



# City of Sultan Comprehensive Plan

## Appendix L CTED GMA Checklist



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY,  
TRADE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CHECKLIST**  
A Technical Assistance Tool From Growth Management Services

<b>Name of city or county:</b>																													
<b>Staff contact, phone, and e-mail address:</b>																													
<p><b>Instructions:</b> This checklist is intended to help jurisdictions update their comprehensive plan, as required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(4)</a>. We encourage but do not require jurisdictions to complete the checklist and return it to Growth Management Services (GMS). This checklist is for local governments fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA), not for those planning for resource lands and critical areas only. For general information on update requirements, refer to Technical Bulletins <a href="#">1.2</a> and <a href="#">1.4.1</a>. For Q&amp;A and a map of the smaller, slower-growing cities and counties eligible for a three-year update deadline extension under <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(5)(b and c)</a> see GMS's Timelines Q&amp;A [2006].</p> <p><b>Bold items are a GMA requirement.</b> Other items may be requirements of other state or federal laws, best practices, or ideas to consider. <b>Highlighted</b> items are links to Internet sites. Dates indicate date added to the GMA, or amended.</p> <p>Please submit complete text of proposed plans or amendments in electronic format to GMS for review 60 days prior to adoption [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.106(1)</a>]. If paper copy is mailed, please also submit copies to state agencies listed on our website. Submit adopted items with a copy of the signed adopting ordinance to GMS and any agency that provided comments within 10 days of adoption [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.106(2)</a>].</p> <p>All submittals should be sent to: <a href="mailto:reviewteam@cted.wa.gov">reviewteam@cted.wa.gov</a> or Growth Management Services Attn: Review Team P.O. Box 42525 Olympia, WA 98504-2525</p> <p>If you have questions, call GMS at (360) 725-3000. Please send grant deliverables directly to the Technical and Financial Assistance Team at <a href="mailto:gmsgrants@cted.wa.gov">gmsgrants@cted.wa.gov</a> with a cover letter indicating you are submitting a grant deliverable.</p>	<p><b>Checklist Topics:</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr><td><a href="#">Land Use</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">2</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Housing</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">14</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Capital Facilities</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">16</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Utilities</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">19</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Rural</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">20</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Transportation</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">21</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Economic Development</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">25</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Park and Recreation</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">25</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Shoreline</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">26</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Essential Public Facilities</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">27</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Optional Elements</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">27</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Consistency</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">28</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Public Participation</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">30</td></tr> <tr><td><a href="#">Amendments</a></td><td style="text-align: right;">30</td></tr> </table>	<a href="#">Land Use</a>	2	<a href="#">Housing</a>	14	<a href="#">Capital Facilities</a>	16	<a href="#">Utilities</a>	19	<a href="#">Rural</a>	20	<a href="#">Transportation</a>	21	<a href="#">Economic Development</a>	25	<a href="#">Park and Recreation</a>	25	<a href="#">Shoreline</a>	26	<a href="#">Essential Public Facilities</a>	27	<a href="#">Optional Elements</a>	27	<a href="#">Consistency</a>	28	<a href="#">Public Participation</a>	30	<a href="#">Amendments</a>	30
<a href="#">Land Use</a>	2																												
<a href="#">Housing</a>	14																												
<a href="#">Capital Facilities</a>	16																												
<a href="#">Utilities</a>	19																												
<a href="#">Rural</a>	20																												
<a href="#">Transportation</a>	21																												
<a href="#">Economic Development</a>	25																												
<a href="#">Park and Recreation</a>	25																												
<a href="#">Shoreline</a>	26																												
<a href="#">Essential Public Facilities</a>	27																												
<a href="#">Optional Elements</a>	27																												
<a href="#">Consistency</a>	28																												
<a href="#">Public Participation</a>	30																												
<a href="#">Amendments</a>	30																												
<p><b>Enclosures to submit to GMS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Cover letter</a> noting material type, contact information and important dates;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Complete copy of proposed plan or amendment in electronic format. If paper copy is mailed, please also submit copies to state agencies reviewing <a href="#">comprehensive plans</a>.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Outline of the public participation process (completed and scheduled);</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Outline of State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) compliance process (enclosing all SEPA documents not previously submitted to GMS);</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Outline of coordination with adjacent jurisdictions to ensure consistency; and</li> </ul> <p>For adopted items, the signed ordinance that includes in the findings of fact, a description of the public participation process; and for updates, a statement that the plan and development regulations has been reviewed and updated per <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(4)</a>.</p>	<p><b>Important Dates:</b></p> <p>Date of Council or Commission public hearing:</p> <p><i><u>Planning Board: September 16, 2008</u></i></p> <p>Anticipated date of Council or Commission adoption (must be at least 60-days from date CTED receives notice):</p> <p><i>September 18, 2008.</i></p>																												

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p><b>1. The Land Use Element</b> should be consistent with countywide planning policies (CWPPs) and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a>, and should consider <a href="#">WAC 365-195-305</a>, <a href="#">335</a>, <a href="#">400</a>, <a href="#">410</a>, and <a href="#">430</a>. [The City of Sultan Land Use Element is in Chapter 2.5]</p>		
<p>a. Does the element include goals and policies relating to land use, urban growth and population growth, stormwater and critical areas (unless in separate element), natural resource lands (if applicable), and lands for public purposes?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Goals and policies</b>                      The land use section (2.5) sets the framework for the City’s future land use growth (p. 44). The following are elaborated throughout the Comprehensive Plan and in the following specific sections:                      Urban growth and population growth (Population &amp; Employment, Section 2.2);                      Stormwater (Public Services: Stormwater, Section 2.8C);                      Critical Areas (Environment, Section 2.3);                      Natural Resource Lands (Environment, Section 2.3, Policies 11, 12, 13);                      Lands for Public Purposes (Critical Facilities, Section 2.14).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population and employment assumptions have been updated based on post-2004 information.</li> <li>• Table 1 presents the Planning Assumptions upon which capital facilities plan revisions are based.</li> <li>• Role of public lands in parks and open space development has been clarified.</li> <li>• New goals and policies have been added for stormwater.</li> </ul>	
<p>b. Does the element include a future land use map (or maps)?</p> <p>Maps could fulfill the requirement to <b>clearly show the general distribution of land, where appropriate, for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, general aviation airports, public utilities, public facilities, and other land uses.</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a>]</p> <p><b>Future land use maps should clearly show city limits and urban growth area (UGA) boundaries.</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.110(6)</a>]</p> <p><b>Does the element consider planning approaches that increase physical activity</b>, such as neighborhood commercial nodes to allow walking and cycling to local services, transit- or pedestrian-oriented development, linear</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Land use map</b>                      The Land Use Map is shown on Figure 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2004 land use distribution and Land Use Map remain as adopted.</li> <li>• Buildable lands were quantified and confirm suitability for projected population and employment.</li> <li>• The sizing of the UGA to accommodate housing, population and employment was confirmed.</li> </ul> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Planning for physical activity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies dealing with trails and recreation remain from the 2004 Plan</li> <li>• Transportation policies and plan elements have been added to encourage pedestrian and non-motorized travel.</li> </ul> <p>Population &amp; Employment:                      2.2.17: designate downtown Sultan for</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>parks and trail networks, and siting schools and other public facilities within neighborhoods to allow easy walking? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a>, Amended in 2005]</p>	<p>mixed-used...to maximize...the historical pedestrian-oriented center;                  2.2.23: designate upper Sultan Basin Road for small mom-and-pop or neighborhood commercial use to service residential areas on the plateau;</p> <p>Housing:                  2.4.13: develop mixed-use projects...within downtown to increase...pedestrian-oriented environment.                  2.4.19: develop mixed-used structures in the downtown to increase... pedestrian-oriented environment</p> <p>Shoreline Management:                  2.6.11: Amenities: require waterfront developments to provide...paths or walks.</p> <p>Transportation Improvement Plan:                  2.7A, (Figures T-11 and T-12: arterial rights of way need to accommodate the needs of ...cyclists and pedestrians.                  2.7A, (Table T-8): The City is committed to taking steps toward improving every citizen’s quality of life by crating a safer walking and biking environment.</p> <p>Parks &amp; Recreation:                  2.9.2: Develop neighborhood park sites on the plateau with access to the trail network...for residents of new local housing areas.                  2.9.5: Create a comprehensive system of multipurpose trails for recreational hikers and walkers, joggers, casual strollers, bicyclists, neighborhood residents and equestrians.</p> <p>Industrial Park Master Plan (Appendix M, page “2.1”)                  Internal network of streets will connect uses and will provide for pedestrians and bicycles. Local residents will be able to commute by foot or bicycle.</p>	
<p>c. Does the plan indicate the population for which it is planning and is this projection used consistently in the plan?</p> <p>Is the population growth projected in the comprehensive plan consistent with the Washington Office of Financial Management forecast for the county or the county’s sub-county allocation of that forecast? [<a href="#">RCW 43.62.035</a>] If not, what is the rationale for using another figure?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Population projection uses latest forecast</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2025 population and employment targets have been retained:</li> </ul> <p>Population: 11,119                  Employment: 2,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These targets were adopted as part of the 2004 Plan and are consistent with County and State forecasts.</li> </ul>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>For counties: What is the percentage of county-wide population growth allocated for urban growth areas? Is this allocation consistent with GMA goals of encouraging urban growth in urban areas, reducing sprawl, and ensuring public facilities and services are efficiently provided?</p>	<p>Population assumptions are consistent with Snohomish County (2007 Buildable Lands report) and State Office of Financial Management (June 2007) projections. (2.1.12)</p>	
<p>d. <b>As required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a>, does the Land Use Element include population densities, building intensities, and estimates of future population growth?</b></p> <p>GMS suggests including a table with the range of dwelling units per acre allowed in each land use designation and implementing zone as a projection of existing and projected development capacity. Review <a href="#">WAC 365-195-305(2)(a-k)</a> for a recommendation of how to meet the requirement.</p> <p><b>If a buildable lands analysis has been completed, are measures needed to ensure appropriate densities will result? Have such measures been adopted?</b> [RCW 36.70A.215]</p> <p>Buildable lands analysis was required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.215</a> in the 6 counties with 2004 update deadlines. GMS's <a href="#">Buildable Lands Program Guidelines</a> has a list of measures.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Estimated population capacity and appropriate densities</p> <p>Population and employment densities were confirmed as lying within historical Sultan trends. Densities were used to confirm availability of adequate land for future development and to aid in capital facilities planning.</p> <p>A thorough analysis was conducted of buildable lands to confirm that the Land Use Map allocation for future population and employment growth could be accommodated. 2004 results were confirmed. No additional adjustment was required to the Land Use Map, population, densities or employment allocations</p> <p>See Table 1, Planning Assumptions, Section 2.2 Population and Employment. Data included projections for 2007 – 2025 for population, housing units, average household size, housing vacancy rate, employment and buildable acres.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable measures adopted if needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accessory dwelling units (2.4.10; 2.4.11)</li> <li>Capital Facilities Investments (2.4.2; 2.4.2; 2.5.3)</li> <li>Clustering (2.4.8; 2.5.9)</li> <li>Density Bonuses (2.5.7, 2.5.9)</li> <li>Design Standards (2.4.7; 2.4.10; 2.4.13)</li> <li>Downtown revitalization (2.4.13)</li> <li>Duplexes, townhomes and condominiums (2.4.7)</li> <li>Economic Development Strategy (2.2.2; 2.2.3; 2.2.5 – 2.3.13)</li> <li>Environmental review and mitigation built into the subarea planning process (2.3.19; 2.3.20)</li> <li>Higher allowable densities (2.4.12, 2.4.13,</li> </ul>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
	2.4.14, 2.4.18, 2.4.19 Industrial zones (2.4.5, also Appendix M: Industrial Park Master Plan) Mixed uses (2.4.13, 2.4.19) Multifamily housing (2.4.12) Narrow streets (2.4.16) Phasing urban growth (CFP-Reassessment strategy Policy 8.3.4) Small lots (2.4.14) Urban amenities for increased densities (2.4.2) Urban centers and urban villages (2.4.13)	
<p><b>e. Does the comprehensive plan include policies encouraging the use of innovative land use management techniques, including, but not limited to, density bonuses, cluster housing, planned unit developments, and the transfer of development rights?</b> [RCW 36.70A.090]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Innovative techniques</p> <p>2.5.9 – Clustering and planned unit development provisions: policy recommends amending the zoning code to include these land use techniques.</p> <p>Since 2004 a planned unit development ordinance, with cluster and bonus provisions has been adopted.</p>	
<p><b>f. As required by <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(3)</a>, have urban densities and urban growth areas (UGAs) been reviewed every ten years?</b></p> <p>This may be done as part of a 7-year update under <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(4)</a>. Review <a href="#">WAC 365-195-335</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-630(3)</a> for suggestions on how to decide if the UGA is appropriately sized for the planned population. Supporting information should include: selected population growth forecast scenario [<a href="#">RCW 43.62.035</a>]; population allocation and percentage of land devoted to urban, rural, and resource uses (counties) [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a>]; land capacity analysis for UGAs, and changes to UGAs with reasons for change. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.110</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(3)</a>] By definition, urban growth areas are all unincorporated areas so designated by a county and all incorporated cities and towns. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.110</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-335</a>]</p> <p>Other issues to consider:</p> <p>Can the jurisdiction adequately provide urban services to an expanded UGA within the 20-year planning period? Is there a coordinated approach to planning</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> UGA review (required every 10 years)</p> <p>As part of the 2008 revision process, a substantial review of population, employment, housing need, and the forecasted distribution of each was conducted. This was done as a prelude to the analysis and design of infrastructure to ensure that, as directed by the Hearings Board, the 2025 UGA can be served.</p> <p>Based on the 2008 analysis, the City concludes that the Urban Growth Area boundary adopted in 2004 is the appropriate size. The Capital Facilities Plan outlines the strategy for urban services.</p> <p>No change to the UGA is recommended.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>for development in urban growth areas, especially among adjacent jurisdictions? Do urban growth areas (incorporated or not) provide for achieving urban densities, and providing urban services? Do policies and regulations encourage urban growth in urban areas and reduce sprawl?</p> <p>It is recommended that UGAs not be expanded into areas where urbanization may have a significant adverse impact on critical areas. If a county designates a fully contained community (FCC), part of the county’s population allocation should be reserved for the FCC. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.350(2)</a>]</p>		
<p>f. <b>Does the plan identify lands useful for public purposes such as utility corridors, transportation corridors, landfills, sewage treatment facilities, stormwater management facilities, recreation, schools, and other public uses?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.150</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-430</a>]</p> <p><b>Has a list of acquisitions been developed</b> with a timeline and budget for acquiring lands useful for public purposes under <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.150</a>? [The list need not be part of the comprehensive plan.]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Public use lands Budget dollars have been programmed for new trails within the City’s open space network.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> List of acquisitions The 2008 Plan revision contains an updated Arterial Street Plan with recommendations for new east-west corridor development.</p> <p>Sewer and water plans have been coordinated with the Arterial Plan to minimize additional corridor needs. Utility development is to be coordinated with road construction.</p> <p>Budget dollars have been specifically assigned to the Six-Year and 2025 CIP planning periods, with revenue sources identified.</p>	
<p>g. <b>Does the plan identify open space corridors within and between urban growth areas, including lands useful for recreation, wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.160</a>]</p>	<p>No updates or revisions were necessary for this 2008 review.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Open space corridors Figure P-1 – Parks/Open Space as of Fall 2006 for existing and proposed parks and open space. (Does not include open space corridors)</p> <p>FLUM for steep slopes and wetlands included with residential zoning and future land use designations.</p> <p>Figure 5 – Rivers and streams map.</p> <p>Figure 6 – Aquifer recharge map (from 1994 comprehensive plan).</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>h. If there is an airport within or adjacent to the jurisdiction, <b>does the plan include policies, land use designations, and zoning to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to general aviation airports?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70.547</a>, New in 1996]</p> <p>Has the <b>plan and associated regulations been filed with the Aviation Division of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70.547</a>, New in 1996]</p> <p>Does the plan allow the siting and expansion of general aviation airports according to local provisions and state requirements for siting essential public facilities? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.200</a>]</p> <p>See WSDOT guidance at <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/aviation/Planning/default">www.wsdot.wa.gov/aviation/Planning/default</a>.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No incompatible uses near airports. There is no airport within or adjacent to the City of Sultan. The nearest general aviation airport is Harvey Field, in Snohomish, approximately 14 miles west/northwest of Sultan.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plan filed with WSDOT Not applicable</p>	
<p>i. Is there a U.S. Military Base within or adjacent to the jurisdiction employing 100 or more personnel, and operated by the U.S. Department of Defense? See <a href="#">Map of U.S. bases</a> to help make this determination.</p> <p><b>If so, does the plan include policies, land use designations, and consistent zoning to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to military bases?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.530(3)</a>, New in 2004]</p> <p><b>Has the commander of the base been informed of amendments to comprehensive plan and development regulations on lands adjacent to the base?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.530(3)</a>, New in 2004]</p>	<p>There is no nearby U.S. Military Base.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No incompatible uses near bases Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Base commander notified Not applicable</p>	
<p>j. <b>Does the Land Use Element review drainage, flooding, and stormwater run-off in the area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.70(1)</a>] [<a href="#">RCW 90.56.010(26)</a> defines waters of the state.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater planning A planning level stormwater analysis was conducted for this 2008 Revision with policies adopted accordingly. Level of service standards were included and will be adopted for the first time. A stormwater utility is in the process of being created, with stormwater fees collected for ongoing maintenance of the system.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>Jurisdictions subject to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (<a href="#">NPDES</a>) <a href="#">Phase 1 and Phase 2</a>, should comply with all permit requirements.</p> <p>All local governments are also encouraged to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt the <a href="#">State Department of Ecology’s Stormwater Manual for Eastern</a> or <a href="#">Western Washington</a> or the equivalent.</li> <li>• Adopt policies and regulations that allow low impact development practices such as limiting effective impervious surfaces, clustering development, and preserving open spaces and forests. See Puget Sound Action Team (PSAT) <a href="#">low impact development (LID) guidance</a>.</li> <li>• Incorporate relevant land-use recommendations from adopted local watershed plans <a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/watershed/index.html">www.ecy.wa.gov/watershed/index.html</a>.</li> <li>• Adopt a clearing and grading ordinance if not already existing (See GMS’s <a href="#">Technical Guidance Document for Clearing and Grading in Western Washington</a>).</li> </ul>	<p>Stormwater improvements have been included in the Capital Facilities Plan.</p> <p>Page 131: The City uses the most current “Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington” by the Washington Department of Ecology, published in 2005.</p> <p>2.8C Stormwater Goal: Utilize Natural Drainage Corridors &amp; Methods, Policy 1. Where possible, natural vegetation and other low impact development techniques should be used as a component of drainage design, using the DOE Stormwater Manual and the “Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound” published by Puget Sound Partnership.</p>	
<p>k. <b>Does the comprehensive plan designate and protect critical areas using the best available science (BAS) to protect the functions and values of critical areas, and giving “special consideration” to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172</a>, <a href="#">WAC 365-190-080</a>, and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-900</a> through <a href="#">925</a>, BAS added in 1995]</p> <p>Plan policies should address the five critical areas. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(5)</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> BAS used to designate and protect critical areas</p> <p>A critical areas ordinance was adopted in 2006 incorporating BAS features. No additional revisions to the 2004 plan are necessitated because adoption of the CAO was an implementing measure of 2004 adoption.</p> <p>In Section 2.3 Natural Environment, the first goal, Respect the Natural Environment, includes “enforce exacting performance standard governing possible developments within land or soil areas that are subject to moderate and severe hazards using best</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>See CTED's <a href="#">Critical Areas Assistance Handbook (2003)</a> and <a href="#">Small Communities Critical Areas Ordinance Implementation Guidebook (2007)</a>.</p> <p>CTED recommends that jurisdictions follow the process in <a href="#">WAC 365-195-915</a> to document decisions.</p>	<p>available science in accordance with RCW36.70A.172.” This goal specifically lists the critical areas subject to the guidelines as wetlands, areas with critical recharging affect on aquifers, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas.</p>	
<p>1. Are there policies to designate and protect wetlands and their buffers?</p> <p><b>Are wetlands defined using <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(21)</a>?</b></p> <p><b>Are wetlands delineated using the Ecology's <a href="#">Wetland Delineation Manual?</a> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.175</a>]</b></p> <p>Are wetlands rated using the appropriate <a href="#">wetlands rating system</a>?</p>	<p>No updates were included with the 2008 revision. City and County critical area maps, as adopted, were used in the buildable lands review as part of Capital Facilities Plan development.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands defined under GMA definition Section 2.3.20 establishes the requirement for a sensitive lands review ordinance that provides a review process consistent with the Snohomish County sensitive areas ordinance (Snohomish County Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). The City of Sultan's CAO is included in the City's zoning code, and incorporates the RCW definitions of wetlands.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands delineated using Ecology's manual The City of Sultan's CAO requires the use of the DOE Wetland Delineation Manual when determining the edge of a wetland.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands rating system 2.3.1 – Wetlands should be rated using the Washington Sate Wetlands Rating System for Western Washington.</p>	
<p>m. <b>Does the plan include provisions for protection of the quality and quantity of ground water used for public water supplies?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(1)</a>] (Required if jurisdictions draw groundwater for potable water or need to manage threats to exempt wells.)</p> <p>For water quality, policies should regulate hazardous uses in critical aquifer recharge areas (CARAs) and protect wellhead areas.</p> <p>For water quantity, policies should limit impervious surfaces, encourage water conservation measures such as water</p>	<p>Policies will be adopted as part of the 2008 revision to clarify the status of private wells and the City's water rights. These water rights, together with the rights already possessed by the City for irrigation wells, will be assembled for possible future water supply needs.</p> <p>Where wells remain private for irrigation use, policy will call for the irrigation system to remain separate from the City water system. New backflow prevention valves for irrigation systems will not be permitted.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CARAs protect water quality and quantity 2.3.5 Impermeable soils: protect soils from</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>metering and limiting consumptive uses during low precipitation periods and droughts, and consider Watershed Resource Inventory Assessment (WRIA) plans.</p> <p>See Ecology’s guidance on <a href="#">Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs)</a> and <a href="#">Water Resource Inventory Assessment (WRIA)</a> plans.</p>	<p>development that could contaminate ground water supplies.</p> <p>2.3.6 High water table and aquifer recharge: protect soils over aquifers from developments that create contaminants that could be absorbed into the ground water and aquifer system.</p> <p>2.3.24 Stormwater development standards: promote natural drainage and percolation systems, permeable surface improvements...and other concepts that will reduce stormwater volumes and velocities.</p> <p>2.8B.4 Groundwater: Work with public agencies to reduce possible contamination of the groundwater reserve and aquifer.</p> <p>2.8B.13 Support and implement water conservation and reuse measures that reduce water use, including reclamation of wastewater for irrigation use, drought tolerant plantings and native vegetation, and water restrictions during droughts.</p>	
<p>n. Are policies and land use designations for frequently flooded areas consistent with <a href="#">FEMA and Ecology guidance</a>? Classifications of frequently flooded areas should include, at a minimum, the 100-year floodplain designations of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the National Flood Insurance Program. [<a href="#">WAC 365-190-080(3)</a>]</p> <p>Does the plan address the link between flooding and planned upland development, as well as important ecological functions of flooding, such as groundwater recharge, nutrient cycling in wetlands, and establishment of feeding and rearing habitat for fish?</p>	<p>No changes to existing flood plain boundaries are recommended as part of this 2008 revision.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Frequently flooded areas regulated using FEMA and Ecology guidance.</p>	
<p>o. <b>Are geologically hazardous areas designated according to criteria in <a href="#">WAC 365-190-080(4)</a></b>? Is the range of uses limited in geologically hazardous areas, especially excluding critical facilities such as emergency response, hospitals, hazardous materials storage, etc.?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Geohazard areas designated and managed</p> <p>No changes have been made to critical area maps as part of this revision. Existing policies call for location of future police and fire facilities away from potentially hazardous areas.</p>	
<p>p. <b>Are fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and corridors designated for protection?</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas designated and protected</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>See <a href="#">WAC 365-190-080(5)</a> for more information on specific habitat conservation areas, and factors to consider for their designation and protection. Is there coordination with adjacent jurisdictions when habitat areas cross-jurisdictional boundaries or provide regional benefits? Is the retention of large blocks of habitat included as a policy or goal?</p> <p>See <a href="http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phslist.htm">http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phslist.htm</a> for lists of priority habitats and species. Maps and management recommendations are also available.</p> <p>See <a href="http://www.dnr.wa.gov/forestpractices/watertyping">www.dnr.wa.gov/forestpractices/watertyping</a> to use Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR)'s stream typing system.</p>		
<p>If there are anadromous fisheries, or if the jurisdiction affected by an Endangered Species Act (ESA) 4(d) rule, have sufficient policies been incorporated into the plan? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.172</a>]</p> <p>Have species listings affected land use assumptions, capital facilities planning, and permit processes? Will new capital facilities (e.g., new infrastructure, water, stormwater, and wastewater utilities) be needed to comply with ESA? Have they been included in the Capital Facilities Element of the plan?</p> <p>Will stormwater regulations or clearing and grading ordinances need to be adopted or updated to protect fish habitat? Should new policies be added to the plan?</p> <p>If monitoring programs have been adopted to ensure that habitat is being maintained, is there adequate funding for monitoring? See <a href="#">WAC 365-195-920</a>.</p> <p>Are plan policies and implementing regulations consistent with locally-adopted salmon recovery plans <a href="http://www.governor.wa.gov/gsro/default.htm">www.governor.wa.gov/gsro/default.htm</a>, watershed plans <a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/watershed/index.html">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/watershed/index.html</a>, and other resource protection plans?</p>	<p>No changes occurred to sensitive area maps or critical area regulations as part of this 2008 revision.</p> <p>The critical areas information was used as input to defining buildable lands for purposed of defining infrastructure needs.</p> <p>The revised capital facilities plan has as one of its intentions, to protect groundwater and surface water resources pursuant to ESA and other species protections.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Anadromous fisheries</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Consistency with other adopted plans.</p> <p>The 2006 Critical Areas Ordinance regulates land development in sensitive areas involving shorelines, floodplains, aquifer recharge zones, and wetlands. The ordinance defines sensitive areas to include wetlands and <i>anadromous</i> fish-bearing waters in accordance with the guidelines defined by the Washington State Department of Community, Economic &amp; Trade Development (CTED) under the environmental protection</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>See also <a href="#">Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan (2000)</a> for recommendations and watch for 2008 action area agendas from the Puget Sound Partnership. For species listing status, recovery plans and management recommendations, fish distribution and stock status, locations of priority habitats and species, visit: <a href="http://wdfw.wa.gov/">http://wdfw.wa.gov/</a></p>	<p>provisions of the Growth Management Act (GMA).</p>	
<p>q. If there is inadequate scientific information about critical areas, has the jurisdiction adopted an “adaptive management” policy and program for addressing this situation?</p> <p><a href="#">WAC 365-195-920</a> and <a href="#">Critical Areas Assistance Handbook</a> provide guidance on the recommended approach for addressing inadequate scientific information.</p>	<p>Not applicable. The 2006 Critical Areas Ordinance is based on Best Management Practices and up to date critical areas surveys.</p>	
<p>a. Have non-regulatory measures to protect or enhance functions and values of critical areas been considered? These may include public education, stewardship programs, pursuing grant opportunities, water conservation, farm planning, joint planning with other jurisdictions and non-profit organizations, stream and wetland restoration activities, etc. See <a href="#">Critical Areas Assistance Handbook</a> for more information.</p>		<p>No additional programs were recommended as part of this 2008 revision.</p>
<p>r. <b>Are the criteria for designating natural resource lands consistent with CTED’s Minimum Guidelines to classify agricultural, forest, mineral lands and critical areas?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.050</a>, <a href="#">WAC 365-190</a>, and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-400</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Natural resource lands designation criteria consistent</p>	<p>Emphasis during this 2008 revision was on urban infrastructure for the Urban Growth Area.</p>
<p>s. <b>If forest or agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance are designated inside UGAs, is there a transfer and/or purchase of development rights (TDR, or PDR) program?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.060(4)</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> TDR or PDR program for forest or agricultural lands inside UGAs</p> <p>While the City is aware of TDR programs being considered by Snohomish County, Cascade Land Conservancy and others, no specific program has been brought forward to the City. The 2008 revision did not address this issue.</p>	
<p>t. <b>For agriculturally designated lands,</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Limit accessory uses on agricultural lands</p>	<p>The 2008 revision did</p>

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p><b>are there policies limiting nonagricultural uses to lands with poor soils or otherwise not suitable for agricultural purposes, and policies limiting the allowable range of accessory uses to those allowed under <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.177(3)</a>? [Amended in 2004 and 2006]</b></p>		not address this issue.
<p>u. <b>For critical area regulations which may affect agricultural activities on designated agricultural or rural lands, ordinances may not be amended until July 1, 2010. [RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007]</b></p> <p>Note: Other development regulations may be used if needed to address impacts from agricultural activities during this interim period.</p>		Not applicable to the purposes of the 2008 revision.
<p>v. <b>Are there policies encouraging the conservation of productive forest and agricultural lands and discouraging incompatible uses? [RCW 36.70A.020(8), Amended in 1997]</b></p> <p>Are innovative techniques such as agricultural zoning, cluster zoning, large lot zoning, quarter/quarter zoning, and sliding scale zoning allowed in agricultural lands to conserve lands and encourage the agricultural economy included? [RCW 36.70A.177, Amended in 1997 and 2004]</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Policies encouraging conservation and discouraging incompatible uses on resource lands	Not applicable to the purposes of the 2008 revision.
<p>w. <b>Have designated mineral resource lands been reviewed?</b></p> <p><a href="#">RCW 36.70A.131</a> requires consideration of new information including data available from the Department of Natural Resources relating to mineral resource deposits when reviewing mineral resource land designations. Minerals include sand, gravel and valuable metallic substances. [RCW 36.70A.030(11)]</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Review mineral resource lands	Not applicable to the purposes of the 2008 revision.
<p>x. <b>If the county is eligible and has designated a major industrial development or master planned location outside of the UGA, is the area consistent with the criteria in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.365</a> and <a href="#">367</a>? [New in</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Major industrial area	Not applicable to the purposes of the 2008 revision.

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
1995, Amended in 2004, and 2007]		
y. <b>If the county has permitted a master planned resort, have the requirements of RCW 36.70A.360 and RCW 36.70A.362 been met?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Master planned resort	Not applicable
<p><b>2. The Housing Element is intended to ensure the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods. It should be consistent with relevant CWPPs, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)</a>, and should consider <a href="#">WAC 365-195-310</a>. [The City of Sultan Housing Element is in Chapter 2.4.]</b></p>		
<p>a. <b>Is there a statement of goals, policies, and objectives for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(2)(b)]</a>                      What strategy and mechanisms are there for achieving these targets?                       If enacting or expanding affordable housing programs under <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.540]</a>, does the plan identify certain 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></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strategy for housing                      Section 2.4 – Housing proposes goals and policies for managing housing growth, creating neighborhood planning areas and special districts, promoting diversity, and developing housing location and design standards.                       Affordable housing is available in Sultan, and the City’s comprehensive plan includes goals and policies to allow a variety of housing options, including duplexes, manufactured and mobile homes, mother-in-law units, multifamily residential housing types, etc. (2.4.6 to 16, 18 to 19).</p>	
<p>b. <b>Does the element include an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to provide for projected growth over the planning period?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(2)(a)]</a> Review CTED’s <i>Assessing Your Housing Needs</i> for assistance.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Housing needs analysis using latest population projection                      See Appendix B – Technical Memorandum No. 1, Population, Employment and Housing Forecast for data and analysis of Sultan’s demographic and housing profiles.</p>	
<p>c. <b>Does the element identify sufficient land for housing, including but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, group homes, and foster care facilities?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c)]</a>   <b>No city or county planning under the GMA may enact or maintain ordinances, development regulations, or administrative practices which treat a residential structure occupied by persons with handicaps differently than a similar residential structure</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Special housing planned for and not subject to discrimination                      2.4.6 Housing choice: this policy calls for housing opportunities for every type, age, physical and mental capability of household.                      2.4.9 – Allow the installation of manufactured housing units.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p><b>occupied by a family or other unrelated individuals.</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.410</a>; <a href="#">RCW 70.128.140</a>; Washington Laws Against Discrimination, <a href="#">RCW 49.60.222-225</a>; and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-310(2)(k)</a>]</p>		
<p>d. <b>Does the plan make adequate provisions for existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d)</a>]</p> <p><a href="#">WAC 365-195-310</a> recommends an evaluation of the extent to which the existing and projected market can provide housing at various costs and for various income levels, and an estimation of the present and future populations that would require assistance to obtain housing they can afford. This section should also identify existing programs and policies to promote adequate affordable housing and evaluate their effectiveness.</p> <p>Are affordable housing programs enacted or expanded under <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.540</a> consistent with the RCW? Examples of such programs include but are not limited to: density bonuses within urban growth areas, height and bulk bonuses, fee waivers or exemptions, parking reductions, expedited permitting conditioned on provision of low-income housing units, or mixed use projects. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.540(1)</a>, New in 2006]</p> <p>Affordable housing is defined as when the total housing costs, including basic utilities, does not exceed 30 percent of the income limit (for renters, 50 percent or less of the county median family income, adjusted for family-size, and for owners, 80 percent or less of the county median family income, adjusted for family size for owners). [2006]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Affordable housing planned</p> <p>Affordable housing is available in Sultan, and the City’s comprehensive plan includes goals and policies to allow a variety of housing options, including duplexes, manufactured and mobile homes, mother-in-law units, multifamily residential housing types, etc. (2.4.6 to 16, 18 to 19)</p> <p>Based on Snohomish County buildable lands and employment data, the City of Sultan has established goal and policies to improve an existing imbalance in its jobs-to housing ratio, working with Snohomish and King counties and public and private agencies to create more employment opportunities within the Sultan economy. (2.2.1 to 10)</p>	
<p>e. <b>Are there policies on manufactured housing so that it is not regulated differently than site built housing?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 35.21.684</a>, <a href="#">35.63.160</a>, <a href="#">35A.21.312</a>, and <a href="#">36.01.225</a>, Amended in 2004]</p> <p>A local government may require that</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No discrimination against manufactured housing</p> <p>2.4.9 – Allow the installation of manufactured housing units: the purpose of this policy is to reduce housing costs</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>manufactured homes (1) 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. <a href="#">[National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974]</a></p>		
<p>f. <b>If the city has a population of over 20,000, or the county has a population of over 125,000, does the jurisdiction allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in single-family residential areas?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.400]</a> <a href="#">[RCW 43.63A.215(3)]</a></p> <p>See <i>Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance Study and Recommendations</i> (1994) available from CTED. For counties, ADU provisions in rural areas should review decisions from the appropriate hearings board.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> ADUs allowed</p> <p>2.4.10 – Develop more detached dingle family housing types: Accessory dwelling units are encouraged, described as “mother-in-law units.”</p> <p>Appendix B – Technical Memorandum No. 1, Population, Employment and Housing Forecast contains a discussion of accessory units under the heading of “Promoting Housing Choice” (page 17).</p>	
<p>g. <b>Are family daycare providers allowed in all residential dwellings located in areas zoned for residential or commercial use and are any zoning conditions imposed no more restrictive than conditions imposed on other residential dwellings in the same zone?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.450, Amended in 2007]</a></p> <p>Family daycare provider means someone who regularly provides child daycare for 12 or fewer children in their home. <a href="#">[RCW 43.215.010(c)]</a></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Family daycares allowed</p>	
<p><b>3. The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element</b> needs to be consistent with CWPPs, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(3)</a>, and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-315</a> and should serve as a check on the practicality of achieving other elements of the plan. This element should cover all the capital facilities planned, provided, and paid for by public entities including to local government and special districts, etc. This should include water, wastewater, stormwater, schools, solid waste management, police and fire protection facilities. Park and Recreation facilities may be included in this element, or in a separate element, however all capital expenditures including transportation and park and recreation facilities should be included in this element.</p>		
<p>a. Does the element include goals and policies relating to capital facilities to guide decisions? <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.120]</a></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Goals and policies</p> <p>The 2008 revisions to the capital facilities plan are in response to the Growth Hearings Board Compliance Orders. The City addressed the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Allocating new development among those buildable portions of the various land use</li> </ul>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
	<p>districts identified on the Land Use Map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Developing, confirming, or modifying “level of service” standards for future capital facilities through 2025.</li> <li>▪ Based on adopted level of service standards, identifying what capital facilities will be needed, and when, to adequately serve the future population, housing and employment through 2025.</li> <li>▪ Assessing the cost of providing capital facilities measured against the projected financial resources of the City.</li> <li>▪ Developing a Transportation Element and Capital Facilities element which coordinates improvements with the pace of growth.</li> <li>▪ Developing a six-year Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)</li> <li>▪ Developing a Capital Facilities Plan (six-year and Year 2025) that balances cost with estimated funding.</li> </ul> <p>The Capital Facilities Plan goals and policies are located in Sections 2.7 – 2.10 of the 2008 Plan revision. The Capital Facilities Plan, Transportation Element and TIP integrate policies and plans to address these issues.</p>	
<p>b. <b>Does the element include an inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(3)(a)]</a></p> <p>The inventory could include water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, school, parks and recreation facilities, solid waste management, police and fire protection facilities. The element should include references to water or other system plans, include a brief summary of these plans, indicate location of the 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>.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Inventory of existing facilities</p> <p>A Public Facilities Map is included in Section 2.10. Facilities list include schools, city hall, police and fire stations and the public works yard.</p> <p>Sewer, water and stormwater maps are included as S-1, W-1 and SW-1.</p> <p>The Parks and Open Spaces map is Figure P-1</p>	
<p>c. <b>Is a forecast of the future needs for existing capital facilities included in the element?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(3)(b)]</a></p> <p>The forecast should be based on projected population and adopted levels of service (LOS), population densities,</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Forecast of future needs</p> <p>The future capital project information outlined in the 2004 Plan and EIS has changed substantially, as have the capital cost estimates. These changes are discussed in each of the Plan sections and are summarized in Section 2.10 (Capital Facilities Plan). Adoption of the</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>and distribution of growth over the planning period. <a href="#">WAC 365-195-315(2)(b)</a> suggests that jurisdictions include a strategy for providing capital facilities over the 20-year life of the plan. Consider whether the jurisdiction has sufficient water rights or sewage treatment capacity to support the plan's projected 20-year growth, or a strategy to obtain them.</p>	<p>Plan and CFP in late 2008 will not only meet the Order of the Hearings Board, but will also ensure that the impacts of growth as projected in 2004 will be properly mitigated by a well-planned infrastructure system. Population and employment assumptions, Level of Service standards, infrastructure needs, future capacity requirements and capital funding strategies have all been included in the 2008 revision.</p>	
<p>d. <b>Does the element indicate proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(3)(c)</a>]</p> <p><a href="#">WAC 365-195-315(2)(e)</a> suggests that the phasing schedule in the Land Use Element should dictate when and where capital facilities will be needed. Consider if the concurrency ordinance or other mechanisms have been effective in providing public facilities and services concurrent with development.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Planning for future needs Sewer, water, roads, stormwater and park plans have been revised and integrated in the 2008 revision. Financial strategies are presented in Section 2.10. Projects in the Capital Facilities Plan have been divided between 6-Year and Year 2025 increments. Where capital facilities will be provided along the same corridor (e.g. sewer lines under new roads) both maps and policies have been adjusted to integrate these projects.</p>	
<p>e. <b>Is a six-year plan (at least) included that will finance planned capital facilities within projected funding capacities identifying sources of public money for such purposes? Is the CFP consistent with rest of the comprehensive plan?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(3)(d)</a> and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.120</a>]</p> <p>This CFP should include all public expenditures for capital expenses including water, sewer, parks and recreation, transportation, etc.</p> <p><a href="#">WAC 365-195-315(2)(d)</a> suggests that the capital facilities plan be updated at least biennially so that financial planning remains sufficiently ahead of the present for concurrency to be evaluated. For a list of funding sources, see <a href="http://www.infracfunding.wa.gov/">http://www.infracfunding.wa.gov/</a> and <a href="http://www.awcnet.org">www.awcnet.org</a>.</p> <p>Are there plan provisions establishing policies, levels of service, and regulatory strategies for concurrency as applied to public facilities other than transportation?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Six-year funding plan consistent with comp plan</p> <p>All efforts undertaken during the 2006-2008 planning period have been directed toward developing a financially feasible capital facilities plan that is internally consistent with the growth policies of the Comprehensive Plan and externally consistent with individual (e.g. sewer and water) master plans.</p> <p>Each policy in the 2004 Plan was reviewed against the revised capital facilities planning assumptions to assure consistency. Adjustments were made where appropriate.</p> <p>Level of Service, and regulatory strategies for concurrency were all reviewed as part of the 2008 effort. Changes in each of these areas are proposed.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p><a href="#">[WAC 365-195-510(2 and 3)]</a></p> <p>Can the plan provide adequate facilities in a timely manner? <a href="#">[WAC 365-195-315(2)]</a></p>		
<p>f. <b>Is there a policy to reassess the Land Use Element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the Land Use Element, Capital Facilities Element, and financing plan within the Capital Facilities Element are coordinated and consistent?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e)]</a></p> <p><a href="#">WAC 365-195-315(2)(f)</a> suggests that the plan set forth how pending applications for development will be affected while such a reassessment is being undertaken.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Land Use reassessment policy included</p> <p>The City’s reassessment policy is found in Section 2.10 of the 2008 Plan revision.</p> <p>The policy calls for a reassessment “.... In the event that the City cannot fund the capital improvements needed to maintain required service levels (as identified in the Capital Facilities Plan)..”</p> <p>The City was prepared to revise land use, growth, UGA and other assumptions had its capital facilities analysis required a “Plan Reassessment”. The Capital Facilities Plan analysis, along with the review of buildable lands, UGA, transportation, utilities and other supporting analyses have shown that a reassessment of the land use and growth assumptions are not required.</p>	
<p>g. <b>If impact fees are collected, are the public facilities for which money is to be spent on included in this element?</b> <a href="#">[RCW 82.02.050(4)]</a></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Impact fees used only for projects included in the CFP</p> <p>The Capital Facilities Plan details the role of impact fees, connection fees and other development related fees in the mix of revenues used to fund necessary capital improvements.</p>	
<p><b>4. The Utilities Element</b> should relate to all services provided, planned for, paid for, and delivered by providers other than the jurisdiction. This should be consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(4)</a>, and should consider <a href="#">WAC 365-195-320</a>.</p>		
<p>a. Does the element include goals and policies relating to service arrangements with other providers?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Goals and policies</p> <p>Section 2.11 – Public Services deals with goals and policies relating to public schools and solid waste.</p> <p>Section 2.12 – Private Utilities deals with goals and policies relating to electricity, natural gas and telecommunications services provided by private utility companies.</p>	
<p>b. <b>Does the element show the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> General location of existing facilities</p> <p>Maps are contained in Section 2.12 identifying</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p><b>utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(4)</a>]</p> <p><a href="#">WAC 365-195-320(2)(a)</a> states that proposed utilities are understood to be those awaiting approval when the CFP is adopted. <a href="#">WAC 365-195-320(2)</a> suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinating with non-municipal service providers to analyze the capacity needs of various utilities over the planning period. [<a href="#">WAC 365-195-320(2)(b)</a>]</li> <li>• Evaluating whether any utilities should be identified and classified as essential public facilities (EPF) subject to the separate siting process established for EPFs. [<a href="#">WAC 365-195-320(2)(d)</a>] Consider policies calling for joint use of transportation rights-of-way and utility corridors, coordination between road construction and utility trenching activities, and coordination of utility planning among adjacent jurisdictions. [<a href="#">WAC 365-195-320(2)(g)and (h)</a>]</li> </ul>	<p>significant private utility systems in the UGA. The policies affecting these utilities were as adopted in the 2004 Plan and have not been revised.</p>	
<p><b>5. The Rural Element (counties only)</b> should be consistent with <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(5)</a>, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.011</a> <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030(15 and 16)</a>, and should consider <a href="#">WAC 365-195-330</a>. Rural lands are lands not included in urban growth areas, or designated as agricultural, forest, or mineral resource lands.</p>		
<p>a. Are there goals and policies relating to rural land use and services?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Goals and policies NOT APPLICABLE</p>	<p>NOT APPLICABLE FOR CITIES</p>
<p>b. Does the element define rural character following the guidance of <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.030, (15), and (16)</a>? <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(5)</a> requires that the Rural Element allow rural development, forestry, and agriculture in rural areas and provide for a variety of rural densities, uses, essential public facilities and rural governmental services.</p> <p>CTED suggests that jurisdictions consider <a href="#">Growth Management Hearings Board</a> cases for guidance on appropriate rural densities and levels of governmental services and <b>compile a written record explaining how the rural element harmonizes the planning goals and meets the requirements of the Growth</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate uses, densities, and services NOT APPLICABLE</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Written record developed NOT APPLICABLE</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Urban services limited in rural areas NOT APPLICABLE</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p><b>Management Act.</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(5)(a)</a>]</p> <p>Does the element identify the portion of the county’s population growth which occurs in rural lands? [<a href="#">WAC 365-195-330(2)(b)</a>] Is the population density low enough to limit demands on rural services and preserve rural character?</p> <p><b>Are urban services limited in rural areas?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.110(4)</a>]</p> <p>The plan may include optional techniques such as limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRDs), clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, and conservation easements to accommodate rural uses not characterized by urban growth as specified in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)</a>, [Amended in 2004].</p>		
<p><b>6. The Transportation Element</b> should be consistent with relevant CWPPs and <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)</a>, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.108</a>, and should consider <a href="#">WAC 365-195-325</a>.</p>		
<p>a. Does the element include goals and policies for roadways; fixed route and demand response public transit; bicycle and pedestrian travel; water, rail, air, and industrial port and intermodal facilities; passenger and freight rail; and truck, rail, and barge freight mobility? [<a href="#">WAC 365-195-325(2)(a)</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Goals and policies</p> <p>Goals and policies relating to transportation are included in Sections 2.7 – Transportation. Extensive revision to the 2004 Plan’s Transportation Element and TIP were made, including a revised Arterial Street Plan; adjustments to design standards and Level of Service standards; and a more detailed arterial street improvement plan as part of the Capital Facilities Plan.</p> <p>The detail of the transportation analyses are presented in Sections 2.7, 2.7A, 2.10 and Appendix F.</p>	
<p>b. <b>Is there an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments, state-owned transportation facilities, and general aviation airports to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)</a>]</p> <p><a href="#">WAC 365-195-325(2)(c)</a> provides recommendations for meeting inventory</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Transportation inventory</p> <p>Roads, trails, mass transit and related facilities are discussed in Section 2.7 of the Plan.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
requirements.		
<p>c. <b>Does the element include the land use assumptions used in estimating travel?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i)</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Land use assumptions</p> <p>Population and employment forecasts were distributed among the Traffic Analysis Zones used in the transportation analysis. This distribution is shown on Figure 2. Table 1 presents the Planning Assumption used in the analysis.</p>	
<p>d. <b>Does the element include regionally coordinated level of service (LOS) standards for all arterials and transit routes to gauge the performance of the system, LOS for highways of statewide significance, and LOS for other state highways consistent with the regional transportation plan?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B)</a>, New in 1997]</p> <p>LOS set by WSDOT for highways of statewide significance. LOS on highways that are not of statewide significance should be designated through the regional transportation planning organization. Local LOS should be defined, such as describing what levels A-F look like, or other ways of measuring LOS.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Levels of service for all facilities; local, regional, and state</p> <p>The Transportation Element analyzes the relationship to local streets and arterials to the intersections with US-2. Recommended improvements to intersections are included in the CFP to facilitate traffic flow and safety. The City’s LOS standards were used in this analysis. Policies are included in Section 2.7 relating to multi-modal approaches to meeting the travel needs through 2025.</p>	
<p>e. <b>Does the element identify specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities and services that are below an established LOS standard?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D)</a>, Amended in 2005, <a href="#">WAC 365-195-510</a>, and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-835</a>]</p> <p><b>Are concurrency policies consistent with <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b)</a> [amended in 2005] and do they consider multimodal improvements in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.108</a>?</b> [New in 2005]</p> <p>Strategies such as increased public transit, ride sharing programs, and other multimodal strategies may be used to ensure that development does not cause service to decline on a locally owned facility below adopted levels of service.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Concurrency</p> <p>The 2008 revision reiterates the GMA concurrency standard as follows:  “... transportation concurrency requires that the transportation impacts of land use development actions do not reduce the transportation LOS below the jurisdiction’s adopted LOS standards. If it is determined that the proposed land use action would reduce the LOS below the adopted standard, either the development as proposed must be modified to reduce its transportation impact, or corrective transportation improvements must be identified and implemented at the time of the development or within a six-year period. This determination is made as part of the development approval process. The transportation LOS standard and findings may also be used to program transportation funding priorities of planned improvements.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>If required by <a href="#">RCW 70.94.527</a>, has a commute trip reduction plan to achieve reductions in the proportion of single-occupant vehicle commute trips been adopted and submitted to the regional transportation planning organization? Is it consistent with the comprehensive plan? [New in 2006]</p>	<p>If services that will operate at the adopted LOS standard will not be concurrent with a proposed development, then either funding for the improvements must be identified or the development cannot be granted approval as proposed. ....”</p>	
<p>f. <b>Does the element describe existing and planned transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, such as HOV lanes, parking policies, high occupancy vehicle subsidy programs, etc.?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> TDM Strategies</p> <p>TDM is described in the 2008 revisions and which relates it to the <a href="#">1991 Commute Trip Reduction Law (CTR) (RCW 70.94.521-551)</a></p> <p><u>The Plan revision states that “in order to encourage TDM within the City, Sultan will continue to pursue improvements to transit service and facilities, and development of its nonmotorized system. In addition, the City should explore amending the land use development codes to increase awareness and strengthen implementation of TDM strategies.”</u></p>	
<p>g. <b>Does the element include a pedestrian and bicycle component?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)</a>, Amended in 2005] This should inventory existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and identify and plan improvements for facilities. Improvements could focus on safe routes to school, hazard areas, or pedestrian-generating areas, and should be funded in capital facility or transportation improvement plans.</p> <p>Guidance and example bicycle and pedestrian plans are available from CTED and WSDOT.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle and pedestrian planning</p> <p>2.7A.10 – Trails: provides for the development of an integrated system of regional and local oriented multipurpose trails for bicyclists, pedestrians and equestrians.</p> <p>In addition, the alternative street design standards include provision for bicycle lanes.</p>	
<p>h. <b>Does the element include a forecast of traffic for at least 10 years, based on the Land Use Element, to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(E)</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 10-year Traffic forecast</p> <p>Traffic forecasts are provided through the 2025 planning horizon.</p>	
<p>i. <b>Does the element identify state and local system expansion needs to meet current and future demands?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(F)</a>]</p> <p>Are the needs of state-owned facilities identified in the comprehensive plan</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Future needs</p> <p>The 2008 revision discusses both the Washington State Multimodal System Plan and the WSDOT US 2 Route Development Plan (RDP) and relates both to local planning efforts.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>consistent with the <a href="#">Washington Transportation Plan</a>? [<a href="#">RCW 47.06</a>]</p>		
<p>j. Is the transportation funding program coordinated with the CFP, and does it address the deficiencies identified in the system?</p> <p><b>Does the element analyze the funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)</a>]</p> <p><b>Is a multiyear financing plan included in the element based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program required by <a href="#">RCW 35.77.010</a> for cities, <a href="#">RCW 36.81.121</a> for counties, and <a href="#">RCW 35.58.2795</a> for public transportation systems?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)</a>]</p> <p><b>If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, is there a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that LOS standards will be met?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(C)</a>]</p>	<p>The central focus of the 2008 revisions is the development of a funding strategy to address the documented needs of transportation and other infrastructure.</p> <p>Section 2.10 outlines a strategy of balancing identified and attainable revenues with documented costs.</p> <p>The funding strategy covers both the Six-Year TIP planning period and the long term 2025 needs.</p> <p>The conclusion from the 2008 revisions is that a Plan Reassessment is not necessary. A Reassessment policy however, identifies how the CFP will be monitored over time and how shortfalls in funding will be addressed in the Plan.</p>	
<p>k. <b>Does the element discuss intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(v)</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Intergovernmental coordination</p> <p>The central link between Skykomish Valley jurisdictions (Monroe to Gold Bar) is US 2. Through the City’s participation in the US 2 RDP and the US 2 Safety Coalition, there is good coordination among jurisdictions over coordinated improvements to the system.</p> <p>A portion of the City’s Transportation Plan effort extended beyond its UGA to assure coordination with Snohomish County.</p> <p>The City is also and active participant in overall Snohomish County planning and growth monitoring efforts.</p>	
<p>l. Does the element discuss how the transportation plan implements and is consistent with the land use element,</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Plan certified by RTPO</p> <p>The 2008 revisions note that “To help</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>and how it is consistent with the regional transportation plan? [<a href="#">WAC 365-195-325(2)(b)</a>]</p> <p><b>Is the plan certified by the regional transportation planning organization?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 47.80.23(3)</a> and <a href="#">47.80.026</a>]</p>	<p>facilitate broader regional review and coordination between the City and neighboring jurisdictions in the region and WSDOT, the City is required to have the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan re-certified by the Puget Sound Regional Council’s Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PSRC RTPO)”</p>	
<p><b>7. The Economic Development Element</b> is not required because funding was not provided to assist in developing local elements. However, local goals, policies, objectives, and provisions for economic growth and vitality and a high quality of life should be established in the plan, and supporting strategies should be integrated with the land use, housing, utilities, and transportation elements. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(7)</a>, <i>New in 2002</i>] An Economic Development Element should include:</p>		
<p>A summary of the local economy such as population, employment, payroll, sectors, businesses and sales. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(7)(a)</a>], Consider gathering data and information for your community data profile pertaining to business, transportation, labor, real estate, utilities, incentives, regulatory, government, and quality of life. See CTED’s <i>Guidebook on Economic Development</i> (2005).</p>	<p>See Appendix B – Technical Memorandum No. 1, Population, Employment and Housing Forecast for data and analysis of Sultan’s economic and demographic profile.</p>	
<p>a. A summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the local economy defined as the commercial and industrial sectors and supporting factors such as land use, transportation, utilities, education, work force, housing, and natural/cultural resources. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(7)(b)</a>]</p>	<p>See Appendix B – Technical Memorandum No. 1, Population, Employment and Housing Forecast for analysis of Sultan’s economic strengths and weaknesses. (page 23)</p>	
<p>b. Identification of policies, programs, and projects to foster economic growth and development and to address future needs. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(7)(c)</a>]</p>	<p>Section 2.2 Population and Employment contains the goals and policies to promote a sound fiscal base and increase local economic opportunities.</p>	
<p><b>8. A Park and Recreation Element</b> is not required because the state has not provided funding to assist in developing it. However, park, recreation, and open space planning are GMA goals, and it is important to plan for and fund these facilities. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(8)</a>, <i>New in 2002</i>] CTED’s Guidebook <i>Planning for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in your Community</i>, can provide step-by-step assistance. A Parks and Recreation Element should include:</p>		
<p>b. Goals and policies to guide decisions regarding facilities.</p>	<p>2.9 Park &amp; Recreational Facilities goals and policies focus on:                  2.9.1 – 4: Preserving quality park resources;                  2.9.5 – Developing a train and corridor access system                  2.9.6 – 10: Developing quality recreational facilities                  2.9.11 – 21: Effectively managing park and</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
	recreation resources.	
<p>c. Estimates of park and recreation demand for at least a ten-year period based on adopted levels of service (LOS) and population growth. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(8)(a)</a>]</p>	<p>LOS Estimates are based on population projections for 2025. (page 144)</p> <p>Level of Service standards as well as the existing park inventory underwent significant review and refinement as part of the 2008 revisions. The City now has a much clearer policy on what park facilities exist, future needs and priority funding.</p>	
<p>d. An evaluation of facilities and service needs over the planning period. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(8)(b)</a>]</p>	<p>Park improvements for 2025 LOS are shown in Table P-5. (page 146)</p> <p>The City has specifically identified the acquisition and development of one additional community park as a priority for future funding.</p>	
<p>e. An evaluation of intergovernmental coordination opportunities to provide regional approaches for meeting park and recreational demand. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(8)(c)</a>]</p> <p>This element should be consistent with the Capital Facilities Element as it relates to park and recreation facilities. [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e)</a>]</p>	<p>2.9.13 Coordinate public and private resources: create a comprehensive park and recreational system that integrates Sultan with Snohomish County, Sultan School District, Washington State Department of Wildlife, and other public and private facilities that will best serve Sultan resident interests. Cooperate with other public and private agencies to avoid duplication, improve facility quality and availability.</p> <p>2.10 Capital Facility Plan presents strategic considerations for parks.</p> <p>The City collaborated with County park officials on cost standards and County park proposals as part of its analysis of “regional” park needs.</p>	
<p><b>9. The Shoreline Element</b> of the comprehensive plan is the goals and policies of the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.480</a>] The SMP goals and policies may also be included in an Environmental Element. The SMP goals and policies should be consistent with the rest of the comprehensive plan.</p>		
<p><b>Are SMP goals and policies included in the comprehensive plan?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.480, New in 2003</a>]</p> <p>Currently, critical areas along shorelines are to be designated and protected by the critical areas ordinance (CAO). When a jurisdiction updates its SMP consistent with Ecology’s new guidelines (<a href="#">Chapter 173-26 WAC</a>), and according to a schedule in <a href="#">RCW 90.58.080</a>, protection for critical areas within shorelines is transferred from the critical areas ordinance</p>	<p>The Shoreline Management Plan has been revised and is currently waiting approval by the Department of Ecology.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SMP goals and policies.</p> <p>2.6 Shoreline Management goals and policies focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Protecting natural quality</li> <li>▪ Maintaining a mixed-use waterfront</li> <li>▪ Preserving a quality urban waterfront</li> </ul>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>to the SMP. Protection must be at least equal to that from the CAO under the GMA. Since the SMP is required after the GMA update, jurisdictions are advised to consider consistency between the comprehensive plan and shoreline master plans. See <a href="#">Questions and Answers on ESHB 1933</a> for assistance.</p>		
<p><b>10. Provisions for siting essential public facilities (EPFs) should be consistent with CWPPs, <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.200</a>, and should consider <a href="#">WAC 365-195-340</a>, and <a href="#">840</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></p>		
<p>a. <b>Does the plan include a process or criteria for identifying and siting essential public facilities (EPFs)? 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>? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.200</a>, Amended in 1997 and 2001] <a href="#">WAC 365-195-340</a> suggests a potential process.</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> EPF identification and siting process</p> <p>The siting of critical facilities is included in Section 2.14. No significant revisions were made to the adopted 2004 Plan.</p>	
<p>b. <b>Are there policies that address the statutory requirement that no comprehensive plan may preclude the siting of essential public facilities? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.200(5)</a>]</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No preclusion policy</p> <p>2.14.2 – Ultimate approval: provides that the comprehensive plan may specify particulars involving the existing of essential public facilities, and adds that the plans “may not prevent outright the location...for essential public facilities,” in compliance with RCW 36-70A.200(5).</p> <p>No significant revisions were made to the adopted 2004 Plan.</p>	
<p>c. <b>Did the jurisdiction consider the Office of Financial Management’s list of essential state public facilities that are required or likely to be built within the next six years? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.200(4)</a>]</b> (Instructions to find the list are available from GMS)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> List considered</p> <p>No review was made in addition to the adopted 2004 Plan process. The City is not aware of any additions to this list.</p>	
<p><b>11. Optional plan elements and sub-area plans may be included in the comprehensive plan.</b></p>		
<p>Are additional elements included in the</p>	<p>The City of Sultan comprehensive plan</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>plan, such as energy conservation, historic preservation, natural hazards, or community design? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.080</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-345</a>] These elements should be consistent with all other elements of the plan. Resources: <a href="#">Historic Preservation: A Tool for Managing Growth</a>, CTED, 1994, revised in 2005, <a href="#">Optional Comprehensive Plan Element for Natural Hazard Reduction</a>, CTED, 1999.</p>	<p>includes Section 2.13 – Design resources, which includes provisions to protect features of the manmade environment and to create visual interest</p>	
<p>Are any sub-area plans included in the plan, and are they consistent with the other plan elements? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.080(2)</a>]</p>	<p>The City’s 2004 comprehensive plan includes an industrial park master plan. No significant revisions were made to the adopted 2004 Plan.</p>	
<p><b>12. Consistency</b> is required by the GMA.</p>		
<p>a. <b>Are all plan elements consistent with relevant county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and the GMA?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.100</a> and <a href="#">210</a> and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-300(2)(c)</a> and <a href="#">520</a>] GMS suggests CWPPs be referenced in each element, or be appended to the plan to clearly show consistency. Some jurisdictions use a table to show consistency.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> CWPPs</p> <p>2.1.1 Process – Comply with state laws implicitly includes the requirement to incorporate CWPPs into the City’s comprehensive plan.</p> <p>CWPPs are covered under RCW36.70A.210 and 110, and require consistency in policies relating to the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Urban growth areas</li> <li>2 - Urban services</li> <li>3 - Siting of public capital facilities</li> <li>4 - County-wide transportation facilities</li> <li>5 - Affordable housing</li> <li>6 - Analysis of fiscal impacts</li> </ol> <p>Relevant issues are addressed in the Sultan comprehensive plan through the following goals and policies:</p> <p>Urban Growth Areas:</p> <p>2.5.10 Urban/rural transition area: jointly create an urban/rural transition area with Snohomish County; and</p> <p>2.5.11 Interlocal agreements with Snohomish County: enter into an into-local agreement with Snohomish County to jointly agree upon and coordinate the proposed UGA boundaries and suitable zoning protection.</p> <p>Urban services &amp; public capital facilities:</p> <p>On-site septic systems in unsewered areas (page 106); North Snohomish County Coordinated Water System Plan (page 117); groundwater protection in the UGA (2.8B.4 Water service – Groundwater; coordinate with Snohomish County Fire District 5 to ensure adequate fire protection coverage (2.8B.17);</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
	<p>also</p> <p>2.11.1 Public Services: Cooperate with...Snohomish county Departments of Planning &amp; Community Develop, Parks &amp; Recreation, Public Works...to provide quality public services and facilities for residents; also</p> <p>2.114-6: Joint development, coordinate public service efforts, and joint use facilities.</p> <p>County-wide Transportation: Public transportation is operated by Community Transit, providing fixed route service, paratransit and vanpool service within Snohomish County.</p> <p>Affordable housing: Affordable housing is available in Sultan, and the City’s comprehensive plan includes goals and policies to allow a variety of housing options, including duplexes, manufactured and mobile homes, mother-in-law units, multifamily residential housing types, etc. (2.4.6 to 16, 18 to 19)</p> <p>Based on Snohomish County buildable lands and employment data, the City of Sultan has established goal and policies to improve an existing imbalance in its jobs-to housing ratio, working with Snohomish and King counties and public and private agencies to create more employment opportunities within the Sultan economy. (2.2.1 to 10)</p>	
<p>b. <b>Does the plan describe how all elements fit together, such as consistency of plan elements and future land use map, and consistency of land use and capital facilities elements?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.070</a> (preamble)]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Internal consistency</p> <p>The City, in preparing these 2008 revisions paid close attention to the Order of the Growth Hearing Board, which had as its central theme the inconsistencies between the City’s Plan and its infrastructure plan, CFP and TIP. Correcting these inconsistencies was the main thrust of the revisions.</p> <p>Policy 2.1.12 Process – Ensure consistency: the City will base their planning on a common set of assumptions based on the population, housing and employment estimates from Snohomish County and the State of Washington.</p>	
<p>c. <b>Are there policies directing that capital budget decisions be made consistent with the comprehensive plan?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.120</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Budget decisions consistent with plan Section 2.10, Capital Facilities Plan and the Reassessment Strategy include goals and policies to ensure that the financial plan are consistent with the comprehensive plan.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p>d. <b>Is the plan coordinated with the plans of adjacent jurisdictions?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.100</a>, and <a href="#">WAC 365-195-530</a>]</p> <p>Adjacent jurisdictions should be provided with proposed plan and SEPA documentation.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> External consistency</p> <p>The 2008 revisions will be circulated for review to Snohomish County. It is the City’s belief that the revisions will be found to be consistent with population, economic, housing and land use assumptions.</p> <p>The Cities of Monroe and Gold Bar will each receive copies of the proposed Plan revisions.</p>	
<p><b>13. Public participation, plan amendments and monitoring</b></p>		
<p>a. <b>Does the plan ensure public participation in the comprehensive planning process?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.020(11)</a>, <a href="#">.035</a>, and <a href="#">.140</a>]</p> <p><a href="#">WAC 365-195-600(2)</a> suggests a list of possible public participation choices.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Public participation</p> <p>Process policies include “promote understanding” and “encourage participation.” (2.1.4 and 2.1.5)</p> <p>Consistent with WAC365-195-600, the City is currently using public announcements (newsletters, newspaper, emails, website postings and postings at City Hall), surveys, workshops, and city council and planning board meetings to encourage public involvement.</p>	
<p>b. Does the plan describe the process for making amendments? Is this process coordinated among the county and cities within a county? [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(2)(a)</a>, <a href="#">WAC 365-195.630(2)</a>, and <a href="#">865</a>]</p> <p>Is the process publicized with a brochure, web page, or other form.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Broadly publicized plan amendment process.</p> <p>Process policies include “continuously review...to revise...amend...to comply with...RCW36.70A.130 and WAC365-195-630(2). (2.1.8)</p> <p>The City undertakes an annual amendment process where citizens, property owners and stakeholders may request changes to the Plan. Requests are widely publicized through newsletters and the City’s web site. Proposed changes must be reviewed by the Planning Board and City Council after public hearings by each body.</p>	
<p>c. <b>Does the plan set out a procedure for adopting emergency amendments and does it define emergency?</b> [<a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(2)(b)</a>]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Process for emergency plan amendments</p> <p>Process policies include “continuously review...to reflect changes in conditions...to comply with...RCW36.70A.130. (2.1.8)</p> <p>The City has the authority to institute emergency provisions to its code. The code has several definitions of “emergency” covering specific code topics.</p>	
<p>d. <b>Are amendments to be considered no</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Plan amendments no more than once a year.</p>	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in 2008 revised plan	Update action, if needed
<p><b>more often than once a year not including the exceptions described in <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.130(2)</a>? [Amended in 2006]</b></p>	<p>Process policies include “continuously review...to amend the Comprehensive Plan...in annual update procedures...to comply with...RCW36.70A.130. (2.1.8)</p>	
<p>f. <b>Is there a process to assure that proposed regulatory or administrative actions do not result in an unconstitutional taking of private property? [RCW 36.70A.370]</b> See <a href="#">Attorney General’s Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property</a> for guidance.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Process to avoid takings 2.1.1 Process requires the City to comply with all state planning requirements, including RCW36.70A Growth management, which requires the protection of private property (36.70A.370).</p>	
<p>g. Is there a plan or program for monitoring how well comprehensive plan policies, development regulations, and other implementation techniques are achieving the comprehensive plan’s goals and the goals of the GMA? [<a href="#">WAC 365-195-865(2)</a>]</p> <p>h. Is there a plan or program for monitoring how well natural resource lands and critical areas ordinances and other implementation techniques are protecting critical areas?</p>	<p>2.1.8 Process – Update products: this provision calls for the continuous review of the comprehensive plan and to revise as necessary to ensure consistency with the City’s needs; also 2.1.9 Process – Coordinate efforts: this provision calls for monitoring other agency activities to make effective use of mutual resources and interests. 2.3.19 Environment – Performance criteria: incorporate environmental concerns into performance standards; allow for innovation and detailed investigations, provided the end result will not risk environmental hazards or otherwise create public problems or nuisances.</p>	