



Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

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

How to fill out the checklist

With the most recent version of your comprehensive plan and development regulations in hand, fill out each item in the checklist. Select the check box (place your cursor just before the yes/no box and then double click for check box option menu) or type in text fields, answering the following questions:

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

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

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

How to use the completed checklist

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

This page intentionally left blank

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

Jurisdiction Name:

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

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

1. Land Use Element - A Land Use Element that is consistent with county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and RCW 36.70A.070(1)	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
c. A consistent population projection throughout the plan which should be consistent with the Office of Financial Management forecast for the county or the county's sub-county allocation of that forecast. [RCW 43.62.035]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 4.2.3, (pg. 4-20) 4.5.3 (pg 4-47)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Amendments necessary to include North Highline.
d. Estimates of population densities and building intensities based on future land uses. [RCW 36.70A.070(1)] <i>Note: GMS suggests a table showing land use designations and implementing zoning as a projection of existing and projected development capacity.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 4.5.3 (pg. 4-47) See table 4.5-3 (employment) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>is residential needed?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Combine 4.2.3 with 4.5.3 to meet RCW? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>On hold for Legislature?</i>
e. Provisions for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies. [RCW 36.70A.070(1)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): EV 1.3 (pg 2-26) EV 2.4 (pg 2-28) EV 5 (pg 2-32) EV5.1, EV 5.2, 5.3 (pg. 2-32) EV 5.4 (pg. 2-33) ST 1 (pg 2-109) BMC 19.40.420 & 430	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	I don't think we have any wells. (none referenced in Chpt. 4 see pg. 4-26) Check with water districts. There is a south KC groundwater management plan.

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

1. Land Use Element - A Land Use Element that is consistent with county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) and RCW 36.70A.070(1)	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
aquifer recharge areas, and geologically hazardous areas. In developing these policies, the city must have included the best available science (BAS) to protect the functions and values of critical areas, and give “special consideration” to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries. [RCW 36.70A.030(5), RCW 36.70A.172, BAS added in 1995] <i>Note:</i> See WAC 365-195-900-925	RE 1.2, 1.5 IN 1.1 Character Para EV section starting on page 2-26 through 2-33 EV.1, EV 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 EPF 2.3 <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): EV 4 (all) but no specific mention of anadromous fisheries.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	May need to add language regarding anadromous fisheries.
I. If forest or agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance are designated <i>inside</i> city: a program authorizing Transfer (or Purchase) of Development Rights. [RCW 36.70A.060(4), Amended in 2005]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Not applicable.
2. A Housing Element to ensure the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods and is consistent with relevant CWPPs, and RCW 36.70A.070(2).	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

3. A Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element to serve as a check on the practicality of achieving other elements of the plan, covering all capital facilities planned, provided, and paid for by public entities including local government and special districts, etc.; including water systems, sanitary sewer systems, storm water facilities, schools, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection facilities. Capital expenditures from Park and Recreation elements, if separate, should be included in the CFP Element. The CFP Element must be consistent with CWPPs, and RCW 36.70A.070(3) , and include:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. Policies or procedures to ensure capital budget decisions are in conformity with the comprehensive plan. [RCW 36.70A.120]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 2.9 Capital facilities (pg 2-116) TR 1.1.6, 1.1.7 (pg 2-71)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	May need to develop/enhance internal procedures to ensure consistency with plan.
b. An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities. [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(a)] <i>Note:</i> The inventory should include references to facility plans, include a brief summary of the plans, indicate location of facilities, and show where systems currently have unused capacity. Public services and facilities are defined in RCW 36.70A.030(12 and 13) .	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Chapter 3.0	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Needs updating and references to owned facilities and facility plans.

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

3. A Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element to serve as a check on the practicality of achieving other elements of the plan, covering all capital facilities planned, provided, and paid for by public entities including local government and special districts, etc.; including water systems, sanitary sewer systems, storm water facilities, schools, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection facilities. Capital expenditures from Park and Recreation elements, if separate, should be included in the CFP Element. The CFP Element must be consistent with CWPPs, and RCW 36.70A.070(3) , and include:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
c. A forecast of needed capital facilities. [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(b)] <i>Note:</i> The forecast of future need should be based on projected population and adopted levels of service (LOS) over the planning period. This section should consider sufficiency of water rights, sewage treatment, and other needed public facilities to support the plan's projected 20-year growth. It may also consider system management or demand management strategies to meet forecast need.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Coordination with districts may be necessary to confirm.
d. Proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities. [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(c)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Inventory needed along with integration with Capital Facilities Plan.
e. A six-year plan (at least) identifying sources of public money to finance planned capital facilities. [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(d)] and RCW 36.70A.120	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): CF 3.2 (pg 2-118) references budget Chapter 3.0 Capital Improvement Program Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Need an updated chapter 3.0 CIP. Next year? Once land use, transportation, stormwater and park plans are done?

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

3. A Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Element to serve as a check on the practicality of achieving other elements of the plan, covering all capital facilities planned, provided, and paid for by public entities including local government and special districts, etc.; including water systems, sanitary sewer systems, storm water facilities, schools, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection facilities. Capital expenditures from Park and Recreation elements, if separate, should be included in the CFP Element. The CFP Element must be consistent with CWPPs, and RCW 36.70A.070(3) , and include:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
f. A policy or procedure to reassess the Land Use Element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs. [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(e)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): CF 3.6, 3.7 (pg 2-118)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	May need something here.
g. <i>If impact fees are collected:</i> identification of public facilities on which money is to be spent. [RCW 82.02.050(4)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC Table 19.35-1 (Traffic) Ord no. 493.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	
4. A Utilities Element which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(4) and includes:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

5. A Transportation Element which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(6) and includes:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
b. Adopted levels of service (LOS) standards for all arterials, transit routes and highways. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) , New in 1997]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): TR 1.1.2, 1.1.3 (pg 2-70) Table 4.8-3	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Updates to table needed.
c. Identification of specific actions to bring locally-owned transportation facilities and services to established LOS. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D) , Amended in 2005]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): TR 1.1.6? (pg 2-71)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	I don't believe we are deficient in LOS. We may need an updated inventory. See forecast below.
d. A forecast of traffic for at least 10 years , including land use assumptions used in estimating travel. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i)] [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(E)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	Need new forecast based on new growth targets and buildable lands info.
e. A projection of state and local system needs to meet current and future demand. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(F)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	TMP to address. Will need information from state. Is this on hold for budget reasons?

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

5. A Transportation Element which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(6) and includes:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
f. A pedestrian and bicycle component. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii), Amended 2005]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): TR 5 (pg 2-78 through 2-82) MM 3.1 (pg 2-79)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	
g. A description of any existing and planned transportation demand management (TDM) strategies , such as HOV lanes or subsidy programs, parking policies, etc. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): TR 1.1.5 (pg 2-70) TR 1.2.4 (pg 2-72) TR 4.1.5 (pg 2-77) TR 4.6 (pg 2-78)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	TMP to update/enhance.
h. An analysis of future funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)] .	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	TMP to update

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

5. A Transportation Element which is consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(6) and includes:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
i. A multiyear financing plan based on needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which serve as the basis for the 6-year street, road or transit program. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B) and RCW 35.77.010]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	CIP needs updating.
j. <i>If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs: a discussion of how additional funds will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that LOS standards will be met.</i> [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(C)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	TMP/CIP
k. A description of intergovernmental coordination efforts , including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions and how it is consistent with the regional transportation plan. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(v)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	TMP to update.

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

6. Provisions for siting essential public facilities (EPFs), consistent with CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.200 . 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.	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. A process or criteria for identifying and siting essential public facilities (EPFs). [RCW 36.70A.200, Amended in 1997 and 2001] <i>Note:</i> EPFs include those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, state or regional transportation facilities, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities (SCTFs) defined in RCW 71.09.020(14) . Cities should consider OFM's list of EPFs that are required or likely to be built within the next six years.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): EPF 2.1, 2.2 (pg 2-124) BMC 19.17.110 (SCTF's)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	No projects in Burien in OFM's list (09-15 enacted facility plan)
b. Policies or procedures that ensure the comprehensive plan does not preclude the siting of EPFs. [RCW 36.70A.200(5)] <i>Note:</i> If the EPF siting process is in the CWPPs, this policy may be contained in the comprehensive plan as well.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): EPF 2.9, 2.10 (pg 2-126)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

9. Regulations protecting critical areas are required by RCW 36.70A.060(2) and RCW 36.70A.172(1) . Note: Critical area regulations may not be amended to affect agricultural activities prior to July 1, 2010. [RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007]	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. Classification and designation of each of the five types of critical areas (<i>wetlands, critical aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas</i>), if they are found within your city. [RCW 36.70A.170]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	May need more work on fish and wildlife habitat areas, definitions and mapping.
b. Findings that demonstrate Best Available Science (BAS) was included in developing regulations to protect the function and values of critical areas. In addition, findings should document special consideration to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries. [RCW 36.70A.172(1)] <i>Note:</i> Relevant sources of best available science (BAS) should be documented in the record, together with specific findings that are accurate and explanatory. If the CAO departs from the science-based recommendations, the rationale, risk, and measures to limit the risk should also be documented. [WAC 365-195-915]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): Memo from Adolfson, dated 9/23/03 Mention of anadromous fish.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

9. Regulations protecting critical areas are required by RCW 36.70A.060(2) and RCW 36.70A.172(1) . Note: Critical area regulations may not be amended to affect agricultural activities prior to July 1, 2010. [RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007]	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
f. Regulations that protect the functions and values of critical aquifer recharge areas . RCW 36.70A.060(2) and RCW 36.70A.172(1)	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.420, 430	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	
g. Regulations to protect the quality and quantity of ground water used for public water supplies. [RCW 36.70A.070(1)] <i>Notes:</i> The GMA requires the land use element to achieve this goal. This may require complementary changes to development regulations such as zoning, and/or could be met through critical aquifer recharge area provisions. For water quantity, regulations may include limits on impervious surfaces, or encourage water conservation measures.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.420, 430 BMC 19.15 (use zone charts) impervious surface and building coverage requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

9. Regulations protecting critical areas are required by RCW 36.70A.060(2) and RCW 36.70A.172(1) . Note: Critical area regulations may not be amended to affect agricultural activities prior to July 1, 2010. [RCW 36.70A.560, New in 2007]	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
h. Regulations that protect the functions and values of fish and wildlife habitat areas . RCW 36.70A.060(2) and RCW 36.70A.172(1)	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.380, 390, 400, 410	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
i. Regulations that protect the functions and values of frequently flooded areas . RCW 36.70A.060(2) and RCW 36.70A.172(1) <i>Note:</i> Consider consistency with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements for the National Flood Insurance Program and State floodplain management provisions.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.40.240-280 BMC 15.55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
j. Provisions to ensure water quality and stormwater drainage regulations are consistent with applicable Land Use Element policies. [RCW 36.70A.070(1)] <i>Note:</i> The GMA states that where applicable, the land use element of the comprehensive plan should provide guidance for corrective action to mitigate or cleanse discharges that pollute water of the state. This may require complementary changes to development regulations such as stormwater management; clearing and grading; or low impact development ordinances.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC Chapter 13.10	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

11. The Zoning Code should contain the following provisions:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
<p>a. Family daycare providers are allowed in areas zoned for residential or commercial uses. Zoning conditions should be no more restrictive than those imposed on other residential dwellings in the same zone, but may address drop-off and pickup areas and hours of operation. [RCW 36.70A.450]</p> <p><i>Note:</i> Family daycare provider means a child daycare provider who regularly provides child daycare for not more than 12 children in the provider's home in the family living quarters. [RCW 74.15.020(1)(f)]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Location(s): BMC 19.15.005.3 (SFR Zones) BMC 19.15.010.5 (MFR Zones) BMC 19.15.015.3 BMC 19.15.020.3 BMC 19.15.025.6 BMC 19.15.035.5 BMC 19.15.040.6 BMC 19.15.045.4 BMC 19.15.050.4 BMC 19.15.055.5 BMC 19.15.060.1.B</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i></p>	<p>BMC 19.15.065(SPA-3) Does not specifically list "family day care" as an allowed use, does allow day care center.</p>
<p>b. Manufactured housing is regulated the same as site-built housing. [RCW 35.21.684, 35.63.160, 35A.21.312 and 36.01.225, All Amended in 2004]</p> <p><i>Note:</i> A local government may require that manufactured homes (1) are new, (2) are set on a permanent foundation, and (3) comply with local design standards applicable to other homes in the neighborhood; but may not discriminate against consumer choice in housing.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Location(s): BMC 19.10.135 reference to factory-assembled structure.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i></p>	<p>Consider adding consistent terminology to definition.</p>

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

11. The Zoning Code should contain the following provisions:	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
f. Residential structures that are occupied by persons with handicaps, and group care for children that meet the definition of “familial status” must be regulated the same as a similar residential structure occupied by a family or other unrelated individuals. [RCW 36.70A.410, RCW 70.128.140, RCW 49.60.222-225]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.10.160, Family (combined with) BMC 19.10.115, Dwelling Unit (references the term “family”)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

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

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

12. Subdivision Code regulations	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
b. Code requires written findings documenting that proposed subdivisions provide appropriate provision under RCW 58.17.110(2)(a) for: Streets or roads, sidewalks, alleys, other public ways, transit stops, and other features that assure safe walking conditions for students; potable water supplies [RCW 19.27.097], sanitary wastes, and drainage ways (stormwater retention and detention); open spaces, parks and recreation, and playgrounds; and schools and school grounds.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Subdivision update should consider these requirements.
c. Subdivision regulations may implement traffic demand management (TDM) policies. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)] <i>Note:</i> Examples may include requiring new development to be oriented towards transit streets, pedestrian-oriented site and building design, and requiring bicycle and pedestrian connections to street and trail networks.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Subdivision update should consider these requirements.
13. Concurrency, Impact Fees, and TDM	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

13. Concurrency, Impact Fees, and TDM	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. The transportation concurrency ordinance includes specific language that prohibits development when level of service standards for transportation facilities cannot be met. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b)] <i>Note:</i> Concurrency is required for transportation, but may also be applied to other facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 18.70.070 See TR 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 (pg 2-70)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	All sections in 18.70 should be amended and updated. Current LOS in comp plan is not reflected in BMC.
b. <i>If adopted:</i> impact fee methods are consistent with RCW 82.02.050 through 100	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.35	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	
c. If required by RCW 70.94.527: a commute trip reduction ordinance to reduce the proportion of single-occupant vehicle commute trips. [RCW 70.94.521-551, Amended in 2006] <i>Note:</i> WSDOT maintains a list of affected jurisdictions	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC Chapter 10.60 (Ord. 498)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Further review needed	

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

14. Siting Essential Public Facilities (EPFs)	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. Regulations are consistent with Essential Public Facility siting process in countywide planning policies or city comprehensive plan, and do not preclude the siting of EPFs. [RCW 36.70A.200(5)]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): 19.15.005.12(SFR) 19.15.010.14(MFR) 19.15.025.10(DC) 19.15.035.12(CC) 19.15.040.13(CR) 19.15.050.17(I) 19.15.055.11(SPA-1) 19.15.065.11(SPA-3) 19.15.070.15(SPA-4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	Not sure.
15. Project Review Procedures	Addressed in current plan or regulations? If yes, where?	Changes needed to meet current statute?	Is city considering optional amendments? (comments voluntary)
a. Project review processes integrate permit and environmental review for: notice of application; notice of complete application; one open-record public hearing; allowing applicants to combine public hearings and decisions for multiple permits; notice of decision; one closed-record appeal. [RCW 36.70A.470, RCW 36.70B and RCW 43.21C]	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Location(s): BMC 19.65.065[2] BMC 19.65.070[2] BMC 19.65.075[2]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Further review needed</i>	

Periodic Update Checklist for Cities

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