EXHIBIT 87 86

WAC 365-196-820

Agency filings affecting this section

Subdivisions.

(1) Regulations for subdivision approvals and dedications, must require that the county or city make written findings that "appropriate provisions" have been made for the public health, safety, and general welfare, including open spaces, drainage ways, streets or roads, alleys, other public ways, transit stops, potable water supplies, sanitary wastes, parks and recreation, playgrounds, schools and school grounds, and all other relevant factors, including sidewalks and other planning features that assure safe walking conditions for students who walk to and from school; and that the public use and interest will be served by the platting of such subdivision and dedication.

(2) Regulations for short plat and short subdivision approvals may require written findings for "appropriate provisions" that are different requirements than those governing the approval of preliminary and final plats of subdivisions. However, counties and cities must include in their short plat regulations and procedures provisions for considering sidewalks and other planning features that assure safe walking conditions for students who walk to and from school.

(3) Regulations for subdivision approvals may require that the county or city make additional findings related to the public health, safety and general welfare to the specific listing above, such as protection of critical areas, conservation of natural resource lands, and affordable housing for all economic segments of the population.

(4) In drafting development regulations, "appropriate provisions" should be defined in a manner consistent with the requirements of other applicable laws and with any level of service standards or planning objectives established by the city or county for the facilities involved. The definition of "appropriate provisions" could also cover the timing within which the facilities involved should be available for use, requiring, for example, that such timing be consistent with the definition of "concurrency" in this chapter. See WAC 365-196-210.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 36.70A.050 and 36.70A.190. WSR 10-03-085, § 365-196-820, filed 1/19/10, effective 2/19/10.]

WAC 365-196-825

Agency filings affecting this section

Potable water.

(1) Each applicant for a building permit of a building needing potable water shall provide evidence of an adequate water supply for the intended use of the building. Local regulations should be designed to produce enough data to make such a determination, addressing both water quality and water quantity issues. RCW 19.27.097 provides that such evidence may be in the form of a water right permit from the department of ecology, a letter from an approved water purveyor stating the ability to provide water, or another form sufficient to verify the existence of an adequate water supply.

(2) Counties and cities should give consideration to guidelines promulgated by the departments of ecology and health on what constitutes an adequate water supply. In addition, Attorney General's Opinion, AGO 1992 No. 17, should be consulted for assistance in determining what substantive standards should be applied.

(3) If the department of ecology has adopted rules on this subject, or any part of it, local regulations should be consistent with those rules. Such rules may include instream flow rules, which may limit the availability of additional ground or surface water within a specific geographic area.

(4) Counties and cities may impose conditions on building permits requiring connection to an existing public water system where the existing system is willing and able to provide safe and reliable potable water to the applicant with reasonable economy and efficiency.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 36.70A.050 and 36.70A.190. WSR 10-03-085, § 365-196-825, filed 1/19/10, effective 2/19/10.]

WAC 365-196-830

Agency filings affecting this section

Protection of critical areas.

(1) The act requires the designation of critical areas and the adoption of regulations for the protection of such areas by all counties and cities, including those that do not plan under RCW 36.70A.040. The department has adopted minimum guidelines in chapter 365-190 WAC detailing the process involved in establishing a program to protect critical areas.

(2) Critical areas that must be protected include the following areas and ecosystems:

(a) Wetlands;

(b) Areas of critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water;

(c) Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas;

(d) Frequently flooded areas; and

(e) Geologically hazardous areas.

(3) "Protection" in this context means preservation of the functions and values of the natural environment, or to safeguard the public from hazards to health and safety.

(4) Although counties and cities may protect critical areas in different ways or may allow some localized impacts to critical areas, or even the potential loss of some critical areas, development regulations must preserve the existing functions and values of critical areas. If development regulations allow harm to critical areas, they must require compensatory mitigation of the harm. Development regulations may not allow a net loss of the functions and values of the ecosystem that includes the impacted or lost critical areas.

(5) Counties and cities must include the best available science in developing policies and development regulations to protect functions and values of critical areas. See chapter 365-195 WAC.

(6) Functions and values must be evaluated at a scale appropriate to the function being evaluated. Functions are the conditions and processes that support the ecosystem. Conditions and processes operate on varying geographic scales ranging from site-specific to watershed and even regional scales. Some critical areas, such as wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, may constitute ecosystems or parts of ecosystems that transcend the boundaries of individual parcels and jurisdictions, so that protection of their function, and values should be considered on a larger scale.

(7) Protecting some critical areas may require using both regulatory and nonregulatory measures. When impacts to critical areas are from development beyond jurisdictional control, counties and cities are encouraged to use regional approaches to protect functions and values. It is especially important to use a regional approach when giving special consideration to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries. Conservation and protection measures may address land uses on any lands within a jurisdiction, and not only lands with designated critical areas.

(8) Local government may develop and implement alternative means of protecting critical areas from some activities using best management practices or a combination of regulatory and nonregulatory programs. When developing alternative means of protection, counties and cities must assure no net loss of functions and values and must include the best available science.

(9) In designing development regulations and nonregulatory programs to protect designated critical areas, counties and cities should endeavor to make such regulations and programs fit together with regional, state and federal programs directed to the same environmental, health, safety and welfare ends. Local plans and policies may in some respects be adequately implemented by adopting the provisions of such other programs as part of the local regulations.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 36.70A.050 and 36.70A.190. WSR 10-03-085, § 365-196-830, filed 1/19/10, effective 2/19/10.]

WAC 365-196-840

Agency filings affecting this section

Concurrency.

(1) Purpose.

(a) The purpose of concurrency is to assure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development are adequate to serve that development at the time it is available for occupancy and use, without decreasing service levels below locally established minimum standards.

(b) Concurrency describes the situation in which adequate facilities are available when the impacts of development occur, or within a specified time thereafter. Concurrency ensures consistency in land use approval and the development of adequate public facilities as plans are implemented, and it prevents development that is inconsistent with the public facilities necessary to support the development.

(c) With respect to facilities other than transportation facilities counties and cities may fashion their own regulatory responses and are not limited to imposing moratoria on development during periods when concurrency is not maintained.

(2) Determining the public facilities subject to concurrency. Concurrency is required for locally owned transportation facilities and for transportation facilities of statewide significance that serve counties consisting of islands whose only connection to the mainland are state highways or ferry routes. Counties and cities may adopt a concurrency mechanism for other facilities that are deemed necessary for development. See WAC 365-196-415(5).

(3) Establishing an appropriate level of service.

(a) The concept of concurrency is based on the maintenance of specified levels of service with respect to each of the public facilities to which concurrency applies. For all such facilities, counties and cities should designate appropriate levels of service.

(b) Level of service is typically set in the capital facilities element or the transportation element of the comprehensive plan. The level of service is used as a basis for developing the transportation and capital facilities plans.

(c) Counties and cities should set level of service to reflect realistic expectations consistent with the achievement of growth aims. Setting levels of service too high could, under some regulatory strategies, result in no growth. As a deliberate policy, this would be contrary to the act.

(d) Counties and cities should coordinate with and reach agreements with other affected purveyors or service providers when establishing level of service standards for facilities or services provided by others.

(e) The level of service standards adopted by the county or city should vary based on the urban or rural character of the surrounding area and should be consistent with the land use plan and policies. The county or city should also balance the desired community character, funding capacity, and traveler expectations when adopting levels of service for transportation facilities. For example a plan that calls for a safe pedestrian environment that promotes walking or one that promotes development of a bike system so that biking trips can be substituted for auto trips may suggest using a level of service that includes measures of the pedestrian environment.

(f) For transportation facilities, level of service standards for locally owned arterials and transit routes should be regionally coordinated. In some cases, this may mean less emphasis on peak-hour automobile capacity, for example, and more emphasis on other transportation priorities. Levels of service for highways of statewide significance are set by the Washington state department of transportation. For other state highways, levels of service are set in the regional transportation plan developed under RCW 47.80.030. Local levels of service for state highways should conform to the state and regionally adopted standards found in the statewide multimodal transportation plan and regional transportation plans. Other transportation facilities, however, may reflect local priorities.

(4) Measurement methodologies.

(a) Depending on how a county or city balances these factors and the characteristics of travel in their community, a county or city may select different ways to measure travel performance. For example,

counties and cities may measure performance at different times of day, week, or month (peak versus off-peak, weekday versus weekend, summer versus winter). A city or county may choose to focus on the total multimodal supply of infrastructure available for use during a peak or off-peak period. Counties and cities may also measure performance at different geographic scales (intersections, road or route segments, travel corridors, or travel zones or measure multimodal mobility within a district).

(b) In urban areas, the department recommends counties and cities adopt methodologies that analyze the transportation system from a comprehensive, multimodal perspective, as authorized by RCW 36.70A.108. Multimodal level of service methodologies and standards should consider the needs of travelers using the four major modes of travel (auto, public transportation, bicycle, and pedestrian), their impacts on each other as they share the street or intersection, and their mode specific requirements for street and intersection design and operation.

(c) Although level of service standards and measurement methodologies are interrelated, changes in methodology, even if they have an incidental effect on the resulting level of service for a particular facility, are not necessarily a change in the level of service standard.

(5) Concurrency regulations.

(a) Each planning jurisdiction should produce a regulation or series of regulations which govern the operation of that jurisdiction's concurrency management system. This regulatory scheme will set forth the procedures and processes to be used to determine whether relevant public facilities have adequate capacity to accommodate a proposed development. In addition, the scheme should identify the responses to be taken when it is determined that capacity is not adequate to accommodate a proposal. Relevant public facilities for these purposes are those to which concurrency applies under the comprehensive plan. Adequate capacity refers to the maintenance of concurrency.

(b) Compliance with applicable environmental requirements, such as ambient air quality standards or water quality standards, should have been built into the determination of the facility capacities needed to accommodate anticipated growth.

(c) The variations possible in designing a concurrency management system are many. However, such a system could include the following features:

(i) Capacity monitoring - a process for collecting and maintaining real world data on use for comparison with evolving public facility capacities in order to show at any moment how much of the capacity of public facilities is being used;

(ii) Capacity allocation procedures - a process for determining whether proposed new development can be accommodated within the existing or programmed capacity of public facilities. This can include preassigning amounts of capacity to specific zones, corridors or areas on the basis of planned growth. For any individual development this may involve:

(A) A determination of anticipated total capacity at the time the impacts of development occur.

(B) Calculation of how much of the total capacity will be used by existing developments and other planned developments at the time the impacts of development occur. If a local government does not require a concurrency certification or exempts small projects from the normal concurrency process, it should still calculate the capacity used and subtract that from the capacity available.

(C) Calculation of the amount of capacity available for the proposed development.

(D) Calculation of the impact on capacity of the proposed development, minus the effects of any mitigation provided by the applicant. (Standardized smaller developments can be analyzed based on predetermined capacity impact values.)

(E) Comparison of available capacity with project impact. For any project that places demands on public facilities, cities and counties must determine if levels of service will fall below locally established minimum standards.

(iii) Provisions for reserving capacity - A process of prioritizing the allocation of capacity to proposed developments. This process might include one of the following alternatives:

(A) Setting aside a block or blocks of available or anticipated capacity for specified types of development fulfilling an identified public interest;

(B) Adopting a first-come, first-served system of allocation, dedicating capacity to applications in the order received; or

(C) Adopting a preference system giving certain categories or specified types of development preference over others in the allocation of available capacity.

(6) Regulatory response to the absence of concurrency. The comprehensive plan should provide a strategy for responding when approval of any particular development would cause levels of service for concurrency to fall below the locally adopted standards. To the extent that any jurisdiction uses denial of development as its regulatory response to the absence of concurrency, consideration should be given to defining this as an emergency for the purposes of the ability to amend or revise the comprehensive plan.

(a) In the case of transportation, an ordinance must prohibit development approval if the development causes the level of service on a locally owned transportation facility to decline below the standards adopted in the transportation element of the comprehensive plan unless improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development.

(i) These strategies may include increased public transportation service, ride sharing programs, demand management, and other transportation systems management strategies.

(ii) "Concurrent with development" means that improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years.

(b) If the proposed development is consistent with the land use element, relevant levels of service should be reevaluated.

(c) Other responses could include:

(i) Development of a system of deferrals, approving proposed developments in advance but deferring authority to construct until adequate public facilities become available at the location in question. Such a system should conform to and help to implement the growth phasing schedule contemplated in the land use and capital facilities elements of the plan.

(ii) Conditional approval through which the developer agrees to mitigate the impacts.

(iii) Denial of the development, subject to resubmission when adequate public facilities are made available.

(iv) Redesign of the project or implementation of demand management strategies to reduce trip generation to a level that is within the available capacity of the system.

(v) Transportation system management measures to increase the capacity of the transportation system.

(7) Form, timing and duration of concurrency approvals. The system should include provisions for how to show that a project has met the concurrency requirement, whether as part of another approval document (e.g., permit, platting decisions, planned unit development) or as a separate certificate of concurrency, possibly a transferable document. This choice, of necessity, involves determining when in the approval process the concurrency issue is evaluated and decided. Approvals, however made, should specify the length of time that a concurrency determination will remain effective, including requirements for development progress necessary to maintain approval.

(8) Provisions for interjurisdictional coordination - SEPA consistency. Counties and cities should consider integrating SEPA compliance on the project-specific level with the case-by-case process for concurrency management.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 36.70A.050 and 36.70A.190. WSR 10-03-085, § 365-196-840, filed 1/19/10, effective 2/19/10.]

WAC 365-196-845

Agency filings affecting this section

Local project review and development

agreements.

(1) The local Project Review Act (chapter 36.70B RCW) requires counties and cities planning under the act to adopt procedures for fair and timely review of project permits under RCW 36.70B.020(4), such as building permits, subdivisions, binding site plans, planned unit developments, conditional uses, and other permits or other land use actions. The project permitting procedures ensure that when counties and cities implement goal 7 of the act, under RCW 36.70A.020(7), applications for both state and local government permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner.

(2) Consolidated permit review process.

(a) Counties and cities must adopt a permit review process that provides for consolidated review of all permits necessary for a proposed project action. The permit review process must provide for the following:

(i) A consolidated project coordinator for a consolidated project permit application;

(ii) A consolidated determination of completeness;

(iii) A consolidated notice of application;

(iv) A consolidated set of hearings; and

(v) A consolidated notice of final decision that includes all project permits being reviewed through the consolidated permit review process.

(b) Counties and cities administer many different types of permits, which can generally be grouped into categories. The following are examples of project permit categories:

(i) Permits that do not require environmental review or public notice, and may be administratively approved;

(ii) Permits that require environmental review, but do not require a public hearing; and

(iii) Permits that require environmental review and/or a public hearing, and may provide for a closed record appeal.

(c) Local project review procedures should address, at a minimum, the following for each category of permit:

(i) What is required for a complete application;

(ii) How the county or city will provide notice of application;

(iii) Who makes the final decision;

(iv) How long local project review is likely to take;

(v) What fees and charges will apply, and when an applicant must pay fees and charges;

(vi) How to appeal the decision;

(vii) Whether a preapplication conference is required;

(viii) A determination of consistency; and

(ix) Requirements for provision of notice of decision.

(d) A project permit applicant may apply for individual permits separately.

(3) Project permits that may be excluded from consolidated permit review procedures. A local government may, by ordinance or resolution, exclude some permit types from these procedures. Excluded permit types may include:

(a) Actions relating to the use of public areas or facilities such as landmark designations or street vacations;

(b) Actions categorically exempt from environmental review, or for which environmental review has already been completed such as lot line or boundary adjustments, and building and other construction permits, or similar administrative approvals; or

(c) Other project permits that the local government has determined present special circumstances.

(4) RCW 36.70A.470 prohibits using project review conducted under chapter 36.70B RCW from being used as a comprehensive planning process. Except when considering an application for a major industrial development under RCW 36.70A.365, counties and cities may not consolidate project permit

review with review of proposals, to amend the comprehensive plan, even if the comprehensive plan amendment is site-specific. Counties and cities may not combine a project permit application with an area-wide rezone or a text amendment to the development regulations, even if proposed along with a project permit application.

(5) Consolidated project coordinator.

(a) Counties and cities should appoint a single project coordinator for each consolidated project permit application.

(b) Counties and cities should require the applicant for a project permit to designate a single person or entity to receive determinations and notices about a project permit application as authorized by RCW 36.70A.100.

(6) Determination of complete application.

(a) A project permit application is complete for the purposes of this section when it meets the county's or city's procedural submission requirements and is sufficient for continued processing, even if additional information is required, or the project is subsequently modified.

(b) The development regulations must specify, for each type of permit application, what information a permit application must contain to be considered complete. This may vary based on the type of permit.

(c) For more complex projects, counties and cities are encouraged to use preapplication meetings to clarify the project action and local government permitting requirements and review procedures. Counties and cities may require a preapplication conference.

(d) Within twenty-eight days of receiving a project permit application, counties and cities must provide to the applicant a written determination of completeness or request for more information stating either:

(i) The application is complete; or

(ii) The application is incomplete and what is necessary to make the application complete.

(e) A determination of completeness or request for more information is required within fourteen days of the applicant providing additional requested information.

(f) The application is deemed complete if the county and city does not provide the applicant with a determination of completeness or request for more information within the twenty-eight days of receiving the application.

(g) The determination of completeness may include a preliminary determination of consistency and a preliminary determination of development regulations that will be used for project mitigation.

(h) Counties and cities may require project applicants to provide additional information or studies, either at the time of the notice of completeness or if the county or city requires new information during the course of continued review, at the request of reviewing agencies, or if the proposed action substantially changes.

(7) Identification of permits from other agencies. To the extent known, the county or city must identify other agencies of local, state, or federal governments that may have jurisdiction over some aspect of the application. However, the applicant is solely responsible for knowing of, and obtaining any permits necessary for, a project action.

(8) Notice of project permit application. Notice of a project permit application must be provided to the public and the departments and agencies with jurisdiction over the project permit application. It may be combined with the notice of complete application.

(a) What the notice of application must include:

(i) The date of application, the date of the notice of completion, and the date of the notice of application;

(ii) A description of the proposed project action and a list of the project permits included in the application and a list of any required studies;

(iii) The identification of other permits not included in the application that the proposed project may require, to the extent known by the county or city;

(iv) The identification of existing environmental documents that evaluate the proposed project;

(v) The location where the application and any studies can be reviewed;

(vi) A preliminary determination, if one has been made at the time of notice, of which development regulations will be used for project mitigation and of project consistency as provided in RCW 36.70B.040 and chapter 365-197 WAC;

(vii) Any other information determined appropriate by the local government;

(viii) A statement of the public comment period. The statement must explain the following:

(A) How to comment on the application;

(B) How to receive notice of and participate in any hearings on the application;

(C) How to obtain a copy of the decision once made; and

(D) Any rights to appeal the decision.

(ix) If the project requires a hearing or hearings, and they have been scheduled by the date of notice of application, the notice must specify the date, time, place, and type of any hearings required for the project.

(b) When the notice of application must be provided. Notice of application must be provided within fourteen days of determining an application is complete. If the project permit requires an open record predecision hearing, the county or city must provide the notice of application at least fifteen days before the open record hearing.

(c) How to provide notice of application. A county or city may provide notice in different ways for different types of project permits depending on the size and scope of the project and the types of permit approval included in the project permit. Project review procedures should specify as minimum requirements, how to provide notice for each type of permit. Cities and counties may use a variety of methods for providing notice. However, if the local government does not specify how it will provide public notice, it shall use the methods specified in RCW 36.70B.110 (4)(a) and (b). Examples of reasonable methods of providing notice are:

(i) Posting the property for site-specific proposals;

(ii) Publishing notice in written media such as in the newspaper of general circulation in the general area where the proposal is located, in appropriate regional or neighborhood newspapers, trade journals, agency newsletters or sending notice to agency mailing lists, either general lists or lists for specific proposals or subject areas; or in a local land use newsletter published by the local government;

(iii) Notifying public or private groups with known interest in a certain proposal or in the type of proposal being considered;

(iv) Notifying the news media;

(v) Mailing to neighboring property owners; or

(vi) Providing notice by posting the application and other documentation using electronic media such as an e-mail and a web site.

(9) The application comment period. The comment period must be at least fourteen days and no more than thirty days from the date of notice of application. A county or city may accept public comments any time before the record closes for an open record predecision hearing. If no open record predecision hearing is provided, a county or city may accept public comments any time before the decision on the project permit.

(10) Project review timelines. Counties and cities must establish and implement a permit process time frame for review of each type of project permit application, and for consolidated permit applications, and must provide timely and predictable procedures for review. The time periods for county or city review of each type of complete application should not exceed one hundred twenty days unless written findings specify the additional time needed for processing. Project permit review time periods established elsewhere, such as in RCW 58.17.140 should be followed for those actions. Counties and cities are encouraged to consider expedited review for project permit applications for projects that are consistent with adopted development regulations and within the capacity of system wide infrastructure improvements.

(11) Hearings. Where multiple permits are required for a single project, counties and cities must allow for consolidated permit review as provided in RCW 36.70B.120(1). Counties and cities must determine which project permits require hearings. If hearings are required for certain permit categories, the review process must provide for no more than one consolidated open record hearing and one closed record appeal. An open record appeal hearing is only allowed for permits in which no open record hearing is provided prior to the decision. Counties and cities may combine an open record hearing on one or more permits with an open record appeal hearing on other permits. Hearings may be combined with hearings required for state, federal or other permits hearings provided that the hearing is held within the geographic boundary of the local government and the state or federal agency is not expressly prohibited by statute from doing so.

(12) Project permit decisions. A county or city may provide for the same or a different decision maker, hearing body or officer for different categories of project permits. The consolidated permit review process must specify which decision maker must make the decision or recommendation, conduct any required hearings or decide an appeal to ensure that consolidated permit review occurs as provided in this section.

(13) Notice of decision.

(a) The notice of decision must include the following:

(i) A statement of any SEPA threshold determination;

(ii) An explanation of how to file an administrative appeal (if provided) of the decision; and

(iii) A statement that the affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes notwithstanding any program of revaluation.

(b) Notice of decision should also include:

(i) Any findings on which the final decision was based;

(ii) Any conditions of permit approval conditions or required mitigation; and

(iii) The permit expiration date, where applicable.

(c) Notice of decision may be in the form of a copy of the report or decision on the project permit application, provided it meets the minimum requirements for a notice of decision.

(d) How to provide notice of decision. A local government may provide notice in different ways for different types of project permits depending on the size and scope of the project and the types of permit approval included in the project permit. Project review procedures should specify as minimum requirements, how to provide notice for each type of permit. Examples of reasonable methods of providing notice of decision are:

(i) Posting the property for site-specific proposals;

(ii) Publishing notice in written media such as in the newspaper of general circulation in the general area where the proposal is located, in appropriate regional or neighborhood newspapers, trade journals, agency newsletters or sending notice to agency mailing lists, either general lists or lists for specific proposals or subject areas; or in a local land use newsletter published by the county or city;

(iii) Notifying public or private groups with known interest in a certain proposal or in the type of proposal being considered;

(iv) Notifying the news media;

(v) Mailing to neighboring property owners; or

(vi) Providing notice and posting the application and other documentation using electronic media such as e-mail and a web site.

(e) Cities and counties must provide a notice of decision to the following:

(i) The project applicant;

(ii) Any person who requested notice of decision;

(iii) Any person who submitted substantive comments on the application; and

(iv) The county assessor's office of the county or counties in which the property is situated.

(14) Appeals. A county or city is not required to provide for administrative appeals for project permit decisions. However, where appeals are provided, procedures should allow for no more than one consolidated open record hearing, if not already held, and one closed-record appeal. Provisions should ensure that appeals are to be filed within fourteen days after the notice of final decision and may be extended to twenty-one days to allow for appeals filed under chapter 43.21C RCW.

(15) Monitoring permit decisions. Each county and city shall adopt procedures to monitor and enforce permit decisions and conditions such as periodic review of permit provisions, inspections, and bonding provisions.

(16) Code interpretation. Project permitting procedures must include adopted procedures for administrative interpretation of development regulations. For example, procedures should specify who provides an interpretation related to a specific project, and where a record of such code interpretations are kept so that subsequent interpretations are consistent. Code interpretation procedures help ensure a consistent and predictable interpretation of development regulations.

(17) Development agreements. Counties and cities are authorized by RCW 36.70B.170(1) to enter into voluntary contractual agreements to govern the development of land and the issuance of project permits. These are referred to as development agreements.

(a) Purpose. The purpose of development agreements is to allow a county or city and a property owner/developer to enter into an agreement regarding the applicable regulations, standards, and mitigation that apply to a specific development project after the development agreement is executed.

(i) If the development regulations allow some discretion in how those regulations apply or what mitigation is necessary, the development agreement specifies how the county or city will use that discretion. Development agreements allow counties and cities to combine an agreement on the exercise of its police power with the exercise of its power to enter contracts.

(ii) Development agreements must be consistent with applicable development regulations adopted by a county or city. Development agreements do not provide means of waiving or amending development regulations that would otherwise apply to a project.

(iii) Counties and cities may not use development agreements to impose impact fees, inspection fees, or dedications, or require any other financial contribution or mitigation measures except as otherwise expressly authorized, and consistent with the applicable development regulations.

(b) Parties to the development agreement. The development agreement must include as a party to the agreement, the person who owns or controls the land subject to the agreement. Development agreements may also include others, including other agencies with permitting authority or service providers. Cities and counties may enter into development agreements outside of their boundaries if the agreement is part of a proposed annexation or service agreement.

(c) Content of a development agreement. The development agreement must set forth the development standards and other provisions that apply to, govern, and vest the development, use, and mitigation of the development of the real property for the duration of the agreement. These may include, but are not limited to:

(i) Project elements such as permitted uses, residential densities, and intensity of commercial or industrial land uses and building sizes;

(ii) The amount and payment of fees imposed or agreed to in accordance with any applicable laws or rules in effect at the time, any reimbursement provisions, other financial contributions by the property owner, inspection fees, or dedications;

(iii) Mitigation measures, development conditions, and other requirements under chapter 43.21C RCW;

(iv) Design standards such as maximum heights, setbacks, drainage and water quality requirements, landscaping, and other development features;

(v) Affordable housing;

(vi) Parks and open space preservation;

(vii) Phasing;

(viii) Review procedures and standards of implementing decisions;

(ix) A build-out or vesting period for applicable standards; and

(x) Any other appropriate development requirement or procedure.

(d) The effect of development agreements. Development agreements may exercise a county's or city's authority to issue permits or its contracting authority. Once executed, development agreements are binding between the parties and their successors, including a city that assumes jurisdiction through incorporation or annexation of the area covering the property covered by the development agreement. The agreement grants vesting rights to the proposed development consistent with the development regulations in existence at the time of execution of the agreement. A permit approval issued by the county or city after the execution of the development agreement must be consistent with the development agreement. A development agreement may obligate a party to fund or provide services, infrastructure or other facilities. A development agreement may not obligate a county or city to adopt subsequent amendments to the comprehensive plan, development regulations or otherwise delegate legislative powers. Any such amendments must still be adopted by the legislative body following all applicable procedural requirements.

(e) A development agreement must reserve authority to impose new or different regulations to the extent required by a serious threat to public health and safety.

(f) Procedures.

(i) These procedural requirements are in addition to and supplemental to the procedural requirements necessary for any actions, such as rezones, street vacations or annexations, called for in a development agreement. Development agreements may not be used to bypass any procedural requirements that would otherwise apply. Counties and cities may combine hearings, analyses, or reports provided the process meets all applicable procedural requirements;

(ii) Only the county or city legislative authority may approve a development agreement;

(iii) A county or city must hold a public hearing prior to executing a development agreement. The public hearing may be conducted by the county or city legislative body, planning commission or hearing examiner, or other body designated by the legislative body to conduct the public hearing; and

(iv) A development agreement must be recorded in the county where the property is located.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 36.70A.050 and 36.70A.190. WSR 10-03-085, § 365-196-845, filed 1/19/10, effective 2/19/10.]

WAC 365-196-850

Agency filings affecting this section

Impact fees.

(1) Counties and cities planning under the act are authorized to impose impact fees on development activities as part of public facilities financing. However, the financing for system improvements to serve new development must provide a balance between impact fees and other sources of public funds and cannot rely solely on impact fees.

(2) The decision to use impact fees should be specifically implemented through development regulations. The regulations should call for a specific finding on all three of the following limitations whenever an impact fee is imposed. The impact fees:

(a) Must only be imposed for system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development. "System improvements" (in contrast to "project improvements") are public facilities included in the capital facilities plan that are designed to provide service to service areas within the community at large;

(b) Must not exceed a proportionate share of the costs of system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development; and

(c) Must be used for system improvements that will reasonably benefit the new development.

(3) Impact fees may be collected and spent only for the following capital facilities owned or operated by government entities:

(a) Public streets and roads;

(b) Publicly owned parks;

(c) Open space and recreation facilities;

(d) School facilities; and

(e) Fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire district.

(4) Capital facilities for which impact fees will be imposed must have been addressed in a capital facilities plan element which identifies:

(a) Deficiencies in public facilities serving existing development and the means by which existing deficiencies will be eliminated within a reasonable period of time;

(b) Additional demands placed on existing public facilities by new development; and

(c) Additional public facility improvements required to serve new development.

(5) The local ordinance by which impact fees are imposed must conform to the provisions of RCW 82.02.060. The department recommends that jurisdictions include the authorized exemption for low-income housing.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 36.70A.050 and 36.70A.190. WSR 10-03-085, § 365-196-850, filed 1/19/10, effective 2/19/10.]