



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
WEDNESDAY, February 5, 2014
City Council Chambers - Justice and Municipal Center at 5:30 PM

MEMBERS

Grant Sulham
Winona Jacobsen
Brad Doll
Dennis Poulsen
David Baus
Debbie Strous-Boyd

CITY STAFF

Jason Sullivan, Senior Planner
Debbie McDonald, Planning Commission Clerk

- I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL and NEXT MEETING POLL (February 19, 2014)**
- II. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
- IV. PUBLIC HEARING (None)**
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONCERNS**
- VI. OLD/CONTINUING BUSINESS**
- VII. NEW BUSINESS**
 - 1. 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update – Consistency Report
- VIII. FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER**
 - 1. Correspondence
 - 2. Staff Comments
 - 3. Commissioner Comments
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Next meeting: February 19, 2014



Community Development Department

Planning Commission Minutes

December 11, 2013 Regular Scheduled Meeting
City of Bonney Lake Council Chambers

DRAFTED

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 P.M.

Planning Commission Present

Grant Sulham, **Chair**
L. Winona Jacobsen, **Vice-Chair**
Brandon Frederick
Richards Rawlings
Brad Doll
Dennis Poulsen
Dave Baus

City Staff Present

Jason Sullivan, Senior Planner
Debbie McDonald, Commission Clerk

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DOLL AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BAUS TO CANCEL THE JANUARY 1, 2014 AND JANUARY 15, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS.

MOTION APPROVED 6-0

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER RAWLINGS AND SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIR JACOBSEN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 11, 2013 MEETING.

MOTION APPROVED 6-0

II. PUBLIC HEARING: NONE

III. PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONCERNS: NONE

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

2014 City Council and Planning Commission Joint Meeting

Chair Sulham presented the topics for the City Council Joint Meeting. He and Mr. Sullivan attended the City Council meeting to present the SMP (Shoreline Master Plan).

Mr. Sullivan commented that some City Councilmembers were questioning the SMP.

Chair Sulham commented that a Councilmember was worried about the streamline setbacks and limiting where a new house can be built. He mentioned that if you had already built your house you would not want someone coming in and building a new home that blocks your views.

Vice-Chair Jacobsen asked if City Council takes out the streamline setbacks, would Commissioners be able to comment.

Mr. Sullivan responded it would be City Councils decision, however he would recommend a Public Hearing or at least notifying shoreline homeowners.

Vice-Chair Jacobsen would like to talk about the Arts Commission at the joint meeting. The Mayor talked about forming an Arts Commission and would like Planning Commisison to give him a little nudge.

Commissioner Baus also would like to address traffic and marijuana dispensaries.

Mr. Sullivan responded they can add anything to the joint meeting agenda. Traffic will be addressed in the Comp Plan update.

Commissioner Frederick suggested pushing traffic towards the top, can already see an increase in traffic.

Mr. Sullivan commented that the Tahelah development is locked in to traffic mitigation until they get into Phase II of the development.

Commissioner Baus would like to discuss traffic regarding all City development.

Commissioner Poulsen would like to see what City Council is thinking.

2014-2015 Work Plan

Mr. Sullivan discussed what the Planning Commission will be working on in 2014, the Comp Plan will take up most of the Commissioners time. He will add to the work plan the Planning Commission bylaws and public hearing rules.

V. **OLD/CONTINUING BUSINESS:** NONE

VI. **FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER:**

Correspondence – NONE

Staff Comments – Mr. Sullivan wanted to thank Commissioner Rawlings and Commissioner Fredrick for their service on the Planning Commission. Unfortunately this will be their last Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Rawlings commented it has been fun working with this group and learning about parliamentary procedures.

Commissioner Fredrick responded it has been a pleasure working on the Planning Commission.

Vice-Chair Jacobsen commented she will miss them both.

Commissioner Comments – NONE

VI. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION WAS MADE BY VICE-CHAIR JACOBSEN AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FREDERICK TO ADJOURN.

MOTION APPROVED 6-0

The meeting ended at 6:15 P.M.

Debbie McDonald, Planning Commission Clerk



DRAFT

BONNEY LAKE 2035

2015 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update

DRAFT CONSISTENCY REPORT

Jason Sullivan
Senior Planner
Community Development Department

DRAFT

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Comprehensive Plan Elements	1
2.1 Land Use	1
2.2 Housing	5
2.3 Transportation	8
2.4 Public Facilities and Services	9
2.5 Environmental Conservation	14
2.6 Shoreline	18
2.7 Community Health	18
2.8 Cultural Resources and Heritage	19
3.0 Development Regulations	19
3.1 Critical Area Regulations	19
3.2 Shoreline Master Program	20
3.3 Zoning Code	21
3.4 Subdivision Code	22
3.5 Concurrency, Impact Fees, and Transportation Demand Management (TMD)	22
3.6 Essential Public Facilities	23
3.7 Project review process	24
3.8 General Provisions	25



DRAFT

This page intentionally left blank

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of a comprehensive plan is to shape a jurisdiction's physical development over a 20-year period, guide growth consistent with the community's values, and ensure current and future residents and businesses are supported by necessary public facilities and services. The City of Bonney Lake is required to review and, if needed, update its comprehensive plan and development regulations by June 30, 2015 pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130. This periodic review and update is necessary to ensure compliance with amendments to the Growth Management Act (GMA) since the last update in 2006, other relevant state laws, local needs, and new data.

Additionally, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) adopted new multi-county planning policies (MPPs) in 2008 as part of *Vision 2040*. These policies apply to King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within these counties. Pierce County amended the county-wide planning policies (CPPs) to be consistent with and implement the MPPs. The City of Bonney Lake must now ensure that the Bonney Lake Comprehensive Plan (BLCP) is consistent with both the MPPs and CPPs.

This document is intended to identify all mandatory changes that the City must make to the BLCP in order to ensure consistency with applicable state laws, MPPs, and CPPs. This report does not address other optional changes that the City may elect to make to the BLCP. These optional changes are expected to be identified and discussed through a public review process in 2014. Additional information about the update process can be found at the City's project website: www.citybonneylake.org/planning/complanupdates.

2.0 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENTS

2.1 LAND USE

Overview

The primary function of a land use element is to demonstrate that cities have planned for the population growth allocated to a city by the county government consistent with projections supplied by the Office of Financial Management (OFM) to each county and *Vision 2040*.¹ The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) also assigned employment targets for the counties within the central Puget Sound Region which were sub-regionally allocated to each of the cities within that county. Pierce County adopted Ordinance No. 2011-36s establishing a 2030 Population Target of 21,640, a 2030 Housing Target of 8,498, and a 2030 Employment Target of 5,448 for Bonney Lake.

Under the GMA, cities have an affirmative duty to accommodate the growth that is allocated to them by the county. This duty means that the City's comprehensive plan must include a Future

¹ In *City of Edmonds and City of Lynnwood v. Snohomish County*, the CPSGMHB concluded, "... that the County does have the authority to allocate population and employment to the cities rather than just to urban growth areas. Counties are required to take OFM's county-wide population forecasts and to allocate them among both the incorporated and unincorporated portions of urban growth areas and the non-urban growth areas within the county." (CPSGMHB Case No 93-3-0005 Final Order and Decision. October 4, 1993. Pg.

Land Use Map (FLUM)² that designates sufficient land use densities and intensities to accommodate the population and employment targets within the current incorporated and unincorporated Bonney Lake Urban Growth Area (BLUGA) over the mandatory 20 year planning horizon.³

The growth targets established by Pierce County are a floor not a ceiling; the City can plan for a higher number of people, jobs, and housing. However, if the City adopts higher growth targets, the higher targets cannot be used to justify an enlargement of the BLUGA as the City is not required to handle that additional population or employment growth.⁴

In addition to illustrating the general distribution of land uses within the BLUGA, the *Revised Code of Washington* (RCW) 36.70A.160 specifically requires the City to identify open space corridors within the incorporated and unincorporated portions of the BLUGA that are useful for recreation, wildlife habitat, trails, and the connection of critical areas.⁵ The Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) has determined that in order for a city to meet the requirements of RCW 36.70A.160, a city must include a map that clearly and conspicuously identifies open space corridors and cannot rely on areas shown on various maps within a comprehensive plan that could be considered to be open space corridors.⁶ The CPSGMHB has also determined that the while local jurisdiction are required to identify open space corridors there is not a requirement to prepare development regulations to protect open space corridors identified under RCW 36.70A.160.⁷ Regulation of property designated as open space would be based on the adopted land use designation and corresponding zoning regulations.

The land use element includes the vision of how a community will develop over the next twenty years. The GMA encourages development in urban areas⁸, reduction in the conversion of undeveloped lands into low-density sprawling development⁹, and the promotion of a variety of

² A FLUM illustrates the physical distribution of various land uses to demonstrate where development is envisioned occur given community and environmental features, employment and population growth targets, regional and county planning policies, and needed capital facilities. While the FLUM is the community's visual guide to future planning illustrating what the community wants to have happen; it is not a prediction.

³ *Hensley v. City of Woodinville*, CPSGMHB Case No. 96-3-0031, Final Decision and Order, (Feb. 25, 1997) pgs. 8-9.

⁴ In *Cities of Tacoma, Puyallup, Milton, Sumner v. Pierce County*, the CPSGMHB concluded that, "[A]lthough a county has discretion in determining the physical size of a UGA, it does not have discretion in how much population it should plan for. OFM's twenty-year population projection is the exclusive number to use when designating UGAs." (CPSGMHB Case No 94-3-0001 Final Decision and Order. July 5, 1994. Pg. 26)

⁵ RCW 36.70A.030 defines Critical areas as (a) Wetlands; (b) areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water; (c) fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas; (d) frequently flooded areas; and (e) geologically hazardous areas. The GMA does not include a definition of open space," "recreation," "trails" or "wildlife habitat."

⁶ *Agriculture for Tomorrow v. City of Arlington* (AFT), CPSGMHB Case No. 95-3-0056, Final Decision and Order, (Feb. 13, 1996)

⁷ *LMI/Chevron v. Town of Woodway*, (LMI/Chevron) CPSGMHB Case No. 98-3-0012, Final Decision and Order, (Jan. 8, 1999)

⁸ RCW 36.70A.020(1)

⁹ RCW 36.70A.020(2)

residential densities and housing types.¹⁰ Commonly people misinterpret these goals to mean that communities must increase the density throughout an entire community. However, “[c]ompact urban development’ does not require that the urban environment be exclusively a built environment, nor that the built environment be of a homogenous intensity, form, or character.”¹¹ Both the MPPs and CPPs direct local jurisdiction to balance the need to provide density within communities to handle future population growth and the preservation of existing neighborhoods and community character.¹² By creating nodes of more intense mixed used development within suburban communities, capacity can be provided for future development at densities that support transit without the need to increase the density in all of a city’s residential zones. This approach looks at the collective effect of the City’s density standards and allows for a consideration of a city’s local circumstance.¹³ The question is not how dense should a community make its neighborhoods, but where is it appropriate to provide higher densities to support future population growth?

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws¹⁴, MPPs¹⁵, CPPs¹⁶, the Department of Commerce’s *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*¹⁷ and PSRC’s *Reporting Tool*¹⁸ the City must make the following modifications to the BLCP – Land Use Element:

- *Update the FLUM*: Revise the FLUM to reflect the affiliation of a portion of the Comprehensive Urban Growth Area (CUGA) with the BLUGA.

¹⁰ RCW 36.70A.020(4)

¹¹ *Association of Rural Residents v. Kitsap County*, Final Decision and Order. CPSGMHB Case Number 93-3-0010. June 3, 1994. Pg. 16

¹² In *City of Snoqualmie v. King County*, the CPSGMHB noted that, “[E]very community has characteristics that are the product of its unique physical setting and human history. The future to which a community aspires could build upon those existing characteristics or consciously impose a thematic affectation. In either case, defining community character and selecting design strategies for enhancing or changing that character are local prerogatives.” (CPSGMHB Case No 92-3-0004 Final Decision and Order. March 1, 1993. Fn. 20 Pg. 37)

¹³ In *Suquamish Tribe, et al v. Kitsap County*, the CPSGMHB stated that in determining, “future development capacity the Guidelines (Chapter 365-196 WAC) advise not looking solely to the minimum density in each zone, but to the ‘collective effect of all development regulations.’” (CPSGMHB Case No. 07-3-0019c [2011 Remand]. Final Decision and Order on Remand. August 31, 2011. Pgs. 55-56.)

¹⁴ RCW 36.70A.020, RCW 36.70A.070(1), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.110(6), RCW 36.70A.160, RCW 36.70A.210, RCW 36.70A.215, RCW 43.62.035, RCW 47.80.023(3), WAC 365-196-400(2)(d), WAC 365-196-405, WAC 365-196-335, WAC 468-86-150(1)(c).

¹⁵ MPP-DP-2, MPP-DP-3, MPP-DP-4, MPP-G-3, MPP-DP-11, MPP-DP-13, MPP-DP-14, MPP-DP-15, MPP-DP-33, MPP-DP-34, MPP-DP-35, MPP-DP-43, MPP-DP-45, MPP-DP-29, MPP-En-8, and MPP-En-

¹⁶ Pierce County Ordinance 2011-36s, CPP-UGA-2.1.2, CPP-UGA-2.1.3, CPP-AT-2.3, CPP-BL-3, CPP-BL-4, CPP-BL-6, CPP-BL-7, CPP-UGA-2.1.1, CPP-UGA-2.7, CPP-UGA-8, CPP-CU-1, CPP-HW-1.1, CPP-UGA-6, CPP-UGA-7, CPP-UGA-10, CPP-UGA-11, CPP-UGA-12, CPP-Env-9 through CPP-Env-13, and CPP-Env-15

¹⁷ Commerce 1, Commerce 7.a,

¹⁸ PSRC Part 1 – Development Patterns, PSRC Part 1 – The Environment (Earth and Habitat, PSRC Part 1 – Transportation – Growth Management Requirements, PSRC Part 2 – Population and Employment Growth, and PSRC Part 2 – Monitoring

- *Update out of date growth targets:* The population, housing, and employment projections provided in the Land Use Element – Figure 3-3 were established in 2002 prior to the establishment of the 2030 sub-regional allocations in 2011. The population projections are required to be updated and must be consistent with Pierce County Ordinance No. 2011-36s Table 1 which establishes the current sub-regional 2030 population allocation for the City of Bonney Lake.
- *Correct inconsistent population projections:* Different population projections were identified in the BLCP – Land Use, Parks, Capital Facilities, and Transportation Elements. For instance, the Transportation Element is based on a 2025 population of 30,840 as compared to the more conservative 2020 population of 18,830 established in the Land Use Element – a significant deviation even given the slight difference in planning horizon. The Transportation Element is also based on an employment capacity of 7,530 jobs by 2025 for the traffic forecast while the Land Use Element documents an employment capacity of 3,147 jobs – this again is a significant deviation.
- *Update buildable lands Inventory:* The City's last buildable lands inventory was completed in 2007 and must be update again as part of the periodic update to determine the availability of vacant and underdeveloped lands within the City. The updated inventory is used to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the City's adopted growth targets. The current development capacity numbers were based on the original 2002 *Pierce County Buildable Lands Report*, which is now two editors out of date: the current 2007 *Pierce County Buildable Lands Report* and the 2013 *Pierce County Buildable Lands Report* (currently being prepared).
- *Update out of date employment targets:* The BLCP – Land Use Element does not include current employment figures and does not address the employment growth targets established for the City by Pierce County Ordinance No. 2011-36s.
- *Establish implementation strategies and performance measures:* The BLCP – Land Use Element does not provide strategies to implement the current land use polices and performance measures to demonstrate whether or not the City is achieving the adopted land use goals. The City will need to establish specific strategies that:
 - Identify how the City will preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods, protect natural visual resources, create vibrant compacted mixed-use centers that support transit use, and ensure a high degree of connectivity in the street network. The City must also develop a set of performance measures to determine if the implementation strategies have been successful.
 - Identify how the City will protect and preserve open space.
 - Develop performance measures to determine if the City is achieving the adopted land use goals and policies.

- *Establish policies regarding street interconnectivity and transit use:* The BLCPP – Land Use Element lacks policies related to the role that land use plays in ensuring street connectivity and improving transit ridership. The City will need to add specific policies to guide development in a manner that will facilitate an interconnected street grid and support the expansion of transit.
- *Identify open space corridors:* The City must prepare and adopt a map that clearly and conspicuously identifies open space corridors within the City. In the past, the City has pointed to its critical areas and parks mapping to comply with this requirement. However, this approach does not fulfill the requirements of RCW 36.70A.160 as determined by the CPSGMHB.
- *Establish policies to encourage the recreational use of open space:* The CPPs require that the City develop policies to allow for the recreational use of open spaces within the City; when such uses will not impact the function and values of critical areas.

2.2 HOUSING

Overview

In order to comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070 and RCW 36.70A.215, the City must inventory the current housing stock and identify the remaining housing capacity within the incorporated and unincorporated BLUGA.

The purpose of the inventory and the capacity analysis is to determine if there is sufficient capacity for the development of housing that is accessible to all economic segments of the population and sufficient to accommodate the projected population growth.¹⁹ The capacity in the BLCPP – Housing Element must be consistent with the capacity provided in the Buildable Lands Report.

The CPSGMHB has concluded that the City is not required to use a “grocery store type of inventory of goods in stock” by individually itemizing every residential unit in the City, but is required to determine the nature of housing in the City.²⁰ The CPSGMHB in *Children's Alliance, et al v. City of Bellevue*, (Children's) explained the two prongs of this requirement: the first is “densities” which refers to the number of dwelling units or people within a given geographic unit and the second is “housing types” which refers to the physical form of residential structures and also to the specific housing needs in addition to the traditional single family (e.g. government-assisted housing, housing for low income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities). The CPSGMHB went on to reason in *Children's* that the GMA contains a number of specific references that address housing and residential land uses, some of them more explicit and directive than others but when read together, there is a legislatively preferred residential landscape that, compared with the past, will be less homogeneous, more diverse, more compact, and better furnished with facilities and services to support the needs of the changing residential population.

¹⁹ WAC 365-196-410(2)(i)

²⁰ *Buckles, et al v. King County, et al.* CPSGMHB Case No. 96-3-0022c, Final Decision and Order, (November 12, 1996)

The goal of the inventory is to gauge the nature and availability of housing within the community.²¹ The Department of Commerce has recommended that this inventory identify the amount of various types of housing, median sale/rental prices, and the types of housing (e.g. group homes, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, senior housing, and government-assisted housing).²²

In addition to the inventory and capacity analysis, the City is directed to adopt goals and policies with the objective of ensuring neighborhood vitality and character. The CPSGMHB in *Benaroya, et al v. City of Redmond*, determined that this requirement is neither a mandate, nor an excuse, to freeze neighborhood densities at their pre-GMA levels but to ensure that growth can be accommodated in such a way as to ensure neighborhood vitality and character.²³ The primary goal is to ensure that existing residential areas are protected and preserved by adopting policies and strategies to prevent or mitigate adverse impacts associated with incompatible land uses and higher densities.

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws²⁴, MPPs²⁵, CPPs²⁶, the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*²⁷ and PSRC's *Reporting Tool*²⁸ the City must make the following modifications to the BLCP – Housing Element:

- *Update out of date inventory:* The current inventory provided in the BLCP – Housing Element Tables 4-1 through Table 4-4 (Pgs. 4-2 – 4-3) includes much of the information recommended by the Department of Commerce; however, the inventory is based on the 2000 census and is significantly out of date. The BLCP – Housing Element Tables 4-1 through Table 4-4 (Pgs. 4-2 – 4-3) will need to be updated to reflect changes in the City since 2000 and incorporate updated information available following the 2010 census.
- *Add housing capacity information:* The BLCP – Housing Element does not include housing capacity information. Housing capacity numbers are provided in the BLCP – Land Use Element – Figure 3-2; however, these housing projections are based on the original 2002 *Pierce County Buildable Lands Report*, which is now two editions out of date. A table providing the remaining housing capacity will be added to the BLCP – Housing Element which will be consistent with the 2013 *Pierce County Buildable Lands Report*. This table will provide housing capacity for each type of residential units (e.g. single family, duplex, apartments, etc.).

²¹ WAC 365-196-410(2)(b)(i)

²² WAC 365-196-410(2)(b)(ii) – WAC 365-196-410(2)(b)(iv)

²³ *Benaroya, et al v. City of Redmond*. CPSGMHB Case No. 95-3-0072c. Final Decision and Order. November 12, 1996. Pg. 17.

²⁴ RCW 36.70A.070(2), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.210, and WAC 365-196-410.

²⁵ MPP-H-1 through MPP-H-5, MPP-H-7 through MPP-H-9, H-Action-1, and H-Action-2.

²⁶ CWPP-BL-5 CWPP-EC-1.5 CWPP-AH-1, CWPP-AH-3, CWPP-AH-5, CWPP-AH-6, CWPP-AH-7, and CWPP-AH-8.

²⁷ Commerce 2, Commerce 7.a,

²⁸ PSRC Part 1 – Housing, PSRC Part 2 – Population and Employment Growth, and PSRC Part 2 – Monitoring.

- *Address insufficient housing capacity:* As of 2006, the City had a capacity for an additional 2,061 housing units²⁹; however, the City's is required to provide capacity for an additional 2,670 housing units by 2030³⁰. Therefore, there is a deficiency of approximately 609 units that must be addressed as part of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.
- *Add policies regarding the protection of existing neighborhoods:* The BLCP does not contain policies or goals related to the need to protect existing residential neighborhoods from the adverse impacts of adjacent land uses.
- *Establish implementation strategies and performance measures:* The BLCP – Housing Element does not provide strategies to implement the goals of preserving the existing housing stock, protecting existing residential neighborhoods, and providing housing diversity. The Element also does not include performance measures to demonstrate whether or not the City is achieving these goals. The City will need to establish specific strategies and performance measures to determine if the City is achieving its mandates under the GMA.
- *Address comments from PSRC's Certification Report:* PSRC's *Plan Review Report And Certification Recommendation For the City Of Bonney Lake 2006 Comprehensive Plan* (October 31, 2013) expressed the following concerns that must be addressed by the City as part of the update:
 - Policy 4-3a in the Housing Element reads: "Continue zoning at least as much land for apartments, manufactured housing, duplexes, small-lot developments, and accessory dwelling units as the City does currently." Policy 4-3a appears to work against the spirit of the City's other housing policies as contained in the land use element and housing elements by implying that the current provision of affordable housing and multi-family housing is adequate to meet the population's needs through the plan horizon, even though the City's discussion of housing affordability clearly demonstrates a need for additional affordable housing.
 - Secondly, it was unclear if the housing capacity, as referenced in the land use element, is based upon the zoning designations shown in the future land use map, or if zoning has changed substantially since the housing capacity analysis was performed. This raises questions about the plan's internal consistency. At a minimum, the city should update the estimated housing capacity in the land use element. Likewise, RCW 36.70A.070(2) requires that the housing element "identifies sufficient land for housing... and makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs." The city's housing capacity does not appear to identify sufficient housing to meet the city's own projected demand. This issue needs further attention when the city next updates its plan.

²⁹ *Buildable Lands Report: A Monitoring and Evaluation Analysis of Urban Growth Capacity for Pierce County and its Cities and Towns.* Table 8. Pierce County. September 1, 2007. Pg. 39.

³⁰ Pierce County Ordinance No. 2011-36s – Exhibit A – Table 2

2.3 TRANSPORTATION

Overview

While the BLCP - Transportation Element, which consist of the *City of Bonney Lake 2006 Transportation Plan* and the *Bonney Lake Non-Motorized Transportation Plan Lake*, was completed prior to the adoption of VISION 2040 (2008) and Transportation 2040 (2014), the plan went a long way in addressing many of the provision now in place. However, there are some significant issues with the current element which is requiring the City to a completely re-write the Element to bring it into full compliance with GMA, the MPPs, and the CPPs.

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws³¹, MPPs³², CPPs³³, the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*³⁴ and PSRC's *Reporting Tool*³⁵ the City must make the following modifications to the BLCP – Transportation Element:

- *Address Inconsistent Land Assumptions:* The GMA requires that comprehensive plans be internally consistent. For transportation planning, it specifically requires that the land use assumptions used in traffic forecasts be consistent with those found in the land use element.

In the 2006 update to the city's transportation element, inconsistent land use assumptions were applied in the development of the city's traffic forecast. For instance, the transportation element uses a 10,419 citywide housing unit assumption in 2025, compared to the 6,351 needed to accommodate a more conservative rate of 18,830 people by 2022—a significant deviation even given the slight difference in planning horizon.

The transportation element also uses 7,530 jobs by 2025 for the traffic forecast while the land use element documents a total of 3,147 jobs—this again is a significant deviation. It also should be noted that the 7,530 jobs exceed the capacity for 5,478 jobs documented for employment within the land use element.

- *Update out of date transportation facility inventory:* Both the *City of Bonney Lake 2006 Transportation Plan* and the *Bonney Lake Non-Motorized Transportation Plan* includes a thorough inventory of motorized and non-motorized facilities within the City. However, this inventory is out of date as it was completed in 2006 and 2005, respectively.

³¹ RCW 35.77.101, RCW 36.70A.070(6), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.210, and WAC 365-196-430.

³² MPP-G-1, MPP-G-4, MPP-G-5, MPP-EN-7, MPP-EN-19, MPP-EN-23, MPP-DP-7, MPP-DP-10, MPP-DP-13, MPP-DP-17, MPP-DP-27, MPP-DP-40, MPP-DP-42 through MPP-DP-44, MPP-DP-54 through MPP-DP-56, MPP-H-6, MPP-EC-6 MPP-T-1 through MPP-T-33.

³³ CPP-CU-1, CPP-CU-4, CPP-HW-1, CPP-HW-3, CPP-HW-4, CPP-Env-29 through CPP-Env-31 CPP-Tr-1 through CPP-Tr-20, CPP-UGA-5, CPP-UGA-6, and CPP-UGA-12.

³⁴ Commerce 5, Commerce 7.a,

³⁵ PSRC Part 1 – Development Patterns – Orderly Development (Regional Design), PSRC Part 1 – Transportation – Vision 2040 and Transportation 2040, PSRC Part 2 – Transportation Provisions, and PSRC Part 2 – Monitoring.

- *Update out of date and inconsistent Level of Service (LOS) projections:* The City of Bonney Lake has adopted LOS standards based on the methodologies established in the Highway Capacity Manual. The LOS standards are based on PM peak hour traffic flow and delay at intersections, which is contingent upon a number of factors, including vehicle volume, number of lanes, turn lanes, and signal timing. The analysis also includes a vehicle to capacity ratio for roadways. The future LOS for required intersections was established in 2005 and was based on the inconsistent land use assumptions which need to be corrected to ensure that the City has sufficient capacity for future development.
- *Establish Multi-Modal LOS Standards:* The City is required to develop LOS standards for pedestrians and bicycles pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070(b), RCW 36.70A.108, MPP-DP-54 through MPP-56, and CPPs-Tr-5. These standards should consider the immediate facility (i.e., sidewalk, bike lane), the right-of-way corridor (i.e., roadway crossings, signals, vehicular traffic characteristics), and adjacent land use (i.e., mix of uses, density, visual characteristics).

2.4 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

In order to streamline the BLCF, the current BLCF – Parks Element, Utilities Element, and Capital Facilities Element will be combined into one element entitled the “Public Facilities and Services Element” given the highly interrelated nature of these three elements. This approach is authorized by WAC 365-196-415(2)(a)(iii).

Overview

The GMA creates an affirmative duty for cities to ensure that, over the twenty-year life of the plan, needed capital facilities and public services will be available and provided throughout the jurisdiction’s UGA.³⁶ The first step in ensuring that there is sufficient capital facilities is compiling an inventory of the existing facilities and services: parks and recreation facilities, domestic water supply systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, and schools.³⁷ This inventory must include all publicly owned capital facilities regardless of whether or not the facilities is owned by the City of Bonney Lake.³⁸ As part of the inventory, the City is required to identify lands that are useful for public purposes and develop a prioritized list of lands to be acquired with an associated general timetable for acquisition.³⁹ While the GMA requires that those lands useful for public purposes be identified as part of the adopted comprehensive plan, it neither specifies the means of identification (e.g. mapping or a narrative describing identified lands) nor requires the City to show site-specific locations of lands as “useful for public purposes” with precision.⁴⁰

The adequacy of public facilities and services is determine by the establishment of level of service (LOS) standards for each type of facility or service. All facilities and services included in the BLCF

³⁶ *Hensley v. City of Woodinville.* Final Decision and Order. Case Number CPSGMHB 96-3-0031. 1997 Pg. 9

³⁷ *West Seattle Defense Fund and Neighborhood Rights Campaign v. City of Seattle.* Final Decision and Order. Case Number 94-3-0016. 1995 Pg. 78

³⁸ RCW 36.70A.070(3)(a)

³⁹ RCW 36.70A.150

⁴⁰ *Sky Valley, et al v. Snohomish County, et al.* Final Decision and Order. CPSGMHB Case Number 95-3-0068c. March 3, 1996. Pg. 59.

– Public Facilities and Services Element must have a minimum LOS clearly labeled as such (i.e., not “guidelines” or “criteria”) and must explicitly state which of the listed capital facilities are determined to be “necessary for development” and each of the facilities so designated must have either a “concurrency mechanism” or an “adequacy mechanism” to trigger appropriate reassessment if service falls below the baseline minimum standard.⁴¹

In addition to construction of new capital facilities required to meet the adopted to LOS, maintenance of existing capital facilities is also crucial to meeting the requirement to address “existing needs” established by RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e) as explained by the CPSGMHB:

The Board holds that the phrase “existing needs” refers not only to the construction of new or expanded capital facilities that can be currently identified as needed, but also the maintenance of existing capital facilities. As a matter of sound public policy, a city or county should not plan for additional growth and the associated additional capital facilities that may be necessary to serve that growth, unless it can adequately maintain its existing capital facilities. However, determining the appropriate level of maintenance for capital facilities falls within the local government’s discretion. Cities and counties do not have to construct new or expand old capital facilities, or even improve their maintenance efforts. Instead, they can make the policy choice to reduce expectations by adopting lower levels of service.⁴²

While the primary goal of the Public Facilities and Services Element is to ensure that development is adequately served by public facilities and services,⁴³ conservation is key to meeting many of our needs today and is a vital to ensure that resources will be there for future generations.⁴⁴ Along with conservation, collaborating and coordinating with adjacent jurisdictions and special purpose districts is critical to ensuring the adequacy of public facilities and services.

The City is required to provide a six year financing plan which includes the source of the public funds for those public facilities and services with an adopted LOS.⁴⁵ The GMA in RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e) also requires the reassessment of the land use element, “if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs to ensure the land use element, capital facilities element, and financing plan within the capital facilities element are coordinated and consistent.”

Additionally, in order to maintain eligible for grants from the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB), the BLCP – Public Facilities and Services Element must also meet the requirements for a parks plan which also requires an inventory of existing park and recreation facilities.⁴⁶ The City must also provide park objectives that are supported by a demands and needs assessment

⁴¹ *Jody L. McVittie v. Snohomish County*. Final Decision and Order. Case Number CPSGMHB 01-3-0002. 2001 Pg. 15

⁴² *West Seattle Defense Fund v. City of Seattle*. Final Decision and Order. CPSGMHB Case number 94-3-0016c (1995) Pg. 36

⁴³ RCW 36.70A.050(12)

⁴⁴ Puget Sound Regional Council. *Vision 2040*. December 2009. Pg. 89

⁴⁵ RCW 36.70A.070(3)(d).

⁴⁶ Washington State Recreation and Conservation Funding Board. (2011) *Manual 2: Planning Policies and Guidelines*. (pg. 4 and 10)

in order to be certificated by the RCFB. The RCFB defines objectives as performance measures to achieve adopted park and recreation goals.⁴⁷

As part of the BLCP – Public Facilities and Services Element, the City is required to establish a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities (EPF) and provide policies to ensure that the BLCP does not preclude the siting of EPFs. EPFs include those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as such as airports; state education facilities; state or regional transportation facilities, regional transit authority facilities; state and local correctional facilities; solid waste handling facilities; and inpatient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities. In establishing the process to site EPFs, local jurisdictions have the ability to establish review criteria to ensure the protection of adjacent properties and require mitigation to prevent adverse impacts. However, local governments cannot include a requirement to revisit or “second-guess” a siting decision that has been made by a regional or state entity by requiring a review of alternative sites and/or demonstration of proportionality.⁴⁸

THE CPSGMHB has explained that RCW 36.70A.200's prohibition against EPF preclusion not only includes a flat-out exclusion, but also a prohibition against the imposition of impracticable permit conditions:

The Board has held that jurisdictions preclude the siting of EPFs when they are rendered impossible or impracticable to site. *Children's Alliance v. Bellevue*, CPSGMHB Case No. 95-3-0011, FDO, (Jul. 25, 1995), at 12. “Impracticable” is defined as “incapable of being performed or accomplished by the means or at command.” *Port of Seattle v. Des Moines*, CPSGMHB Case No. 97-3-0014, FDO, (Aug. 13, 1997), at 5 (citing Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 584 (10th ed. 1996)). Impracticability has taken the form of restrictive zoning (*Children's Alliance*), comprehensive plan policies directing opposition to a regional decision (*Port of Seattle*), or the imposition of unreasonable requirements (*Hapsmith v. City of Auburn*, CPSGMHB Case No. 95-3-0075c, FDO, May 10, 1996), at 31-2. In *Sound Transit v. City of Tukwila*, the Board found that policies that did not “obligate or authorize the City to deny necessary permits” for an EPF, in that case a light rail system, did not render it impracticable. *Sound Transit v. City of Tukwila*, CPSGMHB Case No. 99-3-0003, (Sep. 15, 1999), at 5.⁴⁹

Finally, successful growth management requires the application of design to public facilities to create livable communities and provide an intentional connection between the built environment and the natural environment.⁵⁰ Design is not simply about aesthetics; achieving economic, ecological, and community-based objectives are intimately related to enhancing the physical and visual environment of a community.⁵¹ Therefore, *Vision 2040* calls for protecting significant

⁴⁷ Washington State Recreation and Conservation Funding Board. (2011) *Manual 2: Planning Policies and Guidelines*. (pg. 11)

⁴⁸ King County, et al v. Snohomish County. Final Decision and Order. CPSGMHB Case Number 3-3-0011. October 13, 2003. Pg. 15.

⁴⁹ King County, et al v. Snohomish County. Final Decision and Order. CPSGMHB Case Number 3-3-0011. October 13, 2003. Pg. 14.

⁵⁰ Puget Sound Regional Design Team. (2007) *A Regional Design Strategy in Support of VISION 2040 for the Central Puget Sound Region*. Pg. 3.

⁵¹ Puget Sound Regional Design Team. (2007) *A Regional Design Strategy in Support of VISION 2040 for the Central Puget Sound Region*. Pg. 5.

visual and cultural resources to preserve community character and calls for the development of civic and park spaces in order to maintain and enhance the region's unique identity that significantly contributes to its economic vitality, social cohesiveness, and quality of life – making the design of the built environment a critical component of the comprehensive plan.⁵² This objective is furthered by the CPPs-CU-2 which directs cities to design public buildings and public spaces to contribute to the unique sense of the community and a sense of place.

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws⁵³, MPPs⁵⁴, CPPs⁵⁵, the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*⁵⁶ and PSRC's *Reporting Tool*⁵⁷ the City must make the following modifications to the BLCP:

- *Identify all publicly owned capital facilities in the inventory not just the facilities owned by the City:* The BLCP- Capital Facilities Element does not include an inventory of capital facilities not-owned by the City (i.e Tacoma Water and Valley Water facilities located in the City). Therefore, the City will need to prepare maps that identify all of public facilities within the City to comply with RCW 36.70A.070(3)(a).
- *Prepare a map that identifies all capitals facilities:* The BLCP – Capital Facilities Element includes a narrative description of City owned capital facilities, but the element does not illustrate the location of the capital facilities as required by RCW 36.70A.070(3)(a).
- *Update the out of date facility inventory:* The current inventory provided in the BLCP – Capital Facilities Element (Pgs. 8-4 – 8-8) and the BLCP – Park Element (Figures 6-1, 6-2, and Figure 6-13) include much of the information recommended by the Department of Commerce; however, the inventory was completed in 2010 and 2011 respectively.
- *Correct the inconsistent population projections:* The population projections used in the BLCP – Capital Facilities Element are inconsistent with BLMC – Parks Element which are both inconsistent with the population projection in the current BLCP- Land Use Element. The BLCP Capital Facilities Element utilized a 2022 population of 24,284 as compared to 18,830 people by 2022 established in the Land Use Element and a 2025 population of 35,120 established the Parks Element.

⁵² Puget Sound Regional Council. 2009. *Vision 2040*. Pg. 57.

⁵³ RCW 36.70A.030(13), RCW 36.70A.070(1), RCW 36.70A.070(3), RCW 36.70A.070(4), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.120, RCW, RCW 36.70A.150, RCW 36.70A.200, RCW 36.70A.210, RCW 47.80.023(3), RCW 82.02.050(4), WAC 365-196-415, WAC 365-196-340, WAC 365-196-420, WAC 365-196-550, WAC 365-196-850, and WAC 468-86-150(1)(c).

⁵⁴ MPP-G-3, MPP-DP-38 through MPP-DP-41, MPP-PS-1, MPP-PS-2, MPP-PS-4, MPP-PS-7 through MPP-PS-13, and MPP-PS-17 through MPP-PS-20, and PS-Action-4 through PS-Action-6.

⁵⁵ CPP-CU-2, CPP-CU-3, CPP-EPF-1 through CPP-EPF-8, CPP-UGA-2.3.1, CPP-UGA-2.3.2, and CPP-UGA-3.

⁵⁶ Commerce 1.c, Commerce 1.f, Commerce 3, Commerce 4, Commerce 6, Commerce 7.a, and RCO Manual 2 – Section 3

⁵⁷ PSRC Part 1- Regional Design PSRC Part 1 – General Multicounty Planning Policies, PSRC Part 1 – Public Services, PSRC Part 2 – Population and Employment Growth, PSRC Part 2 – The Environment, and PSRC Part 2 – Vision 2040 Actions.

- *Update needs assessment:* The City has already established LOS for all of the City's public facilities and services, but needs to update the needs assessment based on revised population allocation numbers.
- *Prepare implementation strategies and performance measures:* The BLCP – Parks Element, Capital Facilities Element, and Utility Element do not provide strategies to implement the goal of each of the Elements and does not include performance measures to demonstrate whether or not the City is achieving these goals. As part of the Public Facilities and Services Element, the City will need to establish specific strategies that identify how the City will meet the goals for all capital facilities and public services (e.g. parks, water, sewer, police, schools, general governmental services, etc.). The City must also develop a set of performance measures to determine if the implementation strategies have been successful.
- *Add policies to ensure consistency between the CIP and the Comprehensive Plan:* The City is required to have policies that ensure capital budget decisions are in conformity with the comprehensive plan to ensure compliance with RCW 36.70A.120.
- *Update list of projects to be funded with Park Impact Fees:* The current BLCP – Parks Element contains a general list of projects that was completed when the Park Element was last updated in 2011. The City will need to review this list and update the list as necessary.
- *Establish reassessment strategy if funding for public facilities and services falls short:* The BLCP – Capital Facilities Element includes a strategy to monitor the funding for required capital improvements; however, the Element lacks a strategy or procedure for the reevaluation of the Land Use Element if funding is not available to provide the required capital improvements. A strategy or procedure for the reevaluation will be added to the new Public Facilities and Services Element. The strategy will be implemented if funding is not available to provide the required capital improvements and to prevent inconsistency between the adopted LOS and the provided LOS.
- *Identify a process for siting EPFs:* The BLCP – Capital Facilities Element does not identify the process that the City will use to site and review EPFs. The Element references that EPFs will be sited in accordance with the BLMC; however, there is not a process in the BLMC for the siting and review EPFs. As part of the BLCP – Public Facilities and Services Element policies will be created to require that all EPFs obtain a special use permit. The BLMC will need to be modified to add a definition of EPF and clearly require that a special use permit is required for all EPFs.
- *Remove criteria that requires an alternative sites analysis for EPFs:* The current criteria adopted in the BLCP – Land Use Element requires that EPF proponents demonstrate that the site is better than alternative sites. While an alternative site analysis is allowed for City owned EPFs, this alternative site analysis is not allowed as part of the review of the EPF once the location has been chosen by a state or regional agency. The current criteria adopted in the BLCP – Land Use Element will be amended so that state and regional agencies will not be required to perform an alternative site analysis during the permit review of EPFs. A policy will be added to encourage regional and state agencies to engage in an alternative site

analysis as part of the agencies process and encourage the City to be involved in that process. The alternative site analysis is proposed to still be required for City owned EPFs.

2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

The current BLCF contains a Natural Element which will be re-named Environmental Conservation to reflect Bonney Lake's desire to preserve and protect the community's cherished natural setting.

Overview

A local jurisdiction comprehensive plan must address the protection of environmental critical areas which includes:

- Maintaining functions and values of hydrological ecosystems and watersheds through the protection, preservation, and restoration of wetlands, lakes, rivers, ponds, streams, and floodplains.
- Identifying and provide policies to conserve, connect, restore, and prevent impacts to fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.
- Designating and provide policies protect the functions and values of geological hazardous areas and prevent impacts associated with development within geological hazardous areas.
- Providing policies and implementation actions to address federal and state clean air laws to reduce pollutants and incorporate the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's adopted growth management policies.

Policies and strategies must be adopted, based on "best available science," to preserve and protect the functions and values of the waters of the state⁵⁸ and to mitigate or prevent discharges that pollute these waters.⁵⁹

As part of preventing pollutants from enter the waters of the state, jurisdictions subject to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), must also comply with all permit requirements and are encouraged to adopted the Department of Ecology's Stormwater Manual for Western Washington or the equivalent; incorporate relevant land-use recommendations from adopted local watershed plans; and adopt a clearing and grading ordinance.

In addition to the waters of the state, the GMA requires that a jurisdictions comprehensive plan also addresses other critical areas which are defined in RCW 36.70A.030(5) to included geologically hazardous areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas (FWHCA), and critical aquifer recharge areas (CARA).

⁵⁸ Waters of the state are defined in RCW 90.56.010(26) as lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, inland waters, and all other surface waters and watercourses (e.g. wetlands, floodplains, etc.) within the jurisdiction of the state of Washington.

⁵⁹ RCW 36.70A.070(1) and WAC 365-196-405(1)(e)

Geological Hazardous Areas are areas that because of their susceptibility to erosion, sliding, earthquake, or other geological events, are not suited to the siting of commercial, residential, or industrial development. There is no affirmative mandate associated with this definition except to “protect the functions and values.” However, if a local jurisdiction, as the City has, requires lower densities in geologically hazardous areas, the geologically hazardous areas must be mapped using “best available science.”

In regards to FWHCA, the CPSGMHB in *Pilchuck, et al v. Snohomish County*⁶⁰, (Pilchuk) found that the Act requires local governments to designate fish and wildlife habitat areas by mapping the areas now or by adopting a process to designate or map them as information becomes available. In Pilchuk, the CPSGMHB further held that RCW 36.70A.170 and RCW 36.70A.060 only require cities to designate FWHCA and not every parcel of land that constitutes fish and wildlife habitat. FWHCA include areas where endangered, threatened, and sensitive species have a primary association; habitats and species of local importance, as determined locally; commercial and recreational shellfish areas; kelp and eelgrass beds; herring, smelt, and other forage fish spawning areas; naturally occurring ponds under twenty acres and their submerged aquatic beds that provide fish or wildlife habitat; waters of the state; lakes, ponds, streams, and rivers planted with game fish by a governmental or tribal entity; and state natural area preserves, natural resource conservation areas, and state wildlife areas.⁶¹

CARAs are established to protect a source of drinking water that is vulnerable to contamination that would affect the potability of the water or is susceptible to reduced recharging.⁶² Potable water is an essential life sustaining element for people and once contaminated it is difficult, costly, and sometimes impossible to clean up. Preventing contamination is necessary to avoid exorbitant costs, hardships, and potential physical harm to people and ecosystems⁶³. Therefore, WAC 365-190-100(3) requires cities to classify recharge areas for aquifers according to aquifer vulnerability⁶⁴.

In addition to the critical areas identified in the GMA, cities in the central Puget Sound Region are required to address climate change, noise, and air quality. While addressing climate change and noise is neither specifically addressed in the GMA goals established by RCW 36.70A.020 nor the mandatory elements established by RCW 36.70A.070, the City is required to be consistent with adopted MPPs and CPPs pursuant to RCW 36.70A.100 and RCW 36.70A.210. Both the MPPs and CPPs include specific provisions that require the City to establish goals, policies, strategies, and performance measures related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and to address adaptation to the effects of climate change. The CPPs include specific provisions that the local jurisdictions must mitigate noise impacts.

⁶⁰ *Pilchuck, et al v. Snohomish County*. Final Decision and Order. Case Number 95-3-0047c. 1995 Pg. 16

⁶¹ WAC365-190-130(2)

⁶² WAC 365-090-030(3)

⁶³ WAC 365-190-100(1)

⁶⁴ Vulnerability is the combined effect of hydrogeological susceptibility to contamination and the contamination loading potential. High vulnerability is indicated by land uses that contribute directly or indirectly to contamination that may degrade groundwater, and hydrogeologic conditions that facilitate degradation. Low vulnerability is indicated by land uses that do not contribute contaminants that will degrade groundwater, and by hydrogeologic conditions that do not facilitate degradation. Hydrological conditions may include those induced by limited recharge of an aquifer. Reduced aquifer recharge from effective impervious surfaces may result in higher concentrations of contaminants than would otherwise occur. (WAC 365-190-100(3))

Air quality is not identified as critical area, but protecting air quality is listed as goal of the GMA and both the MPPs and CPPs include specific provisions that require the City to establish policies strategies related air quality. In the Puget Sound Region the primary concern is ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide, and fugitive dust which can damage lung tissue leading to respiratory disease, contribute to cancer and cardiovascular disease, and obscure many of our most scenic vistas, such as views of the Olympic and Cascade mountain ranges, including Mount Rainier.⁶⁵

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws⁶⁶, MPPs⁶⁷, CPPs⁶⁸, the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*⁶⁹ and PSRC's *Reporting Tool*⁷⁰ the City must make the following modifications to the BLCP:

- *Update the out of date critical area maps:* The critical area maps were prepared in 2004 and have not been update since. As part of the update the City will prepare a Map Folio that includes maps for the floodplains, wetlands, streams, and impaired water bodies. The maps will be based on known conditions and reflect changes in the wetland classification methodology
- *Provide maps of geological hazardous areas:* Maps will be prepared to identify the geologically hazardous areas within the City based on the criteria established for each of the following types of hazards: erosion hazard (WAC 365-190-120(5)); landslide hazard (WAC 365-190-120(6)); seismic hazard (WAC 365-190-120(7)); and/or areas subject to other geological events such as coal mine hazards and volcanic hazards (WAC 365-190-120(8)).
- *Add policies related to air quality:* A new section will be added to the BLCP – Environmental Conservation Element to establish goals, policies, strategies, and performance measures related to the reduction of ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide, and fugitive dust and incorporate the policies of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.
- *Add policies to address climate change:* The BLCP does not include specific provisions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to the effects of climate change as required by both the MPPs and CPPs. A new section will be added to the BLCP – Environmental Conservation Element to establish goals, policies, related to the reducing greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to the effects of climate change.

⁶⁵ Puget Sound Regional Council. *Vision 2040*. 2008 pg. 39.

⁶⁶ RCW 36.70A.020(9), RCW 36.70A.020(10), RCW 36.70A.050, RCW 36.70A.070(1), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.172, RCW 36.70A.210, RCW 70.235.020(1)(a), RCW 90.56.010(26), WAC 365-090-030(3), WAC 365-190-080, WAC 365-190-090, WAC 365-190-110, WAC 365-190-120, WAC 365-190-130, WAC 365-196-405(1)(d), WAC 365-196-485(1)(b), WAC 365-196-485(1)(d) through WAC 365-196-485(1)(f), WAC 365-196-485(2)(a), WAC 365-196-485(2)(d) WAC 365-195-900 through WAC 365-195-925, and WAC 356-196-485.

⁶⁷ MPP-En-13 through MPP-En-25, MPP-DP-45, MPP-T-5 though MPP-T-7, MPP-PS-1, MPP-PS-12, MPP-PS-13.

⁶⁸ CPP-Env-2, CPP-Env-4, CWPP-Env-5, CPP-Env-7, CPP-Env-16, CPP-Env-17, CPP-Env-20, CPP-Env-21, CPP-Env-26, and CPP-Env-28 through CPP-Env-31.

⁶⁹ Commerce 1.j, Commerce 1.k, and Commerce 7.a.

⁷⁰ Part 1 – The Environment and PSRC Part 2 – The Environment.

- *Development implementation strategies and performance measures:* The BLCP – Natural Environment Element does not provide strategies or guidance to protect and preserve waters of the state and performance measures to demonstrate whether or not the City is achieving the goal of preserving and protecting waters of the state. As part of the new Environmental Conservation Element, the City will establish specific strategies that identify the how the City will:
 - Ensure the protection of waters of the state;
 - Protect geological hazardous areas, critical aquifer recharge areas;
 - Preserve current fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and to restore native vegetation to improve habitat conservation areas;
 - Address noise impacts;
 - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions;
 - Adaptation to the effects of climate change; and
 - Reduce ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide, and fugitive dust.

The City will also develop a set of performance measures to determine if is achieving the goal of preserving and protecting the waters of the State

- *Establish Policies related to the Biological Opinion for the management of floodplains:* The City is required to comply with federal environmental quality standards for the protection of floodplains as established by the Biological Opinion issued by National Marine Fisheries.
- *Update the out of date wetland classification:* The wetland classification system referenced in the BLCP – Natural Element is out of date as the section was written prior to the issuance of the Washington Departments of Ecology (DOE) and Fish and Wildlife's (WDFW) *Wetlands in Washington State, Volume 1: A Synthesis of Science* (March 2005) and *Wetlands in Washington State, Volume 2: Managing and Protecting Wetlands* (April 2005).
- *Identify impaired water bodies:* The current BLCP – Natural Environmental Element does not contain a map or list identifying the impaired water bodies within the City and the nature of the impairment (e.g. invasive species, invasive plants, water quality, etc.).
- *Establish restoration polices or goals:* Vision 2040 establishes policies that call for the enhancement of habitat and the restoration of native vegetation⁷¹; however, the BLCP – Natural Element does not contain similar policies and as such is not consistent with the adopted MPPs.

⁷¹ MPP-En-9 and MPP-En-12

2.6 SHORELINE

Overview

RCW 36.70A.480(1) incorporated the goals and policies of the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) as set forth in RCW 90.58.020 into the goals of the GMA as set forth in RCW 36.70A.020; therefore, the goals and policies of the City's SMP are considered an element of the BLCP.

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws⁷², MPPs⁷³, CPPs⁷⁴, the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*⁷⁵ and PSRC's *Reporting Tool*⁷⁶ the City must make the following modifications to the Bonney Lake Comprehensive Plan:

- *Add a Shoreline Element:* The current goals and policies related to the shoreline were not adopted as part of the City's 1975 Shoreline Master Program (SMP), but were inserted during the last periodic update of the comprehensive plan. RCW 36.70A.480 requires that the goals and policies of the SMP be included as an element of the comprehensive plan. As part of the required update of the City's 1975 SMP, the City prepared a new Shoreline Element that once adopted will contain the goals and policies of the SMP in order to comply with the requirement of RCW 36.70A.480.

2.7 COMMUNITY HEALTH

Overview

In 2005, the State Legislature amended RCW 36.70A.070(1) requiring local jurisdictions to consider urban planning approaches that promote physical activity. The addition of this requirement is based on research studies that have linked land use patterns and travel behavior to a decrease in physical activity which has become a growing health problem contributing to obesity, osteoporosis, depression, and premature death.⁷⁷ The existing BLCP contain numerous policies focused on improving the environment for walking and bicycling in the city, both for transportation and recreation. The Parks Element calls for continued development of parks and open space areas with opportunities for passive and active recreation, to be connected by a safe and accessible network of trails, sidewalks, and bicycle facilities. Policies and provisions in the Transportation Element call for investments in transportation facilities and programs to reduce adverse health impacts and promote active transportation options. The Community Character Element contains policies supporting the needs of pedestrian and bicyclist. The City also prepared the *Bonney Lake Non-Motorized Transportation Plan* in 2007 with the intent of making Bonney Lake a more walkable community in part to encourage residents to become more active.

Required Actions

⁷² RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.2010, RCW 36.70A.480 and WAC 365-196-580.

⁷³ MPP-En-14.

⁷⁴ CPP-Env-16.4 through CPP-Env-16.7.

⁷⁵ Commerce 7.a and Commerce 8.

⁷⁶ PSRC Part 1 – The Environment (Water Quality).

⁷⁷ Puget Sound Regional Council. *Vision 2040*. 2008 pg. 58

No Action is required based on the applicable state laws⁷⁸, MPPs⁷⁹, CPPs⁸⁰, the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*⁸¹ and PSRC's *Reporting Tool*.⁸²

2.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES AND HERITAGE

Overview

While the City is not required to have an element specifically for culture and historic preservation, local jurisdictions must be guided by RCW 36.70A.020(13) which calls on counties and cities to identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical or archaeological significance.⁸³ In addition to the requirements of RCW 36.70A.020(13), the City must also demonstrate that the City's comprehensive plan is consistent with adopted MPPs and CPPs,⁸⁴ which both contain policies relate to the protection and preservation of cultural and historic resources.

Required Actions

No Action is required based on the applicable state laws⁸⁵, MPPs⁸⁶, CPPs⁸⁷, the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*⁸⁸ and PSRC's *Reporting Tool*.⁸⁹

3.0 DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

3.1 CRITICAL AREA REGULATIONS

Overview

Two of the established goals of the GMA relate directly to the natural environment. One goal is to, "Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks."⁹⁰ The other goal is to, "Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water."⁹¹ GMA defines critical areas as CARAs, FWHCAs, frequently flooded areas, geologically hazardous areas, and

⁷⁸ RCW 36.70A.020, RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.210, and WAC 365-196-450.

⁷⁹ MPP-G-1, MPP-DP-34, and MPP-DP-37.

⁸⁰ CPP-HAC-1, CPP-HAC-2, CPP-HAC-3, and CPP-HAC-4.

⁸¹ Commerce 7.a.

⁸² PSRC Part 1 – Regional Design.

⁸³ WAC 365-196-450(1)

⁸⁴ RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.210(1), and RCW 36.70A.210(7)

⁸⁵ RCW36.70A.070(1), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.210, and WAC 365-196-405(2)(j).

⁸⁶ MPP-DP-43, MPP-DP-45, and MPP-T-15.

⁸⁷ CPP-HW-1.

⁸⁸ Commerce 1.b and Commerce 7.a.

⁸⁹ PSRC Part 1 – Health and Activity Living.

⁹⁰ RCW 36.70A.020(9)

⁹¹ RCW 36..70A.020(10)

wetlands.⁹² The GMA also specifically requires that jurisdictions adopt development regulations to protect the functions and values of all critical areas⁹³ based on “best available science.”⁹⁴

As part of the update of the City's Shoreline Master Program the City was required to complete a review of the City's existing development regulations for critical areas to determine if the regulations were consistent with applicable state requirements.⁹⁵ The City determined that the regulations for Flood Hazards, CARAs, Floodplains, Geologically Hazardous Areas, and FWHCA were consistent with the state requirements. However, the City's wetland regulations were not consistent with current state requirements. In order to correct this deficiency, as part of the SMP update, the City is updating the CAO regulations to bring the City's wetland regulations into compliance with state law, the Washington Departments of Ecology (DOE) and Fish and Wildlife's (WDFW) *Wetlands in Washington State, Volume 1: A Synthesis of Science* (March 2005) and *Wetlands in Washington State, Volume 2: Managing and Protecting Wetlands* (April 2005).

Required Actions

Given the CAO amendments being adopted as part of the SMP update, no further action is required as part of the 2015 Comprehensive Update process based on the applicable state laws, MPPs⁹⁶, CPPs⁹⁷, and the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*.⁹⁸

3.2 SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM

Overview

In 2003, the state legislature amended to the GMA to add the goals and policies of the SMA as set forth in RCW 90.58.020 as the fourteen goal of the GMA. The legislature also required that once a local jurisdiction completes the required update of its SMP, critical areas located within the jurisdiction of SMA must be regulated under the SMP and not the critical areas regulations adopted under the GMA.

Over the last five years, staff has been working with a citizen advisory committee, consultants, the Cascade Water Alliance, the Department of Ecology, and the Planning Commission to develop an SMP that balances the environmental protections mandated by the state, private property rights, and recreational usage of the shoreline. As part of the update to the SMP, the City adopted its CAO requirements by reference to comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.480(4) and WAC 365-196-580. This approach has been utilized by a number of jurisdictions and is acceptable to the state.

⁹² RCW 36.70A.030(5)

⁹³ RCW 3670A.060

⁹⁴ RCW 36.70A.172

⁹⁵ RCW 36.70A.030(5), RCW 36.70A.030(9), RCW 36.70A.170, RCW 36.70A.060(2), and RCW 36.70A.172(1), RCW 36.70A.370, RCW 36.70A.570, RCW 76.09.240, WAC 173-22-035, WAC 175-158-040, WAC 365-190-110 through WAC 365-190-130, WAC 365-196-830(2), Chapter WAC 365-195

⁹⁶ MPP-En-13 through MPP-En-25, MPP-DP-45, MPP-T-5 though MPP-T-7, MPP-PS-1, MPP-PS-12, MPP-PS-13.

⁹⁷ CPP-Env-2, CPP-Env-4, CWPP-Env-5, CPP-Env-7, CPP-Env-16, CPP-Env-17, CPP-Env-20, CPP-Env-21, CPP-Env-26, and CPP-Env-28 through CPP-Env-31.

⁹⁸ Commerce 10

Required Actions

No further action related to shoreline development regulations is required as part of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, based on the applicable state laws,⁹⁹ and the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*.¹⁰⁰

3.3 ZONING CODE

Overview

As part of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, the City of Bonney Lake must demonstrate that the City's Zoning Code:

- Allows family daycare providers in all residential structures in both residential and commercial zones;
- Regulates manufactured housing the same as site-built housing;
- Regulates residential structures that are occupied by persons with handicaps, as defined under the federal fair housing amendments act of 1988,¹⁰¹ the same as similar residential structures occupied by a family or other unrelated individuals; and
- Allows electrical vehicle battery charging stations in all commercial zones of the City.

The City is in compliance with most of these requirements. The City has adopted Chapter 15.08 BLMC – Manufactured Homes which specifically allows manufactured homes in all residential zones subject to limitations that are consistent with RCW 35A.21.312. The City's Zoning Code does not contain any special provisions related to residential structures occupied handicapped individuals. However, the City has not developed regulations allowing for electrical vehicle battery charging stations and does not allow family day cares in the C-2 and Easttown zones which allow residential structures.

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws,¹⁰² and the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*,¹⁰³ the City as part of the 2015 update process the City will have to make the following changes to the City's Zoning Code:

- *Added family day care centers to the list of permitted use in the C-2 and Easttown zones:* Both of these zones allow residential uses; however, family day cares are not listed as a permitted use in these zones. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.450, the City cannot enact, enforce, or maintain an ordinance, development regulation, zoning regulation, or official control, policy, or administrative practice that prohibits the use of a residential dwelling,

⁹⁹ RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.480, RCW 90.58.090(4), and WAC 365-190-580

¹⁰⁰ Commerce 11

¹⁰¹ 42 U.S.C Sec. 3602

¹⁰² RCW 36.70A.450, RCW 36.70A.695, and WAC 365-196-850

¹⁰³ Commerce 12

located in an area zoned for residential or commercial use, as a family day-care provider's home facility.

- *Develop an Electrical Vehicle Regulations.* By July 1, 2011, the City was required to develop regulations allowing battery charging stations in all commercially zoned areas.

3.4 SUBDIVISION CODE

Overview

The City's Subdivision Code (Title 17 BLMC) was developed to regulate the division of land, promote the public health, safety, and general welfare in accordance with adopted standards, and implement the BLCP. The City's Subdivision Code requires the adoption of written findings that a proposed subdivision or short subdivision provides appropriate provisions for streets or roads, sidewalks, alleys, other public ways, transit stops, and other features that assure safe walking conditions for students; potable water supplies, sanitary wastes, and drainage ways (stormwater retention and detention); open spaces, parks and recreation, and playgrounds; and schools and school grounds.

Required Changes

No changes to the City's Subdivision Code are required as part of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, based on a review of the applicable state laws,¹⁰⁴ and the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*.¹⁰⁵

3.5 CONCURRENCY, IMPACT FEES, AND TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TMD)

Overview

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) all local jurisdictions in the Central Puget Sound Region, must have a concurrency regulation that prohibits development if the development causes the LOS standard on a locally owned transportation facility to decline below the LOS standards adopted in the transportation element, unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development.¹⁰⁶ In order to comply with this requirement the City has adopted Chapter 19.02 BLMC – Concurrency Management. As part of the re-write of the City's transportation plan, the City has hired a consultant to review the City's traffic concurrency program to ensure that the City's regulations are in compliance with state law. Upon completion of this review, changes may be required to bring the City into compliance with state law.

Additionally, the City must review the City's impact fee programs (parks, traffic, school) to ensure that the provisions are consistent with the requirements of RCW 82.02.050 through RCW 82.02.100.

¹⁰⁴ RCW 36.70A.030(7), RCW 36.70A.040(4)(d), RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi), Chapter 58.17 RCW, and WAC 365-196-820

¹⁰⁵ Commerce 13

¹⁰⁶ Hensley/McVittie v. Snohomish County. CPSGMHB Case No. 01-3-0004c, Order Finding Compliance and Final Decision and Order. (June 17 2002) Pg. 18

Jurisdictions are authorized to impose impact fees on development activity as part of the financing for public facilities, provided that the financing is for system improvements to serve new development and must provide for a balance between impact fees and other sources of public funds. Impact fees may only be collected and spent on public facilities in a capital facilities plan adopted pursuant to the provisions of RCW 36.70A.070. The City's impact fee program is consistent with the mandatory requirements of RCW 82.02.050 through RCW 82.02.100; except for the City's park and school impact fees regulations, which requires the funds to be spent within 6 years of receipt of the funds instead of the 10 years now allowed under RCW 82.02.070(3)(a).

Require Actions

- *Extend the timeframe to spent school and park impact fees:* Currently the City's park and school impact fee programs require the funds to be spent within 6 years of receipt or refunded to the applicant that paid the impact fees. In 2011, the state legislature amended RCW 82.02.070(3)(a) extending the timeframe to spent collected impact fees to 10 years. The City adopted the longer timeframe for the transportation impact fees, but did not amend the park and school impact fee regulations to provide for the longer timeframe.

3.6 ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES

Overview

The City is required to provide a process for identifying and siting EPF and cannot adopted development regulations that preclude the siting of EPFs.¹⁰⁷ Additionally, the City cannot establish a process that would allow the City to deny a permit for the siting of an EPF.¹⁰⁸ As part of the process to review and site EPFs state law¹⁰⁹ allows the City to:

- Impose reasonable conditions on EPFs necessary to mitigate the impacts. The combination of any existing development regulations and any conditions may not render impossible or impracticable, the siting, development or operation of the EPF;
- Provide notice and an opportunity to comment to other interested counties and cities and the public.
- Require a use permit, but the process used must ensure a decision on the EPF is completed without unreasonable delay.
- Impose design conditions to make an EPF compatible with its surroundings. Cities may also consider provisions for amenities or incentives for neighborhoods in which EPFS are sited. Any conditions imposed must be necessary to mitigate an identified impact of the EPF.

¹⁰⁷ RCW 36A.70A.200(5)

¹⁰⁸ WAC 365-196-550(6)(a)

¹⁰⁹ WAC 365-196-500(5) and WAC 365-196-550(6)

The City's zoning code does not currently contain a process to review or permit EPFs within the City. Additionally, the City's Land Use Matrix excludes EPF from most zoning districts within the City which is a violation RCW 36.70A.200(5).

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws,¹¹⁰ and the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*,¹¹¹ the City as part of the 2015 update process the City will have to make the following changes to the City's Zoning Code:

- *Amend the Land Use Matrix to allow EPFs:* The City will need to amend the land use matrix codified in BLCM 18.08.020 to allow EPFs in all zoning districts. In order to ensure that all impacts associated with EPFs are sufficiently mitigated the City will require that all EPFs obtain a special use permit.
- *Establish a use permit for EPF:* The City will need to develop a permit type for EPF and establish the criteria for the review of the permit consistent with the requirements of WAC 365-196-550.

3.7 PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS

Overview

In 1995, the state legislature adopted the Regulatory Reform Act (Engrossed Senate House Bill 1724) codified as Chapter 36.70B RCW finding that:¹¹²

- The number of environmental laws and development regulations has increased for land uses and development, so has the number of required local land use permits, each with its own separate approval process.
- The increasing number of local and state land use permits and separate environmental review processes required by agencies has generated continuing potential for conflict, overlap, and duplication between the various permit and review processes.
- This regulatory burden has significantly added to the cost and time needed to obtain local and state land use permits and has made it difficult for the public to know how and when to provide timely comments on land use proposals that require multiple permits and have separate environmental review processes.

The Regulatory Reform Act required that the project review processes integrate permit and environmental review and provide for a notice of application, a notice of complete application; notice of decision, one open-record public hearing one closed-record appeal; and allowing applicants to combine public hearings and decisions for multiple permits.

¹¹⁰ RCW 36.70A.200(5) and WAC 365-196-550

¹¹¹ Commerce 15

¹¹² RCW 36.70B.010

In order to comply the requirements of the Chapter 36.70B RCW, the City adopted Title 14 BLMC – Development Code Administration. The provision found in Title 14 are in substantial compliance with the mandatory requirements of Chapter 36.70B RCW; however, there are some provisions that are not in full compliance with the requirements.

Required Actions

Based on the applicable state laws,¹¹³ and the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*,¹¹⁴ the City as part of the 2015 update process the City will have to make the following changes to Title 14:

- *Modify regulations related to public notice of permit applications:* The City's current regulations related to the public notice of application for projects that are not exempt from the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) provide that the public notice of application should be issued at the same time that the City issues its threshold determination under SEPA. This provision must be amended to ensure that any required public notice of application is issued within 14 days of the notice of complete application. The City may combine notices issued under SEPA with the notice of application, but cannot hold back the notice of application until a SEPA threshold determination has been reached by the City.

3.8 GENERAL PROVISIONS

In general, a local jurisdiction's development regulations are required to be consistent with the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan and implement the policies contained within the comprehensive plan.¹¹⁵ Additionally, the jurisdiction's development regulations must provide sufficient capacity of land suitable for development within their jurisdictions to accommodate allocated housing and employment growth, including the accommodation of, as appropriate, the medical, governmental, educational, institutional, commercial, and industrial facilities related to such growth, consistent with the applicable countywide planning policies and the twenty-year population forecast from the office of financial management as allocated by the county.¹¹⁶ The City's current development regulations comply with these general requirements.

Additionally, in the drafting of development regulations, cities must use the *Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property* (December 2006) issued by the attorney general pursuant to RCW 36.70A.370, to assure that governmental actions do not result in an unconstitutional taking of private property. Procedures for avoiding takings, such as variances or exemptions, should be built into the overall regulatory process.¹¹⁷ The Advisory Memorandum was developed to provide state agencies and local governments with a tool to assist them in the process of evaluating whether proposed regulatory or administrative actions may result in an unconstitutional taking of private property or raise substantive due process

¹¹³ RCW 36.70A.470, Chapter 36.70B, Chapter 43.21C RCW, and WAC 365-196-845

¹¹⁴ Commerce 16

¹¹⁵ RCW 36.70A.040(3)

¹¹⁶ RCW 36.70A.115

¹¹⁷ WAC 365-196-855

concerns.¹¹⁸ The City's development regulations are consistent with the guidelines established in the Advisory Memorandum. The City's development regulations also include variance procedures as recommended by WAC 365-196-855.

Required Actions

No Action is required based on the applicable state laws¹¹⁹, the AG's Advisory Memorandum, and the Department of Commerce's *Periodic Update Checklist for Cities*.¹²⁰

DRAFT

¹¹⁸ State Of Washington Office of the Attorney General. (December 2006) *Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property*. Pg. 1

¹¹⁹ RCW 36.70A.020(11), RCW 36.70A.035, RCW 36.70A.130, RCW 36.70A.170, RCW 36.70A.370, and WAC 365-193-855.

¹²⁰ Commerce 17

2015 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PERIODIC UPDATE

2013		2014				2015			
Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4

PHASE 1 OBJECTIVES AND PARTICIPATION

Task 1.1: Kickoff, Scope Document, and Public Participation Strategy

Task 1.2 Resolution Initiating Update Process

Task 1.3 Develop Update Website

★ Kickoff Meeting with PC

● — ● Comprehensive Plan Update Scope

● — ● Public Participation Plan

▲ PC Public Hearing On Scope and Participation Plan

◆ CC Briefing and Action

● — ● Bonney Lake 2035 Webpage

PHASE 2 CONSISTENCY REVIEW

Task 2.1: Consistency Report

Task 2.2: Update Webpage

● — ● Comprehensive Plan Audit

● — ● Development Regulations Audit

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

◆ CC Briefing and Action

PHASE 3 VISIONING AND GROWTH STRATEGY

Task 3.1 Community Vision

Task 3.2 Land Use Scenarios

Task 3.3 Economic Position and Capacity

● — ● Update Buildable Lands Inventory

● — ● Demographic and Economic Profile

● — ● Community Survey

■ Public Open House

● PC Briefing

● — ● Update Land Use Element

● — ● Updated Community Character Element

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

◆ EDC Briefing

◆ CDC Briefing

◆ CC Briefing and Action

● — ● Market Analysis

● — ● Economic Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, Threat Analysis

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

◆ EDC Briefing

◆ CC Briefing and Action

● — ● RFP Period

PHASE 4 PLAN AND REGULATIONS

Task 4.1 Comp Plan

Task 4.2 Development Regulations

● — ● Updated Housing Element

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

◆ CC Briefing and Action

● — ● Public Service Element

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

● Parks Board Briefing and Recommendation

◆ CDC Briefing

◆ CC Briefing and Action

● — ● Conservation Element

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

◆ CC Briefing and Action

● — ● Community Health Element

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

◆ CC Briefing and Action

● — ● Cultural Resources Element

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

◆ CC Briefing and Action

● — ● Transportation Element

● PC Briefing and Recommendation

◆ CC Briefing and Action

PHASE 5 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Task 5.1 SEPA

● — ● SEPA Strategies

● — ● Scoping

● — ● Draft SEIS

● — ● Comment Period

● — ● Final SEIS

PHASE 6 LOCAL ADOPTION & CERTIFICATION

▲ PC Public Hearing

▲ CC Workshop

▲ CC Hearing

▲ CC Deliberation

● Commerce Review

● PSRC Review