

**SULTAN PLANNING BOARD
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

ITEM NO: D-1

DATE: May 4, 2010

SUBJECT: Housing Element Goals and Policies

CONTACT PERSON: Deborah Knight, City Administrator

ISSUE:

Review the staff proposed changes to the housing element goals and policies (Attachment A) and make recommended changes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. Review the Puget Sound Regional Council Vision 2040 multi-county planning policies and Snohomish County county-wide planning policies for housing.
2. Review proposed changes to the housing element in the 2008 revisions to the 2004 comprehensive plan. Make recommended changes to the goals and policies for the 2011 comprehensive plan update.

SUMMARY:

The city is in the process of moving forward with the 7-year update of its comprehensive plan as required by the Growth Management Act.

The city council is continuing with the 7-year update even though the 2010 State Legislature extended the deadline to complete the 7-year update from 2011 to 2013. The focus of the Sultan update is to align the city's goals and policies with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Vision 2040 and the Snohomish County county-wide planning policies.

The city's effort to update its comprehensive plan started in June 2009 with a joint meeting between the planning board and city council. The city council directed the planning board and city staff to move forward with scheduling small group meetings to get community input on proposed changes to the comprehensive plan goals and policies. The city hosted a small work group meeting on December 8, 2009 to get feedback on the housing goals and policies. The city received additional comments by e-mail (Attachment B).

The planning board has completed its review of the land use and transportation elements of the city's comprehensive plan. The planning board forwarded its recommended changes to the goals and policies to the city council for consideration.

The planning board is now prepared to review the goals and policies in the housing element. The intent is to review the proposed amendments to the goals and policies prepared by city staff and make additional changes as the board recommends.

What's Next

Proposed changes to the environmental element are in the queue for advanced review on May 17, 2010.

How to Review Proposed Changes to the Goals and Policies

The review and recommended changes begin with the goals and policies adopted in the 2008 Revisions (2008 Revisions) to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan (adopted October 2008).

In order to track changes and provide an efficient review, the housing goals and policies are numbered H = Housing with headings and subheadings to differentiate goals and policies (e.g. H 1 is a goal, H 1.3 is a policy)

Using common editing functions deleted text from the 2008 Revision is shown as ~~strike through~~, added text is underlined. Existing text is unchanged.

City staff have provided four attachments to assist in reviewing proposed changes to the goals and policies:

1. Attachment A – Proposed changes to the housing element goals and policies
2. Attachment B – Summary comments on the housing policy questions
3. Attachment C - Vision 2040 Multi-County Housing Planning Policies
4. Attachment D – Draft Countywide Housing Planning Policies (CPP Draft 04-06-10)

DISCUSSION:

Under the Growth Management Act, the city is required to align the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan with Vision 2040 multi-county planning policies (MPP) and countywide planning policies (CPP). Following is a summary of the housing goals for Vision 2040 and the Countywide Planning Policies.

The planning board will want to carefully review these guiding goals and policies and ensure the city's housing goals and policies are consistent.

Vision 2040 Housing Goals

The regional plan, Vision 2040, contains an “overarching goal” for housing that calls for the region to:

“...preserve, improve, and expand its housing stock to provide a range of affordable, healthy, and safe housing choices for every resident. The region will continue to promote fair and equal access to housing for all people.”

Vision 2040 places significant emphasis on the location of housing in proximity to growth and employment centers and promotes fair and equal access to housing. Increasing housing choices and opportunities in growth and employment centers is also a primary goal that strives to improve the efficiency of our transportation system and strengthen the region’s economy.

Through the Regional Growth Strategy, new housing development will be directed to the urban growth area and regionally designated growth centers along the I-5 corridor.

Vision 2040 encourages local jurisdictions to development mechanisms to allow for a wider array of housing types - especially affordable housing. Affordable housing is defined as monthly housing costs that are less than 30 percent of gross household income. Expenses for commuting to and from work are also critical when considering the true cost of housing. Reducing commute times by placing jobs and housing in close proximity can lower the true cost of housing.

- MPP H-1 Provide a range of housing types and choices to meet the housing needs of all income levels
- MPP H-2 Achieve and sustain – through preservation, rehabilitation, and new development a sufficient supply of housing to meet the needs of low-income, moderate-income and middle-income households
- MPP H-3 Promote home ownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income and middle-income households
- MPP H-4 Promote accessibility to jobs and provide opportunities to live in proximity to work.
- MPP H-5 Expand the supply and range of housing in centers throughout the region.
- MPP H-6 Give regional funding priority to projects that advance the development of housing in designated regional growth centers.
- MPP H-7 Review and streamline development standards and regulations
- MPP H-8 Encourage the use of innovative techniques to provide a broader range of housing types.
- MPP H-9 Encourage interjurisdictional cooperation to advance affordable housing.

Countywide Housing Policies

Planning board members may want to review the 2004 Snohomish County Fair Share Allocation Policy. The policy provides specific direction and allocations of “affordable housing” to cities in Snohomish County. Under the policy, the City of Sultan is responsible for provide over 800 additional units of affordable housing.

Snohomish County and the cities that are a part of Snohomish County Tomorrow are in the process of reviewing the policy and may move away from specific affordable housing allocations.

The county-wide planning housing goals and policies generally follow the organization of Vision 2040. The policies reflect the need to develop vibrant communities that offer diverse housing options for all demographic segments and income groups.

- HO-1 Promote fair and equal access to housing
- HO-3 Strengthen interjurisdictional cooperative efforts
- HO-4 Adopt and implement a fair share distribution of low-income and special needs housing.
- HO-5 Each jurisdiction shall include strategies to attain fair share housing objectives.
- HO-6 Encourage rehabilitation and preservation of existing affordable housing
- HO-9 Consider how to balance existing neighborhood identity with siting essential public residential facilities for special needs populations.
- HO-11 Improve the jobs-housing balance.
- HO-14 Minimize housing production costs by considering infrastructure funding methods.

City of Sultan Housing Element

Under Vision 2040, the staff recommended Housing Element goals and policies are divided into four topic headings consistent with Vision 2040:

1. Housing diversity and affordability
2. Jobs-housing balance
3. Centers housing
4. Neighborhood identity – this topic heading is not required by Vision 2040

Small Group Comments from December 8, 2009

- Seek opportunities to preserve critical areas while developing family friendly neighborhoods with backyards and/or common play areas.
- Eliminate accessory dwelling units as option in the development code.

- Tot-lots and trails improve quality of life for all residents.
- Developers should pay necessary development fees – growth should pay for growth.
- The city should encourage mixed-use development.
- Minimize the initial capital outlay for impact fees and other upfront development costs by delaying payment from building permit to close of sale.
- Enforce property maintenance standards for rentals, owner-occupied and commercial units.

Community Comments

- Not everyone wants larger lots sizes
- Keep government out of the property maintenance and code enforcement business.
- There's no need to join a regional coalition to provide affordable housing. Reducing fees will result in lower home costs.
- Postpone development fees until the unit is occupied.
- The city should encourage mixed-use development
- Let the housing market determine where new units should be located.
- Use existing zoning code to mitigate conflicts between residential and commercial uses.

SUMMARY:

PSRC and the county-wide planning policies emphasize the big picture – housing diversity and affordability; jobs-housing balance and directing future housing to transportation and employment centers.

The difficult work is putting these concepts into practice in Sultan. Many people in the city already feel there is sufficient (and perhaps more than sufficient) “affordable” housing. Regardless, the city has an obligation under the Growth Management Act to ensure there is adequate housing for the median household income of \$46,000.

There is community consensus the city should encourage mixed-use development. The community is split on other housing issues especially on the question of market driven versus government driven improvements. The small group that met on December 8 to discuss housing issues was strongly in favor of larger residential lots, property maintenance codes, and developer supported open space trails and tot-lots.

Members of the community that weighed in by e-mail were strongly opposed to these same ideas. Out of all the small group meetings, the housing goals and policies generated the most community feedback.

The planning board will need to carefully discern what is best for the community in its opinion before making a recommendation to the city council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. Review the Puget Sound Regional Council Vision 2040 multi-county planning policies and Snohomish County county-wide planning policies for housing.
2. Review proposed changes to the housing element in the 2008 revisions to the 2004 comprehensive plan. Make recommended changes to the goals and policies for the 2011 comprehensive plan update.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Attachment A – Proposed changes to the housing element goals and policies
2. Attachment B – Summary comments on the housing policy questions
3. Attachment C - Vision 2040 Multi-County Housing Planning Policies
4. Attachment D – Draft Countywide Housing Planning Policies (CPP Draft 04-06-10)

HOUSING ELEMENT

Regional Context

The regional plan, Vision 2040, contains an “overarching goal” for housing that calls for the region to:

“...preserve, improve, and expand its housing stock to provide a range of affordable, healthy, and safe housing choices for every resident. The region will continue to promote fair and equal access to housing for all people.”

Vision 2040 places significant emphasis on the location of housing in proximity to growth and employment centers and promotes fair and equal access to housing. Increasing housing choices and opportunities in growth and employment centers is also a primary goal that strives to improve the efficiency of our transportation system and strengthen the region’s economy.

Through the Regional Growth Strategy, new housing development will be directed to the urban growth area and regionally designated growth centers along the I-5 corridor.

Vision 2040 encourages local jurisdictions to development mechanisms to allow for a wider array of housing types - especially affordable housing. Affordable housing is defined as monthly housing costs that are less than 30 percent of gross household income. Expenses for commuting to and from work are also critical when considering the true cost of housing. Reducing commute times by placing jobs and housing in close proximity can lower the true cost of housing.

Growth Management Requirements

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods identifies:

- Sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to,
 - government-assisted housing
 - housing for low-income families
 - manufactured housing
 - multifamily housing
 - group homes and foster care facilities
- Makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

Snohomish County Fair Share Housing Policy

The Growth Management Act requires jurisdictions to set targets for affordable housing and to establish plans for meeting those targets while recognizing the vitality and character of existing residential neighborhoods.

The purpose of the Fair Share Housing Policy is to ensure an equitable distribution of low-income households across the county. The goal is to prevent further concentration of low-income households in only a few areas.

Based on Sultan's population allocation of 11,119 by 2025, the city's allocation of affordable housing units is 825 or 33% of the total anticipated 2500 housing units (6500 new residents/2.6 people per household in 2025 = 2500 housing units).

Organization

Under Vision 2040, the Housing section is divided into three topic headings:

1. Housing diversity and affordability
2. Jobs-housing balance
3. Centers housing
4. Neighborhood identity - This topic heading not required by Vision 2040

Editor's Note

The following draft goals and policies are built on the framework of the City of Sultan 2008 Revised Comprehensive Plan.

Goals and policies in the 2008 Revision are not numbered. The goals and policies proposed for the 2011 Comprehensive Plan Update are numbered in the proposed version to allow readers and comments to be easily referenced. A numbering system will be adopted in the final revision of the 2011 Update

New proposed text and policies are shown as underline. Text and policies proposed to be deleted are shown as ~~strikethrough~~.

Topic 1. Housing Diversity and Affordability

Vision 2040 Goal:

The region needs a diverse and well-distributed mix of homes affordable to both owners and renters in every demographic and income group. VISION 2040 encourages the construction, preservation, and ownership of a variety of homes — including for special needs and middle- to low-income households.

Sultan 2040 Goal

H 1 Goal: Manage growth potentials

Maintain a realistic balance between the land's capable, suitable potentials and Sultan's ability to provide housing choices and opportunities to meet the housing needs of all income levels and demographic groups within the city. (MPP H-1)

H 1.1 Growth management priorities

Determine the developable acreage contained within the prescribed Sultan urban growth area. Determine population or land use holding capacities and service requirements of proposed urban expansion areas. Use this information to ensure there is sufficient zoned land capacity for housing to accommodate 20-year growth targets. Establish priorities between the areas to control the extension of services and the timing of acceptable development proposals or public improvement projects. (Vision 2040 – page 67)

H 1.3 Adopt land use regulations that support a variety of housing types and costs.

H 1.4 Encourage preservation and maintenance of existing affordable housing. (MPP H-2)

Editor's note: Goal H2 has been moved to Topic Heading 4 – Create an Identity

H 3 Goal: Promote diversity

Create district definitions, review and approval processes that allow for innovation and performance.

Editor's note – not sure what is meant by “district definitions”. Consider deleting text.

H 3.1 Innovative ~~districts~~Land Use Planning

~~Establish special planning procedures to govern~~ Support efficient the review and approval of innovative land use developments. ~~Establish special planning development procedures for such as~~ industrial or business parks, mixed density residential developments, special business district projects, or other proposals that may be submitted and considered.

H 3.2 Housing choice

Expand housing district and code definitions to allow a broad choice of housing types, locations and prices. Provide housing opportunities for every type, age, physical and mental capability of household to include the family, the single-headed household, the individual, and the elderly. To the extent appropriate, recognize social area specialization by household and age group, and provide public services that reflect each area's special needs.

H 3.3 Innovative housing product definitions

Amend the zoning ordinance to define an increased variety of housing products including detached single-family, detached lot line, duplex, townhouse, multiplex, and garden apartments in addition to the single-family and mobile home products now included in the prevailing ordinance.

H 3.4 Clustering and ~~planned unit development~~ Lot Averaging provisions

~~Amend the zoning ordinance to allow~~ Allow clustering and ~~planned unit residential developments where the objective would be~~ lot averaging to allow for a variety of housing products, create common open space, and/or conserve significant social characteristics of the land like wooded areas and scenic views. (Note: Council is considering proposal to repeal Planned Unit Development regulations in favor of lot averaging)

H 3.5 Allow the installation of manufactured housing units – on single family lots to reduce housing costs.

H 3.6 Develop more detached single family housing types ~~including village, patio, and mother-in-law units especially within older developed areas~~ – to reduce development costs, increase choice, achieve higher densities, but still maintain a low-density scale and appearance. (Note: Council approved repealing ADU code to allow mother-in-law units)

H 3.7 Develop attached single family housing types including duplex, quadplex, garden, row or townhouses – to reduce development costs, increase choice, achieve higher densities, but still maintain a moderate-density scale and appearance. (Editor's note – define garden, row and patio houses)

H 3.8 Develop multiple family housing types including multiplexes, townhouses, and some garden apartments – to increase choice and achieve higher densities in newly developing areas.

H 3.9 Develop mixed-use projects that provide housing over ground floor commercial or office activities, particularly within the downtown – to increase choice and achieve higher densities within a village or pedestrian-oriented environment.

H 4 Goal: Housing – design concepts

H 4.1 Allow smaller single family lot sizes – in order to increase density, but maintain single family building scale and character in existing neighborhoods.

H 4.2 Cluster housing developments – to protect sensitive environmental areas, increase open space amenities, and reduce development costs.

H4.3 Develop new housing with shared access streets and parking lots – to make more effective use of the roadways and reduce development costs.

Topic 2. Jobs Housing Balance**Vision 2040 Goal:**

Vision 2040 places significant emphasis on the location of housing in proximity to growth and employment centers and promotes fair and equal access to housing. Increasing housing choices and opportunities in growth and employment in centers is also a primary goal that strives to improve the efficiency of our transportation system and strengthen the region's economy.

H 5.1 Develop vacant lands on the Sultan River valley floor and in older neighborhoods with single family housing product types – to retain and protect existing low-density areas and reduce risk exposure on flood prone lands.

H 5.2 Develop moderate to higher density housing product types on the edge of the plateau bordering the proposed new commercial and employment areas – to increase housing choice and density on environmentally capable lands in proximity to employment centers.

H 5.3 Develop mixed-use structures with upper story housing in the downtown and retail centers – to increase housing choice and density within a pedestrian-oriented environment in proximity to proposed employment centers.

H 5.4 Support housing that is affordable for the types of jobs available in Sultan (CPP HO-11)

Topic 3. Best Housing Practices

Vision 2040 Goal: Encourage local jurisdictions to adopt available best housing practices and innovative techniques to advance the provision of affordable, healthy, and safe housing for all the region’s residents.

Sultan 2040

H 1.2 Support regional efforts to encourage development of affordable homes for owners and renters in every demographic group and income level.

H 1.5 Streamline and simplify development regulations to minimize the cost of housing development. (Sultan 2040 Mission Statement)

Topic 4. Create Identity

H 2 Goal: Create identity

Define a pattern of urban development that is recognizable, provides an identity, and reflects Sultan values and opportunities.

H 2.1 Neighborhood planning areas

Define and protect the integrity of small planning areas, particularly residential neighborhoods that have common boundaries, uses, and concerns using transition land use areas and landscape buffers.

H 2.2 Special districts

Establish special zoning districts that may distinguish unique land use concerns and utilize special or extra planning and design reviews. Special districts could be established for a Sultan downtown business district.

H 2.3 Encourage neighborhood property owners, including residents of lands that may annex to Sultan, to participate in the creation of local plans that may detail public improvements, zoning issues, and other planning concerns.

H 2.3 Promote quality housing to meet the community’s needs. (Sultan 2040 Mission Statement)

2011 Comprehensive Plan Update
Small Work Group Meeting- HOUSING
December 8, 2009

HOUSING ELEMENT

Regional Context

The regional plan, Vision 2040, contains an "overarching goal" for housing that calls for the region to

"preserve, improve, and expand its housing stock to provide a range of affordable, healthy, and safe housing choices for every resident. The region will continue to promote fair and equal access to housing for all people."

Vision 2040 places significant emphasis on the location of housing in proximity to growth and employment centers and promotes fair and equal access to housing. Increasing housing choices and opportunities in growth and employment centers is also a primary goal that strives to improve the efficiency of our transportation system and strengthen the region's economy.

Growth Management Requirements

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods identifies:

- Sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to,
 - government-assisted housing
 - housing for low-income families
 - manufactured housing
 - multifamily housing
 - group homes and foster care facilities
- Makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

Snohomish County Fair Share Housing Policy

The purpose of the Fair Share Housing Policy is to ensure an equitable distribution of low-income households across the county. The goal is to prevent further concentration of low-income households in only a few areas.

2011 Comprehensive Plan Update
Small Work Group Meeting- HOUSING
December 8, 2009

Based on Sultan's population allocation of 11,119 by 2025, the city's allocation of affordable housing units is 825 or 33% of the total anticipated 2500 housing units (6500 new residents/2.6 people per household in 2025 = 2500 housing units).

Policy Questions

1. How can the city balance the growth management act requirements to have a minimum 4 housing units per acre and preserve critical areas with the communities stated desire to have larger lot sizes?

2. The city is required to provide "affordable" housing. When housing costs exceeds 30% of a total household's income; the housing is no longer considered affordable. With a median income in Sultan of \$47,600 (2007) this allows for the purchase of an approximately \$180,000 home. **How can the city encourage quality affordable housing? For example, should we preserve and maintain existing affordable housing, lower permit costs for affordable housing or take other approaches?**

3. Should the city adopt a property maintenance code for rental housing to preserve and maintain affordable housing?

4. Should the city adopt a property maintenance code for owner occupied housing? How should the city pay for enforcing a maintenance code?

5. Should the city participate with other Snohomish County cities in forming a housing coalition to locate affordable housing throughout the county even if the city has to pay an annual fee based on population to participate?

6. Should the city allow accessory dwelling units in single-family housing or on single-family lots subject to specific development, design and occupancy standards?

**2011 Comprehensive Plan Update
Small Work Group Meeting- HOUSING
December 8, 2009**

7. Should the city require common, convenient, and usable open space in residential developments such as on site tot-lots and trails?
8. A builder must pay approximately \$26,000 in impact and connection fees for each house at the time of building permit application. **Should growth pay for growth or should current residents pay higher taxes to underwrite the cost of mitigating the impacts of new development by lowering impact fees and connection fees?**
9. When should the city collect impact fees for parks and roads (e.g. before the building permit is due, when the building permit is issued, at the time of occupancy)?
10. Should the city encourage in-fill development on existing lots before allowing the subdivision of large parcels?
11. Should the city encourage mixed use (commercial/residential) developments in "centers"?
12. Should housing be located within walking and biking distance to Sultan's job centers?
13. How can the city mitigate conflicts between residential and commercial uses located close together?

Al Wirta

Deborah Knight

From: Al Wirta [alwirta@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2010 12:44 PM
To: 'Deborah Knight'
Subject: RE: Roll up your Sleeves and Change Sultan's Future - Housing Element

Deborah,

My responses forthwith:

- 1) Affordable housing, (will never happen with all of the current regulations and coming regulations) low-income housing, (not everyone should own a house) government-assisted housing (Person A gets the house, person B ..taxpayer.. is responsible to supply person A with a house after the government takes its cut from the taxpayer for this program). the GMA has created the taking of property legally through the critical areas ordinances. driving up the cost of all properties . Some people want larger lots, some people want smaller lots. Let the housing market determine that.
- 2) See # 1.
- 3) How is a property maintenance code for rental housing going to maintain affordable housing?
- 4) No way ! We do not need more bureaucrats telling how we should be living. If I wanted that, I would live in a development that has a HOA.
- 5) We don't need the City of Sultan joining with anyone concerning affordable housing (see # 1 again). The City is always looking for more funding, why would you want to spend more of what you don't have? The housing market will determine what a house and property cost will be based to great degree on the regulations and fees placed on the builder. I don't ever see affordable housing happening as long as the regulations and fees continue to climb.
- 6) Of course. If one of your goals is to supply affordable housing , then ADU's will help. If the median income of Sultan residents is \$47,000 , I don't think a mortgage or bank would loan on that income, especially in this economy.
- 7) See # 1 again. Affordable housing is once again hurt by more regulation.
- 8) Growth can pay for growth when investors see incentive (profit) to do so.
- 9) The impact fees should be due when the services are provided. I don't pay for my bread until I take it out of the store.
- 10) The City should let the market determine infill or new development. There needs to be a profit (sounds nasty and heartless doesn't it) incentive because that is how the economy works. No profit - no incentive.
- 11 and 12) Of course, although the government (schools, police, City hall, fire stations) are the big job centers.
- 13) We already have zoning laws?

Thank you,

Al Wirta

From: Deborah Knight [mailto:deborah.knight@ci.sultan.wa.us]
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2009 2:47 PM
To: Deborah Knight
Subject: FW: Roll up your Sleeves and Change Sultan's Future - Housing Element

The city hosted a comprehensive small group meeting on November 24, 2009 to review the requirements for the housing chapter (element) of the comprehensive plan. The group discussed 13 policy questions (see below). Following each policy question are responses sent to the city by Stan and Judy Heydrick. Stan and Judy's comments are part of the public record. Feel free to send me your responses or share additional thoughts.

You can view the materials presented at the four small group meetings on the city's website at:
http://www.ci.sultan.wa.us/City_Hall/City_Departments/Community_Development/

Loretta Storm

Deborah Knight

From: Loretta Storm [mailto:lorettastorm@seanet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2010 8:07 AM
To: Knight Deborah
Cc: Eslick Carolyn
Subject: City Liabilities and 2011 Comp Plan Survey comment

Importance: High

Dear City Administrator Knight:

First, I am requesting you to ensure this email is received by all city council members, ideally before the Jan. 14th meeting.

Peacock Problems in Sultan: Apparently, more than one genus of peacock resides in Sultan: [KOMO-TV Story \(Link: http://www.komonews.com/news/local/80316327.html?tab=video\)](http://www.komonews.com/news/local/80316327.html?tab=video) And the [Herald story of this morning: http://www.heraldnet.com/article/20100112/NEWS01/701129873&news01ad=1#Rogue.peacocks.a.pain.for.Sultan.neighbors](http://www.heraldnet.com/article/20100112/NEWS01/701129873&news01ad=1#Rogue.peacocks.a.pain.for.Sultan.neighbors)

Liability from property damage, the presence of feces and other health-related problems abound, not only to the peacock's owner(s) but to the people of Sultan. Moreover, this incident represents, in a nutshell, Sultan's traditional, time-honored lack of code enforcement, and this fault has a direct and detrimental effect in terms of how it affects the general community surrounding Sultan's ongoing deterioration, and the perception of Sultan by potential new residents and business owners. Almost every time we drive through Sultan, we grow alarmed at the swiftness with which the city's physical appearance is decaying, despite the valiant and worthy efforts by many good-hearted, hard-working volunteers, and the Sky Chamber's substantial, energetic dedication to raise Sultan's image.

It's not only the physical deterioration that concerns us; we also fear the increase in the transient population in and around Sultan. Even to the casual observer, it is clearly growing once again, assisted by the presence of drug trafficking and the recent murder on the east side of City Hall.

Related to that murder, I wish to voice substantial kudos to Brian Copple's long-term advocacy of, and independent action for, security around city hall and the VIC: were it not for his efforts, instead of facing jail terms the murderers would still be roaming Sultan's streets (and perhaps beyond).

What Ray and I fear most, however, is the certain growth and movement of these unsavory forces, which will soon be headed up the Sultan Basin Road to infect the families living outside the Sultan's city limits in the No Man's Land, deemed unworthy to provide input for the City's 2011 Comprehensive Plan survey.

I will appreciate if you will *now* consider our comments.

Ray Kistenmacher and Loretta Storm
33520 - 116th St. SE
Sultan WA 98294

Ray & Kay George

Deborah Knight

From: Ray & Kay George [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, December 31, 2009 8:45 AM
To: 'Deborah Knight'
Subject: RE: Responses to Housing Policy Questions

Absolutely. Please share this with whomever will listen. Please also list my name, address, qualifications and comments with these answers. I would like you to answer my question as to who wrote this survey. I am sorry, but because my plate is quite full I am unavailable to formulate surveys for the City of Sultan.

From: Deborah Knight [mailto:deborah.knight@ci.sultan.wa.us]
Sent: Thursday, December 31, 2009 8:05 AM
To: 'Ray & Kay George'
Subject: RE: Responses to Housing Policy Questions

Kay,

Did you want me to share your responses with the council, planning board and comprehensive plan small group members?

In your response you expressed dissatisfaction with the housing policy questions. Are there other housing policy questions the city should be asking community members?

Deborah Knight
City Administrator
360-793-1164 (phone)
360-793-3344 (fax)
deborah.knight@ci.sultan.wa.us
www.ci.sultan.wa.us

From: Ray & Kay George [mailto:inov8@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 31, 2009 7:50 AM
To: 'Deborah Knight'
Subject: Responses to Housing Policy Questions

Attached are my responses to the housing policy questions you recently distributed. Having owned a real estate brokerage since 1996, located that brokerage within the city limits of Sultan for about 10 years, being a citizen of the city for the same period of time and also building 1 duplex and 1 6-plex within this jurisdiction, I feel as though I am pretty qualified to answer these questions. Thank you. Kay George, 1304 Skywall Drive, Sultan, WA 98294, 360-793-2305.

1. Not all the community wants larger lot sizes. I live on .18 of an acre, and sometimes feel with our busy lifestyle our lot is too large to maintain in the fashion I would like. I know of many people who feel that way. Larger lots mean less affordable housing. Everybody would prefer to live on large lots, but the bottom line is most people who live here or who will move here cannot afford to purchase or rent homes on large lots. Existing buffer requirements from critical areas should be reduced.

2. Several years ago, I worked with staff to come up with ADU regulations. In the end, my suggested fees for creation of an ADU were doubled. Additionally, the city ultimately adopted a policy that any ADU must be owner-occupied. Because my suggestions were ignored, few ADUs have been created in Sultan. Therefore, this issue should be revisited. Other easy ways the city could encourage affordable housing is to stop chasing business and development away with oppressive fees and regulations. It does not take a genius to understand these factors make this community undesirable to investors.
3. Absolutely not. Expanding city government to the point to where a city employee determines and enforces “pretty laws” is not the answer. Adequate measures are already in place in numerous other regulations addressing this issue. If city employees are even considering this issue, they should first focus their attention on rundown rental property it owns. Instead of paying expensive salaries to city employees to ponder and hash over and over such issues, why should we not instead spend the money to put a coat of trim paint on the post office?
4. Absolutely not. See No. 3 above. We have neighbors whose idea of property maintenance is far below our standards; however, creating a new division of city government to oversee maintenance of individual citizens’ properties will be costly and like all government entities will eventually get so out of control they will be harassing property owners who have relatively well-maintained properties. There is already existing regulations on the books regarding health and safety.
5. No. All cities know that reduced fees and regulation will improve affordable housing. We do not need to pay to be part of a coalition to look into this issue.
6. With the median income in Sultan being \$47,600, it is unlikely the bank would give the average citizen a loan to purchase a home. That means in order to accommodate the average citizen in Sultan, there needs to be more rentals. Existing city employees, fees and regulations makes it unprofitable to build new rentals, so the only answer is creating affordable rentals with the existing housing we have. If the cost and regulations to create an ADU were adjusted to where it was economically feasible, this would allow for more affordable housing.
7. No more regulations. The existing ones already chase away investment in our community. Besides, there are often issues with maintenance of private parks and open spaces and the city cannot afford to properly maintain the existing parks and open spaces.
8. Growth will pay for growth if the city reduces its fees and regulations to make it profitable for an investor to invest in our community. As I publically stated when the city passed the progressive increases in utility fees: as the city continues to chase away development with its employees, oppressive regulation, high fees and costs which makes it economically non-feasible for anyone to invest in our community, the only resource left to pay for the escalating numbers and salaries of city employees are the pockets of its current citizens.
9. Developers should not have to pay for services not rendered. Until a dwelling is completed these services are not rendered. Therefore, they should not be required to pay for services prior to receipt of said services. These fees should be due in exchange for the certificate of occupancy of the dwelling. This should also be true for water and sewer fees.
10. The city should encourage development within its jurisdiction wherever the open market sees fit. If you do not allow subdivisions of large parcels prior to infill, an individual or small group of anti-developers can simply refuse to develop their infill property in order to halt any development whatsoever in Sultan. Additionally, in our city most infill property is in the flood plane in the downtown area, which property would be more costly to build and more importantly more costly to insure on an ongoing basis (which leads to less affordable housing).
11. Absolutely. If done right, it is yet another way to reduce housing costs.
12. No. Collectively, government is Sultan’s primary employer. City hall, schools, the school district, the police station and 1 of our 2 fire stations are located in the downtown area within the flood plane. This is not the best location to build houses. If you let the common sense of the open market make this decision, I am certain you will find they will focus development outside this area.
13. Refer to existing zoning laws.

In general, I wonder who came up with these questions. The answers to most of these questions should be obvious to most persons who have had even the slightest experience in business or development.

Ray George

1. The whole critical areas issue is an attack on private property rights. It effectively makes property worth less, and in some cases, worthless. Actually, worse than worthless, since the property owner would still be expected to pay taxes on land he is forbidden to use.

The price tag required to market a house cannot support the cost of building the house, plus a lot of excess land. What may be desired by the community at large, in the form of large open spaces, may not produce willing or qualified buyers.

2. All housing is affordable, but not to all buyers. People with low incomes need low cost housing. Unfortunately, one of the unintended consequences of the GMA has been to increase the cost of housing, and quite substantially.

For your hypothetical \$180,000 dwelling, nearly 1/6 of that cost is needed to cover fees to the City. That's before any land, material, expenses, or labor is factored in. Is the cost of the land any less per acre for low cost housing? Of course not. All the restrictions being placed on land use, along with the high connection and impact fees, can only be supported by the prices that larger, more expensive houses command.

The State is pushing new energy efficiency standards that are estimated to raise the cost of each house an average of \$24,000. What part of the \$180,000 target is this expected to come out of? This is a perfect example of why government is never as efficient as private enterprise. Someone spending his own money would go through a thought process something like this: 1. This would probably save about \$50/month, which would require 40 years to recapture; 2. If the \$24,000 is financed, which it almost certainly would be, it could add \$200/month to the mortgage, while only saving \$50/month in utilities. This does not pass the reasonable man test. However, for a bureaucrat, forcing other people to spend their money, this sounds like a great idea; we're saving energy, great, let's do it!

3. Two problems with this. First it singles out a certain class of property owner, which doesn't afford equal protection under the law. Second, it has a tone of rent controls. Price controls do not work – never have. This ultimate effect of this will be to reduce the supply of low-rent housing.

It is not uncommon for rent paid by a tenant to be less than mortgage, taxes, and maintenance paid by the landlord. The landlord subsidizes the actual cost, counting on future appreciation of the property value. If it becomes too costly to have renters, then the number of vacant houses could increase, in which case they would be more likely to become run down.

Government regulation will have the opposite of the intended effect; it will reduce the supply of low cost housing.

4. No. The City should start maintaining its own properties. How long does the paint have to peel off of the Post Office building before it's taken care of?
5. Absolutely not. The free market is much better equipped to take care of this than the government. Stop taking on new ways to spend money you don't have.

6. Yes. You want low cost housing? This is one of the most effective ways to provide quality, low rent, dwellings, especially for single adults (of any age).
7. This will raise the cost of housing. I thought the goal was lower cost housing. Also, Tot-Lots can be a huge liability for local neighborhoods. Large lots, plus common open space? Wonder why you can't get more than four houses per acre?
8. This overlooks the fact that investors have the free will to go where they can get the best deal. Maybe we should just make the connection/impact fees \$100,000 per unit to solve our money problems.

Growth will occur when and where it is encouraged and welcomed. It will only happen when investors freely choose to invest in this community because they feel it is in their own self interest. The City cannot mandate growth, but it has a great capacity to chase it away.

9. The fairest system would be to charge at the time of occupancy. After all, that's when the impacts start to have an impact. The City prefers to collect for services not yet rendered, but this also adds to the strain on funds available for use to build with.

Say the City collects all these fees at the time the permit is issued. If the project is cancelled, and the building doesn't get built, would the City be willing to refund the fees?

10. The City should encourage ALL development. You cannot refuse someone the right to build on his property until all infill is developed. What if someone is happy with their double lot, and has no desire to build on it?

11. Yes.

12. What job centers? The only job center in Sultan is government, and we don't need it to be a growth industry. Again, the market is much better at sorting these things out. If the City is in favor of this, then accommodate it, but refrain from trying to force it. If this is how the market decides to go, it will happen. Otherwise, it won't.

13. That's what zoning is for.

Ray E. George

Stan & Judy Heydrick

Deborah Knight

From: judystan@speakeasy.net
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2009 12:35 PM
To: Deborah Knight; robert.martin@ci.sultan.wa.us
Cc: carolyn.eslick@ci.sultan.wa.us
Subject: Re: Roll up your Sleeves and Change Sultan's Future - Housing Element

Mayor Eslick; Deborah; Robert

Responses to Housing Policy questions.

Judy Heydrick

HOUSING ELEMENT

Growth Management Requirements

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.070(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods 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 makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

Policy Questions

1. How can the city balance the growth management act requirements to have a minimum 4 housing units per acre and preserve critical areas with the communities stated desire to have larger lot sizes?

RESPONSE: Per GMA, before a parcel of land is considered for development, critical areas and their buffers must first be identified, delineated and set aside. The remaining land is developable. Since Sultan residents do not favor dense developments and some properties do not yield 4 du per acre, the city should encourage the transfer of development rights to more capable lands.

2. The city is required to provide "affordable" housing. When housing costs exceeds 30% of a total household's income; the housing is no longer considered affordable. With a median income in Sultan of \$47,600 (2007) this allows for the purchase of an approximately \$180,000 home. How can the city encourage quality affordable housing (e.g. preserve and maintain existing affordable housing, lower permit costs for affordable housing, etc.)?

3. Should the city adopt a property maintenance code for rental housing to preserve and maintain affordable housing?

RESPONSE: Yes a maintenance code should be adopted so rental housing units don't become run down, unsafe eyesores impacting other people's property values.

4. Should the city adopt a property maintenance code for owner occupied housing? How should the city pay for enforcing a maintenance code?

RESPONSE: Set up a town housing authority to be funded by city revenues.

5. Should the city participate with other Snohomish County cities in forming a housing coalition to locate affordable housing throughout the county even if the city has to pay an annual fee based on population to participate?

RESPONSE: Perhaps, depending upon the terms and cost factors. This could be cheaper for the city than paying for expensive new infrastructure and services.

6. Should the city allow accessory dwelling units in single-family housing or on single-family lots subject to specific development, design and occupancy standards?

RESPONSE: No, too many problems associated with ADU's.

7. Should the city require common, convenient, and usable open space in residential developments such as on site tot-lots and trails?

RESPONSE: Yes, it's a good use of common open space. Tot lots and trails offer quality of life benefits.

8. A builder must pay approximately \$26,000 in impact and connection fees for each house at the time of building permit application. Should growth pay for growth or should current residents pay higher taxes to underwrite the cost of mitigating the impacts of new development by lowering impact fees and connection fees?

RESPONSE: Growth should pay for growth. 75% of Sultan schoolchildren qualify for low cost or free lunches. If parents don't have the resources to feed their children how can they afford to subsidize development?

9. When should the city collect impact fees for parks and roads (e.g. before the building permit is due, when the building permit is issued, at the time of occupancy)?

RESPONSE: When the building permit is issued.

10. Should the city encourage in-fill development on existing lots before allowing the subdivision of large parcels?

RESPONSE: Absolutely!! The objective of the GMA is to reign in sprawl. Policy language in previous and current Comp Plan supports this objective "Complete development - of the available lands that are within present city limits." In an October 9, 2006 Memo from Washington State Fish and Wildlife GMA biologist Pam Erstad to Snohomish County Planner Will Hall, the WDFW official urged "Local jurisdictions should make every effort to first provide for efficient use of current urban areas before proposing growth into undeveloped, relatively pristine areas that potentially contain highly valuable habitat for fish and wildlife."

In accordance with RCW36.70A.110(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas.

11. Should the city encourage mixed use (commercial/residential) developments in "centers"?

RESPONSE; Yes, it's an efficient use of property.

12. Should housing be located within walking and biking distance to Sultan's job centers?

RESPONSE: Yes. Good way to reduce harmful greenhouse gas emmissions.

13. How can the city mitigate conflicts between residential and commercial uses located close together?

RESPONSE: Encourage quality design standards and ensure that there is adequate parking for all.

Gerry Gibson

Deborah Knight

From: bonger@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 9:36 AM
To: CAROLYN ESLICK; Knight@Ci. Sultan. Us; Robert martin
Subject: Comp. Plan Meetings
Attachments: Comp Plan.pdf

I have not been able to attend the Comprehensive Plan Meetings. Input was, however, invited so I am submitting the following. Please share with the Work Group, Planning Board, and Council.

I submitted the attached letter last year and wanted to include it as much of it applies today, especially items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 under General Comments and items 1 and 2 under Neighborhood Related Comments.

Items 3, 4, 5, 7 and under my General Comments relate to the meeting this evening.

Other general comments are as follows:

I am even more concerned with the housing element in the Plan (see item 8 on page 3 of the attachment), since my neighborhood is currently experiencing the effect of an Accessory Dwelling Unit matter.

Any revision to the Comprehensive Plan should address the new state laws pertaining to restricting development and redevelopment in flood prone areas and the proposed FEMA map revisions which will dramatically change (increase) flood zones. This should change projected population growth and change some areas to low density zoning. RCW 36.70.A.070(2) would also rule.

Again, I feel strongly about the city having a responsibility to notify residents that may or will be affected by the Plan. See item #7, pg 3 on the attached which discusses the details of this. At that time Council was interested in this and asked for sample letters which I included.

Gerry Gibson

1102 Dyer Rd.

August 24, 2008

Mayor
City Administrator
City Council
Planning Board
319 Main Street
Sultan, WA 98294

RE: Draft Comprehensive Plan Comments

I have read every page of the Draft Comprehensive Plan. While I don't pretend to understand all of it, I have attended as many Planning Board and City Council meetings as possible and I have tried to learn as much as I can. I do wish to make comments concerning the Draft Comprehensive Plan:

According to the state's web cite, the GMA was adopted because "uncoordinated and unplanned growth posed a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the quality of life". It requires state and local governments to manage growth "by identifying and protecting critical areas and natural resource lands, designating urban growth areas, preparing comprehensive plans and implementing them through capital investments and development regulations". I have tried to keep this in mind when reading the Plan and in making these comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. Water flow levels will be decreased. Why would anyone want the standards for fire water flow level lowered? If the City already has a standard higher than the minimum required, why would anyone want it lowered? If my house is burning, I want the highest water flow level possible. This appears to be just another example of everyone else paying for or giving up something for development.
2. Maintaining a minimum police level of service will no longer be required. Presently, the City is required to have a certain level of police officers. This will be eliminated in the revision to the Plan. I do not see this as a good thing for Sultan. Presently in the Capital Facilities section it states "Ensure that adequate public facilities and services serving new developments are concurrent at the time of land use approval of such developments or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years of the time of development and that services for new developments will not negatively impact existing levels". Page 71 This will be removed in the revised plan. In other words, the level of police protection for the City's residents will be like a yoyo depending upon the flow of revenue into the General Fund, the quality of planning, and revenue prediction. The City will balance its budget with the police force. Each resident will get less and less police protection as the city grows because there will be no required increase in police with growth. We have already experienced this and this is the reason we currently

have only 5 officers. As far as I know, this is the only level of service issue that the City sought public opinion. The opinion of the residents was eight police officers are "about right". Town meeting on levy In addition to not following the required formula of police to resident ratio, the City has also failed at maintaining a level of eight officers. On page 20 of the Plan is a list of 7 negative impacts to the public from changing the requirements. These include an increase in overtime costs, police responses will take longer, responses will be mainly on emergency calls, policing will be reactive and not proactive, response times will be slower, police will not be available at the police station, follow up investigations may be delayed, and community policing may receive less attention. Who in their right mind would support this for the City and its residents? When I call the police, I'd like them to respond as soon as possible and not in the next day or two or never. The list on page 20 left out one of the most important drawbacks: attracting applicants for police officer positions when funding is uncertain and can change with a whim. We have experienced this in trying to hire a police chief and an officer. Why would any police candidate come to Sultan under these essentially temporary conditions?

3. The current ratio of park and recreational area to residents will be decreased. I agree with this as the current ratio is too high and the City has failed horribly at maintaining some very beautiful parks for lack of funds to do so. Reducing the park impact fees for new development is crazy in my mind. A reduction of \$415,000 in park revenue doesn't make sense, especially when the City doesn't have funds to maintain the parks it currently has, is planning to build more parks, and the "first priority over the next six years will be acquisition of land" page 20 Why would anyone support reducing the impact fees? I wonder what the public wants; no one knows.
4. The Plan proposes to lower the level of service for some roads, meaning that there will be more congestion and slower movement of traffic. Why would anyone who travels these roads want this? Congestion will only get worse with additional development. By lowering the LOS, additional development cannot be denied for not being concurrent and development will not have to make improvements to maintain the higher LOS. The costs of later improvements to ease congestion will be made by the residents and not development. This is not right and I again wonder if this is what the public wants; again no one knows.
5. The Plan relies heavily upon developer financing. I think this is a strategy that is not as well thought out as it should be. Developer financing in my opinion is a petre dish for corruption. There are also current examples in which the City relied upon development to pay for infrastructure and then the development did not materialize or has been delayed. The resulting domino effect is damaging to the City's budget and plans.
6. The Plan includes huge wastewater treatment estimates. I do not see anything that would fix the overflow problems during flooding that discharges raw sewage into the rivers. This should be a top priority and be fixed before any expansion.

7. I have been to as many meetings regarding the Plan as possible and know that there has been very little citizen participation. I think one reason for this is that most do not think that the plan will affect them in any significant way. The city has held quite a few meetings to inform the public about the general plans. I think that many more citizens would participate if they knew minor details that would actually affect them. I am disappointed that the city has not notified all those who will be impacted by the Plan. These include a number of items:
- The 490 households that will be paying for sewer lines constructed on their streets and then essentially and eventually being required to pay also for the hook up fee, additional construction costs to run the line from the street to your house and take care of the old septic tank, and then a monthly fee. This also includes those citizens who will have a pump station next to or in the immediate vicinity of their house. I think these residents need to be notified and provided the opportunity to participate in this important public process.
 - The plan also requires "property acquisition where appropriate". Sewer Plan top of page 8 The proposed or potential properties are not, however, identified. Such properties need to be identified and, of course, related acquisition costs must be included in the Capital Facilities Plan. All citizens that would be affected by the possibility of losing their property or those in the vicinity of such property acquisition by the City should be notified so they can participate in the process. Certainly these people have a right to know that the City is planning to take their land and the City has an obligation to so advise.
 - The plan identifies a substantial area that is or will be within the UGA. All these property owners should be notified and provided the opportunity to participate in this process. Further, the plan calls for those annexed into the city to hook up to sewer and water. Those affected should be notified of this so they can participate in the process. The additional costs of sewer hook up and monthly fees in addition to being required to connect to the city water system from a well could have a very significant effect on these people.
 - The plan proposes some new streets. The property owners affected by these new streets need to be notified so they can participate in the process.
8. The housing element of the Plan is frustrating to me. Page 50-54 The vision I have of Sultan is different than that in the Plan. The Plan suggests needs for more "affordable housing" and targets housing in the \$180,000 area. It suggests this can be attained with higher density and encourages manufactured housing units, more mother-in-law units, village patio units, and row units – everything but campers and tents. I am confident this is not what the public wants. I suggest this be looked at again as it greatly amplifies the requirements of the GMA.
9. The city is making a number of changes, yet does not know, in most instances, what its citizens want. It has been suggested a number of times that a survey be sent to all

those affected by the CP. This was not done. The comments from the city were that there was not enough time and not enough money. Over a year has passed since the survey was suggested and several hundred thousands of dollars have been spent on the many consultants involved in the preparation of the CP. The City should know what the residents want in my opinion.

10. There has been concern by citizens for some time that development should pay for the increased costs of added infrastructure from development. A former Interim Financial Advisor for the City once reported that development was only paying 60% of the added infrastructure costs of development and the remaining 40% of such costs are paid by residents. Certainly this seems unfair; development must pay for these added costs. It appears the complete "fair share" costs of the new sewer extensions will be charged only to those where the benefit is conferred. Why is this not the same for development? This is illustrated in the table (VIII-7) included in a recent brochure mailing from the City and titled "Our Community's Planned Infrastructure (2008-2025)". It shows that of the \$252 million total costs, the developer provided amount is \$125.7 million.

NEIGHBORHOOD RELATED COMMENTS

1. The Plan claims there are about 409 residences (page 126) within the City limits that are not sewerred and list the costs to provide sewer services to these parcels. I am concerned with these costs at least in my neighborhood on Dyer Road as I don't believe there is anyone that can afford the approximate \$50,000 per residence. (\$1,204,000 for the sewer extension (page 132) plus \$434,000 for the pump station and force mains (page 133) = 1,638,000 divided by the approximate 80 residences = \$20,475 per house. Adding \$13,800 for hook-up fees is \$34,275 and then around \$10,000 to run the line from the street to your house, plus whatever needs to be done with the old septic system, would be nearly \$50,000). And then the monthly fee begins. While the Plan most likely will not mandate immediate hook up, it does mandate paying "fair share costs" and paying for the "benefit conferred" and I am sure the following code revisions will include late-comer fees. No one can afford this. Further, this was all based upon assumptions that the developer for the Twin Rivers Estates would pay to extend the sewer line under the BNSF railroad tracks and also assumptions that BNSF would permit the sewer line to go under the tracks. It appears the developer has now decided that such costs are prohibitive for the development. The property is now listed for sale and it appears the proposed development is abandoned. The Plan does not address such development abandonment which is the foundation for this sewer project.

There is nothing in the Plan to indicate that other routes for the sewer extension were considered. For example, could the costs of property acquisition be avoided by running the sewer line under the tracks on 10th Street and would this change the location of or need for a pump station?

I am also concerned in that the General Sewer Plan Amendment 2 advises that there will be property acquisition where appropriate. (page 8) The property owners where the City plans to take property need to be notified and the City has an obligation to notify all who could be affected. The location of a proposed pump station is listed as 10th and Dyer. A community-owned river access lot is located at 10th and Dyer. If the City is intending to put the pump station at this location, the owners need to be notified.

2. The storm water management portion of the Plan is confusing. Table VIII-14 on page 194 identifies planned projects on Dyer Road. Projects C-10 is \$5,100, E-11 is \$10,800, and E-12 is \$9,100 all to correct standing water on "Cul-de-sac at Dyer Road". I have seen the proposals for this. It is simply to correct potholes that make puddles when it rains. People who live in this area have called the City many times and asked for the roads to be graded to solve the standing water problem. When the City did not respond, several neighbors got together with picks and shovels and fixed the problem. It doesn't seem that these projects are very well thought out. The \$25,000 seems quite costly to fix a few potholes.

Project E-16a is \$46,700 and apparently involves debris removal from Wagleys Creek. Again this seems exorbitant to periodically remove debris. Included here is \$7,000 in easements or land acquisitions. The property involved is not identified. I feel strongly that all property owners involved need to be notified so they have the opportunity to participate in this process.

Project E-16b is \$464,200 and, I assume by the amount, is for replacing the culvert where Dyer crosses Wagleys Creek. Included here is also \$21,000 for easements or land acquisitions. The property involved is not identified. Again, all property owners involved need to be notified so they have the opportunity to participate in this process.

Project E-16c is \$14,700 and is listed as ditches and culverts and not further described.

There has been no detail of these projects other than the potholes presented to the public that I know of and there has been no public involvement. All those who live on Dyer Road should be notified of these project and provided the opportunity to participate in the process and especially so when easements or property acquisition is involved.

3. I have submitted public comment regarding the City's Determination of Non Significance regarding the General Sewer Plan portion of the Plan. The SEPA checklist for this determination is significantly flawed due to vague, incomplete, and inaccurate responses to many questions and should not be relied upon in my opinion.

Gerry Gibson
1102 Dyer Road
Sultan, WA 98294

9/11/2008

Steve,

At last night's joint Council/PB meeting I made a lot of comments about the City notifying property owners when the Comp Plan anticipates a direct impact upon them or their property. You asked that I provide examples of such notifications. Attached are some examples. These don't cover all the potential situations, but here are four.

To me, this just seems to be the right thing to do. I am sure it would cause a lot of hassle at first, but in the long run there will be a better relationship between the City and the residents.

Gerry

Joe Propertyowner --
1111 Dyer Place
Sultan, WA 98294

there are 4 properties where Wagley crosses
10th street

RE: Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mr. Propertyowner:

This letter is being sent to you to inform you of matters within the Sultan Comprehensive Plan which may have a direct impact upon you and your property. The following projects contained in the Comprehensive Plan include potential easements or land acquisition by the City:

Project E-16b Work on Wagleys Creek

Project E-16a Work on Wagleys Creek

These projects are listed in the Comprehensive Plan on page 194, copy attached. Additional information can be found by contacting XXXXXX, phone number.

Sincerely,

XXXXXX

DRAFT City of Sultan Comprehensive Plan/SEIS for Public Comment

Storm Sewer

Storm Water Capital Project Needs

Table VIII-14: Unconstrained Storm Water Needs List.

Basic Projects		Permits &			Easements or		Total
Project ID	Project Name	Study	Design/Plans	Construction	Land Acq		
C-2	Date & 3rd, Standing Water	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 50,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,500
C-3	Birch & 3rd, Infiltration	\$ -	\$ 2,200	\$ 22,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,500
C-6a	Main Street, 1st to 5th, Stormwater	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,900	\$ 28,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,600
C-6b	Regional Water Quality Facility for	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000
C-7 / C-14	Murphy Way Entrance Standing W	\$ -	\$ 3,200	\$ 32,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,200
C-8	5th Place & 6th Street, Gravel Rce	\$ -	\$ 8,400	\$ 64,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 70,400
C-10	Cul-de-Sac at Dyer Road, Standin	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 4,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,100
C-12	Culvert at Bus Maint. Drive for Sch	\$ -	\$ 140	\$ 1,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500
C-15	2nd and Cedar, Standing Water	\$ -	\$ 2,200	\$ 22,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,600
C-16	1st & Date, Standing Water	\$ -	\$ 600	\$ 6,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,000
C-17	2nd and Birch, Standing Water	\$ -	\$ 2,200	\$ 22,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,600
C-18	High Ave. Standing Water at Bus I	\$ -	\$ 1,200	\$ 12,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,500
C-20	4th & Birch, Flooding	\$ -	\$ 2,600	\$ 26,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28,600
N-2A	311st & Wisteria, Street Flooding	\$ -	\$ 900	\$ 9,300	\$ 12,800	\$ -	\$ 23,000
N-4	Wisteria Ave & Gohr Rd, Northeast	\$ -	\$ 4,100	\$ 41,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,400
W-1	Highway US 2, Illicit Discharge In :	\$ -	\$ 1,500	\$ 14,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,400
W-3	Marcus Road and Hwy US 2, Sen	\$ -	\$ 600	\$ 8,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,600
E-11	Cul-de-Sac at Dyer Road, Standin	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 9,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,800
E-12	Cul-de-Sac at Dyer Road, Standin	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ 8,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,100
E-16b	Dyer Rd. at Wagleys Creek, Cons	\$ 30,000	\$ 37,560	\$ 375,600	\$ 21,000	\$ -	\$ 464,200
E-16c	Dyer Road, Ditches and Culverts /	\$ -	\$ 1,300	\$ 13,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,700
SE-1	Level Spreader at 339th & Old Sul	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ 8,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,800
Non-Impact Projects Total							\$ 988,100

Projects Related to Development

Project ID	Project Name	Permits &			Easements or		Total
		Study	Design & Plans	Construction	Land Acq		
C-11	High School South Lot, Filling of Infiltration Ditch	\$ -	\$ 1,600	\$ 15,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,500
C-13	1st Street Culvert Crossing, 200 Ft. South of Willow	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 3,800	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 4,700
C-19	8th Street at Depot Ln, Regional Flooding	\$ 5,000	\$ 900	\$ 9,000	\$ 11,800	\$ -	\$ 26,700
N-2B	311st & Wisteria, Winters Creek Culvert	\$ -	\$ 330	\$ 3,300	\$ 14,200	\$ -	\$ 17,800
N-3	Gohr Road 310' south of N Park Drive, Lot Flooding	\$ 8,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 15,300	\$ 16,900	\$ -	\$ 41,700
N-5	Gohr Road, Drainage Improvements	\$ -	\$ 870	\$ 8,700	\$ 2,300	\$ -	\$ 11,900
E-3	Wagleys Creek Crossing at 339th Ave	\$ 15,000	\$ 2,300	\$ 23,300	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ 44,600
E-8	132nd St., Plugged Culvert	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 900	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000
E-10	E. Main Street, Drainage Problems at Gravel Rd &	\$ 40,000	\$ 26,300	\$ 262,700	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 329,000
E-16a	Dyer Rd. Culverts at Wagleys Creek, Debris	\$ 20,000	\$ 1,800	\$ 17,900	\$ 7,000	\$ -	\$ 46,700
E-21	Foundry Drive, Connecting Riser & Storm	\$ -	\$ 22,400	\$ 223,600	\$ 39,000	\$ -	\$ 295,000
SE-2	Extend 36" Culvert Under US 2, 400 Ft. East of	\$ -	\$ 24,800	\$ 248,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 273,200
SE-3	Ditch on South Side of US 2, East of Rice Rd.	\$ -	\$ 16,200	\$ 161,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 177,700
Basic Projects Related to Development							\$ 1,289,000
Developer Funded Improvement Project							
E-4	Sultan Basin Rd, Flooding in Area North of Bryant	\$ 8,000	\$ 3,200	\$ 32,100	\$ 35,300	\$ -	\$ 78,600
E-7A	132nd Street, Storm Conveyance	\$ 12,000	\$ 6,700	\$ 66,700	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85,400
E-7B	132nd Street Storm Conveyance - Storm Pipe	\$ 10,000	\$ 13,700	\$ 137,400	\$ 11,800	\$ -	\$ 172,900
E-19	Wagleys Creek Culvert at 140th Street SE	\$ 10,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 9,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,800
N-1	Deteriorating Culvert at Trout Farm Road	\$ 8,000	\$ 5,100	\$ 50,700	\$ 12,800	\$ -	\$ 76,600
Projects Related to Development Funded by Developers							\$ 434,000
Likely, Total =							Total = \$ 1,723,000

Joe Propertyowner --
1111 Dyer Place
Sultan, WA 98294

I don't know how many property owners
are involved

RE: Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mr. Propertyowner:

This letter is being sent to you to inform you of matters within the Sultan Comprehensive Plan which may have a direct impact upon you and your property.

The Comprehensive Plan anticipates building a road adjacent to/ through certain properties. This may involve your property. Additional information can be found by contacting XXXXX, phone number XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Sincerely,

XXXXX

Joe Propertyowner --
1111 Dyer Place
Sultan, WA 98294

There are 409 households within the city
and I don't know how many to be annexed

RE: Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mr. Propertyowner:

This letter is being sent to you to inform you of matters within the Sultan Comprehensive Plan which may have a direct impact upon you and your property.

The Comprehensive Plan includes providing sewer services to all households within the city limits and to all new properties added to the city. Your property is included. Further, these projects may involve pump stations and potential property acquisition by the City. For more details, you may contact XXXXXX, phone number XXXXXX

Sincerely,

XXXXXX

Joe Propertyowner --
1111 Dyer Place
Sultan, WA 98294

I don't know how many property owners
are involved

RE: Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mr. Propertyowner:

This letter is being sent to you to inform you of matters within the Sultan Comprehensive Plan which may have a direct impact upon you and your property.

The Comprehensive Plan anticipates annexing certain properties. This may involve your property. Along with the annexation, there are certain requirements mandated by the Comprehensive Plan. These include requirements to connect to the City sewer and water systems as well as other requirements. Additional information can be found by contacting XXXXX, phone number XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Sincerely,

XXXXX

DRAFT City of Sultan Comprehensive Plan/SEIS for Public Comment

Storm Sewer

Storm Water Capital Project Needs

Table VIII-14: Unconstrained Storm Water Needs List.

Basic Projects						
Project ID	Project Name	Permits &			Easements or	
		Study	Design/Plans	Construction	Land Acq	Total
C-2	Date & 3rd, Standing Water	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 50,400	\$ -	\$ 55,500
C-3	Birch & 3rd, Infiltration	\$ -	\$ 2,200	\$ 22,300	\$ -	\$ 24,500
C-6a	Main Street, 1st to 5th, Stormwater	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,900	\$ 28,800	\$ -	\$ 36,600
C-6b	Regional Water Quality Facility for	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000
C-7 / C-14	Murphy Way Entrance Standing W	\$ -	\$ 3,200	\$ 32,000	\$ -	\$ 35,200
C-8	5th Place & 6th Street, Gravel Ros	\$ -	\$ 6,400	\$ 64,000	\$ -	\$ 70,400
C-10	Cul-de-Sac at Dyer Road, Standin	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 4,600	\$ -	\$ 5,100
C-12	Culvert at Bus Maint. Drive for Sch	\$ -	\$ 140	\$ 1,400	\$ -	\$ 1,500
C-15	2nd and Cedar, Standing Water	\$ -	\$ 2,200	\$ 22,400	\$ -	\$ 24,600
C-16	1st & Date, Standing Water	\$ -	\$ 600	\$ 8,400	\$ -	\$ 7,000
C-17	2nd and Birch, Standing Water	\$ -	\$ 2,200	\$ 22,400	\$ -	\$ 24,600
C-18	High Ave. Standing Water at Bus I	\$ -	\$ 1,200	\$ 12,300	\$ -	\$ 13,500
C-20	4th & Birch, Flooding	\$ -	\$ 2,800	\$ 28,000	\$ -	\$ 28,800
N-2A	311st & Wisteria, Street Flooding	\$ -	\$ 900	\$ 9,300	\$ 12,800	\$ 23,000
N-4	Wisteria Ave & Gphr Rd, Northeast	\$ -	\$ 4,100	\$ 41,300	\$ -	\$ 45,400
W-1	Highway US 2, Illicit Discharge In :	\$ -	\$ 1,500	\$ 14,900	\$ -	\$ 16,400
W-3	Marcus Road and Hwy US 2, Sen	\$ -	\$ 600	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ 6,600
E-11	Cul-de-Sac at Dyer Road, Standin	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 9,800	\$ -	\$ 10,800
E-12	Cul-de-Sac at Dyer Road, Standin	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ 8,300	\$ -	\$ 9,100
E-16b	Dyer Rd. at Wagleys Creek, Cons	\$ 30,000	\$ 37,560	\$ 375,600	\$ 21,000	\$ 464,200
E-16c	Dyer Road, Ditches and Culverts /	\$ -	\$ 1,300	\$ 13,400	\$ -	\$ 14,700
SE-1	Level Spreader at 339th & Old Sul	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ 8,000	\$ -	\$ 8,800
Non-Impact Projects Total						\$ 986,100
Projects Related to Development						
Project ID	Project Name	Permits &			Easements or	
		Study	Design & Plans	Construction	Land Acq	Total
C-11	High School South Lot, Filling of Infiltration Ditch	\$ -	\$ 1,600	\$ 15,900	\$ -	\$ 17,500
C-13	1st Street Culvert Crossing, 200 Ft. South of Willow	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 3,800	\$ 500	\$ 4,700
C-19	8th Street at Depot Ln, Regional Flooding	\$ 5,000	\$ 900	\$ 9,000	\$ 11,800	\$ 26,700
N-2B	311st & Wisteria, Winters Creek Culvert	\$ -	\$ 330	\$ 3,300	\$ 14,200	\$ 17,800
N-3	Gohr Road 310' south of N Park Drive, Lot Flooding	\$ 8,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 15,300	\$ 16,900	\$ 41,700
N-5	Gohr Road, Drainage Improvements	\$ -	\$ 870	\$ 8,700	\$ 2,300	\$ 11,900
E-3	Wagleys Creek Crossing at 339th Ave	\$ 15,000	\$ 2,300	\$ 23,300	\$ 4,000	\$ 44,600
E-8	132nd St., Plugged Culvert	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 900	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,000
E-10	E. Main Street, Drainage Problems at Gravel Rd &	\$ 40,000	\$ 26,300	\$ 262,700	\$ -	\$ 329,000
E-16a	Dyer Rd. Culverts at Wagleys Creek, Debris	\$ 20,000	\$ 1,800	\$ 17,900	\$ 7,000	\$ 46,700
E-21	Foundry Drive, Connecting Riser & Storm	\$ -	\$ 22,400	\$ 223,600	\$ 49,000	\$ 295,000
SE-2	Extend 36" Culvert Under US 2, 400 Ft. East of	\$ -	\$ 24,800	\$ 248,400	\$ -	\$ 273,200
SE-3	Ditch on South Side of US 2, East of Rice Rd.	\$ -	\$ 16,200	\$ 161,500	\$ -	\$ 177,700
Basic Projects Related to Development						\$ 1,289,000
Developer Funded Improvement Project						
E-4	Sultan Basin Rd, Flooding in Area North of Bryant	\$ 8,000	\$ 3,200	\$ 32,100	\$ 35,300	\$ 78,600
E-7A	132nd Street, Storm Conveyance	\$ 12,000	\$ 6,700	\$ 66,700	\$ -	\$ 85,400
E-7B	132nd Street Storm Conveyance - Storm Pipe	\$ 10,000	\$ 13,700	\$ 137,400	\$ 11,800	\$ 172,900
E-19	Wagleys Creek Culvert at 140th Street SE	\$ 10,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 9,800	\$ -	\$ 20,800
N-1	Deteriorating Culvert at Trout Farm Road	\$ 8,000	\$ 5,100	\$ 50,700	\$ 12,800	\$ 76,600
Projects Related to Development Funded by Developers Likely, Total =						\$ 434,000
Total =						\$ 1,723,000

The countywide planning housing goals and policies generally follow the organization of the Vision 2040 Multicounty Planning Housing Policies.

These policies reflect the need for the County and its cities to develop vibrant communities that offer diverse housing options for all demographic segments and income groups and are intended to implement the goals of the Regional vision in the Snohomish County context.

Housing Goal:

Snohomish County and its cities will promote an affordable lifestyle where residents have access to safe, affordable, and diverse housing options near their jobs.

- HO-1** The County and cities should support the principle that fair and equal access to housing is available to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, national origin, familial status, source of income, or disability.
- HO-2** The County and cities shall make adequate provisions in their comprehensive plans for existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments.
- HO-3** The County and cities should strengthen and/or establish interjurisdictional cooperative efforts to:
- a. Ensure an adequate and diversified supply of housing is available countywide; and
 - b. Facilitate private/public financing programs to provide for an adequate supply of low and moderate income housing.

[Editor's Note: There was considerable discussion of HO-4 by the CPP subcommittee. The outcome was that the forthcoming SCT project to update the fair share methodology is the appropriate vehicle for amending this policy. The staff report accompanying the CPP update will include a summary of the issues discussed as a reference for the fair share project.]

- HO-4** Adopt and implement a fair share distribution of low-income and special needs housing so as to prevent further concentration of such housing into only a few areas. The county and cities will collaborate in formulating a methodology to assess existing and projected housing needs of the county's population and a fair share housing allocation methodology.

[Editor's Notes:

1) *Subpolicy (c) is a suggestion made by June Robinson, Director of the Housing Consortium via email on 11/3/09. In her email she says:*

What I am looking for is a statement that encourages a match between the jobs available and the type of housing available, so if a jurisdiction is creating low-wage jobs they shouldn't be also creating \$500,000 single family homes.

2) *This suggestion led to some back and forth dialog via email from CPP subcommittee and PAC members.*

3) *Because this came from an outside source, the CPP subcommittee is elevating the proposed HO-11.c to the PAC for consideration rather than taking a position.*

HO-11 In order to improve the jobs-to-housing balance in Snohomish County, jurisdictions should encourage:

jobs/housing
balance

- a. development of a variety of housing types, including affordable housing, in proximity to existing employment concentrations; and
- b. development of employment opportunities in proximity to existing residential communities in the Urban Growth Areas

c. development of housing that is affordable for the types of jobs available in the same jurisdiction.

HO-12 Jurisdictions should encourage the use of environmentally sensitive housing development practices in order to minimize the impacts of growth on the county's natural resource systems.

HO-13 The County and cities should consider the economic implications of proposed building and land use regulations so that the broader public benefit they serve is achieved with the least additional cost to housing.

HO-14 The County and cities should minimize housing production costs by considering the use of a variety of infrastructure funding methods, including but not limited to existing revenue sources, impact fees, local improvement districts, and general obligation bonds.

HO-15 Jurisdictions should ensure that their impact fee programs add no more to the cost of each housing unit produced than a fairly-derived proportionate share of the cost of new public facilities needed to accommodate the housing unit as determined by the impact fee provisions of the Growth Management Act cited in chapter 82.02 RCW.

APPENDIX C: Multi-County Planning Policies

VISION 2040 includes multicounty planning policies which, as required by the State Growth Management Act, articulate the overall policy direction of the region (see RCW 36.70A.210(7)). Multicounty policies provide direction for transportation planning and investment decisions and form the policy framework for development of **Transportation 2040**. The multicounty policies articulate the region's vision in the following categories: environment, development patterns, housing, economy, transportation, and public services. Because **VISION 2040** is an integrated growth management, economic, environmental, and transportation strategy, the region's policy framework is comprised of general, regional framework policies from each of these areas as well as more specific transportation policies. The following multicounty policies are the framework that guided development of **Transportation 2040**.

GENERAL MULTICOUNTY PLANNING POLICIES

MPP-G-1 Coordinate planning efforts among jurisdictions, agencies, and federally recognized Indian tribes where there are common borders or related regional issues, to facilitate a common vision.

MPP-G-2 Update countywide planning policies, where necessary, prior to December 31, 2010, to address the multicounty planning policies in **VISION 2040**.

MPP-G-3 Monitor implementation of **VISION 2040** to evaluate progress in achieving the regional growth strategy, as well as the environment, development patterns, housing, economy, transportation, and public services provisions.

Fiscal

MPP-G-4 Explore new and existing sources of funding for services and infrastructure, recognizing that such funding is vital if local governments are to achieve the regional vision.

MPP-G-5 Identify and develop changes to regulatory, pricing, taxing, and expenditure practices, and other fiscal tools within the region to implement the vision.

ENVIRONMENT

Environmental Stewardship

Goal: *The region will safeguard the natural environment by meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.*

MPP-En-1 Develop regionwide environmental strategies, coordinating among local jurisdictions and countywide planning groups.

MPP-En-2 Use integrated and interdisciplinary approaches for environmental planning and assessment at regional, countywide and local levels.

MPP-En-3 Maintain and, where possible, improve air and water quality, soils, and natural systems to ensure the health and well-being of people, animals, and plants. Reduce the impacts of transportation on air and water quality, and climate change.

MPP-En-4 Ensure that all residents of the region, regardless of social or economic status, live in a healthy environment, with minimal exposure to pollution.

MPP-En-5 Locate development in a manner that minimizes impacts to natural features. Promote the use of innovative environmentally sensitive development practices, including design, materials, construction, and on-going maintenance.

MPP-DP-49 Support and provide incentives to increase the percentage of new development and redevelopment – both public and private – to be built at higher performing energy and environmental standards.

MPP-DP-50 Streamline development standards and regulations for residential and commercial development, especially in centers, to provide flexibility and to accommodate a broader range of project types consistent with the regional vision.

Incompatible Land Uses

MPP-DP-51 Protect the continued operation of general aviation airports from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.

MPP-DP-52 Protect military lands from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.

MPP-DP-53 Protect industrial lands from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.

Concurrency

MPP-DP-54 Develop concurrency programs and methods that fully consider growth targets, service needs, and level-of-service standards. Focus level-of-service standards for transportation on the movement of people and goods instead of only on the movement of vehicles.

MPP-DP-55 Address nonmotorized, pedestrian, and other multimodal types of transportation options in concurrency programs – both in assessment and mitigation.

MPP-DP-56 Tailor concurrency programs for centers and other subareas to encourage development that can be supported by transit.

HOUSING

Housing diversity and affordability

MPP-H-1 Provide a range of housing types and choices to meet the housing needs of all income levels and demographic groups within the region.

MPP-H-2 Achieve and sustain – through preservation, rehabilitation, and new development – a sufficient supply of housing to meet the needs of low-income, moderate-income, middle-income, and special needs individuals and households that is equitably and rationally distributed throughout the region.

MPP-H-3 Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families and individuals.

Jobs-housing balance

MPP-H-4 Develop and provide a range of housing choices for workers at all income levels throughout the region in a manner that promotes accessibility to jobs and provides opportunities to live in proximity to work.

Centers housing

MPP-H-5 Expand the supply and range of housing, including affordable units, in centers throughout the region.

MPP-H-6 Recognize and give regional funding priority to transportation facilities, infrastructure, and services that explicitly advance the development of housing in designated regional growth centers. Give additional priority to projects and services that advance affordable housing.

Best housing practices

MPP-H-7 Encourage jurisdictions to review and streamline development standards and regulations to advance their public benefit, provide flexibility, and minimize additional costs to housing.

MPP-H-8 Encourage the use of innovative techniques to provide a broader range of housing types for all income levels and housing needs.

MPP-H-9 Encourage interjurisdictional cooperative efforts and public-private partnerships to advance the provision of affordable and special needs housing.

ECONOMY

Business

Goal: The region's economy prospers by supporting businesses and job creation.

MPP-Ec-1 Support economic development activities that help to retain, expand, or diversify the region's businesses. Target recruitment activities towards businesses that provide family-wage jobs.

MPP-Ec-2 Foster a positive business climate by encouraging regionwide and statewide collaboration among business, government, education, labor, military, workforce development, and other nonprofit organizations.

MPP-Ec-3 Support established and emerging industry clusters that export goods and services, import capital, and have growth potential.

MPP-Ec-4 Leverage the region's position as an international gateway by supporting businesses, ports, and agencies involved in trade-related activities.

MPP-Ec-5 Foster a supportive environment for business startups, small businesses, and locally owned businesses to help them continue to prosper.

MPP-Ec-6 Ensure the efficient flow of people, goods, services, and information in and through the region with infrastructure investments, particularly in and connecting designated centers, to meet the distinctive needs of the regional economy.

MPP-Ec-7 Encourage the private, public, and nonprofit sectors to incorporate environmental and social responsibility into their practices.

People

Goal: The region's economy prospers by investing in all of its people.

MPP-Ec-8 Promote economic activity and employment growth that creates widely shared prosperity and sustains a diversity of family-wage jobs for the region's residents.

MPP-Ec-9 Ensure that the region has a high quality education system that is accessible to all of the region's residents.

MPP-Ec-10 Ensure that the region has high quality and accessible training programs that give people opportunities to learn, maintain, and upgrade skills necessary to meet the current and forecast needs of the regional and global economy.

MPP-Ec-11 Address unique obstacles and special needs – as well as recognize the special assets – of disadvantaged populations in improving the region's shared economic future.

MPP-Ec-12 Foster appropriate and targeted economic growth in distressed areas to create economic opportunity for residents of these areas.