AN ACT Relating to encouraging rural economic development; amending RCW 36.70A.020, 36.70A.280, 36.70A.330, 90.58.080, and 90.58.080; reenacting and amending RCW 36.70A.070 and 36.70A.130; adding a new section to chapter 35A.14 RCW; adding new sections to chapter 36.70A RCW; creating a new section; providing an effective date; and providing an expiration date.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

NEW SECTION. Sec. 1. The legislature finds that encouraging economic development in rural areas is a compelling reason to amend the growth management act. Additionally, creating a path forward for cities and counties to collaboratively seek solutions to the complicated issues regarding annexation will enable the local jurisdictions to appropriately allocate development without competing for resources.

Asking local jurisdictions to thoughtfully examine the status of their local economy and its potential for growth moving forward has been agreed upon as an appropriate addition to any jurisdiction's comprehensive growth management plan. The legislature finds that economic development is an equally important value and goal within the growth management act and should be thoughtfully considered accordingly.
As the growth management act has evolved and grown over time, it has become a trap for smaller jurisdictions. Small, rural jurisdictions need a safe harbor and an ally to help them effectively plan for their futures while giving them space from the threat of impending litigation costs. The legislature finds that a voluntary, limited safe harbor with assistance from the state may provide that necessary space for small rural jurisdictions to be able to invest their limited funds into growing their community instead of continually defending it from well-meaning outsiders. Small jurisdictions, particularly, in this climate are struggling to decide how to spend their limited funds. Adding more planning requirements only stretches nonexistent dollars. Looking forward, until the legislature finds that funding for planning for growth is a priority, these jurisdictions should not be punished, but instead encouraged to continue their planning endeavors. As such, the smallest, poorest jurisdictions should be given time and space to plan without being burdened by the requirements necessary to their bigger, more prosperous colleagues. The legislature finds that the rural areas of the state are important to this state and, during these difficult times, it is important to enable rural areas to focus on their economic development and growth.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 2. A new section is added to chapter 35A.14 RCW to read as follows:

(1) A code city as provided in RCW 35A.14.296(2) may collaborate with the county or counties where the code city is located to form an interlocal agreement regarding annexation of unincorporated territory within the urban growth area boundary. The interlocal agreement must be formed consistent with the planning requirements of chapter 36.70A RCW. This method of annexation shall be an alternative method and is additional to all other methods provided for in this chapter.

(2) An interlocal agreement under this section will qualify the city for the annexation sales tax credit.

(3) The agreement or plan under this section must address the following:

(a) A balancing of annexations of commercial, industrial, and residential properties so that any potential loss or gain is considered and distributed fairly as determined by tax revenue;

(b) Development, ownership, and maintenance of infrastructure;

(c) The potential for revenue-sharing agreements.
NEW SECTION.  Sec. 3.  A new section is added to chapter 36.70A RCW to read as follows:

(1) The economic development element required by RCW 36.70A.070(7) may include the following:
   (a) A summary of the local economy, such as population, employment, payroll, sectors, businesses, sales, and other information as appropriate;
   (b) A summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the local economy, which may include the commercial, industrial, manufacturing, natural resource, and other locally significant economic sectors and supporting factors such as land use, transportation, utilities, education, workforce, housing, and natural/cultural resources;
   (c) An identification of policies, programs, and projects to foster economic growth and development and to address future needs;
   (d) Policies to promote increases in family, individual, and business incomes;
   (e) An examination of whether sites planned for economic development have adequate public facilities and services, and, as appropriate, a plan for any needed public facilities and services;
   (f) Policies to encourage access to education and training for family wage jobs; and
   (g) Policies and opportunities to address economic development including existing industries and businesses, value-added manufacturing of locally produced natural resources, and the use of locally produced energy and other natural resources.

(2) Each county and city planning under this chapter is encouraged to adopt comprehensive plans and development regulations that promote economic development in urban and rural areas, and evaluate economic performance in the jurisdiction in the time since the most recent update to the comprehensive plan. Each county and city planning under this chapter may make findings regarding the economic condition of the jurisdiction. If there is stagnation or economic deterioration during the period of time since the most recent update to the comprehensive plan, the comprehensive plan and development regulations may be modified to increase economic development opportunities.

(3)(a) Counties with a population of less than 75,000 as of January 1, 2021, as determined by the office of financial management and published on April 1, 2021, that are planning under this chapter, and the cities within those counties, may identify policies,
programs, and development opportunities to address the potential for
economic deterioration and to seize economic development
opportunities that may deviate from prescriptive interpretations of
this chapter.

(b) For purposes of this section, economic deterioration is
exemplified by, but not limited to, any combination of the following
performance outcomes:

(i) Incomes that are at least $10,000 less than the statewide
median household income for the same year as established by the
office of financial management;

(ii) A decrease in the county's household median income during
any year within the prior eight years;

(iii) The inability of the jurisdiction to add new full-time jobs
in sufficient quantities to provide for population increases;

(iv) Decreases or stagnation of economic start-ups during
multiple years within the prior eight years;

(v) Unemployment rates that are higher than the national and
statewide averages over multiple years within the prior eight years;

and

(vi) Decreases or stagnation in the issuance of commercial
building permits during multiple years.

(4) In situations where the competing goals of this chapter would
restrain economic development in the counties described in subsection
(3)(a) of this section, and the cities within those counties, that
are experiencing economic deterioration, the growth management
hearings board and courts shall afford deference to local development
choices that make economic development a priority, consistent with
the presumption of validity required under RCW 36.70A.320.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 4. A new section is added to chapter 36.70A
RCW to read as follows:

(1) For certain countywide planning policy, comprehensive plan,
and development regulations specified in this section, counties and
their cities may apply for a determination of compliance from the
department finding that the action is in compliance with the
requirements of this chapter and chapter 43.21C RCW and the
applicable rules.

(2) Counties and cities may submit the following actions to the
department for approval under this subsection:

(a) Development of or amendments to the housing element;
(b) Development of or amendments to comprehensive plan or
development regulations designating or protecting critical areas;
(c) Development of or amendments to comprehensive plan or
development regulations to designate or assure the conservation of
resource lands;
(d) Development of or amendments to countywide planning policy,
comprehensive plan, or development regulation amendments that change
the urban growth area;
(e) Countywide planning policy, comprehensive plan, or
development regulation amendments that govern the siting of essential
public facilities;
(f) Findings of noncompliance referred to the department by the
growth management hearings board under RCW 36.70A.330.
(3) Matters submitted to the department for approval become
effective when approved by the department as provided in subsection
(5) of this section.
(4)(a) Upon receipt of a proposed comprehensive plan, development
regulation, or countywide planning policy, the department shall:
(i) Provide notice to and opportunity for written comment by all
interested parties of record as a part of the local government review
process for the proposal and to all persons, groups, and agencies
that have requested in writing notice of the proposed action. The
comment period shall be at least 30 days, unless the department
determines that the level of complexity or controversy involved
supports a shorter period;
(ii) In the department's discretion, conduct a public hearing
during the 30-day comment period in the jurisdiction proposing the
comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning
policy;
(iii) Within 15 days after the close of public comment, request
the local government to review the issues identified by the public,
interested parties, groups, and agencies and provide a written
response as to how the proposal addresses the identified issues;
(iv) Within 30 days after receipt of the local government
response pursuant to (a)(iii) of this subsection, make written
findings and conclusions regarding the consistency of the proposal
with the goals and requirements of the growth management act and with
applicable guidelines and procedural criteria adopted by the
department, provide a response to the issues identified in (a)(iii)
of this subsection, and either approve the comprehensive plan,
development regulation, or countywide planning policy as submitted, recommend specific changes necessary to make the comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy approvable, or deny approval of the comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy in those instances where no alternative comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy appears likely to be consistent with the goals and requirements of the growth management act and with applicable guidelines and procedural criteria adopted by the department. The written findings and conclusions shall be provided to the local government, and made available to all interested persons, parties, groups, and agencies of record on the proposal.

(b) If the department recommends changes to the proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy, within 90 days after the department mails the written findings and conclusions to the local government, the local government may:

(i) Agree to the proposed changes by written notice to the department; or

(ii) Submit an alternative comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy. If, in the opinion of the department, the alternative is consistent with the purpose and intent of the changes originally submitted by the department and with this chapter, it shall approve the changes and provide notice to all recipients of the written findings and conclusions. If the department determines the proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the changes proposed by the department, the department may resubmit the proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy for public and agency review pursuant to this section or reject the proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy.

(5) The department shall approve a proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy unless it determines that the proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy is not consistent with the goals and requirements of the growth management act and with applicable guidelines and procedural criteria adopted by the department.
(6) A comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy takes effect when and in such form as approved or adopted by the department. The effective date is 14 days from the date of the department's written notice of final action to the local government stating the department has approved or rejected the proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy. The department's written notice to the local government must conspicuously and plainly state that it is the department's final decision and that there will be no further modifications to the proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy. The department shall maintain a record of each comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy, the action taken on any proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy, and any appeal of the department's action.

(7) Promptly after approval or disapproval of a comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy, the department shall publish a notice consistent in the Washington State Register that the comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy has been approved or disapproved.

(8) The department's final decision to approve or reject a proposed comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy may be appealed according to the following provisions:

(a) The department's final decision to approve or reject a comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy may be appealed to the growth management hearings board by filing a petition as provided in RCW 36.70A.290.

(b) A decision of the growth management hearings board concerning an appeal of the department's final decision to approve or reject a proposed greenhouse gas emissions reduction subelement or amendment must be based solely on whether or not the adopted comprehensive plan, development regulation, or countywide planning policy complies with the goals and requirements of the growth management act and with applicable guidelines and procedural criteria adopted by the department, or chapter 43.21C RCW.

(c) If approval of a determination of compliance by the department under this section is appealed to the growth management hearings board under RCW 36.70A.280, the city or county may not be determined to be ineligible or otherwise penalized in the acceptance.
of applications or the awarding of state agency grants or loans under RCW 43.17.250 during the pendency of the appeal before the board or subsequent judicial appeals.

Sec. 5. RCW 36.70A.020 and 2002 c 154 s 1 are each amended to read as follows:

The following goals are adopted to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans and development regulations of those counties and cities that are required or choose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040. Any changes or additions to this chapter after December 2020 must only be mandatory two years after the requirement becomes state law if funding sufficient to cover the additional costs is specifically provided for those planning requirements by the state. The following goals are not listed in order of priority and shall be used exclusively for the purpose of guiding the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations:

(1) Urban growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.

(2) Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.

(3) Transportation. Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.

(4) Housing. Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

(5) Economic development. Encourage economic development throughout the state that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, promote the retention and expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new businesses, recognize regional differences impacting economic development opportunities, and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the state's natural resources, public services, and public facilities.

(6) Property rights. Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property
rights of landowners shall be protected from arbitrary and
discriminatory actions.

(7) Permits. Applications for both state and local government
permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure
predictability.

(8) Natural resource industries. Maintain and enhance natural
resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural,
and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive
forestlands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage
incompatible uses.

(9) Open space and recreation. Retain open space, enhance
recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat,
increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop
parks and recreation facilities.

(10) Environment. Protect the environment and enhance the state's
high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the
availability of water.

(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the
involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure
coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile
conflicts.

(12) Public facilities and services. 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.

(13) Historic preservation. Identify and encourage the
preservation of lands, sites, and structures, that have historical or
archaeological significance.

Sec. 6. RCW 36.70A.070 and 2017 3rd sp.s. c 18 s 4 and 2017 3rd
sp.s. c 16 s 4 are each reenacted and amended to read as follows:

The comprehensive plan of a county or city that is required or
chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall consist of a map or maps,
and descriptive text covering objectives, principles, and standards
used to develop the comprehensive plan. The plan shall be an
internally consistent document and all elements shall be consistent
with the future land use map. A comprehensive plan shall be adopted
and amended with public participation as provided in RCW 36.70A.140.
Each comprehensive plan shall include a plan, scheme, or design for each of the following:

1. A land use element designating the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land, where appropriate, for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, general aviation airports, public utilities, public facilities, and other land uses. The land use element shall include population densities, building intensities, and estimates of future population growth. The land use element shall provide for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies. Wherever possible, the land use element should consider utilizing urban planning approaches that promote physical activity. Where applicable, the land use element shall review drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff in the area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state, including Puget Sound or waters entering Puget Sound.

2. A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that: (a) Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth; (b) includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences; (c) identifies sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and (d) makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. In counties and cities subject to the review and evaluation requirements of RCW 36.70A.215, any revision to the housing element shall include consideration of prior review and evaluation reports and any reasonable measures identified.

3. A capital facilities plan element consisting of: (a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities; (b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities; (c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; (d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly
identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and (e) a  
requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding  
falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use  
element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within  
the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent.  
Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital  
facilities plan element.

(4) A utilities element consisting of the general location,  
proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed  
utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines,  
telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines.

(5) Rural element. Counties shall include a rural element  
including lands that are not designated for urban growth,  
agriculture, forest, or mineral resources. The following provisions  
shall apply to the rural element:

(a) Growth management act goals and local circumstances. Because  
circumstances vary from county to county, in establishing patterns of  
rural densities and uses, a county ((may)) must consider local  
circumstances, ((but shall)) and must develop a written record  
explaining how the rural element harmonizes the planning goals in RCW  
36.70A.020 and meets the requirements of this chapter.

(b) Rural development. The rural element shall permit rural  
development, forestry, and agriculture in rural areas. The rural  
element shall provide for a variety of rural densities, uses,  
essential public facilities, and rural governmental services needed  
to serve the permitted densities and uses. To achieve a variety of  
rural densities and uses, counties may provide for clustering,  
density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements, and  
other innovative techniques that will accommodate appropriate rural  
economic advancement, densities, and uses that are not characterized  
by urban growth and that are consistent with rural character.

(c) Measures governing rural development. The rural element shall  
include measures that apply to rural development and protect the  
rural character of the area, as established by the county, by:

(i) Controlling rural development;

(ii) Assuring visual compatibility of rural development with the  
surrounding rural area;

(iii) Reducing the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land  
into sprawling, low-density development in the rural area;
(iv) Protecting critical areas, as provided in RCW 36.70A.060, and surface water and groundwater resources; and

(v) Protecting against conflicts with the use of agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170.

(d) Limited areas of more intensive rural development. Subject to the requirements of this subsection and except as otherwise specifically provided in this subsection (5)(d), the rural element may allow for limited areas of more intensive rural development, including necessary public facilities and public services to serve the limited area as follows:

(i) Rural development consisting of the infill, development, or redevelopment of existing commercial, industrial, residential, or mixed-use areas, whether characterized as shoreline development, villages, hamlets, rural activity centers, or crossroads developments.

(A) A commercial, industrial, residential, shoreline, or mixed-use area are subject to the requirements of (d)(iv) of this subsection, but are not subject to the requirements of (c)(ii) and (iii) of this subsection.

(B) Any development or redevelopment other than an industrial area or an industrial use within a mixed-use area or an industrial area under this subsection (5)(d)(i) must be principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population.

(C) ((Any development or redevelopment in terms of building size, scale, use, or intensity shall be consistent with the character of the existing areas.) Development and redevelopment may include changes in use from vacant land or a previously existing use so long as the new use conforms to the requirements of this subsection (5) and is consistent with the local character;

(ii) The intensification of development on lots containing, or new development of, small-scale recreational or tourist uses, including commercial facilities to serve those recreational or tourist uses, that rely on a rural location and setting, but that do not include new residential development. A small-scale recreation or tourist use is not required to be principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population. Public services and public facilities shall be limited to those necessary to serve the recreation or tourist use and shall be provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl;
(iii) The intensification of development on lots containing isolated nonresidential uses or new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses that are not principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population and nonresidential uses, but do provide job opportunities for rural residents. Rural counties may allow the expansion of small-scale businesses as long as those small-scale businesses conform with the rural character of the area as defined by the local government according to RCW 36.70A.030((16)) (20). Rural counties may also allow new small-scale businesses to utilize a site previously occupied by an existing business as long as the new small-scale business conforms to the rural character of the area as defined by the local government according to RCW 36.70A.030((16)) (20). Public services and public facilities shall be limited to those necessary to serve the isolated nonresidential use and shall be provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl;

(iv) A county shall adopt measures to minimize and contain the existing areas ((or uses)) of more intensive rural development, as appropriate, authorized under this subsection. Lands included in such existing areas ((or uses)) shall not extend beyond the logical outer boundary of the existing area ((or use)), thereby allowing a new pattern of low-density sprawl. Existing areas are those that are clearly identifiable and contained and where there is a logical boundary delineated predominately by the built environment, but that may also include undeveloped lands if limited as provided in this subsection. The county shall establish the logical outer boundary of an area of more intensive rural development. In establishing the logical outer boundary, the county shall address (A) the need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities, (B) physical boundaries, such as bodies of water, streets and highways, and land forms and contours, (C) the prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries, and (D) the ability to provide public facilities and public services in a manner that includes utility service areas and facilities and considers needed upgrades and replacement of related infrastructure including the economies of scale for such service-related infrastructure and affordability for ratepayers, and does not permit low-density sprawl;

(v) For purposes of (d) of this subsection, an existing area or existing use is one that was in existence:
(A) On July 1, (1990) 1997, in a county that was initially required to plan under all of the provisions of this chapter;

(B) On the date the county adopted a resolution under RCW 36.70A.040(2), in a county that is planning under all of the provisions of this chapter under RCW 36.70A.040(2); or

(C) On the date the office of financial management certifies the county's population as provided in RCW 36.70A.040(5), in a county that is planning under all of the provisions of this chapter pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040(5).

(e) Exception. This subsection shall not be interpreted to permit in the rural area a major industrial development or a master planned resort unless otherwise specifically permitted under RCW 36.70A.360 and 36.70A.365.

(6) A transportation element that implements, and is consistent with, the land use element.

(a) The transportation element shall include the following subelements:

(i) Land use assumptions used in estimating travel;

(ii) Estimated traffic impacts to state-owned transportation facilities resulting from land use assumptions to assist the department of transportation in monitoring the performance of state facilities, to plan improvements for the facilities, and to assess the impact of land-use decisions on state-owned transportation facilities;

(iii) Facilities and services needs, including:

(A) An inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments and general aviation airport facilities, to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning. This inventory must include state-owned transportation facilities within the city or county's jurisdictional boundaries;

(B) Level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system. These standards should be regionally coordinated;

(C) For state-owned transportation facilities, level of service standards for highways, as prescribed in chapters 47.06 and 47.80 RCW, to gauge the performance of the system. The purposes of reflecting level of service standards for state highways in the local comprehensive plan are to monitor the performance of the system, to evaluate improvement strategies, and to facilitate coordination.
between the county's or city's six-year street, road, or transit program and the office of financial management's ten-year investment program. The concurrency requirements of (b) of this subsection do not apply to transportation facilities and services of statewide significance except for counties consisting of islands whose only connection to the mainland are state highways or ferry routes. In these island counties, state highways and ferry route capacity must be a factor in meeting the concurrency requirements in (b) of this subsection;

(D) Specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities or services that are below an established level of service standard;

(E) Forecasts of traffic for at least ten years based on the adopted land use plan to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth;

(F) Identification of state and local system needs to meet current and future demands. Identified needs on state-owned transportation facilities must be consistent with the statewide multimodal transportation plan required under chapter 47.06 RCW;

(iv) Finance, including:

(A) An analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources;

(B) A multiyear financing plan based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which shall serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program required by RCW 35.77.010 for cities, RCW 36.81.121 for counties, and RCW 35.58.2795 for public transportation systems. The multiyear financing plan should be coordinated with the ten-year investment program developed by the office of financial management as required by RCW 47.05.030;

(C) If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level of service standards will be met;

(v) Intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions;

(vi) Demand-management strategies;

(vii) Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian
and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles.

(b) After adoption of the comprehensive plan by jurisdictions required to plan or who choose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040, local jurisdictions must adopt and enforce ordinances which 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 transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development. These strategies may include increased public transportation service, ride-sharing programs, demand management, and other transportation systems management strategies. For the purposes of this subsection (6), "concurrent with the 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. If the collection of impact fees is delayed under RCW 82.02.050(3), the six-year period required by this subsection (6)(b) must begin after full payment of all impact fees is due to the county or city.

(c) The transportation element described in this subsection (6), the six-year plans required by RCW 35.77.010 for cities, RCW 36.81.121 for counties, and RCW 35.58.2795 for public transportation systems, and the ten-year investment program required by RCW 47.05.030 for the state, must be consistent.

(7) An economic development element establishing local goals, policies, objectives, and provisions for economic growth and vitality and a high quality of life. A city that has chosen to be a residential community is exempt from the economic development element requirement of this subsection.

(8) A park and recreation element that implements, and is consistent with, the capital facilities plan element as it relates to park and recreation facilities. The element shall include: (a) Estimates of park and recreation demand for at least a ten-year period; (b) an evaluation of facilities and service needs; and (c) an evaluation of intergovernmental coordination opportunities to provide regional approaches for meeting park and recreational demand.

(9) It is the intent that new or amended elements required after January 1, 2002, be adopted concurrent with the scheduled update provided in RCW 36.70A.130. Requirements to incorporate any such new
or amended elements shall be null and void until funds sufficient to
cover applicable local government costs are appropriated and
distributed by the state at least two years before local government
must update comprehensive plans as required in RCW 36.70A.130.

(10) A county that is required or chooses to plan under RCW
36.70A.040 with a population of 70,000 or less and with a growth rate
of less than 20 percent over the previous 10 years; or a population
of 50,000 or less; or the comprehensive plan for the unincorporated
lands of a county that is considered rural according to the
definition in RCW 82.14.370, but not including the cities within such
county, is not subject to subsections (2)(a), (c), and (d), (3)(c)
and (d), (5)(a) and (c)(i) and (ii), (6)(a)(iii)(E), and (8) of this
section.

Sec. 7. RCW 36.70A.130 and 2020 c 113 s 1 and 2020 c 20 s 1026
are each reenacted and amended to read as follows:
(1)(a) Each comprehensive land use plan and development
regulations shall be subject to continuing review and evaluation by
the county or city that adopted them. Except as otherwise provided, a
county or city shall take legislative action to review and, if
needed, revise its comprehensive land use plan and development
regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the
requirements of this chapter according to the deadlines in
subsections (4) and (5) of this section.

(b) Except as otherwise provided, a county or city not planning
under RCW 36.70A.040 shall take action to review and, if needed,
revise its policies and development regulations regarding critical
areas and natural resource lands adopted according to this chapter to
ensure these policies and regulations comply with the requirements of
this chapter according to the deadlines in subsections (4) and (5) of
this section. Legislative action means the adoption of a resolution
or ordinance following notice and a public hearing indicating at a
minimum, a finding that a review and evaluation has occurred and
identifying the revisions made, or that a revision was not needed and
the reasons therefor.

(c) The review and evaluation required by this subsection shall
include, but is not limited to, consideration of critical area
ordinances and, if planning under RCW 36.70A.040, an analysis of the
population allocated to a city or county from the most recent ten-
year population forecast by the office of financial management.
(d) Any amendment of or revision to a comprehensive land use plan shall conform to this chapter. Any amendment of or revision to development regulations shall be consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan.

(2)(a) Each county and city shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program consistent with RCW 36.70A.035 and 36.70A.140 that identifies procedures and schedules whereby updates, proposed amendments, or revisions of the comprehensive plan are considered by the governing body of the county or city no more frequently than once every year. "Updates" means to review and revise, if needed, according to subsection (1) of this section, and the deadlines in subsections (4) and (5) of this section or in accordance with the provisions of subsection (6) of this section. Amendments may be considered more frequently than once per year under the following circumstances:

(i) The initial adoption of a subarea plan. Subarea plans adopted under this subsection (2)(a)(i) must clarify, supplement, or implement jurisdiction-wide comprehensive plan policies, and may only be adopted if the cumulative impacts of the proposed plan are addressed by appropriate environmental review under chapter 43.21C RCW;

(ii) The development of an initial subarea plan for economic development located outside of the one hundred year floodplain in a county that has completed a state-funded pilot project that is based on watershed characterization and local habitat assessment;

(iii) The adoption or amendment of a shoreline master program under the procedures set forth in chapter 90.58 RCW;

(iv) The amendment of the capital facilities element of a comprehensive plan that occurs concurrently with the adoption or amendment of a county or city budget; or

(v) The adoption of comprehensive plan amendments necessary to enact a planned action under RCW 43.21C.440, provided that amendments are considered in accordance with the public participation program established by the county or city under this subsection (2)(a) and all persons who have requested notice of a comprehensive plan update are given notice of the amendments and an opportunity to comment.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in (a) of this subsection, all proposals shall be considered by the governing body concurrently so the cumulative effect of the various proposals can be ascertained. However, after appropriate public participation a county or city may
adopt amendments or revisions to its comprehensive plan that conform with this chapter whenever an emergency exists or to resolve an appeal of a comprehensive plan filed with the growth management hearings board or with the court.

(3)(a) Each county that designates urban growth areas under RCW 36.70A.110 shall review, according to the schedules established in subsections (4) and (5) of this section, its designated urban growth area or areas, and the densities permitted within both the incorporated and unincorporated portions of each urban growth area. In conjunction with this review by the county, each city located within an urban growth area shall review the densities permitted within its boundaries, and the extent to which the urban growth occurring within the county has located within each city and the unincorporated portions of the urban growth areas.

(b) The county comprehensive plan designating urban growth areas, and the densities permitted in the urban growth areas by the comprehensive plans of the county and each city located within the urban growth areas, shall be revised to accommodate the urban growth projected to occur in the county for the succeeding twenty-year period. The review required by this subsection may be combined with the review and evaluation required by RCW 36.70A.215.

(4) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (6) and (8) of this section, counties and cities shall take action to review and, if needed, revise their comprehensive plans and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter as follows:

(a) On or before June 30, 2015, for King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within those counties;

(b) On or before June 30, 2016, for Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(c) On or before June 30, 2017, for Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Kittitas, Lewis, Skamania, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(d) On or before June 30, 2018, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(5) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (6) and (8) of this section, following the review of comprehensive plans and development regulations as required by subsection (4), the county shall adopt amendments or revisions to its comprehensive plan that conform with this chapter, and each city located within the urban growth area shall review and, if needed, revise its development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter as follows:

(a) On or before June 30, 2019, for King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within those counties;

(b) On or before June 30, 2020, for Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(c) On or before June 30, 2021, for Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Kittitas, Lewis, Skamania, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(d) On or before June 30, 2022, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(6) If a city has a designated urban growth area, the city shall review and, if needed, revise its development regulations to ensure the development regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter as follows:

(a) On or before June 30, 2016, for Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(b) On or before June 30, 2017, for Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Kittitas, Lewis, Skamania, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(c) On or before June 30, 2018, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(7) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (8), amendments or revisions to the comprehensive plan, and development regulations shall be consistent with the requirements of this chapter.

(8) Amendments or revisions to the urban growth area designations and development regulations may be adopted after June 30, 2022, if the county or city has followed the requirements of this section.
development regulations required by subsection (4) of this section, counties and cities shall take action to review and, if needed, revise their comprehensive plans and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter as follows:

(a) On or before June 30, 2024, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within those counties;

(b) On or before June 30, 2025, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(c) On or before June 30, 2026, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Franklin, Kittitas, Skamania, Spokane, Walla Walla, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(d) On or before June 30, 2027, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(6)(a) Nothing in this section precludes a county or city from conducting the review and evaluation required by this section before the deadlines established in subsections (4) and (5) of this section. Counties and cities may begin this process early and may be eligible for grants from the department, subject to available funding, if they elect to do so.

(b) A county that is subject to a deadline established in subsection (5)(a)(ii) through (iv) [(b) through (d)] of this section and meets the following criteria may comply with the requirements of this section at any time within the twenty-four months following the deadline established in subsection (5) of this section: The county has a population of less than fifty thousand and has had its population increase by no more than seventeen percent in the ten years preceding the deadline established in subsection (5) of this section as of that date.

(c) A city that is subject to a deadline established in subsection (5)(a)(ii) through (iv) [(b) through (d)] of this section and meets the following criteria may comply with the requirements of this section at any time within the twenty-four months following the
deadline established in subsection (5) of this section: The city has
a population of no more than five thousand and has had its population
increase by the greater of either no more than one hundred persons or
no more than seventeen percent in the ten years preceding the
deadline established in subsection (5) of this section as of that
date.

   (d) State agencies are encouraged to provide technical assistance
to the counties and cities in the review of critical area ordinances,
comprehensive plans, and development regulations.

   (7)(a) The requirements imposed on counties and cities under this
section shall be considered "requirements of this chapter" under the
terms of RCW 36.70A.040(1). Only those counties and cities that meet
the following criteria may receive grants, loans, pledges, or
financial guarantees under chapter 43.155 or 70A.135 RCW:

   (i) Complying with the deadlines in this section; or

   (ii) Demonstrating substantial progress towards compliance with
the schedules in this section for development regulations that
protect critical areas.

   (b) A county or city that is fewer than twelve months out of
compliance with the schedules in this section for development
regulations that protect critical areas is making substantial
progress towards compliance. Only those counties and cities in
compliance with the schedules in this section may receive preference
for grants or loans subject to the provisions of RCW 43.17.250.

   (8)(a) Except as otherwise provided in (c) of this subsection, if
a participating watershed is achieving benchmarks and goals for the
protection of critical areas functions and values, the county is not
required to update development regulations to protect critical areas
as they specifically apply to agricultural activities in that
watershed.

   (b) A county that has made the election under RCW 36.70A.710(1)
may only adopt or amend development regulations to protect critical
areas as they specifically apply to agricultural activities in a
participating watershed if:

   (i) A work plan has been approved for that watershed in
accordance with RCW 36.70A.725;

   (ii) The local watershed group for that watershed has requested
the county to adopt or amend development regulations as part of a
work plan developed under RCW 36.70A.720;
(iii) The adoption or amendment of the development regulations is necessary to enable the county to respond to an order of the growth management hearings board or court;

(iv) The adoption or amendment of development regulations is necessary to address a threat to human health or safety; or

(v) Three or more years have elapsed since the receipt of funding.

(c) Beginning ten years from the date of receipt of funding, a county that has made the election under RCW 36.70A.710(1) must review and, if necessary, revise development regulations to protect critical areas as they specifically apply to agricultural activities in a participating watershed in accordance with the review and revision requirements and timeline in subsection (5) of this section. This subsection (8)(c) does not apply to a participating watershed that has determined under RCW 36.70A.720(2)(c)(ii) that the watershed's goals and benchmarks for protection have been met.

(9) At the midpoint of the 10-year plan update cycles identified in subsection (5)(a) and (b) of this section, metropolitan counties, and their cities, shall report to the department the progress they have achieved in implementing state goals regarding RCW 36.70A.020 and permit timelines in chapter 36.70B RCW. Such reports are not subject to appeals under this chapter or chapter 43.21C RCW. The department will review the report under the process and authority of RCW 36.70A.385 and issue its determination within 90 days. The department will adopt by administrative rule indicators, milestones, and criteria to determine compliance with this chapter.

Sec. 8. RCW 36.70A.280 and 2011 c 360 s 17 are each amended to read as follows:

(1) The growth management hearings board shall hear and determine only those petitions alleging either:

(a) That, except as provided otherwise by this subsection, a state agency, county, or city planning under this chapter is not in compliance with the requirements of this chapter, chapter 90.58 RCW as it relates to the adoption of shoreline master programs or amendments thereto, or chapter 43.21C RCW as it relates to plans, development regulations, or amendments, adopted under RCW 36.70A.040 or chapter 90.58 RCW. Nothing in this subsection authorizes the board to hear petitions alleging noncompliance with RCW 36.70A.5801;
That the twenty-year growth management planning population projections adopted by the office of financial management pursuant to RCW 43.62.035 should be adjusted;

(c) That the approval of a work plan adopted under RCW 36.70A.735(1)(a) is not in compliance with the requirements of the program established under RCW 36.70A.710;

(d) That regulations adopted under RCW 36.70A.735(1)(b) are not regionally applicable and cannot be adopted, wholly or partially, by another jurisdiction; ((ex))

(e) That a department certification under RCW 36.70A.735(1)(c) is erroneous;

(f) That a department determination under RCW 36.70A.060(1)(d) is erroneous; or

(g) That a department approval under section 4 of this act is clearly erroneous. Actions submitted to the department for approval may only be appealed to the growth management hearings board within 60 days following publication by the department of a determination of compliance.

(2) A petition may be filed only by: (a) The state, or a county or city that plans under this chapter; (b) a person who has participated orally or in writing before the county or city regarding the matter on which a review is being requested; (c) a person who is certified by the governor within sixty days of filing the request with the board; or (d) a person qualified pursuant to RCW 34.05.530.

(3) For purposes of this section "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, state agency, governmental subdivision or unit thereof, or public or private organization or entity of any character.

(4) To establish participation standing under subsection (2)(b) of this section, a person must show that his or her participation before the county or city was reasonably related to the person's issue as presented to the board.

(5) When considering a possible adjustment to a growth management planning population projection prepared by the office of financial management, the board shall consider the implications of any such adjustment to the population forecast for the entire state.

The rationale for any adjustment that is adopted by the board must be documented and filed with the office of financial management within ten working days after adoption.
If adjusted by the board, a county growth management planning population projection shall only be used for the planning purposes set forth in this chapter and shall be known as the "board adjusted population projection." None of these changes shall affect the official state and county population forecasts prepared by the office of financial management, which shall continue to be used for state budget and planning purposes.

Sec. 9. RCW 36.70A.330 and 1997 c 429 s 21 are each amended to read as follows:

(1) After the time set for complying with the requirements of this chapter under RCW 36.70A.300(3)(b) has expired, or at an earlier time upon the motion of a county or city subject to a determination of invalidity under RCW 36.70A.300, the board shall set a hearing for the purpose of determining whether the state agency, county, or city is in compliance with the requirements of this chapter.

(2) The board shall conduct a hearing and issue a finding of compliance or noncompliance with the requirements of this chapter and with any compliance schedule established by the board in its final order. A person with standing to challenge the legislation enacted in response to the board's final order may participate in the hearing along with the petitioner and the state agency, county, or city. A hearing under this subsection shall be given the highest priority of business to be conducted by the board, and a finding shall be issued within forty-five days of the filing of the motion under subsection (1) of this section with the board. The board shall issue any order necessary to make adjustments to the compliance schedule and set additional hearings as provided in subsection (5) of this section.

(3) If the board after a compliance hearing finds that the state agency, county, or city is not in compliance, the board shall transmit its finding to the governor. ((The))

(a) The board may refer a finding of noncompliance to the department. The purpose of the referral is for the department to provide technical assistance to facilitate speedy resolution of the finding of noncompliance.

(b) Alternatively, the board may recommend to the governor that the sanctions authorized by this chapter be imposed. The board shall take into consideration the county's or city's efforts to meet its compliance schedule in making the decision to recommend sanctions to the governor.
(4) In a compliance hearing upon petition of a party, the board shall also reconsider its final order and decide, if no determination of invalidity has been made, whether one now should be made under RCW 36.70A.302.

(5) The board shall schedule additional hearings as appropriate pursuant to subsections (1) and (2) of this section.

Sec. 10. RCW 90.58.080 and 2011 c 353 s 13 are each amended to read as follows:

(1) Local governments shall develop or amend a master program for regulation of uses of the shorelines of the state consistent with the required elements of the guidelines adopted by the department in accordance with the schedule established by this section.

(2)(a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (5) and (6) of this section, each local government subject to this chapter shall develop or amend its master program for the regulation of uses of shorelines within its jurisdiction according to the following schedule:

(i) On or before December 1, 2005, for the city of Port Townsend, the city of Bellingham, the city of Everett, Snohomish county, and Whatcom county;

(ii) On or before December 1, 2009, for King county and the cities within King county greater in population than ten thousand;

(iii) Except as provided by (a)(i) and (ii) of this subsection, on or before December 1, 2011, for Clallam, Clark, Jefferson, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(iv) On or before December 1, 2012, for Cowlitz, Island, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, and Skamania counties and the cities within those counties;

(v) On or before December 1, 2013, for Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(vi) On or before December 1, 2014, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(b) Nothing in this subsection (2) shall preclude a local government from developing or amending its master program prior to the dates established by this subsection (2).
(3)(a) Following approval by the department of a new or amended master program, local governments required to develop or amend master programs on or before December 1, 2009, as provided by subsection (2)(a)(i) and (ii) of this section, shall be deemed to have complied with the schedule established by subsection (2)(a)(iii) of this section and shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable dates established by subsection (4)(b) of this section. Any jurisdiction listed in subsection (2)(a)(i) of this section that has a new or amended master program approved by the department on or after March 1, 2002, but before July 27, 2003, shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable date provided by subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(b) Following approval by the department of a new or amended master program, local governments choosing to develop or amend master programs on or before December 1, 2009, shall be deemed to have complied with the schedule established by subsection (2)(a)(iii) through (vi) of this section and shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable dates established by subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(4)(a) Following the updates required by subsection (2) of this section, local governments shall conduct a review of their master programs at least once every eight years as required by (b) of this subsection. Following the review required by this subsection (4), local governments shall, if necessary, revise their master programs. The purpose of the review is:

(i) To assure that the master program complies with applicable law and guidelines in effect at the time of the review; and

(ii) To assure consistency of the master program with the local government's comprehensive plan and development regulations adopted under chapter 36.70A RCW, if applicable, and other local requirements.

(b) Counties and cities shall take action to review and, if necessary, revise their master programs as required by (a) of this subsection as follows:

(i) On or before June 30, 2019, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within those counties;

(ii) On or before June 30, 2020, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason, San
Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(iii) On or before June 30, 2021, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, ((Grant)) Kittitas, Lewis, Skamania, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(iv) On or before June 30, 2022, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(5) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this section, local governments are encouraged to begin the process of developing or amending their master programs early and are eligible for grants from the department as provided by RCW 90.58.250, subject to available funding. Except for those local governments listed in subsection (2)(a)(i) and (ii) of this section, the deadline for completion of the new or amended master programs shall be two years after the date the grant is approved by the department. Subsequent master program review dates shall not be altered by the provisions of this subsection.

(6) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this section, the following shall apply:

(a) Grants to local governments for developing and amending master programs pursuant to the schedule established by this section shall be provided at least two years before the adoption dates specified in subsection (2) of this section. To the extent possible, the department shall allocate grants within the amount appropriated for such purposes to provide reasonable and adequate funding to local governments that have indicated their intent to develop or amend master programs during the biennium according to the schedule established by subsection (2) of this section. Any local government that applies for but does not receive funding to comply with the provisions of subsection (2) of this section may delay the development or amendment of its master program until the following biennium.

(b) Local governments with delayed compliance dates as provided in (a) of this subsection shall be the first priority for funding in subsequent biennia, and the development or amendment compliance
deadline for those local governments shall be two years after the
date of grant approval.

(c) Failure of the local government to apply in a timely manner
for a master program development or amendment grant in accordance
with the requirements of the department shall not be considered a
delay resulting from the provisions of (a) of this subsection.

(7) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this
section, all local governments subject to the requirements of this
chapter that have not developed or amended master programs on or
after March 1, 2002, shall, no later than December 1, 2014, develop
or amend their master programs to comply with guidelines adopted by
the department after January 1, 2003.

(8) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this
section, local governments may be provided an additional year beyond
the deadlines in this section to complete their master program or
amendment. The department shall grant the request if it determines
that the local government is likely to adopt or amend its master
program within the additional year.

Sec. 11. RCW 90.58.080 and 2020 c 113 s 2 are each amended to
read as follows:

(1) Local governments shall develop or amend a master program for
regulation of uses of the shorelines of the state consistent with the
required elements of the guidelines adopted by the department in
accordance with the schedule established by this section.

(2)(a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (5) and (6) of
this section, each local government subject to this chapter shall
develop or amend its master program for the regulation of uses of
shorelines within its jurisdiction according to the following
schedule:

(i) On or before December 1, 2005, for the city of Port Townsend,
the city of Bellingham, the city of Everett, Snohomish county, and
Whatcom county;

(ii) On or before December 1, 2009, for King county and the
cities within King county greater in population than ten thousand;

(iii) Except as provided by (a)(i) and (ii) of this subsection,
on or before December 1, 2011, for Clallam, Clark, Jefferson, King,
Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the
cities within those counties;
On or before December 1, 2012, for Cowlitz, Island, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, and Skamania counties and the cities within those counties;

(v) On or before December 1, 2013, for Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(vi) On or before December 1, 2014, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(b) Nothing in this subsection (2) shall preclude a local government from developing or amending its master program prior to the dates established by this subsection (2).

(3)(a) Following approval by the department of a new or amended master program, local governments required to develop or amend master programs on or before December 1, 2009, as provided by subsection (2)(a)(i) and (ii) of this section, shall be deemed to have complied with the schedule established by subsection (2)(a)(iii) of this section and shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable dates established by subsection (4)(b) of this section. Any jurisdiction listed in subsection (2)(a)(i) of this section that has a new or amended master program approved by the department on or after March 1, 2002, but before July 27, 2003, shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable date provided by subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(b) Following approval by the department of a new or amended master program, local governments choosing to develop or amend master programs on or before December 1, 2009, shall be deemed to have complied with the schedule established by subsection (2)(a)(iii) through (vi) of this section and shall not be required to complete master program amendments until the applicable dates established by subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(4)(a) Following the updates required by subsection (2) of this section, local governments shall conduct a review of their master programs at least once every eight years as required by (b) of this subsection. Following the review required by this subsection (4), local governments shall, if necessary, revise their master programs. The purpose of the review is:
(i) To assure that the master program complies with applicable law and guidelines in effect at the time of the review; and

(ii) To assure consistency of the master program with the local government's comprehensive plan and development regulations adopted under chapter 36.70A RCW, if applicable, and other local requirements.

(b) Counties and cities shall take action to review and, if necessary, revise their master programs as required by (a) of this subsection as follows:

(i) On or before June 30, 2028, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties and the cities within those counties;

(ii) On or before June 30, 2029, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Clallam, Clark, Island, Jefferson, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties;

(iii) On or before June 30, 2030, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Benton, Chelan, Cowlitz, Douglas, Franklin, Kittitas, Skamania, Spokane, Walla Walla, and Yakima counties and the cities within those counties; and

(iv) On or before June 30, 2031, and every ((eight)) 10 years thereafter, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties.

(5) In meeting the review requirements of subsection (4) of this section, local governments are encouraged to begin the process of developing or amending their master programs early and are eligible for grants from the department as provided by RCW 90.58.250, subject to available funding. Except for those local governments listed in subsection (2)(a)(i) and (ii) of this section, the deadline for completion of the new or amended master programs shall be two years after the date the grant is approved by the department. Subsequent master program review dates shall not be altered by the provisions of this subsection.

(6) In meeting the review requirements of subsection (4) of this section, the following shall apply:

(a) Grants to local governments for reviewing master programs pursuant to the schedule established by this section shall be provided at least two years before the adoption dates specified in
subsection (4) of this section. To the extent possible, the department shall allocate grants within the amount appropriated for such purposes to provide reasonable and adequate funding to local governments that have indicated their intent to develop or amend master programs during the biennium according to the schedule established by subsection (4) of this section. Any local government that applies for but does not receive funding to comply with the provisions of subsection (4) of this section may delay the development or amendment of its master program until the following biennium.

(b) Local governments with delayed compliance dates as provided in (a) of this subsection shall be the first priority for funding in subsequent biennia, and the periodic review compliance deadline for those local governments shall be two years after the date of grant approval.

(c) Failure of the local government to apply in a timely manner for a master program development or amendment grant in accordance with the requirements of the department shall not be considered a delay resulting from the provisions of (a) of this subsection.

(7) In meeting the update requirements of subsection (2) of this section, all local governments subject to the requirements of this chapter that have not developed or amended master programs on or after March 1, 2002, shall, no later than December 1, 2014, develop or amend their master programs to comply with guidelines adopted by the department after January 1, 2003.

(8) In meeting the review requirements of subsection (4) of this section, local governments may be provided an additional year beyond the deadlines in this section to complete their master program or amendment. The department shall grant the request if it determines that the local government is likely to adopt or amend its master program within the additional year.

--- END ---