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Introduction

The purpose of this report is to assist the public and elected officials in consideration of Spokane County’s update of its Comprehensive Plan and urban growth area (UGA) boundary. A review of the UGA is required by the Countywide Planning Policies to occur every 5 years after adoption of the plan. State law requires the UGA review to occur at least every 10 years. The County’s Comprehensive Plan and UGA were adopted in 2001.

The primary focus of the study is analyzing the UGA needs for the metropolitan area. The metropolitan area includes The City of Spokane, Spokane Valley, Airway Heights, Liberty Lake, Millwood and the existing UGAs surrounding these cities. The non-metropolitan cities and towns are analyzed only in terms of their capacity needs and development of specific UGA study areas for the non-metropolitan cities are not included within this study.

The study evaluates the current population capacity of the existing UGA and determines future capacity needs for the 20 year planning horizon. The study includes a land quantity analysis for Spokane County, and includes a preliminary environmental and service and facility review for identified study areas. The study establishes potential, metropolitan UGA expansion areas that will form the basis for a more formal analysis through a public participation and environmental review process.

The study was conducted by the Planning Technical Committee under the oversight of the jurisdictions planning director and the Steering Committee of Elected Officials. The Committee includes planners from Spokane County and Cities within the County. The Planning Technical Committee met on a regular basis between April and July of 2007. The Committee is advocating the concept of regional collaboration in the UGA update process.

The study has identified 17 potential UGA expansion areas as the best suited areas for further review and analysis. The land quantity analysis reveals that under the Washington State Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) medium forecast the County currently has sufficient capacity within the existing Metro UGA to meet the capacity requirements for the 20 year planning horizon. The higher forecast and associated allocation numbers approved for “planning purposes” by the Board of County Commissioners on May 23, 2006 would however, require expansion of the existing Metro UGA.
Background

In 1990, the Growth Management Act (GMA) was passed by the Washington State Legislature. It required the State’s largest and fastest-growing counties, and each of their cities, to develop Comprehensive Plans to prepare for the future. Spokane County was mandated to fully plan under the GMA in 1993 based on population growth in the preceding 10 years.

The GMA planning process began with the development of the Countywide Planning Policies (CWPPs). This was coordinated by the Steering Committee of Elected Officials, consisting of officials from Spokane County and its eleven (at that time) cities and towns, along with representatives from water, school and fire districts, utility companies and the public. The CWPPs formed the planning framework that would guide the planning process for the County and its cities and towns. The Steering Committee met frequently during an 18-month period, listening to residents and formulating the vision of the community into the CWPPs. The CWPPs were adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on December 22, 1994.

After the CWPPs were adopted, the Steering Committee began development of the Interim Urban Growth Area (IUGA) boundary which was completed in 1997. The IUGA established a temporary growth boundary to act as a place holder while the County and the Cities completed work on their comprehensive plans.

Spokane County adopted its GMA comprehensive plan in 2001 with most other jurisdictions in the County adopting their plans in the same time period. Spokane County utilized the SEPA/GMA integration process as the mechanism for environmental review in the adoption of its plan. This process consisted of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Interim UGA followed with a Supplemental EIS for the formal adoption of the plan.

Changes in governance since the Growth Management plan was adopted are described on the following pages.
Changes to Governance Since the GMA Plan was Adopted
Incorporations
Incorporations are limited to areas within existing UGAs and require a review process through the Washington State Boundary Review Board. The fairly recent incorporations of the City of Liberty Lake and the City of Spokane Valley have significantly altered the structure of governance in Spokane County. Liberty Lake was incorporated in 2001 with a population of 3,265. The City of Spokane Valley was incorporated in 2003 with a population of 80,700. In 2004 the new cities were granted population allocations of 20,666 for Spokane Valley and 5,511 for Liberty Lake (BCC res. # 04-1009). The allocations were limited to growth within the corporate boundaries of the two cities.

Table 1 – Recent Incorporations in Spokane County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>Incorporation</td>
<td>4.5 sq mi</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>August 31, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>Incorporation</td>
<td>38 sq mi</td>
<td>80,700</td>
<td>March 31, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.5 sq mi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>83,965</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annexations
There have been numerous annexations in Spokane County since the County’s Comprehensive Plan and UGA was adopted in 2001. Annexations are required to occur within existing UGA boundaries. Table 2 illustrates the annexations which total approximately 3.2 square miles in size. A map illustrating both incorporations and annexations is provided on page 4.

Table 2 – Annexations in Spokane County
After Comprehensive Plan Adoption (November 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>Liberty Lake Meadows</td>
<td>329.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>Emtman Annexation</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Verhoogen</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Muirfield</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>February 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Shopko</td>
<td>206.96</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>February 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>Haas</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>September 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>Inland Empire Paper</td>
<td>645.80</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Park Place</td>
<td>495.71</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>Moe Property</td>
<td>83.60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>November 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>McCardle</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>North Division</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2059.75 acres</strong></td>
<td>(3.2 sq mi)</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendments
Since the adoption of the County’s Comprehensive Plan in 2001, several amendments have been approved through the annual amendment process. Table 3 illustrates approved Comprehensive Plan amendments that have expanded the County’s UGA. Approximately 873 acres or 1.4 square miles have been added to the UGA.

Some of the additions to the UGA have subsequently been removed and placed back into a rural category pursuant to the settlement of a Growth Management Hearing Board decision (BCC res. # 07-0077). The areas include CPA-31-03 through CPA-36-03 and CPA-01-04. The removal of these areas reduces the acreage total from 873 acres to 628 acres, however, a number of urban scale plats in the amendment areas have received preliminary approval and are vested. These areas, although now in a rural classification, will develop at an urban population capacity level. A map illustrated the location of the comprehensive plan amendments is provided on page 6.

Table 3 - Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendments 2002-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPA-39-02</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Alcott</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-31-03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Five Mile</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-32-03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>Five Mile</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-33-03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Five Mile</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-34-03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Five Mile</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-35-03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Five Mile</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-36-03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Five Mile</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-49-03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>Moran-Glenrose</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-51-03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Valley-Barker</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-01-04</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Rural Traditional</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>West Plains</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-07-05</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Rural Traditional</td>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA-09-05</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Rural Traditional</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>873</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statutory Requirements and Efforts to Date

Statutory Requirements
Comprehensive Plan Text Update
The Revised Code of Washington Chapter RCW 36.70a.130(4)(b) requires periodic review of city and county comprehensive plans and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Act. The required completion date for Spokane County’s update was December 1, 2006. Spokane County completed an update to its comprehensive plan text and development regulations on March 13, 2007 to comply with the update requirement (BCC res. # 07-0208). This update did not consider proposed map amendments or expansion of the UGA boundary.

UGA Expansion and Comprehensive Plan Map Updates
The Revised Code of Washington Chapter RCW 36.70a.130(3)(a) requires review of UGAs and the densities permitted in both the incorporated and unincorporated portions of each urban growth area at least every ten years. The UGAs are required to be considered and adjusted, if necessary, to ensure accommodation of urban growth for the next 20 years. The County’s Comprehensive Plan was initially adopted on November 5, 2001 (resolution # 01-1059). Under state law a review of the UGA must occur no later than November 5, 2011.

The Countywide Planning Policies (CWPPs) under Policy Topic 1, Urban Growth Areas, requires, under Policy 16, that the UGA shall be comprehensively reviewed at least every five years following the initial adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. The Steering Committee of Elected Officials has been considering revision to Policy 16 and has established a subcommittee to make recommendations. Discussions have considered altering the current five year review period by either lengthening the time frame or making it consistent with the ten year interval prescribed by state law.

Regional Collaboration
The Countywide Planning Policies support the concept of regional collaboration and coordinated planning efforts. The CWPPs, Policy Topic 2, Joint Planning within Urban Growth Areas, states the following:

Spokane County and each jurisdiction must plan jointly in the establishment of Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and for future activity within those areas. RCW 36.70A.020 (Planning Goals), Goal # 11, states, “Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts”. RCW 36.70A.100 (Comprehensive Plans, Must be Coordinated) states, “the comprehensive plan of each county or city that is adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 shall be coordinated with, and consistent with, the comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 of other counties or cities with which the county or city has, in part, common borders or related regional issues.” Finally, RCW 36.70A.210(3)(f) (Countywide Planning Policies), states that the Countywide Planning Policies must address “policies for joint county and city planning within urban growth areas.”
The following policies are also included in Policy Topic 2, Joint Planning within Urban Growth Areas:

POLICIES

1. The joint planning process should:
   a. Include all jurisdictions adjacent to the Urban Growth Area and Special Purpose Districts that will be affected by the eventual transference of governmental services.
   b. Recognize that Urban Growth Areas are potential annexation areas for cities.
   c. Ensure a smooth transition of services amongst existing municipalities and emerging communities.
   d. Ensure the ability to expand urban governmental services and avoid land use barriers to expansion; and
   e. Resolve issues regarding how zoning, subdivision and other land use approvals in designated joint planning areas will be coordinated.

2. Joint planning may be accomplished pursuant to an interlocal agreement entered into between and/or among jurisdictions and/or special purpose districts.

Comprehensive Plan and UGA Update Efforts to Date

Various levels of public participation and analysis have occurred related to the UGA expansion and Comprehensive Plan updates. These have occurred at the regional level through the Steering Committee of Elected Officials (SCEO) and at the county and city level.

Steering Committee

The SCEO, as required by the Countywide Planning Policies, has reviewed and debated population forecasts and allocations and has made recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners. The Board of County Commissioners (BoCC), on May 23, 2006, established for “planning purposes” a 20-year population allocation for the years 2006 to 2026 (BoCC res. 06-0438) (see Table 5).

Public Participation

The BoCC adopted a public participation plan outlining the needs for public participation throughout the UGA update process on October 17, 2006 (BoCC res. # 06-0869). This plan references and relies on the adopted Public Participation Guidelines that have formed the basis for past public participation efforts (BoCC res. # 98-0788).

Spokane County and a number of cities in the County have held public work shops and have invited comment and requests related to the UGA expansion. Spokane County has received over 300 comments/requests related to the update and UGA expansion. A map of these requests and additional information regarding the requests may be found on the County’s website at www.spokanecounty.org/bp. Many of the non-metro cities in the County have completed or are near completion of their update to their comprehensive plans and UGAs. Liberty Lake has concluded their update process as contained in Liberty Lake resolution #N007-106.

Screening Criteria

The BoCC adopted screening criteria on August 8, 2006 (BoCC res # 06-714) to provide guidance in the consideration of potential UGA expansion areas. The screening criteria consider comprehensive planning, land use/zoning, service and utility provision, transportation impacts, environmental features and public input. Potential County UGA
areas were evaluated by County staff using these screening criteria. That evaluation was utilized by the Planning Technical Committee in their development of the potential UGA study areas.

**State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)**

Spokane County has employed consultants to provide guidance on the requirements of SEPA and to assist in developing a SEPA process appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan and UGA update. A number of discussion papers have been produced addressing the SEPA procedural requirements. The Planning Technical Committee is recommending a SEPA/GMA integrated EIS as the appropriate environmental process.

**Planning Technical Committee**

A Planning Technical Committee began a collaborative work process on this study in April 2007 and in consultation with the Steering Committee of Elected Officials (SCEO) and the Sub-Committee of the SCEO. The Planning Technical Committee advocates a coordinated regional approach in the metropolitan area for the UGA update planning effort. The Technical Committee includes planners from Spokane County, City of Spokane, City of Spokane Valley, Liberty Lake, Millwood, Airway Heights and the Boundary Review Board for Spokane County. The regional planning effort was addressed with the Steering Committee of Elected Officials on May 29, 2007 with the Steering Committee formally recommending a regionally collaborative environmental planning process at that meeting.

The Planning Technical Committee’s approach is to encourage a collaborative development of UGA alternatives by the use of shared information and coordinated public outreach. This coordinated, multi-jurisdictional approach is supported by the Countywide Planning Policies under Policy Topic 1, Urban Growth Areas (UGAs); Urban Policy 5 which states:

5. The Steering Committee shall analyze each jurisdiction’s proposed Urban Growth Area (UGA) through the use of a multi-jurisdictional planning team and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners for Urban Growth Area (UGA) adoption or revision.

**Non-Metro Cities**

The small cities and towns lying outside the metropolitan area have undergone UGA planning efforts. These efforts will likely be considered separately because many of the efforts are near completion and are ready for review by the Steering Committee and Board of County Commissioners. The June, 2007 agenda of the Steering Committee included a workshop to review the non-metro UGA proposals.
Population Forecasts and Allocations

Population Forecasts
Figure 1 below and Table 4 on page 11 illustrate the results of population forecasts for our region from three separate studies. The Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) provides a high, medium and low forecast for counties and cities to use in meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act. Counties and cities must plan within the range of population forecasts presented by OFM.

Avista Utilities has produced a population forecast that they use for their utilities planning. The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) also conducted an independent forecast for the Spokane region by use of a demographic consultant, Intermountain Demographics. Figure 1 additionally illustrates the BoCC allocation projection and a ten year average growth rate.

Figure 1 - 2006-2028 Population Forecasts for Spokane County
Table 4 - Population Forecasts for Spokane County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Forecasts</th>
<th>OFM 2026</th>
<th>Avista 2026</th>
<th>SRTC 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Projection</td>
<td>672,122</td>
<td>611,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Projection</td>
<td>571,075</td>
<td>554,965</td>
<td>563,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Projection</td>
<td>506,037</td>
<td>498,362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rural Population Forecast**
Evaluating the potential population growth in rural areas lying outside of the UGA relies on analyzing historic population growth and projecting that growth for the next 20 years. The projection of rural population is based on an analysis of new housing permits in Spokane County since the year 2000. This analysis found that approximately 25 percent of all growth in Spokane County is occurring in the unincorporated rural areas outside of urban growth areas.
**Population Allocations**

Board of County Commissioners Resolution 06-0438 established a 20-year population projection and allocation for the years 2006 to 2026 on May 23, 2006. This projection was intended to be used for initial planning purposes in the Comprehensive Plan/UGA update. The Board’s projection and allocation is between the OFM medium forecast and the OFM high forecast. The projection is 32,962 less than the OFM high and 68,085 higher than the OFM medium projection. The allocation numbers for the cities in Table 5 below include both the projected population within corporate city limits and population that can be accommodated in adjacent UGAs. In adopting the projection and allocation, the Board of Commissioners considered previous discussion and recommendations of the Steering Committee of Elected Officials.

**Table 5 - Population Projection and Allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>BoCC 2026 Projection</th>
<th>2006 Population</th>
<th>Allocation* 2006-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County Total</td>
<td>639,160</td>
<td>441,521</td>
<td>197,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County UGA Areas</td>
<td>188,987</td>
<td>122,914</td>
<td>66,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>10,256</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>5,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>13,409</td>
<td>10,120</td>
<td>3,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>5,879</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>21,517</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>15,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>5,187</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwood</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangle</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>270,673</td>
<td>200,439</td>
<td>70,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>118,879</td>
<td>85,754</td>
<td>33,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The allocation numbers listed for cities include population both inside city limits and within potential city-UGA areas.
Population Allocation Comparison

Table 6 compares population allocations from past planning efforts. The 2015 allocation was adopted for development of the Interim Urban Growth Area (IUGA) boundary (BoCC res. # 97-0321). The 2020 allocation was the final allocation used in the adoption of the 2001 County Comprehensive Plan (BoCC res. # 01-1059). The 2020 adjusted allocation reflects a revision to the allocation based on the incorporation of Liberty Lake and the City of Spokane Valley (BoCC res. # 04-1009). The 2026 allocation includes the allocation adopted for “planning purposes” (BoCC res. # 06-0438) and also reflects the increased population that can be accommodated within the existing city limits per the Steering Committee of Elected Officials recommendation dated March 31, 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2020 Adjusted</th>
<th>2026*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>126,500</td>
<td>155,597</td>
<td>155,597</td>
<td>197,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>60,500</td>
<td>89,597</td>
<td>64,420</td>
<td>109,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>92,177</td>
<td>88,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>2,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>9,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwood</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangle</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>47,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20,666</td>
<td>20,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The allocation numbers listed for cities reflect the population increase that can be accommodated within the city’s current municipal boundaries per the Steering Committee of Elected Officials recommendation dated March 31, 2006.
Land Quantity Analysis and Mapping

Land Quantity Methodology
County-wide Planning Policies direct the County and its jurisdictions to utilize the Land Quantity Analysis methodology (LQA) developed by the Washington State Department of Community Trade and Economic Development and from the guidebook, “Issues in Designating Urban Growth Areas.” This guidebook provides a step-by-step process for determining the land supply available to accommodate growth in a 20-year planning horizon. The attached tables and corresponding map are the result of following the Land Quantity Analysis methodology as adopted by the Steering Committee of Elected Officials.

Each jurisdiction is responsible for developing its own LQA report to provide quantitative information for existing and future urban areas to support residential and non-residential growth. This information is then used by the Steering Committee of Elected Officials, each jurisdiction’s elected officials, the Board of County Commissioners, and the public to designate and/or update Urban Growth Areas (UGAs).

This report contains the most recent LQA for the incorporated areas, existing unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and Joint Planning Areas (JPAs) originally adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on November 5, 2001. In addition, this LQA evaluates the Urban Reserve areas and study areas illustrated on the attached map for future population capacity, as Spokane County and its jurisdictions coordinate and collaborate on efforts to update UGAs and Comprehensive Plans as required by the Growth Management Act (GMA).

The primary tool for performing the LQA is Spokane County’s Geographic Information System (GIS). The County’s GIS is a computer system which stores numerous layers of geographic data layers such as parcels, zoning, sewer and water districts, school and library districts and critical areas. These GIS layers are maintained by the County’s GIS staff and used in the steps of the LQA methodology to create the LQA tables and the study map found within this document. The tables and mapping from the GIS Land Quantity Analysis provides decision makers with the best available data for determining where growth can be accommodated.

Step 1 of the LQA identifies the vacant, partially used, and under utilized parcels in the County which can accommodate growth based on information from the above geographic data layers. Step 2 subtracts parcels which are not developable because of critical area limitations such as wetlands and steep slopes. Step 3 subtracts 20% of the available land for public purposes such as road right-of-ways and utility easements. Step 4 subtracts resource lands, public land, and tax exempt land from the available land. Step 5 removes 30% of the available land which the community assumes would not be available in the 20-year planning period for market reasons. Step 6 can provide for a safety factor if the County lacks the ability to monitor land supply. This step was not taken because Spokane County has a GIS and the ability to monitor available land with the LQA methodology. Finally, Step 7 determines the population capacity of the available land based on the number of housing units allowed by the zone designation multiplied by the Census Bureau’s average number of persons per household. These seven steps follow the adopted Land Quantity Analysis methodology for Spokane County.
**Identifying Study Areas**
Cities, existing UGAs/JPAs and potential UGAs within the metropolitan area are illustrated on page 16 on the map titled, “Planning Technical Committee UGA/JPA and Expansion Study Areas.” The map also illustrates through color coding some of the previous study areas that were considered by the various jurisdictions.

In identifying the potential UGA expansion areas, the Planning Technical Committee relied on a preliminary service and facility review, consideration of public participation efforts to date, and an analysis based on the BoCC adopted UGA screening criteria. Through this analysis polygons reflecting logical study areas around the existing metropolitan UGA were developed.

The identified potential UGA study areas are separated into two categories. The areas considered most likely for future expansion by the Planning Technical Committee were labeled “Potential UGA Expansion Areas” (see Table 9, page 19). The other study areas that were considered by the Committee are reflected in Table 10, page 19 and are labeled as “Additional Study Areas.”

**Land Quantity Analysis – Study Assumptions**
Land Quantity Analysis (LQA) studies have determined the potential population capacity for each of the metro-cities, existing UGAs and potential UGA expansion areas. Average densities, consistent with existing zoning classifications, were used for the land quantity analysis on the existing UGAs.

The LQA and population capacity for the potential UGA expansion areas were calculated at an average density of 4 dwelling units per acre. A conceptual mixed use neighborhood center was factored in for many of the potential areas to provide for a more realistic development scenario. The densities and land use assumptions for the potential UGA expansion areas are consistent with the County’s low density residential and mixed use zoning designations.

**Rural Capacity and Population Projection**
Evaluating the potential population growth in rural areas relies on analyzing historic population growth and projecting that growth for the next 20 years. A review of vacant and undeveloped land illustrates that there remains significant capacity to accommodate historic growth trends over the planning horizon. The projection of rural population is based on an analysis of new housing permits in Spokane County since the year 2000. This analysis found that approximately 25 percent of all growth in Spokane County is occurring in the rural areas, outside of UGAs.
Population Capacity

Metro-Area, Cities and UGAs
Population capacity within existing cities and existing UGAs within the urban metropolitan area are illustrated in Table 7. The Metro-Area includes the City of Spokane, City of Spokane Valley, Liberty Lake, Millwood, and Airway Heights. The total capacity within the cities equals 79,320. The capacity for the metropolitan cities is the capacity numbers presented to the Steering Committee of Elected Officials (SCEO) and accepted by the SCEO on March 6, 2006. The capacity for the existing metropolitan UGAs is 40,238. This population capacity was calculated using the land quantity methodology as adopted within the Countywide Planning Policies and previously described in this report.

Table 7 - Metro Urban Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro-Area Cities</th>
<th>Population Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>47,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane Valley</td>
<td>20,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Liberty Lake</td>
<td>8,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Airway Heights</td>
<td>2,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Millwood</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Capacity</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing UGAs</th>
<th>Population Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights UGA - JPA</td>
<td>1,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcott UGA - JPA</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillyard UGA - JPA</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Canyon UGA - JPA</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran/Glenrose UGA - JPA</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Metro UGA</td>
<td>12,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Metro UGA - JPA</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Mile UGA - JPA</td>
<td>1,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee UGA - JPA</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upriver UGA - JPA</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley UGA</td>
<td>12,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Plains UGA - JPA</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Plains /Thorpe UGA - JPA</td>
<td>6,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing UGAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,238</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Cities and UGAs       | 119,558             |
Population Capacity

Non-Metro-Area Cities and UGAs
Population capacity for non-metro cities and towns and their associated UGAs is illustrated in Table 8. The total capacity within the corporate limits of the non-metro cities and towns is 7,382. This reflects the capacity numbers presented to the Steering Committee of Elected Officials (SCEO) and recommended by the SCEO on March 6, 2006. The capacity for the non-metro cities and town UGAs is 1,835. This number reflects an initial land quantity analysis performed by Spokane County and may need future revision based on LQAs subsequently submitted by each of the jurisdictions in their own planning efforts.

Table 8 - Non-Metro Urban Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Metro-Area Cities</th>
<th>Population Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Cheney</td>
<td>2,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Deer Park</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Medical Lake</td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Spangle</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Latah</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fairfield</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Waverly</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rockford</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Capacity = 7,382

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Metro-Area UGAs*</th>
<th>Population Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Cheney</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Deer Park</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Medical Lake</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Spangle</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Latah</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fairfield</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Waverly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rockford</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total UGAs = 1,835

Total = 9,217

* The Non-Metro-Area UGA capacity numbers are based on initial LQA analysis by Spokane County.
Population Capacity

Potential UGA Expansion Areas

The Potential Metro UGA expansion Areas are considered the most likely areas for future expansion by the Planning Technical Committee. The population capacity of the 17 potential expansion areas is illustrated in Table 9. The total capacity of the areas is 60,430. This capacity was calculated using the adopted land quantity methodology. The expansion areas offer a range of choices for consideration of the UGA update.

The UGA expansion areas are almost entirely located in Urban Reserve designations of the Comprehensive Plan. The Urban Reserve designation identifies rural areas that will most likely be included in the UGA at some point in the future. Urban Reserve zoning employs development standards to ensure that large areas of vacant land will be retained for future development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1 Indian Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2 Five Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3 East of Eden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U4 Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U5 Valley Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U7 Argonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U8 North Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11 Southeast Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12 South Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U13 Edge Cliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14 Southeast Glenrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U15 Palouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U17 Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U18 West Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U19 Spur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U22 Hayford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U23 Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential UGA Expansion Areas =</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Additional Metro Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U4-b Mead-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U4-c Mead-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U4-d Mead-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U6 Minnehaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U9 River Crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U10 Legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U15-b Palouse-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U16 Hangman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U20 Hwy 2 - West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U21 Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total =</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Quantity Analysis and Population Capacity Conclusions

Table 11 illustrates the results of the land quantity and population capacity analysis performed for this study. The population and capacity numbers are projected to 2028 to reflect a 20 year planning horizon. By showing estimated growth of Spokane County to 2028 and then subtracting existing population capacity and projected rural population growth, the additional UGA capacity required for the planning horizon can be determined.

### Table 11
Spokane County Population Capacity Projections (2006-2028)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OFM High</th>
<th>BoCC¹</th>
<th>OFM Medium</th>
<th>OFM Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate of County Population (2028)</td>
<td>700,607</td>
<td>666,641</td>
<td>585,657</td>
<td>512,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current County Population (2006)</td>
<td>443,800</td>
<td>443,800</td>
<td>443,800</td>
<td>443,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate of Total County Growth (2028)</td>
<td>256,807</td>
<td>222,841</td>
<td>141,857</td>
<td>68,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity within Metro-Area Cities:</td>
<td>79,320</td>
<td>79,320</td>
<td>79,320</td>
<td>79,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity within Non-Metro Cities:</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>7,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of Metro UGAs</td>
<td>40,238</td>
<td>40,238</td>
<td>40,238</td>
<td>40,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of Non-Metro UGAs</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Pop. Projection²</td>
<td>64,202</td>
<td>55,710</td>
<td>35,464</td>
<td>17,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Metro UGA Capacity Needed</td>
<td>63,830</td>
<td>38,356</td>
<td>-22,382</td>
<td>-77,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metro = Cities of Spokane, Spokane Valley, Liberty Lake, Airway Heights, and Millwood
Non-Metro Cities = Cheney, Deer Park, Fairfield, Medical Lake, Latah, Waverly, Spangle and Rockford
1. The BoCC verbally approved projection for “planning purposes” on May 23, 2006 (BoCC res. # 06-0438).
2. Rural Population is 25% of total population growth based on historical growth patterns.

The Need for UGA Expansion and the Identified Study Areas

The Potential UGA Expansion study areas identified by the Planning Technical Committee have a population capacity of 60,430 people (see Table 9, page 19). None of these potential UGA expansion areas would be needed if the OFM low or medium projections are used as the existing UGA has sufficient capacity to meet the capacity needs under these two projections.

Approximately two-thirds of the capacity within the potential UGA expansion areas would be needed under the BoCC allocation which requires additional UGA areas to accommodate 38,356 people.

The OFM high projection requires additional capacity of 63,830 people and all of the potential areas would need to be included in the UGA and even additional areas would be necessary.
Additional Conclusions of the LQA and Population Capacity Study
The expansion of the UGA by annual amendments to include an additional 873 acres has added urban capacity to the UGA over time. These incremental additions have reduced the capacity needs for the planning horizon determined in this study.

The study finds that previous estimates of rural growth were underestimated and that the actual growth in the rural areas is higher than reflected in previous population allocations. A study of building permit data found that in the past five years approximately 25 percent of population growth for the entire county has occurred in the rural area. Past population allocations have attributed only approximately 8% of the expected population growth to the rural area. The higher rural population projection reduces the capacity needs within the urban area.

Conclusions and Recommendations of Planning Technical Committee

Need for UGA Expansion
The land quantity and population capacity analysis reveals that the current UGA boundary provides existing capacity to meet the Office of Financial Management (OFM) medium projection for population growth. The OFM medium projection is generally consistent with Avista and SRTC independent forecasts for population growth.

The Planning Technical Committee suggests that a reasonable approach to the UGA review may be to accept the current UGA as meeting the needs of the region while still monitoring land consumption to ensure that land supply remains adequate. This approach would allow for a more detailed focus on other regional issues such as utility and service provision, land uses within the UGA, interlocal agreements and regional transportation mitigation. Should the decision be made to pursue examination of alternatives that include UGA expansion, then the Technical Committee suggests the following considerations for regional collaboration, environmental review and development of a regional work plan.

Regional Collaboration
The Planning Technical Committee is advocating a regionally collaborative approach to updating local comprehensive plans and the UGA. A regional approach is supported by Countywide Planning Policies and local comprehensive plans (see discussion on page 9 and 10). Regional collaboration should encompass a regionally developed UGA proposal including a range of alternatives. Regional coordination of public participation activities will provide efficient use of staff resources and present a clear and consistent picture of the proposed alternatives to the public. Sharing information and resources will reduce inconsistencies in data collection and analysis and provide a more seamless process for achieving County and City planning objectives. Identifying planning challenges early and developing processes for negotiating differences will help ensure a positive result.

Regional Work Plan
A coordinated and consistent regional work plan is necessary for the successful achievement of the UGA update. Required studies and public participation efforts need to occur concurrently throughout the process to ensure that each of the jurisdictions meet the objectives of the update in a timely manner. The illustration on page 23
provides a generalized flow chart reflecting the UGA update process. A detailed, regional work program outlining specific timeframes and milestones should be developed and adopted by local jurisdictions and the SCEO.

**Environmental Review**
The Planning Technical Committee suggests that a collaborative and integrated SEPA/GMA EIS would be the preferred approach to environmental review. An integrated SEPA/GMA document combines required comprehensive plan contents with required environmental analysis contents. An integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS process dovetails public review requirements, avoids duplication of effort with similar GMA and SEPA requirements and ensures that environmental analysis under SEPA occurs as an integral part of the planning and decision-making process.

The basis for SEPA/GMA integration is provided in the SEPA rules. WAC 197-11-210 states that GMA counties and cities are authorized to integrate the requirements of SEPA and GMA to ensure that environmental analyses under SEPA can occur concurrently with and as an integral part of the planning and decision making under GMA. The process of integrating SEPA and GMA should begin at the early stages of plan development. The development of shared regional analysis through the integrated SEPA/GMA approach will help ensure consistent and coordinated planning.

The use of consultant services is recommended in the development of SEPA documents and the potential sharing costs of services should be considered.

**Joint Planning Areas and Interlocal Agreements**
Identifying joint planning areas and developing interlocal agreements in the metropolitan area is probably the most difficult and challenging task facing Cities and the County. However, developing these agreements is paramount to a successful UGA update process.

Interlocal agreements can enhance the economic development potential of our region. These agreements can ensure the efficient delivery of services and facilities and provide quick and equitable mitigation of development impacts. Interlocal agreements can provide a regulatory environment that is consistent throughout the urban metropolitan area, giving developers and neighborhoods a level of certainty in the growth of their community. Interlocal agreements addressing annexation and revenue sources can ensure an orderly transition of governance that considers fiscal and other impacts. Finally interlocal agreements give certainty to cities as they develop their long range land use, transportation and capital facility plans.

The metro jurisdictions have just completed a collaborative planning grant to review development regulations in the UGAs and identify a joint planning process. The Planning Technical Committee recommends that development of Interlocal agreements should be a high priority item within our regional planning effort. The Committee suggests that for interlocals to be successful there should be direct negotiation between elected officials with the assistance of a skilled facilitator.
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