TR 7.1(2-82)
	<b>Freight</b>	
<b>MPP-T-17:</b>	Ensure the freight system meets the needs of: (1) global gateways, (2) producer needs within the state and region, and (3) regional and local distribution.	PSRC/County/City
<b>MPP-T-18:</b>	Maintain and improve the existing multimodal freight transportation system in the region to increase reliability and efficiency and to prevent degradation of freight mobility.	PSRC/County/City
<b>MPP-T-19:</b>	Coordinate regional planning with railroad capacity expansion plans and support capacity expansion that is compatible with state, regional, and local plans.	N/A

	<b>Context and Design</b>	
<b>MPP-T-20:</b>	Design transportation facilities to fit within the context of the built or natural environments in which they are located.	All + City TR 1.5(2-74), TR 7(2-82)
<b>MPP-T-21:</b>	Apply urban design principles in transportation programs and projects for regional growth centers and high-capacity transit station areas.	City MM 3.11 (2-81)
<b>MPP-T-22:</b>	Implement transportation programs and projects in ways that prevent or minimize negative impacts to low-income, minority, and special needs populations.	PSRC/County/City
	<b>GREATER OPTIONS AND MOBILITY GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	<i>The region will invest in transportation systems that offer greater options, mobility, and access in support of the regional growth strategy.</i>	
<b>MPP-T-23:</b>	Emphasize transportation investments that provide and encourage alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel and increase travel options, especially to and within centers and along corridors connecting centers.	All + City Nothing directly related to prioritizing transportation investments.
<b>MPP-T-24:</b>	Increase the proportion of trips made by transportation modes that are alternatives to driving alone.	All + City Nothing that specifically states increasing trips by other modes. MM 3.2, 3.3 (2-79) encourage provision of such facilities. TR 7.1.1(2-83)
<b>MPP-T-25:</b>	Ensure mobility choices for people with special transportation needs, including persons with disabilities, the elderly, the young, and low-income populations.	All + City MM 3.3 (2-79), TR.6 (2-82)
<b>MPP-T-26:</b>	Strategically expand capacity and increase efficiency of the transportation system to move goods, services, and people to and within the urban growth area. Focus on investments that produce the greatest net benefits to people and minimize the environmental impacts of transportation.	PSRC/County/City
<b>MPP-T-27:</b>	Improve key facilities connecting the region to national and world markets to support the economic vitality of the region.	PSRC/County
<b>MPP-T-28:</b>	Avoid construction of major roads and capacity expansion on existing roads in rural and resource areas. Where increased roadway capacity is warranted to support safe and efficient travel through rural areas, appropriate rural development regulations and strong commitments to access management should be in place prior to authorizing such capacity expansion in order to prevent unplanned growth in rural areas.	N/A
<b>MPP-T-29:</b>	Promote the preservation of existing rights-of-way for future high-capacity transit.	All + City No specific policy regarding high-capacity transit and preservation of right of ways. TR 4.5 (2-78)
<b>MPP-T-30:</b>	Encourage public and private sector partnerships to identify and implement improvements to personal mobility and freight movement.	All + City TR 4.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.5, 4.1.6 (2-77)
<b>MPP-T-31:</b>	Support effective management of existing air transportation capacity and ensure that future capacity needs are addressed in cooperation with responsible agencies, affected communities, and users.	All + City Not sure if policy is needed? May apply to county and regional planning agencies.

<b>MPP-T-32:</b>	Integrate transportation systems to make it easy for people and freight to move from one mode or technology to another.	City TR 4.3 (2-78), MM.3 (2-78)
<b>MPP-T-33:</b>	Promote transportation financing methods, such as user fees, tolls, and pricing, that sustain maintenance, preservation, and operation of facilities and reflect the costs imposed by users.	PSRC, County
	<b>SERVICES IN GERNERAL POLICIES</b>	
<b>MPP-PS-1:</b>	Protect and enhance the environment and public health and safety when providing services and facilities.	All + City No general statement on facilities. Some statements on transportation and storm water.
<b>MPP-PS-2:</b>	Time and phase services and facilities to guide growth and development in a manner that supports the regional vision.	All + City No direct policy connection to the regional vision.
<b>MPP-PS-3:</b>	Promote demand management and the conservation of services and facilities prior to developing new facilities.	N/A
<b>MPP-PS-4:</b>	Do not provide urban services in rural areas. Design services for limited access when they are needed to solve isolated health and sanitation problems, so as not to increase the development potential of the surrounding rural area.	N/A
<b>MPP-PS-5:</b>	Encourage the design of public facilities and utilities in rural areas to be at a size and scale appropriate to rural locations, so as not to increase development pressure.	N/A
<b>MPP-PS-6:</b>	Obtain urban services from cities or appropriate regional service providers, and encourage special service districts, including sewer, water, and fire districts, to consolidate or dissolve as a result.	City No policy encouraging consolidation or dissolution.
	<b>SERVICES BY TYPE GOAL AND POLICIES</b>	
<b>MPP-PS-7:</b>	Develop conservation measures to reduce solid waste and increase recycling.	All + City UT 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 (2-91) but no direct link to creating conservation measures.
<b>MPP-PS-8:</b>	Promote improved conservation and more efficient use of water, as well as the increased use of reclaimed water, to reduce wastewater generation and ensure water availability.	All + City No specific policy, see SU 3.2(2-132)
<b>MPP-PS-9:</b>	Serve new development within the urban growth area with sanitary sewer systems or fit it with dry sewers in anticipation of connection to the sewer system. Alternative technology to sewers should only be considered when it can be shown to produce treatment at standards that are equal to or better than the sewer system and where a long-term maintenance plan is in place.	All + City UT 3.1, 3.2, 3.3(2-90)
<b>MPP-PS-10:</b>	Replace failing septic systems within the urban growth area with sanitary sewers or alternative technology that is comparable or better.	All + City No mention of replacing failing septic systems.
<b>MPP-PS-11:</b>	Use innovative and state-of-the-art design and techniques when replacing septic tanks to restore and improve environmental quality.	N/A
<b>MPP-PS-12:</b>	Promote the use of renewable energy resources to meet the region's energy needs.	All + City No mention of renewable resources.
<b>MPP-PS-13:</b>	Reduce the rate of energy consumption through conservation and alternative energy forms to extend the life of existing facilities and infrastructure.	All + City SU.3 (2-131) encourages

		conservation. No real connection to alternative energy forms and/or existing facilities.
<b>MPP-PS-14:</b>	Plan for the provision of telecommunication infrastructure to serve growth and development in a manner that is consistent with the regional vision and friendly to the environment.	All + City UT 1.8, 1.11 (2-89)
<b>MPP-PS-15:</b>	Coordinate, design, and plan for public safety services and programs.	All + City No specific policy.
<b>MPP-PS-16:</b>	Encourage health and human services facilities to locate near centers and transit for efficient accessibility to service delivery.	All + City No specific policy.
<b>Goal:</b>	<b><i>Residents of the region will have access to high quality drinking water that meets or is better than federal and state requirements.</i></b>	
<b>MPP-PS-17:</b>	Identify and develop additional water supply sources to meet the region's long-term water needs, recognizing the potential impacts on water supply from climate change and fisheries protection.	N/A
<b>MPP-PS-18:</b>	Promote coordination among local and tribal governments and water providers and suppliers to meet long-term water needs in the region in a manner that supports the region's growth strategy.	N/A
<b>MPP-PS-19:</b>	Reduce the per capita rate of water consumption through conservation, efficiency, reclamation, and reuse.	All + City UT 3.5 (2-90) not much on conservation, reclamation and reuse.
<b>MPP-PS-20:</b>	Protect the source of the water supply to meet the needs for both human consumption and for environmental balance.	N/A
	<b>SITING FACILITIES POLICIES</b>	
<b>MPP-PS-21:</b>	Site schools, institutions, and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plans.	PSRC/County/City Can control through zoning.
<b>MPP-PS-22:</b>	Locate schools, institutions, and other community facilities serving rural residents in neighboring cities and towns and design these facilities in keeping with the size and scale of the local community.	N/A
<b>MPP-PS-23:</b>	Site or expand regional capital facilities in a manner that (1) reduces adverse social, environmental, and economic impacts on the host community, (2) equitably balances the location of new facilities, and (3) addresses regional planning objectives.	All + City EPF 2.2, 2.3(2-124) but no mention of economic impacts.
<b>MPP-PS-24:</b>	Do not locate regional capital facilities outside the urban growth area unless it is demonstrated that a non-urban site is the most appropriate location for such a facility.	N/A
	<b>LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICES ACTIONS</b>	
	<b>Special Service Districts Planning: PS-Action-5</b> Counties, in their review of special service districts' plans, will identify any inconsistencies with local growth management goals and objectives, as well as the regional vision. As part of this review, counties, in consultation with pertinent cities, will work with special service districts to provide guidance for facilities and service planning to ensure that districts develop long-range plans that implement the regional vision.  • Short-term \ MPP-PS-4 through 6, 21 through 24	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results and Products: <i>(1) consistency report (or similar) to special districts, (2) recommendations and examples to districts concerning the regional vision</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Facilities Siting and Design: PS-Action-6</b> Counties and cities will collaborate with special service districts to review district location and design criteria for new schools, libraries, and other such public facilities — to ensure that growth management goals and the regional vision are addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term \ MPP-PS-21 through 24</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results and Products: <i>report (or similar) and recommendations on siting and design criteria</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Facilities Location: PS-Action-7</b> Counties and cities will collaborate with special service districts to identify opportunities for co-location of facilities and services — such as parks adjacent to schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term \ MPP-PS-4 through 6, 21 through 24</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results and Products: <i>recommendations to districts and local governments for facility siting criteria</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Coordinated Planning and Programming for Facilities: PS-Action-8</b> Counties and cities will submit a consistency assessment of their capital facilities programming processes to the Regional Council as part of the Policy and Plan Review process. This assessment should address consistency of capital improvement programs and facility plans with adopted growth management objectives, the comprehensive plan, and the regional vision. The Puget Sound Regional Council will provide guidance and assistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term, ongoing \ MPP-PS-1 through, 3, 23</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results and Products: <i>Consistency Assessment Report as part of material submitted for review of local plans</i></li> </ul>	
--	---	--