

Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
1	3	<p>Revise so that it is consistent with RCW 36. 70A.110(4) which provides in general, cities are the units of local government most appropriate to provide urban governmental services." This change is needed to comply with state law. Please see page 5 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments: <i>RCW 36.70A.110(4) provides that:</i> (4) In general, cities are the units of local government most appropriate to provide urban governmental services. In general, it is not appropriate that urban governmental services be extended to or expanded in rural areas except in those limited circumstances shown to be necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development.</p> <p>However, Topic 1 Policy 3 on pages of 24 is not consistent with this requirement. We recommend that Topic 1 Policy 3 be rewritten to read as follows with our additions double underlined and our deletions double struck through.</p> <p>3. It is appropriate that urban government services be provided by Spokane County and its constituent cities <u>and towns</u>, and urban government services should not be provided in rural areas [RCW 36.0A.110(3&4)].</p>	<p>We support the notion that cities are, by tradition, places and custodians of urban services. We recognize, also, that Spokane County has a somewhat unique role to oversee urban development in UGAs that are not proposed for annexation in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>We suggest:</p> <p>3. Within UGAs, it is most appropriate that urban government services be provided by cities, towns, and special districts. Urban government services should not be provided in rural areas</p>
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
1	7a	<p>Revise to prohibit including forest and agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance in urban growth areas as state law requires. Please see page 6 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments: <i>RCW 36.70A.060(4) provides that:</i> "Forestlands and agricultural land located within urban growth areas shall not be designated by a county or city as forestland or agricultural land of long-term commercial significance under RCW 36.70A.170 unless the city or county has enacted a program authorizing transfer or purchase of development rights." Spokane County does not have a purchase or transfer of development</p>	<p>We support adding clarity to this policy. Spokane County currently allows transfer of development rights "...if a site contains a regulated wetland, wetland buffer, or buffer area which is required to protect priority habitats or species areas or geologically hazardous areas."</p>

		<p>rights program. Spokane County must also conserve the lands that qualify as agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance. 7 So Spokane County cannot legally include agricultural or forest lands of long-term commercial significance in the urban growth areas and cannot convert these lands to open space. So, Topic 1 Policy 7a should be revised to read as follows with our additions double underlined and our deletions double struck through:</p> <p>7. The location of critical areas and natural resource lands shall be a prime consideration in delineating UGAs.</p> <p>a. Whenever possible and practical, n<u>Natural resource lands of long-term commercial significance shall should not be included within UGAs unless used as open space.</u></p>	<p>We suggest:</p> <p>7. The location of critical areas and natural resource lands shall be a prime consideration in delineating UGAs.</p> <p>a. Natural resource lands of long-term commercial significance should not be included within UGAs unless or until the city or county in which they reside has enacted a program authorizing transfer or purchase of development rights.</p>
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
1	7	<p>Retain the requirement to base urban growth area expansions outside cities and towns on the jurisdiction's ability to provide urban governmental services in Topic 1 Policy 7. This is necessary to comply with state law. Please see page 7 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments: <i>Topic 1 Policy 7 on page 6 of 24 formerly provided that:</i> The determination and proposal of an Urban Growth Area (UGA) outside existing incorporated limits shall be based on a jurisdiction's ability to provide urban governmental services at the minimum level of service specified by the Steering Committee. Jurisdictions may establish higher level of service standards in their respective comprehensive plans.</p> <p><i>RCW 36.70A.020(12), the Growth Management Act's public facilities and services goal, provides:</i> Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.</p>	<p>We concur that provision of urban services is the foundation upon which a UGA is planned.</p>

		<p>The public facilities and services goal is implemented by the requirements to prepare a capital facility plan and transportation element to provide the public facilities and services needed to serve the jurisdiction including any urban growth area expansions.⁸ This goal and the requirements are in the Growth Management Act to provide public facilities and services to existing urban growth areas and new growth. One of the specific requirements of the capital facilities plan element is to "inventory existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities"⁹ One of the reasons to inventory capacities is to direct growth to the lowest cost locations to save taxpayers and ratepayers. So, basing urban growth area expansions on the jurisdiction's ability to provide urban governmental services will ensure that necessary public facilities and services are provided and that they can be provided in the least cost locations saving taxpayers and rate payers money.</p>	
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
1	9	<p>Continue to require the submission of a land capacity analysis and evidence of the ability to provide urban governmental services and public facilities along with proposals for urban growth area expansions in Topic 1 Policy 9. These requirements are necessary to comply with the requirement that urban growth area expansions cannot exceed the amount of land required to accommodate the planned population projection and a reasonable market factor and other state laws.⁸ Please see page 8 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Topic 1 Policy 9 on page 6 of 24 currently requires that requests for urban growth area expansions had to include justification in the form of a land capacity analysis, the information documenting the jurisdiction's ability to provide urban governmental services and public facilities, and the amount of population growth which could be</p>	

		<p>accommodated by the expansion and the analytical basis by which this growth figure was derived.¹⁰ This information should continue to be required as it is necessary to comply with state law.</p> <p>The Washington State Supreme Court has held that "a county's UGA designation cannot exceed the amount of land necessary to accommodate the urban growth projected by OFM, plus a reasonable land market supply factor."¹¹ So the ability to document that an urban growth area expansion is needed to accommodate a jurisdiction's population projection and associated land use needs is required before approving an urban growth area expansion. That is why Topic 1 Policy 9 currently requires this information. If the county and cities want future urban growth area expansions to be upheld they should continue to require this information. And as was previously explained, evidence of the ability to provide urban services and capital facilities is necessary too. The requirements in Topic 1 Policy 9 to provide this information along with an urban growth area expansion request should be retained.</p>	<p>We suggest this edit:</p> <p>9. In determining how much additional population can be accommodated within an UGA, jurisdictions should first encourage new development in areas where all urban governmental services and public facilities currently exist and secondly encourage new development in areas where all urban governmental services and public facilities can be provided economically.</p> <p>a. Each jurisdiction shall submit UGA growth projections and a land quantity analysis to support all proposed UGA boundary revisions to the Steering Committee at the time a jurisdiction is considering amendment of its Comprehensive Plan.</p>
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
1	16	<p>Topic 1 Policy 16 cannot be amended to allow new or expanded limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRDs) as an ongoing planning tool. This violates state law.⁴ Please see page 8 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments: Topic 1 Policy 16 on page 7 of 24 is proposed to be amended to allow something called "Local Areas of More Intense Rural Development" as a tool for the preservation of rural open space. This is contrary to state law and must be deleted. The Washington State Supreme Court held that [limited areas of more intense rural development] "LAMIRDs are not intended for continued use as a planning device, rather, they are 'intended to be a one-time recognition of existing areas and uses and are not intended to be used continuously to meet needs (real or perceived) for additional commercial and industrial lands."¹² So new LAMIRDs cannot be established and existing ones cannot be expanded. Calling them something else does not make them legal. To comply with state law, Topic 1 Policy 16 must not be amended to allow something called</p>	

		<p>"Local Areas of More Intense Rural Development." Further, it should be clear clustering and the uses allowed in clusters must comply with state law.¹³ We recommend that proposed Topic 1 Policy 16 be modified to reads as follows with our additions double underlined and our deletions double struck through:</p> <p>16. Local Areas of More Intense Rural Development and <u>e</u>Clustering of rural development may be permitted as a tool for the preservation of rural open space as long as rural character of the area is maintained, and that urban services are not required to serve the new development, <u>and the other applicable requirements of the Growth Management are met.</u></p>	<p>We agree with amended language.</p> <p>Suggest the following:</p> <p>16. Clustering of rural development may be permitted as a tool for the preservation of rural open space as long as rural character of the area is maintained.</p>
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
2		<p>We recommend that joint planning should take place as part of the process for adopting urban growth area expansions to provide for adequate public facilities and services and to ensure that UGAs are developed to the standards of the cities and towns that will ultimately annex the expansions and be responsible for their long-term governance and providing and maintaining public facilities and services. Please see page 9 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>RCW 36. 70A.210(3) provides that countywide planning policies "shall at a minimum, address ... (f) Policies for joint county and city planning within urban growth areas " Joint planning is particularly important because Spokane County does not provide some of the public facilities and services essential for urban development such as potable water and fire services.</p> <p>Policy Topic 2 formerly provided that "the Steering Committee of Elected Officials will be responsible to ensure joint planning within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs)." Now the topic provides that "the Countywide Planning Policies recognize the need for joint planning in the unincorporated UGA, and generally for planning issues that are</p>	<p>We support enhancing the opportunity for joint planning.</p> <p>The Countywide Planning Policies recognize the need for joint planning in the unincorporated to propose or modify a UGA, and generally for planning issues that are interjurisdictional in nature.</p> <p>e. Resolve issues regarding how zoning, subdivision, infrastructure, and other land use approvals and development standards in joint planning areas will be coordinated.</p>

		interjurisdictional in nature." But it does not provide when and how joint planning will occur. We recommend that joint planning should take place as part of the process for adopting urban growth area expansions to provide of adequate public facilities and services and to ensure that UGAs are developed to the standards of the city or town that will ultimately annex them and be responsible for their long-term governance and the maintenance of public facilities and services.	
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
3		<p>Retain the regional minimum level of service standards (LOSs) for urban governmental services. Adopting these minimum levels of service ensure that new developments are adequately served by water and other urban governmental services and that cities and towns will be willing to annex and manage urban governmental services long-term. Please see page 10 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>RCW 36.70A.210(3) provides that countywide planning policies "shall at a minimum, address ... (b) Policies for promotion of contiguous and orderly development and provision of urban services to such development ... " To comply with this requirement, the Steering Committee formerly had accepted regional minimum level of service standards for urban governmental services other than police protection.¹⁴ These regional level of service standards make sense because many capital facilities and urban governmental services are provided by jurisdictions other than the county. Adopting these minimum levels of service ensure that new developments are adequately served by water and other urban governmental services and that cities will be willing to annex and manage these areas long-term. We urge the Steering Committee to retain these minimum level of service standards.</p>	<p>We suggest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each jurisdiction's <u>comprehensive plan</u> should include policies and levels of services in its comprehensive plan to address how urban development will be managed to promote efficiency in the use of land and the provision of urban governmental services and public facilities.

Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
3	7	<p>Because of the high and increasing fire danger in Spokane County, the countywide planning policies should retain the adequate fire protection policies in former Topic 3 Policy 7. Please see page 10 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments: Spokane County, like most of Washington State, is subject to significant fire danger. For example, the 1991 firestorm in Spokane County included over go wildfires.¹⁵ Warming is expected to "bring larger and more frequent wildfires to both sides of the Cascades"¹⁶</p> <p>RCW 36.70A.210(3) provides that countywide planning policies "shall at a minimum, address ... (b) Policies for ... provision of urban services to such development ... " Given the significant and increasing risk of fires, we recommend that Topic 3 Policy 7 calling for policies to plan for adequate fire protection be retained.</p>	<p>We suggest:</p> <p>8. Each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan's policies should encourage construction in areas served by a fire protection district or within the corporate limits of a city providing its own fire department</p>

Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
3	8	<p>Retain Topic 3 Policy 8 until policies that include parameters for the distribution of affordable housing are adopted in the countywide planning policies. This policy is needed to partially comply with RCW 36.70A.210(3)(e). Please see page 11 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments: RCW 36.70A.210(3)(e) requires that countywide planning policies "shall at a minimum, address" "policies that consider the need for affordable housing, such as housing for all economic segments of the population and parameters for its distribution " Topic 3 Policy 8 formerly provided that the "Steering Committee shall recommend to the Board of County Commissioners the allocation of population to jurisdictions based, in part, on each jurisdiction's contribution to regional housing goals and the ability to serve special-needs populations." While this policy does not fully comply with RCW 36.70A.210(3)(e)'s requirement that the countywide planning policies</p>	<p>Restore for now and reconsider when assessing Topic 7 Housing:</p> <p>The Steering Committee will recommend to the Board of County Commissioners the allocation of population to jurisdictions based, in part, on each jurisdiction's contribution to regional housing goals and the ability to serve special needs populations.</p>

		include parameters for its distribution of affordable housing, it partially addressed that requirement. Topic 3 Policy 8 should not be deleted until policies that include parameters for its distribution of affordable housing are adopted as part of the countywide planning policies.		
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Futurewise Statement	
4	1	<p>Retain Topic 4 Policy 1 which called on the county, cities, and other bodies to plan for and acquire parks and open space outside a municipality's corporate boundary and within its urban growth area to keep parks and open space affordable and to reduce the need to displace residents and businesses. Please see page 11 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>After areas are added to the urban growth are developed it becomes more expensive to acquire parks and open space. Topic 4 Policy 1 formerly called on the county, cities, and other bodies to plan for and acquire parks and open space outside a municipality's corporate boundary and within its urban growth area. Since acquiring parks and open space after an area develops will be more expensive, we recommend that Topic 4 Policy 1 be retained. It also reduces the need to displace residents and businesses for the development of parks when urban growth areas become built up.</p>	<p>We suggest:</p> <p>a. The County in consultation with each jurisdiction shall identify potential parks and open space corridors within and between urban growth areas. (RCW 36.70A.160).</p>	
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response	
5	6	<p>Topic 5 Policy 6, formerly Policy 7, should continue to call on jurisdictions to identify and plan for the acquisition and construction of high-capacity transportation corridors. This will provide for more and affordable travel options. Please see page 11 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Topics Policy 6, formerly Policy 7, on page 13 of 24 states that "long term growth and change will necessitate the designation of specific transportation corridors to support high-capacity transportation." While this is certainly true, Topic s Policy 6 no longer calls on</p>	<p>SCEO considered and decided the "designation of specific transportation corridors" was sufficient narrative to show commitment to future acquisition when, and if feasible.</p>	

		jurisdictions to do anything to address the high-capacity transportation corridors. This policy formerly required the identification of these corridors and planning for the acquisition and construction. This policy should restore these provisions. Otherwise, it is largely meaningless.	
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
5	8	<p>Topic 5 Policy 8 should continue to call for the protection of rail corridors for both freight and passenger service. This will help provide travel alternatives and continue to bring tourists and visitors that travel by train to the county. Please see page 12 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Topic 5 Policy 8 formerly recognized the need to maintain existing rail lines for shipping commodities and called on jurisdictions to protect rail facilities to the extent possible for all rail uses. The mainline railroads in Spokane County are used for freight and passenger rail service.¹⁷ Topic 5 Policy 8 should continue to call on protecting rail facilities for all of their uses. We recommend that Topic s Policy 8 be revised to read as follows with our deletions double struck through.</p> <p>8. Jurisdictions should protect rail facilities to the extent possible to maintain existing rail lines for shipments of commodities.</p>	<p>We suggest:</p> <p>9. Jurisdictions should protect rail facilities to the extent possible to maintain existing rail lines for all rail uses.</p>
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
5	11/16	<p>Topic 5 Policies 11 and 16 should continue to call for land use planning that encourages transit use and to reduced energy consumption. Transit use reduces air and water pollution, reduces the need to spend money expanding roadways and highways, and saves riders money. Please see page 12 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Topic 5 Policy 11 formerly provided that each jurisdiction should include land use designations and site design requirements that</p>	

		<p>support transit. Land use measures can significantly increase transit use, allowing riders to save money and reduce air and water pollution.18 Topic 5 Policy 16 called for conserving energy by providing transportation alternatives and planning that makes these alternatives effective. We recommend that Topic 5, Policy 11 and Policy 16 should be retained. Those policies formerly read as follows:</p> <p>11. Each jurisdiction shall address land use designations and site design requirements that are supportive of and compatible with public transportation, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. pedestrian scale neighborhoods and activity centers;b. mixed use development; andc. pedestrian friendly and nonmotorized design. <p>16. Each jurisdiction shall address energy consumption/conservation by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. designing transportation improvements for alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle;b. locating and adopting design standards for new development to support pedestrian or nonmotorized travel;c. providing regulatory and financial incentives to promote efforts of the public and private sector to conserve energy; andd. reducing the number of vehicle miles traveled and number of vehicle trips.	<p>The SCEO considered the deletion/modification of the noted policies and determined each was better suited to definitions and commitments via comprehensive planning as each is generally project-specific.</p>
--	--	--	---

Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
5	17	<p>Topic 5 Policy 17 should continue to call for transit level of service standards to comply with state law which requires transit level of service standards Please see page 13 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) requires comprehensive plans to include “level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system.” RCW 36.70A.210(3) provides that countywide planning policies "shall at a minimum, address ... (d) Policies for countywide transportation facilities and strategies " Transit facilities are countywide transportation facilities and transit is a countywide transportation strategy. So, Topics Policy 17 should continue to call for transit level of service standards to comply with state law. We recommend the following policy should be retained.</p> <p>17. The transportation element of each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan, where transit service exists, will include level of service standards for transit routes and services. Each jurisdiction will coordinate the level of service standards with all adjacent jurisdictions and appropriate agencies.</p>	<p>We suggest:</p> <p>9. Each jurisdiction should coordinate its housing and transportation strategies to support existing, or develop new, public multi-modal transportation systems, including levels of services, in partnership with the Spokane Transit Authority (STA).</p> <p>And</p> <p>16. The transportation element of each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan will include level of service standards for all locally owned arterial facilities and transit routes. Each jurisdiction should coordinate the level of service standards with all adjacent jurisdictions and appropriate agencies.</p>
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
7		<p>Policy Topic 7 must be comprehensively updated to comply with the recently adopted requirements for housing including affordable housing and equity in RCW 36. 70A.070(2) when the State of Washington Department of Commerce guidance is available. Please see page 13 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>RCW 36.70A.210(3)(e) requires that countywide planning policies "shall at a minimum, address" "policies that consider the need for</p>	<p>Consider in 2023 topic update</p>

		<p>affordable housing, such as housing for all economic segments of the population and parameters for its distribution " Since the Countywide Planning Policies for Spokane County were last updated the legislature has made major changes to the requirements for housing elements and planning for housing and affordable housing in RCW 36.70A.070(2). The Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) memorandum to the Steering Committee recommends tabling the affordable housing topic while awaiting further guidance from the Department of Commerce on implementing HB 1220. HB 1220 was the state law that amended the requirements for the housing element and planning for housing and affordable housing. The PTAC recommendation is understandable given the substantial nature of the changes to requirements for the housing element and planning for housing and affordable housing in RCW 36.70A.070(2). Because Policy Topic 7 Affordable Housing requires a major rewrite to reflect the changes to the requirements for the housing element and planning for housing and affordable housing and the State of Washington Department of Commerce's upcoming guidance we support this recommendation.</p>	
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
7	7	<p>Retain and improve Topic 7 Policy 7 to help address housing equity and comply with state law. Please see page 14 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Unfortunately, the update does not table the topic of affordable housing. Instead, it includes substantive amendments that make Policy Topic 7, Affordable Housing, inconsistent with state law. RCW 36.70A.070(2)(f) provides that each "comprehensive plan shall include a plan, scheme, or design" that "identifies and implements policies and regulations to address and begin to undo racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing caused by local policies, plans, and actions</p>	<p>We suggest adding:</p> <p>7. Each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan and development regulations shall recognize and incorporate the mandates of federal and state fair housing laws, particularly as they relate to siting and development of housing for special-needs populations.</p>

		<p>" The Countywide Planning Policies for Spokane County formerly included Topic 7 Policy 7 providing that "each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan and development regulations shall recognize and incorporate the mandates of federal and state fair housing laws, particularly as they relate to siting and development of housing for special-needs populations." Removing this policy is inconsistent with the requirement to that comprehensive plans and development regulations shall "address and begin to undo racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing "19 Federal and state fair housing laws can help undo racially disparate impacts and exclusion in housing.</p> <p>Rather than deleting Topic 7 Policy 7 the Countywide Planning Policies should retain and improve the policy. In addition to being required by state law it is the right thing to do.</p>	
Topic	Policy	Futurewise Statement	Response
Tribal		<p>Futurewise supports adding a new topic area on tribal cultural resources and tribal participation in planning. This is necessary to comply with RCW 36.70A.210(3) and RCW 36.70A.040(8). Please see page 15 of this letter for more information.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>RCW 36.70A.210(3) provides that countywide planning policies "shall at a minimum, address ... (i) Policies that address the protection of tribal cultural resources in collaboration with federally recognized Indian tribes that are invited pursuant to subsection (4) of this section, provided that a tribe, or more than one tribe, chooses to participate in the process." In addition, RCW 36.70A.040(8) provides that federally recognized Indian tribes may voluntarily choose to participate in county or regional planning processes and coordinate with the county and cities that plan under then Growth Management Act (GMA).</p>	<p>New legislation. SCEO intent to include after guidance in 2023.</p> <p><i>Note: Spokane County invited Spokane Tribe and Kalispel Tribe professional staff to participate with the PTAC in 2021-'22.</i></p>

		<p>So, we support adding a new topic area on tribal cultural resources as the Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) memorandum to the Steering Committee recommends. In addition, since the countywide planning policies on one of the chief methods of regional planning, the countywide planning policies should also provide for tribal participation in the countywide planning policy process consistent with RCW 36.70A.040(8).</p>	
--	--	--	--