Ordinance No. 3794

(Amending or Repealing Ordinances)

CFN=377 – Comprehensive Plans
Comprehensive Plan Amendments
ORDINANCE NO. 3794

AN ORDINANCE of the city council of the city of Kent, Washington, amending the city of Kent Comprehensive Plan to amend the Capital Facilities Element, the Transportation Element, the Land Use element, and Appendix A (CPA-2005-(4-7)).

RECITALS

A. Kent's Comprehensive Plan was updated in August 2004 (the "Update"). The research, analysis, and adoption of the update took place over approximately a two (2) year period of time. Since the Update, additional city wide studies have been completed and corresponding ordinances have been adopted. There have also been changes for several city departments in data that is not reflected in the Update. All of these factors mean that portions of the Comprehensive Plan are outdated and require amendment.

B. The city of Kent has established procedures for amending the Comprehensive Plan in chapter 12.02 of the Kent City Code, allowing amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with state law, no more than once per calendar year with a few narrow exceptions.

C. The Kent Fire Department submitted proposed amendments to the Capital Facilities Element, the Transportation Element, and Appendix A of the Comprehensive Plan. These amendments reflect changes made to the department's Comprehensive Plan Amendments
level of service and measurement standards that were made in 2004 through the department's accreditation. These amendments also account for changes in inventory and facility locations due to department surplusing actions. (CPA-2005-4)

D. The city of Tukwila submitted a request to adjust the Potential Annexation Area (PAA) Boundary map in Kent's Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The revision is necessary to reflect changes made by the city of Tukwila to its southern PAA boundary which adjoins Kent's PAA. In addition to the Tukwila boundary revision, city of Kent staff has included a revision to the GIS mapping layers required by a 1993 annex/deannexation effort between the city of Kent and the city of SeaTac near Interstate 5 and State Route 518 interchanges. (CPA-2005-5).

E. Kent's Facilities Management Division has submitted a request to amend the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan to reflect changes made in the space occupied by the city within the Centennial Center and the Kent Municipal Court. (CPA-2005-6).

F. The final revisions requested were submitted by the city's Planning Services Division. The requested revisions are to the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan to reflect changes made necessary by significant land use and zoning map changes made by the city council in November 2005 under Ordinance No. 3769 as a result of the Urban Density Study. Because of those changes, several tables, text, and maps in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan are now outdated. In addition, by the city council's adoption of Ordinance No. 3746 regarding critical areas, the Hazard Areas map included within the Land Use Element is now obsolete and should be deleted. (CPA-2005-7).

G. The proposed amendments set forth in recitals (C) through (F) were initially introduced to the Land Use and Planning Board as part of the 2005 Annual Docket Report in accordance with Ch. 12.02 of the Kent City Code, which was approved by the city council on December 13, 2005. The Land Use and Planning Board approved the amendments by a vote of 5 to 0 on December 13, 2005. (CPA-2005-8).
Board conducted a public hearing on the issues February 27, 2006. The amendments were also considered by the city council's Planning and Economic Development Committee on March 20, 2006.

H. On January 25, 2006, the city provided the State of Washington the required sixty (60) day notification under RCW 36.70A.106 of the city's proposed amendments to the Capital Facilities Element, the Transportation Element, the Land Use Element, and Appendix A of the Comprehensive Plan. The sixty (60) day notice period has lapsed.

I. The City's SEPA responsible official issued a Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) (#ENV-2005-56(D)) for the proposed rezone on February 23, 2006.

J. On April 4, 2006, the city council for the city of Kent approved the above-stated amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (CPA-2005-(4-7)).

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KENT, WASHINGTON, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

ORDINANCE

SECTION 1. – Incorporation of Recitals. The preceding recitals are incorporated herein.

SECTION 2. – Amendment – Land Use Element. The Land Use Element of the City of Kent Comprehensive Plan is amended as shown in the attached Exhibit “A”, which is incorporated herein.

SECTION 3. – Amendment – Capital Facilities Element. The Capital Facilities Element of the City of Kent Comprehensive Plan is amended as shown in the attached Exhibit “B”, which is incorporated herein.
SECTION 4. - Amendment - Transportation Element. The Transportation Element of the City of Kent Comprehensive Plan is amended as shown in the attached Exhibit "C", which is incorporated herein.

SECTION 5. - Amendment - Appendix A, Background and Analysis of the Comprehensive Plan. Appendix A of the City of Kent Comprehensive Plan is amended as shown in the attached Exhibit "D", which is incorporated herein.

SECTION 6. - Severability. If any one or more sections, sub-sections, or sentences of this ordinance are held to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portion of this ordinance and the same shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 7. - Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from and after the date of passage as provided by law.

ATTEST:

BRENDA JACOBER, CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

TOM BRUBAKER, CITY ATTORNEY
PASSED: ___ day of April, 2006.
APPROVED: ___ day of April, 2006.
PUBLISHED: ___ day of April, 2006.

I hereby certify that this is a true copy of ordinance no. 3794, passed by the city council of the city of Kent, Washington, and approved by the mayor of the city of Kent as hereon indicated.

Brenda Jacober (Seal)
BRENDA JACOBER, CITY CLERK

Comprehensive Plan Amendments
CHAPTER FOUR

LAND USE ELEMENT

The Land Use Element outlines the proposed general distribution and location of various uses of land within the Planning Area, which consists of the City of Kent and the Potential Annexation Area, which is the area within unincorporated King County that is Kent's designated annexation area. The element consists of two major components: (1) a map that illustrates the general location of land use designations; and (2) goals and policies that guide future development. In addition, there are reviews of existing land use trends, including future development potential and a review of policy decisions, which together have laid the foundation for the goals and policies in the element.

More important than the components of the element, however, is the purpose that the element serves. The Land Use Element will guide all decisions about where development takes place. It also will guide when development takes place, because land use policies determine the scheduling of capital improvement expenditures. In addition, it will guide the character of the development pattern of the Kent area. The Land Use Element is not only a critical part of the Comprehensive Plan, but it is a required component of the plan under the Growth Management Act.

Requirements of the Growth Management Act

When the State Legislature adopted the Growth Management Act (GMA), they found that "...a lack of common goals expressing the public's interest in the conservation and the wise use of our lands pose a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state. It is in the public interest that citizens, communities, local governments, and the private sector cooperate and coordinate with one another in comprehensive land use planning." (RCW 36.70A.010). This finding, which summarizes the intent of the GMA, emphasizes the central role of the Land Use Element.

The Act requires the Land Use Element to designate the general distribution, location, and extent of land for various land uses, including resource lands, housing, commerce, industry,
parks and open space, and public facilities. This element considers all these land uses, with the exception of public facilities, which is considered in detail within the Capital Facilities Element. The Land Use Element shall consider population densities, building densities, and estimates of future population growth. It also shall provide for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies, and consider and mitigate the impacts of storm water runoff both in the immediate area and in surrounding jurisdictions.

Most importantly, however, the GMA requires that other elements of the Comprehensive Plan relate back to the Land Use Element. For example, the Act specifically requires both the Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements to be coordinated and consistent with the Land Use Element. It also states that the entire Comprehensive Plan shall be internally consistent, and that all elements shall be consistent with the Land Use Map. Additionally, the GMA requires that planning efforts for regional growth centers, such as Urban Centers or Activity Centers be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the GMA puts the Land Use Element in the central role of defining the direction of the Comprehensive Plan, and thereby defining the vision of the community.

The focus of the Land Use Element is the Goals and Policies and the Land Use Map. The goals and policies found in the Land Use Element are the product of both existing conditions and plans and policies which previously have been adopted.

**BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS**

As noted in the introductory chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, Kent has undergone a number of changes since the 1977 Comprehensive Plan was adopted, as the City and the Puget Sound region have experienced unprecedented growth over the past decades. This section analyzes the extent of existing land uses in the City, and outlines the growth, which is expected to occur within the City and the Potential Annexation Area (PAA) within the next ten (10) to twenty (20) years. This analysis sets the stage for the level of growth and development, which this plan will accommodate.

**Urban Growth Area Boundary**

The GMA mandates each county to designate an urban growth area (UGA) within which urban growth is to be encouraged, and outside of which urban growth and annexations may not occur. The UGA must contain enough land to accommodate twenty (20) years of projected residential growth, as determined for each county by the State Office of Financial
Management. The entire city limits of each city must be included in the UGA, and unincorporated areas also may be included. However, the GMA states that an urban growth area may include land outside of a city only if this land is "...already characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth..." (RCW 36.70A.110).

The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) adopted and ratified in 1992 included an urban growth boundary for King County. The Kent Planning Commission and City Council also considered an urban growth area for the City of Kent. The primary purpose of this process was to delineate a planning area for the Comprehensive Plan. The UGA also was intended to help define the City's future annexation area. After considering several alternatives, the Kent City Council designated an Interim Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundary in November 1992 (Resolution #1334). In the 2002/2004 Update, the UGA was superseded by a final boundary delineation of Kent's Potential Annexation Area.

**Potential Annexation Area**

In addition to urban growth areas which are mandated by the GMA, the King County CPPs discuss future annexation areas. The CPPs state that within the County's UGA boundary, each city shall identify land needed for its growth during the twenty (20) year horizon of the Comprehensive Plan. The policies further state that although the GMA does not explicitly equate urban growth areas with municipal annexation areas, the urban growth areas around cities may be considered their expansion area.

Following this reasoning, and to facilitate intergovernmental planning efforts, the policies direct cities to establish Potential Annexation Areas. The policies state:

> In collaboration with adjacent counties and cities and King County, and in consultation with residential groups in affected areas, each city shall designate a Potential Annexation Area. Each Potential Annexation Area shall be specific to each city. Annexation areas shall not overlap. (CPP, LU-19)

King County established a Potential Annexation Areas Subcommittee in January 1993 to coordinate a regional process for the designation of municipal annexation areas. As a result of the work of this subcommittee and in coordination with adjacent jurisdictions, the Kent City Council adopted an Interim Potential Annexation Area (PAA) in May 1993, (Resolution #1360). The Council amended the boundaries in March 1995 as a result of negotiations with adjacent jurisdictions. In May 2003 revisions to the CPPs were ratified, removing the
Lower Green River Agricultural Production District from the Urban Growth Area. Both the GMA (RCW 36.70A.110), and Countywide Planning Policies (LU-2 and LU-7), prohibit urban expansion through annexation into designated rural areas. The 2002/2004 Update reflects the new Potential Annexation Area (PAA) for Kent (see Figure 4.1). Kent city limits and the PAA together form the Planning Area for the City's Land Use Map and for all the elements in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Existing Zoning Pattern**

The City of Kent has five general categories of zoning districts: agricultural, single-family residential, multifamily residential, commercial, and industrial. Within each of these general categories, there are several zoning districts, which allow varying levels of land uses and bulk and scale of development. Table 4.1 shows the land area of each of these zoning categories and Figure 4.2 shows the distribution of these zoning districts.

In the unincorporated area within the northeastern portion of the Potential Annexation Area (PAA), the predominant land use is single-family residential. Most of the residential land is zoned either R-6 or R-8, which are generally comparable to the City's SR-6 and SR-8 zones. There is one (1) commercial and multifamily residential node in the unincorporated area, located at SE 208th and 108th Avenue SE. The zoning for the unincorporated area was adopted in 1991 as part of the Soos Creek Community Plan, and was amended on November 5, 2001, by Ordinance #14241 as part of King County’s process to update their comprehensive plan. The southern portion of Kent’s PAA is located adjacent to King County’s Lower Green River Agricultural Production District. King County’s land use for the area to the west is R-4 (i.e., single-family 4 dwelling units per acre) and to the east is I (industrial) where an existing wrecking yard is located and R-1 where steep slopes dominate the landscape.

**Inventory of Critical Areas & Resource Lands**

The Growth Management Act requires cities to inventory, designate and protect through development regulations all critical areas and designated resource lands. "Critical Areas" are defined as wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologic hazard areas. Designated "Resource Lands" within Kent are agricultural in nature and are considered to have long-term commercial significance. The development rights for the Agricultural Resource Lands in Kent were purchased under King County’s Agricultural Preservation Program during the 1980’s, ensuring they will remain in agricultural land use in perpetuity.
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FIGURE 41

SCALE 1" = 45,000'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>AREA (ACRES)</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL AREA</th>
<th>ALLOWED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-R</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-S</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>272.3</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>290-6875.4</td>
<td>4.65.3</td>
<td>SR-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-4</td>
<td>570.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>SR-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-3</td>
<td>935-264.5</td>
<td>5.40.4</td>
<td>SR-1, SR-2, SR-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-4.5</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>SR-4, 5, SR-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-6</td>
<td>6,304-694.8</td>
<td>34.438.9</td>
<td>SR-1, SR-2, SR-3, SR-4, 5, SR-6, SR-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-8</td>
<td>305-840.13</td>
<td>4.72.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>MHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>8,524-98,597.1</td>
<td>46.552.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDMF</td>
<td>740-3761.5</td>
<td>3.94.6</td>
<td>SR-8, MR-D, MR-G, MRT-12, MRT-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDMF</td>
<td>756-7765.7</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>MR-M, MR-H, MRT-12, MRT-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,467-01,527.2</td>
<td>8.09.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>670-1761.5</td>
<td>3.74.6</td>
<td>GC, CC, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NCC, MRT-12, MRT-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>856.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>GC, GWC, CC, O, CM-1, CM-2, MRT-12, MRT-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>292.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>DC, DCE, GC MRT-12, MRT-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4,926-21,848.6</td>
<td>10.011.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2,232.2</td>
<td>42.213.5</td>
<td>MA, M1, M2, M3, M1-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>1,968.6</td>
<td>40.712.0</td>
<td>M2, M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4,200.8</td>
<td>22.925.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Open Space</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>2,030-82,044.8</td>
<td>4-712.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14,438,216,446</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City already has adopted policies and development regulations to protect critical areas. Because critical areas have a major effect on how land uses are distributed throughout the City and the Potential Annexation Area (PAA), their general location will be described in this section. There are many notable natural features in Kent. Kent is distinguished by the Green River Valley, which runs north to south through the center of the City. To the east and west of the valley are East Hill and West Hill, respectively. One of the most significant natural features is the Green River, which extends through a major portion of the City. The Green River is considered a Shoreline of Statewide Significance and falls under the jurisdiction of the Washington State Shoreline Management Act (SMA), which places restrictions on shoreline development. Lake Meridian located on East Hill is also a Shoreline of Statewide Significance with similar restrictions. There are two additional significant water bodies located in Kent city limits. Clark Lake and Lake Fenwick While Clark Lake and Lake Fenwick do not meet the parameters for protection under the Shoreline Master Program, they are significant natural resources. In the PAA, Panther Lake is also a significant natural resource but does not meet the SMA parameters for protection. However, these three (3) smaller lakes will be protected by the Critical Areas Ordinance. Due to the natural drainage patterns of the valley and upland, and the amount of development that has taken place over the past thirty (30) years, there are a significant number of wetlands located in the City of Kent. These wetlands have been inventoried and encompass over 2,414 acres of the planning area. The hydrology of Kent also includes several major creeks, including Mill Creek, Garrison Creek, Springbrook Creek, and Big Soos Creek and its tributaries Big Soos Creek serves as the eastern boundary of the planning area and the City of Kent, and a portion of this creek is provided protection under the SMA. Many of these creeks, wetlands and the Green River corridor are fish and wildlife habitat areas. Two notable habitat sites are publicly owned: The Green River Natural Resources Area (304 acres) and Clark Lake Park (125 acres).

In addition to the water-related natural constraints to development, the other predominant natural feature in Kent is steep slopes. Slopes in excess of 25% are found along both East Hill and West Hill. There also are several ravines that typically are associated with creek beds. These hillsides along East Hill and West Hill provide a natural, wooded border to the more developed Green River Valley area, and they are a distinct part of the City's natural landscape.

Environmentally Critical Areas are shown on Figure 4.3 (i.e., Hazard Areas) and Figure 4.4 (i.e., inventoried wetlands). These natural features are valued by the community and must be protected as part of the comprehensive planning process. The protection of these areas
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will constrain development. Therefore, it is important to note their location and consider their influence on the location and density of future land uses.

Additional constraints are placed on Agricultural Resource Land. When the development rights are purchased from Agricultural Resource Land, covenants dictate uses and some development standards. Because Agricultural Resource Land is protected for farming only, the GMA requires that adjacent property owners who propose development must be notified of the Agricultural Resource Land protected status to ensure there are no conflicts between land uses. Kent’s Agricultural Resource Land and the County’s Lower Green River Agricultural Production District are illustrated in Figure 4.54.

**Analysis of Development Capacity**

A final, but critical measure of existing conditions and future development potential is the analysis of development capacity. Development capacity refers to an estimate of the amount of development, which could be accommodated on vacant and redevelopable land in Kent if it were developed. The level of development, which could occur on a particular parcel of land is influenced by the size of the parcel, the zoning district in which the parcel is located, and any environmental constraints that restrict development. Development capacity shows the estimated amount of development, which could be accommodated under existing zoning, considering recent market activity. It serves as a benchmark from which to gauge to what extent current land use and zoning policies can accommodate growth.

In 1991, the City estimated capacity for residential, commercial, and industrial development. The City updated the information in 1993, 1997, and again in 2001. King County estimated capacity for the unincorporated area located within the City’s Potential Annexation Area. A detailed explanation of the 1993 and 1997 methodology and assumptions used for estimating capacity can be found in the supporting documents. In brief, vacant land and land deemed appropriate for redevelopment were aggregated for each zoning district. The overall development potential of each zone then was calculated, taking into consideration reductions for critical areas, land which was unlikely to develop or redevelop (such as parks, churches), and right-of-way and other public purpose dedications.

The 2001 methodology to estimate capacity was based on the Buildable Lands Program and differs from earlier work. The Buildable Lands Program was established by a legislative amendment to the GMA in 1997 (RCW 36.70A.215). Under Buildable Lands, the City is
required to implement a review and evaluation program for the purpose of determining the adequacy of the current supply of “lands suitable for development” to accommodate future growth needs for housing and employment and to evaluate the effectiveness of local plans and regulations. In order to accomplish this, the Buildable Lands Program requires annual data collection to determine the amount and density of recent development, an inventory of the land supply suitable for development, and an assessment of the ability to accommodate expected growth for the remainder of the twenty (20) year planning horizon.

It is important to note that these estimates of capacity represent maximum potential build out; they are not projections of expected growth. In the 1995 Comprehensive Plan, the City used a methodology which was developed by the King County Data Resources Technical Forum. This methodology projected maximum theoretical buildout in most residential, commercial and industrial zoning categories. This methodology was revised countywide with the implementation of the 1997 Buildable Lands Program. Revisions reflect the statutory requirement that projections of future capacity reflect the actual densities of recent development projects. The resulting Buildable Lands analysis gives a January 2001 snapshot of land supply and development capacity throughout Kent. Both methodologies are consistent with those used by other jurisdictions in the county. Figure 4.6-5 shows the location and extent of vacant and redevelopable sites in Kent based on the Buildable Lands Analysis. Table 4.2 summarizes the residential household capacity for the City of Kent based on Buildable Lands Analysis.

**Table 4.2**

**CITY OF KENT 2001 RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Zones</th>
<th>Vacant Capacity</th>
<th>Redevel. Capacity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>1,956 households</td>
<td>3,725 households</td>
<td>5,681 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>832 households</td>
<td>903 households</td>
<td>1,735 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY TOTALS:</td>
<td>2,788 households</td>
<td>4,628 households</td>
<td>7,416 households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1995, King County staff estimated capacity for the unincorporated area based on the adopted zoning in the Soos Creek Community Plan. The 2002 update of capacity used the King County Zoning Atlas and recent data from the King County Assessor’s Office. The summary of King County’s estimated capacity for Kent’s PAA is found in Table 4.3. This
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NATURAL RESOURCES GOALS & POLICIES

The natural environment of the Green River Valley, and adjacent hillsides and plateaus, provide a unique and distinctive character to the City of Kent. The major hydrologic feature is the Green River which encompasses a system that consists of associated creeks and wetlands. Some of the creeks in the Green River system, such as Mill Creek and Garrison Creek, flow through steep ravines into the valley floor. While Big Soos Creek, Springbrook Creek and Mendian Valley Creek flow at lower grades, they also contribute habitat. Significant fish and wildlife habitat areas within this system support local and regional fish and wildlife resources. These include smaller streams and their associated wetlands, and several small lakes, namely Fenwick, Clark and Panther. While these lakes are not regulated by the State Shorelines Act, they are protected through local Critical Areas regulations.

In 2002, the City of Kent began revising Critical Areas regulations as required by the GMA, using best available science standards tailored specifically for Kent. Once complete, the final regulations will guide future development in and near sensitive areas that will protect the ecological functions and values of critical areas from cumulative adverse environmental impacts. Designated critical areas include aquifer recharge areas, frequently flooded areas, geologic hazard areas, wetlands, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. In addition to protecting and preserving critical areas through regulations, a number of other programs work cooperatively to form a systematic approach toward Kent’s natural resource policies. These other programs include: stormwater regulation, environmental capital improvement projects, inter-jurisdictional collaborative efforts, and the support of the adjacent King County’s Lower Green River Agricultural Production District and the “Agricultural Resource” land within Kent.

As a complement to new Critical Areas regulations, Kent’s 1999 Shoreline Master Program provides for the management and protection of local shoreline resources by planning for reasonable and appropriate uses. The goals, policies, and regulations in the Shoreline Master Program apply to activities in all lands and waters under the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW). The goals and policies of Kent’s Shoreline Master Program are incorporated herein (see appendices).

Kent is home to four watersheds namely Big Soos Creek, Mill Creek/Springbrook, Green River, and Puget Sound Watersheds, each with major creek systems, all with varying degrees of urban development. The Big Soos Creek Watershed is a region of approximately 70 square miles, and within the Kent City limits, includes the Soosette, Lake Mendian, and
Meridian Valley Creek subbasins, as depicted in Figure 4.76, as well as areas draining directly to Big Soos Creek located outside Kent's Planning Area. The system has nearly ninety (90) miles of streams flowing into the Green River, and the basin includes many wetlands and lakes. The Soos Creek Basin Plan, adopted by King County in January 1992, recommended a combination of tools for basin management aimed at correcting surface water problems and providing protection for the basin's water resources. One of the tools recommended was to maintain rural densities, especially in areas of the Soosette Creek subbasin.

Big Soos Creek is a major creek lying within the Green River Basin. The creek meanders in and out of the easterly city limits of Kent and provides a natural open space corridor between the cities of Kent and Covington and between Urban Growth Areas and Rural Areas of unincorporated King County. Big Soos Creek provides significant habitat for fish and wildlife, and it is an area of natural beauty that provides recreational and educational opportunities throughout the region. The Soos Creek Trail, which runs for four (4) miles from Gary Grant Park at SE 208th and 137th Avenue SE to Lake Meridian Park, provides opportunities for walking, bicycling and horseback riding.

The east and west banks of the Green River Valley and other unique natural features such as the Olsen Creek Canyon provide natural opportunities for Urban Separators. The eastern plateau in particular provides a natural separation between the cities of Kent and Covington, and between the urban and rural areas of unincorporated King County.

The Olsen Creek Canyon provides separation between a portion of Kent and Auburn. This separation continues as a result of both natural features and existing land use preservation within the Lower Green River Agricultural Production District of King County. In addition, the wetlands and floodplains of the Northeast Auburn drainage ditch, Mill Creek (Auburn) and Mullen Slough limit development potential. The result is a complete east-west corridor of environmental, visual, recreational, and wildlife benefits.

In 1985, the City of Kent, in conjunction with the establishment of the City stormwater drainage utility, adopted the following water quality goal: "Reduce the environmentally detrimental effects of present and future runoff in order to maintain or improve stream habitat, wetlands, particularly water quality, and protected water-related uses." Beginning in 1986, the City worked with Green River Community College to analyze samples each month from eleven (11) stream locations in Kent for twenty-four (24) water quality parameters. In recent years, the City of Kent has been monitoring water quality.
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Figure 4.6
Documentation of water quality conditions within Kent may be found in the 1999 – 2000 Ambient Monitoring “Draft” Final Report. The data collected indicate that water quality problems continue to exist.

To address water quality problems within the City, a number of capital improvement projects have been constructed and are being designed. Non-point source pollution is treated at numerous public and private stormwater treatment facilities throughout the City. One example may be found at the 304-acre Green River Natural Resources Area (GRNRA). The GRNRA provides regional treatment of surface water runoff from an 832-acre area on the valley floor, flood control of 100-year flood events in the valley, wildlife habitat, and public education opportunities. Since 1980, Kent has completed several projects to protect the water quality of Lake Fenwick. In 1995, the City installed an aeration system to improve Lake Fenwick’s water quality. Water quality monitoring continues for all lakes within the City.

The principal sources of water supply for the City's water system, Clark Springs, Kent Springs, and Armstrong Springs, are located outside Kent city limits, adjacent to the jurisdictions of unincorporated King County and the cities of Black Diamond, Covington and Maple Valley. A Wellhead Protection Plan (Resolution #1563) has been prepared in cooperation with Covington Water District and King County Water District #111. This plan identifies aquifer recharge areas, potential contamination sources, and management strategies for protection of aquifers. Today these management strategies are being implemented in cooperation with Covington Water District and King County Water District #111.

Native plants, trees and shrubs are found throughout the City. Preservation and planting of native trees and shrubs, particularly near streams and wetlands on individual properties, in parks, schools, and other public spaces protect and enhance environmental quality for fish and wildlife habitat. Today preservation of open space, fish and wildlife habitat, and other critical areas occurs through the development process using “Sensitive Area Easements”.

It is the City of Kent’s goal to participate in regional efforts to ensure long-term protection of our salmonid resources to harvestable levels for today and future generations. Successful restoration and maintenance of healthy salmon populations will require time, money, and collaboration with tribal governments, federal, state, and local jurisdictions, as well as private citizens, businesses, and environmental groups.
In March 1999 the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) listed the Chinook salmon as “threatened” under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In December 1999 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) listed the Puget Sound and Coastal Bull trout as threatened under the ESA. In the future, additional salmonid species such as Coho may also be listed under the ESA. In accordance with the ESA, the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the USFWS issued regulations deemed necessary to provide for the conservation of Puget Sound Chinook Salmon and other salmonids. Commonly referred to as the 4(d) rule, the rule legally establishes the protective measures deemed necessary to conserve the species. Local governments will be required to comply with these protective measures.

In cooperation with federal, state, and tribal governments, and other major stakeholders, local governments in the Puget Sound region have begun to identify early actions and develop long-range strategies for the permanent conservation of the species. These strategies are developed at the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA), which include the boundaries of multiple jurisdictions. Kent has interest in two WRIA’s: WRIA 9 (the Green/Duwamish Watershed) and WRIA 8 (the Cedar/Sammamish Watershed).

Historically, the commercial agricultural lands in the Green River Valley have added to the City’s economic support. Today, the majority of protected agricultural resource lands in the Valley are located south of Kent’s municipal limits within King County’s Lower Green River Agricultural Production District. There are a few designated “Agricultural Resource” lands within Kent whose development rights have been purchased and protected from conversion to a more intensive land use. Activities within the land use designation “Agricultural Support” (i.e., AG-S) will help sustain the agricultural community by providing land dedicated to the processing and retailing of local agricultural production.

Kent is committed to a multi-faceted approach toward the protection and enhancement of local and regional natural resources. As such, the City will continue to protect natural resources through the promulgation of development standards, enhancement of natural resources through a variety of capital improvement programs, and looking for opportunities to support regional efforts to preserve our resources for future generations.
Goal LU-21:
Foster recognition of the significant role played by natural features and systems in determining the overall environmental quality and livability of the community

Policy 21.1: Educate City staff, developers, and other citizens on the interaction between natural features and systems, such as wetlands, streams, and geologically hazardous areas, and human activities

Goal LU-22:
Coordinate with appropriate individuals and entities to create a long-term, sustainable relationship among local and regional natural resource protection entities, for future growth and economic development, through enhancement of wildlife, fisheries, and recreational opportunities, protection of cultural resources; protection of water quality in wetlands, aquifers, lakes, streams, and the Green River, provision of open space and screening to reduce impacts of development, protection of environmentally sensitive areas to preserve life, property, water quality and fish and wildlife habitat, and retention of the unique character and sense of place provided by the City's natural features.

Policy LU-22.1: Provide incentives for environmental protection and compliance with environmental regulations. Foster greater cooperation and education among City staff, developers, and other citizens. Determine the effectiveness of incentives by establishing monitoring programs.

Policy LU-22.2: Continue to evaluate programs and regulations to determine their effectiveness in contributing to the conservation and recovery of ESA listed species.

Policy LU-22.3: Continue to participate in regional and WRIA planning efforts to support the conservation of listed species.

Goal LU-23:
Protect and enhance environmentally sensitive areas via the adoption of City regulations and programs which encourage well-designed land use patterns such as clustering and planned unit development. Use such land use patterns to concentrate higher urban land use densities and intensity of uses in specified areas in order to preserve natural features such as large wetlands, streams, geologically hazardous areas, and forests.

Policy LU-23.1: Create development regulations for clustering single and multifamily residential developments that are constrained by critical areas.

Policy LU-23.2: Where practical, allow planned unit developments in single-family neighborhoods.
Goal LU-24:
Encourage well designed, compact land use patterns to reduce dependency on the automobile, and thereby improve air and water quality and conserve energy resources. Establish mixed-use commercial, office, and residential areas to present convenient opportunities for travel by transit, foot, and bicycle.

Policy LU-24.1: Incorporate bike lanes in designated roadway designs, ensure that sidewalks and other pedestrian amenities are provided in conjunction with private and public development, and incorporate convenient transit stations in designs for mixed-use development.

Goal LU-25:
Ensure that the City's environmental policies and regulations comply with state and federal environmental protection regulations regarding air and water quality, hazardous materials, noise and wildlife and fisheries resources and habitat protection. Demonstrate support for environmental quality in land use plans, capital improvement programs, code enforcement, implementation programs, development regulations, an site plan review to ensure that local land use management is consistent with the City's overall natural resource goals.

Policy LU-25.1: Protect and enhance environmental quality via maintenance of accurate and up-to-date environmental data, and by City support of environmental management programs, park master programs, and environmental education and incentive programs.

Policy LU-25.2: Provide to property owners and prospective property owners general information concerning natural resources, critical areas, and associated regulations. Ensure developers provide site-specific environmental information to identify possible on- and off-site constraints and special development procedures.

Policy LU-25.3: Indemnify the City from damages resulting from development in naturally constrained areas. To the extent possible or feasible, require that developers provide to the City accurate and valid environmental information.

Policy LU-25.4: Continue a periodic storm drainage/environmental inspection program to ensure constant maintenance and upkeep of storm systems and on-going compliance with general environmental processes.

Policy LU-25.5: Ensure that decisions regarding fundamental site design are made prior to the initiation of land surface modifications. Grade and fill permits, which do not include site development plans, may be issued by the City where such activities do not disturb sensitive areas, such as wetlands.
Policy LU-25.6: Require site restoration if land surface modification violates adopted policy or if development does not ensue within a reasonable period of time.

Policy LU-25.7: Adopt a clearing and grading code to protect upland habitat, as well as site designations and special restrictions relevant to Kent's construction standards and detention criteria.

Policy LU-25.8: As additional land is annexed to the City, assign zoning designations, which will protect natural resources and environmentally sensitive areas.

Policy LU-25.9: Continue to support waste reduction and recycling programs in City facilities, and in the City at large, to meet State and County waste reduction and recycling goals.

Policy LU-25.10: Work cooperatively with tribal, federal, state and local jurisdictions, as well as major stakeholders, to conserve and work towards recovery of ESA listed threatened and endangered species.

Goal LU-26:
Protect and enhance natural resources for multiple benefits, including recreation, fish and wildlife resources and habitat, flood protection, water supply, and open space.

Policy LU-26.1: Maintain the quantity and quality of wetlands via current land use regulation and review, and increase the quality and quantity of the City's wetlands resource base via incentives and advance planning.

Policy LU-26.2: Protect wetlands not as isolated units, but as ecosystems, and essential elements of watersheds. Base protection measures on wetland functions and values, and the effects of on-site and off-site activities.

Policy LU-26.3: When jurisdictional boundaries are involved coordinate wetland protection and enhancement plans and actions with adjacent jurisdictions and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe.

Policy LU-26.4: Maintain rivers and streams in their natural state. Rehabilitate degraded channels and banks via public programs and in conjunction with proposed new development.

Policy LU-26.5: On a regular basis, evaluate the adequacy of the existing building setback and stream buffer requirements in relation to goals for water resource and fisheries and wildlife resource protection. When necessary, modify the requirements to achieve goals.
Policy LU-26.6: Coordinate with King County to produce critical area maps of the Potential Annexation Area which are consistent with the City of Kent Critical Areas Maps

Policy LU-26.7: Protect the quality and quantity of groundwater used for water supply in accordance with the City of Kent Water Quality Program recommendations

Policy LU-26.8: Update the City of Kent Critical Areas Maps as new information about aquifer recharge areas and wellhead protection areas becomes available

Policy LU-26.9: In accordance with GMA regulations, update critical areas development regulations to identify, protect, and preserve wildlife species and areas of local significance

Policy LU-26.10: Protect the habitat of native and migratory wildlife by encouraging open space conservation of beneficial habitat through public capital improvement projects and private development.

Policy LU-26.11: Provide incentives for on-going water conservation activities and practices, in accordance with the City of Kent Water System Plan

Goal LU-27:
Ensure that uses, densities, and development patterns on lands adjacent to the shorelines of the Green River are compatible with shoreline uses and resource values, and support the goals and policies of the City of Kent’s Shoreline Master Program and the Green-Duwamish Watershed Nonpoint Action Plan

Policy LU-27.1: Reserve appropriate shoreline areas for water-oriented uses.

Policy LU-27.2: Minimize the loss of vegetation as new development occurs
Continue to recognize the value of trees and other vegetation in increasing the livability of Kent

Policy LU-27.3: Promote and support a systematic approach to enhancing the City through carefully planned plantings and ongoing maintenance of street trees, public landscaping, and greenbelts Require the use of native and low water use vegetation.

Policy LU-27.4: Require protection of ecologically valuable vegetation, when possible, during all phases of land use development In cases where development necessitates the removal of vegetation, require an appropriate amount of native or low water use landscaping to replace trees, shrubs, and ground cover, which were removed during development
Policy LU-27.5: Record and protect established greenbelts to preserve existing natural vegetation in geologically hazardous areas, along stream banks, wetlands, and other habitat areas, and where visual buffers between uses or activities are desirable.

Goal LU-28:
Regulate development in environmentally critical areas to prevent harm, to protect public health and safety, to preserve remaining critical areas, and enhance degraded critical areas in the City.

Policy LU-28.1: Encourage enhancement of existing environmental features such as rivers, streams, creeks, and wetlands.

Policy LU-28.2: Promote the creation and preservation of natural corridors adjacent to areas such as the Green River, Soos Creek, and other streams and wetlands within the City of Kent for fish and wildlife habitat, open space and passive recreation. Whenever possible, preservation of these lands should link other properties with similar features to create a natural corridor.

Goal LU-29:
Include provisions in the City’s land use regulations to preserve reasonable access to solar energy for all lots in the City where access or potential access exists.

Goal LU-30:
Ensure the conservation and enhancement of productive agricultural land via regulation, acquisition, or other methods.

Policy LU-30.1: Establish a notification process as specified by the GMA to ensure incompatible land uses adjacent to agricultural lands are aware of adjacent agricultural resource land.

Goal LU-31:
Establish Urban Separators to protect environmentally sensitive areas, including lakes, streams, wetlands, and geologically unstable areas such as steep slopes, to create open space corridors that provide environmental, visual, recreational and wildlife benefits within and between urban growth areas, and to take advantage of unusual landscape features such as cliffs or bluffs and environmentally unique areas.

Policy LU-31.1: Establish Urban Separators as low-density areas of no greater than one dwelling unit per acre.

Policy LU-31.2: Only allow amendments to the Urban Separator policy at the time coinciding with King County’s twenty (20) year review of its 1994 Policy Update of
the Comprehensive Plan or by Kent City Council initiation because of pending danger or public safety.

**Policy LU-31.3:** Require subdivisions within or adjacent to Urban Separators to provide open space linkages within or to the Urban Separator.

**Policy LU-31.4:** Establish Urban Separators as links between, and for protection of, sensitive areas, public parks, open spaces or trails, critical aquifer recharge areas, floodplains, high value wetlands, unstable slopes, regionally or locally significant resource areas, fish and wildlife habitat and other unique environmental features.

**Policy LU-31.5:** Coordinate with appropriate South King County agencies, adjacent cities, and unincorporated King County to create a regional approach to Urban Separators.

**Policy LU-31.6:** Link Urban Separators within the City of Kent to those of adjacent cities and unincorporated King County.

**Policy LU-31.7:** Encourage well-designed land use patterns, including clustering of housing units, transfer of development rights, zero lot lines and other techniques to protect and enhance urban separators.

**Policy LU-31.8:** Consider funding options, land trusts, purchase of development rights, and other methods for public acquisition of Urban Separators.

**LAND USE MAP**

Along with the Goals and Policies listed above, the Land Use Element also includes the Land Use Map. This map is a vital part of the Land Use Element and the Comprehensive Plan as a whole, because it establishes the framework for amendments to the City's official zoning map. It also establishes the land use and zoning framework to be used as land currently in the Potential Annexation Area is annexed into the City.

**DEFINITION OF MAP DESIGNATIONS**

There are several different land use designations. They relate to various types of land uses, such as residential, commercial, industrial, and the like. These designations are found on the Land Use Map (Figure 4.87) and are explained below. One needs to bear in mind, however, that there are certain types of land uses that need relative freedom of location and, thus,
should not be restricted to certain districts. These types of uses may be allowed via general conditional use permit in many of the listed districts, whether residential, commercial or industrial. The uses include utility, transportation, and communication facilities; schools; public facilities; open space uses such as cemeteries, golf course, and so forth; and retirement homes, convalescent facilities and certain other welfare facilities.

**Single-Family Residential (SF)**

The Single-family Residential designation allows single-family residential development at varying densities and housing forms (e.g., cottage and cluster). In the city limits, there are four single-family designations SF-1, SF-3, SF-4.5, SF-6, and SF-8. These designations allow development of up to 1, 3, 4.5, 6, and 8 dwelling units per acre, respectively. It should be stressed that these designations represent a range of densities, with the designation being the maximum allowable density. For example, the SF-6 designation allows zoning which could accommodate up to 6 units per acre; it also could accommodate less than that.
PAGES 57-59 NOT INCLUDED
CHAPTER EIGHT

CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

The Capital Facilities Element is a required element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, mandated by the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA). This element contains goals and policies related to the provision and maintenance of public services and capital facilities required to adequately support anticipated growth during the next twenty (20) years. The goals and policies of this element are consistent with the Land Use, Transportation, and Park & Open Space Elements. Further, the Capital Facilities Element, in its incorporation of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) by reference and partial publication addresses the development activities undertaken by the City to accommodate the demand for public services. The CIP is updated annually to coincide with the Council budgeting process. The CIP lists adopted and funded capital and operating projects with costs and revenues identified over a six (6) year period.

While the Capital Facilities Element includes summary information, inventories and levels-of-service pertaining to parks, open space, and transportation facilities; more comprehensive consideration of these policy areas are provided in the Park & Open Space and Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Other City-provided services and facilities are considered more fully within this element. Some of these services and facilities are internal to the effective functioning of Kent City government, but most services and facilities considered in this element serve the public directly.

The Capital Facilities Element contains goals and policies to guide the provision and maintenance of public services and capital facilities with performance measures for assessing the adequacy of public services and capital facilities to meet population and employment growth. The Capital Facilities Element considers over the next twenty (20) years the performance of public services and related capital needs in maintaining or elevating the provision of public services according to adopted level-of-service (LOS) standards.
REQUIREMENTS OF THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the Comprehensive Plan to identify existing and future public facilities needed to be consistent with the Land Use Element. Updates of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which contains a list of adopted capital projects including costs and projected revenues, are incorporated into the Capital Facilities Element through the annual budgeting process by City Council ordinance. The GMA requires that services and facilities provided to residents and businesses by adjacent jurisdictions and public agencies must also be considered. Several providers of public services and facilities serve Kent, and the operating plans of these agencies are referenced in the Comprehensive Plan.

Concurrency and Levels-of-Service
One of the goals of the GMA is to have public services and capital facilities provided concurrent with or prior to development. This concept is known as “concurrency,” also called "adequate public facilities". In the City of Kent, concurrency requires 1) services and facilities which serve the development to be in place at the time of development (or for some types of facilities, a financial commitment to be made to provide for services and facilities within a specified period of time); and 2) services and facilities which serve the development to have sufficient capacity to serve the development without decreasing level-of-service (LOS) below minimum standards adopted in the Capital Facilities Element. In order to make use of the LOS method, the City selects the way in which it will measure performance of each service or amount of each type of facility (i.e., response time, acres, gallons, etc.). It also identifies the current and proposed LOS standard for each measurement. The standards adopted should be considered to reflect the quality of life against which performance of services or provision of facilities are measured for concurrency.

The GMA specifically requires concurrency for transportation facilities. The GMA, through the Countywide Planning Policies (specifically LU-29) requires all other public services and facilities to be "adequate" (see RCW 19.27.097, 36.70A 020, 36.70A.030, and 58.17.110). Concurrency management will ensure that sufficient public service and facility capacity is available for each proposed development.

Capital Facilities Planning and Finance
The GMA requires cities and counties to approve and maintain a six (6) year capital facilities plan which includes requirements for specific types of capital facilities, measurable level-of-service (LOS) standards, financial feasibility, and assurance that adequate facilities will be provided as population and employment growth occurs. The Annual Budget Document and six-year Capital
Improvement Program (CIP) fulfill the GMA requirement for facilities planning; but, in addition, these documents serve as a foundation for City fiscal management and eligibility for grants and loans. These documents and the Capital Facilities Element provides coordination among the City's many plans for capital improvements, including other elements of the Comprehensive Plan, operating plans of departmental service providers, and facilities plans of the State, the region, and adjacent local jurisdictions.

The CIP identifies the location and cost of needed facilities, and the sources of revenue that will be used to fund the facilities. The CIP, which is a component of this Element, is approved through the annual budgeting process. Subsequently adopted amendments to the CIP and the Annual Budget Documents are hereby incorporated by reference into this Element. The Capital Facilities Element contains or refers to LOS standards for each public service and facility type, and requires that new development be served by adequate services and facilities. Operating plans of the City and other public services and facilities providers also contain information associated with levels-of-service. The Annual Budget Document and Six-Year CIP contain broad goals and specific financial policies that guide and implement the provision of adequate public services and facilities.

The CIP must be financially feasible; in other words, dependable revenue sources must equal or exceed anticipated costs. If the costs exceed the revenue, the City must reduce its levels-of-service, reduce costs, or modify the Land Use Element to bring development into balance with available or affordable facilities.

The GMA mandates forecasts of future needs for capital facilities and the use of standards for levels of service of facility capacity as the basis for public facilities contained in the CIP (see RCW 36.70A.020 [12]). As a result, requested public services and facilities detailed in the CIP must be based on quantifiable, objective measures of service or facility capacity, such as traffic-volume capacity per mile of road and acres of park land per capita, or average emergency response times.

BACKGROUND

Population And Service Areas
The City of Kent population has grown through annexations, in-migration and births to 84,275 as of 2002. Kent’s Planning Area, which includes the Potential Annexation Area (PAA), has a 2000 population of 103,521. Based on estimates from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), the projected population for the Kent Planning Area in 2020 is anticipated to number approximately 124,903. Some service agencies of the City and other public service providers have different geographic boundaries and may therefore assume different service population figures. Operating
plans of these service providers should be referenced for more accurate population and service area information. Maps provided in this element indicate service areas for agencies servicing homes and businesses within Kent, its PAA, and adjacent areas.

**Setting the Standards for Levels-of-Service**

Because the projected demand for public services and capital facilities will be largely influenced by the appropriate level-of-service (LOS) measure adopted in the Capital Facilities Element, the key to adequate and timely provision of public services and capital facilities is the establishment of measurable and achievable LOS standards. LOS standards are measures of the quality of life of the community. The standards should be based on the Community's vision of its future and its values. The final legal authority to establish LOS standards rests with the City Council, because the City Council enacts the LOS standards that reflect the Community's vision.

Selection of a specific LOS to be the "adopted standard" during the original Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Element drafting was accomplished by a 12-step process. The process could be described in brief as an assessment of inventoried City facilities and population, along with the costs of funded capital projects, including "non-capacity" projects that were under consideration at that time. The LOS standards were reflective of strategic capital facilities programming in the early 1990s. While capital improvement programs and capital facilities plans will continue to reflect strategic needs for capital projects during six (6) year cycles, many of the present levels-of-service reflect robust performance measures. Such performance measures are oriented toward assessing the quality of public services, and proposed capital projects would be expected to maintain or improve the level-of-service.

Every year, as required by the Growth Management Act, department service providers reassess land use issues, inventories of public services and facilities, level-of-service standards, and projected revenues to determine what changes, if any are needed. The capital facility operating plans of the City of Kent, and other providers of services and facilities to Kent homes and businesses, contain technical information used in such reassessments, and are incorporated into the Capital Facilities Element by reference.
DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES, INVENTORIES AND
LEVELS-OF-SERVICE BY SERVICE TYPE

Measuring performance of and citizen satisfaction with City services has provided important indicators of achievements and needs for public services, and by extension, capital facilities. Budget requests for service programs and facilities are responsive to performance measures, which are impacted by growth. As will be frequently noted, many of the previously used measures for establishing level-of-service standards were more reflective of existing capital facilities inventories than of the performance of public services and provision of facilities that continue to directly contribute to the quality of life in Kent. Services or facilities operating below the established minimums for levels-of-service could be an indication that a need may exist for service improvements, programmatic changes, new or improved facilities, or a re-evaluation of the level-of-service standards. The current LOS for each service or facility may be found in the operating documents referenced in this Element, and in the City of Kent Performance Measurement Report.

POLICE AND CORRECTIONS

The City of Kent Police Department provides a variety of patrol, investigative and community education services to Kent and neighboring jurisdictions as appropriate. The Police Department also provides correctional services, programs and facilities for the detention and rehabilitation of criminal offenders. The City of Kent Police Department has been periodically re-accredited by the nationally-recognized Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), for the quality of its performance on several objectives relating to field and administrative police work, and community involvement. This accreditation enables the Police Department to access grant funding, additional risk management training, and decreased operating insurance costs. The Corrections Division is pursuing a separate accreditation from the American Corrections Association that would entitle access to grant funding.

Police Services and Facilities Inventory

The Police Department serves Kent residents and businesses through its Patrol, Investigations, and Administrative Support Divisions. The Police Department contracts 911 emergency response through Valley Communications. The Police Headquarters building is located on the City Hall campus at 232 Fourth Avenue S. The City of Kent Corrections Facility is located at 1201 South Central. The Police/Fire Training Center is located on the East Hill at 24611 116th Avenue SE. Figure 8.1 illustrates the location of police services areas and facilities. Police facilities are listed in the Table 8.1.
Table 8.1
POLICE FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Area - City Hall</td>
<td>220 Fourth Avenue S</td>
<td>1,250 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Substation</td>
<td>25440 Pacific Highway S</td>
<td>750 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill Substation</td>
<td>20676 - 72nd Avenue S</td>
<td>132 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police East Hill Substation</td>
<td>24611 - 116th Avenue SE</td>
<td>880 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Headquarters</td>
<td>232 Fourth Avenue S</td>
<td>18,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/Fire Training Center</td>
<td>24611 - 116th Avenue SE</td>
<td>8,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing Range</td>
<td>24611 - 116th Avenue SE</td>
<td>3,670 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hill Substation</td>
<td>26512 Military Road S</td>
<td>910 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springwood Substation</td>
<td>27405 - 129th Place SE, #23</td>
<td>850 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Panther Lake Substation</td>
<td>21006 - 132nd Avenue SE</td>
<td>3,850 s.f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Potential conversion of Fire Department Logistics Building.

**Correctional Services and Facilities Inventory**

The City of Kent Correctional Facility (CKCF) capacity is **one hundred-thirty (130)** beds. The correctional facility has an intergovernmental contract with the Federal Marshal’s Office. Due to the opening of the Federal Correctional Facility in SeaTac, federal prisoners are housed at the CKCF infrequently. The average length of stays at the CKCF increased from 14 days in 2001 to 15 days in 2002. The Kent Police Department has focused efforts to address the increasing demands for jail capacity. The CKCF Programs Division added day reporting and work crew programs in 2002 to the existing electronic home detention, work release and work time credit programs. The CKCF is undertaking the challenge of becoming a fully-accredited correctional facility through the American Corrections Association, with an audit planned for the third quarter of 2003. Accreditation for the CKCF would provide increased access to grant funding and reduced liability insurance costs. Correctional facilities are listed in Table 8.2 and their locations are illustrated in Figure 8.1. Performance measures for Police LOS standards are found in Table 8.3.
### Table 8.2
CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facility</td>
<td>1230 South Central Avenue</td>
<td>130 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections Annex</td>
<td>8309 South 259th Street</td>
<td>3,093 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Municipal/Aukeen District Court</td>
<td>1210 South Central Avenue</td>
<td>4,694,051 s.f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.3
POLICE LOS STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>LOS Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsive Police Service</td>
<td>Average response times to Top Priority Calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 minutes or less to scene from receipt of emergency call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Sense of Safety</td>
<td>Annual Citizen Satisfaction Survey respondents' perceived level of safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of respondents indicate feeling &quot;somewhat safe&quot; to &quot;very safe&quot; in Kent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 2002, the Kent Police Department is satisfactorily meeting both of the LOS standards.

### FIRE & LIFE SAFETY SERVICES

The City of Kent Fire Department is responsible for delivering fire protection and emergency medical services to the City, and to the geographic area within King County Fire District #37 that includes the City of Covington. Fire Suppression & Emergency Medical Response units provide the most directly recognizable services to homes and businesses in Kent and other service area jurisdictions. Other fire districts adjacent to Kent may provide response assistance as requested. The Emergency Management Office and Fire Prevention Office carry out several objectives, including assessment and reduction of potential fire and life hazard risks through educational outreach programs and development plan inspections throughout the City. The Kent Fire Department is participating in an accreditation program received accreditation offered jointly by the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), the Commission on Fire Accreditation International (CFAI), and the International Cities/Counties Management Association (ICMA).
Fire & Life Safety Services and Facilities Inventory

The City owns six (6) fire stations: Station 71 (in the southern portion of Downtown Kent); Station 72 (Lake Meridian area); Station 73 (West Hill); Station 74 (East Hill); Station 75 (east, near Covington), and Station 76 (north, in the industrial area). A seventh station is located in Fire District #37 and is owned by the Fire District. Each station is equipped with at least one fire engine or ladder truck that carries emergency medical supplies and equipment. Each station is staffed with a minimum of three (3) personnel 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. Each station has future capacity for additional staffing. The Fire Department Logistics Building is presently used for equipment storage, and might be converted in the future for use as a Police Department Substation serving the Panther Lake Potential Annexation Area. Fire District #37’s Capital Facilities Plan identifies two (2) future stations that will serve the City. Station 78, which will open in January 2008, will be located in the City of Covington and will serve the east side of the City of Kent. There is also a proposed station serving the North Benson/Panther Lake neighborhood. The North Benson/Panther Lake station will be inside the potential annexation area for the City of Kent.

The Fire District is currently collecting level-of-service fees for the future construction and purchase of land for these projects. In addition, Stations 75 and 76 have a King County Medic One paramedic unit housed in the station. Each unit is staffed with two (2) personnel. These units are part of the countywide Advance Life Support (ALS) system. Table 8.4 lists each station, location, number and type of units in service, total station capacity, and minimum staffing. Figure 8.2 illustrates locations of fire and life safety services and facilities.

All of the stations listed in Table 8.4, with the exception of the Fire Department Logistics Building, have capacity for one (1) or more additional staffed unit(s). Performance measures for fire and life safety LOS standards are found in Table 8.5.

As of 2002, preliminary collection of data for response times indicates that the Fire Department LOS is not meeting the standard. It should be noted again that the Kent Fire Department, serves Fire District 37, which includes unincorporated King County, Covington, Maple Valley and Black Diamond. Current data collection for the level-of-service indicates that the Fire Department is not meeting the standard. The Kent Fire Department is refining its data collection and analysis support functions in order to identify areas in need of capital and operating improvements. Such improvements would be pursued to reduce average response times meet the established levels-of-service. Performance measures for fire and life safety LOS standards are found in Table 8.5.
Police/Fire Training Center

The Police/Fire Training Center is located on East Hill at 24611 116th Avenue Southeast at Station 74. The Center, housed in an 8,000 square foot building, provides audio and visual equipment and other facilities for in-service training for City of Kent police officers and fire fighters. Instruction is conducted by Kent Police and Fire Department personnel, and by nationally known instructors from organizations such as the International Association of Police Chiefs and the State Fire Service. In addition to providing a facility for training City of Kent personnel, the training center also accommodates a satellite training program sponsored by the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission.
### Table 8.4
FIRE & LIFE SAFETY FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Units in Service</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Minimum Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station 71</td>
<td>504 West Crow Street</td>
<td>Engine 71 and Aid 71</td>
<td>3-4Bays</td>
<td>5 - (3) Engine, (2) Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 72</td>
<td>25620 - 140th Avenue SE</td>
<td>Engine 72</td>
<td>3 Bays</td>
<td>3 - Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 73</td>
<td>26512 Military Road S</td>
<td>Engine 73</td>
<td>3 Bays</td>
<td>3 - Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 74</td>
<td>24611 - 116th Avenue SE</td>
<td>Ladder 74; Aid 74, and Battalion Chief</td>
<td>3 Bays</td>
<td>6 - (3) Ladder; (2) Aid; (1) Battalion Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 75</td>
<td>15635 SE 272nd St</td>
<td>Engine 75 KC Medic 11</td>
<td>3 Bays</td>
<td>3 - Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 76</td>
<td>20676 - 72nd Avenue S</td>
<td>Engine 76 KC Medic 7</td>
<td>3 Bays</td>
<td>3 - Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 77</td>
<td>20717 - 132nd Avenue SE</td>
<td>Engine 77</td>
<td>3 Bays</td>
<td>3 - Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Department Logistics Building Station 78</strong></td>
<td>24006-132nd Avenue SE Corner of 180th Avenue SE and SE 256th Street</td>
<td>None Proposed Engine</td>
<td>2-3 Bays</td>
<td>None Operational 1/1/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Benson Panther Lake Area | In area of 108th Avenue SE and SE 216th Street | To Be Determined to Be Determined | To Be Determined |

*Ladder Truck*

** Existing use with potential conversion to Police substation serving Panther Lake Potential Annexation Area.
### Table 8.5
**FIRE & LIFE SAFETY LOS STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Structure Fires - All</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>LOS Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average response timesResponse Time by percentage (fractile)</td>
<td>13 to 15 firefighters on scene within 10 minutes from origin of emergency call for 90% of events. First due apparatus with a minimum of 3 firefighters will arrive on scene within 7 minutes of initial dispatch on 80% of incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Life Support (life threatening) Incidents Structure Fires – Single-family residential and standard commercial</td>
<td>Average response timesResponse Time by percentage (fractile)</td>
<td>5 to 6 first responders to scene within 4 minutes from origin of emergency call for 90% of events. Effective Response Force of 16 firefighters will arrive on scene within 10 minutes of initial dispatch on 80% of incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fires - Commercial target hazards</td>
<td>Response Time by percentage (fractile)</td>
<td>Effective Response Force of 18 firefighters will arrive on scene within 10 minutes of initial dispatch on 80% of incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fires - High risk target hazards</td>
<td>Response Time by percentage (fractile)</td>
<td>Effective Response Force of 21 firefighters will arrive on scene within 10 minutes of initial dispatch on 80% of incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Life Support – Life threatening</td>
<td>Response Time by percentage (fractile)</td>
<td>Effective Response Force of 5 to 6 firefighters will arrive on scene within 10 minutes of initial dispatch on 80% of incidents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES - GENERAL GOVERNMENT

The City of Kent Operations Department manages several facilities and buildings necessary to the administrative and maintenance functions of the City. These include City Hall and the City Council Chambers, and the Centennial Center; all located in the heart of Downtown Kent. Table 8.6 below lists the name, location and capacity of each facility:

### Table 8.6
**CITY ADMINISTRATION OFFICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CAPACITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>220 - 4th Avenue South</td>
<td>35,230 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
<td>302 West Gowe Street</td>
<td>4,045 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Center</td>
<td>400 West Gowe Street</td>
<td>70,670-71,600 s.f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY SERVICES GOALS & POLICIES

Goal CF-10:
Ensure that residents, visitors and businesses in Kent continue to feel safe and prepared for emergency response throughout our community.

Policy CF-10.1: Establish, maintain, and monitor effective services and programs with the goal of increasing the sense of life safety and emergency preparedness throughout our community. Such services and programs should be consistent with other Comprehensive Plan goals and policies.

Goal CF-11:
Establish, maintain and strengthen community relationships through direct contact opportunities, community awareness, education and volunteer programs.

Policy CF-11.1: Establish and maintain direct contact between representatives of the Fire Department and concerned citizens, community groups, schools, business operators, developers and building contractors, local media, and human services providers.

Policy CF-11.2: Establish and maintain community education programs that promote the awareness of life safety, fire prevention, hazardous materials, and available human services for impacted populations of emergency events.

Goal CF-12:
Promote an understanding that preventative measures and appropriate responses to emergency events are a critical factor in limiting the extent of impacts resulting from an initial event.

Goal CF-13:
Establish and maintain responsive, quality fire and life hazard prevention services throughout Kent's service area and other areas

Policy CF-13.1: Maintain or improve the level of confidence citizens have in their ability to respond to personal or household emergencies.
**Policy CF-13.2:** Maintain or improve the level of confidence citizens have in their ability to respond to natural or man-made disasters that could impact their community.

**Policy CF-13.3:** Periodically evaluate the effectiveness of existing fire and life hazard prevention practices, and research best practices as appropriate.

**Policy CF-13.4:** Provide staff training as needed to incorporate best practices that will improve responsiveness of fire and life hazard prevention services.

**Policy CF-13.5:** To improve long-term fire and life hazard prevention service effectiveness, work with various members of the community to improve staff awareness of localized issues and community resources.

**Goal CF-14:** Provide effective, efficient, equitable and professional fire suppression and emergency medical response services throughout the City of Kent Fire Department service area.

**Policy CF-14.1:** Consider average response times and response time percentage as the primary level-of-service measure in assessing needs for fire suppression and emergency medical response service improvements.

**Policy CF-14.2:** Maintain or improve annually-calculated average response times and the level-of-service to emergency calls, where fire or other community safety hazards are reported to exist.

**Policy CF-14.3:** Maintain or improve annually-calculated average response times and the level-of-service to personal emergency medical calls, where no immediate danger exists to the community-at-large.

**Policy CF-14.4:** Periodically evaluate the effectiveness of existing fire suppression and emergency medical response service practices, and research best practices as appropriate.

**Policy CF-14.5:** Provide staff training as needed to incorporate best practices that will improve responsiveness of fire suppression and emergency medical response services.
Policy CF-14.6: To improve long-term fire suppression and emergency medical response service effectiveness, work with various members of the community to improve staff awareness of localized issues and community resources.
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EXHIBIT C
TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The Transportation Element is one of seven mandatory elements of the Comprehensive Plan required by the Growth Management Act (GMA). The purpose of the Transportation Element is to establish goals and policies that will guide the development of the transportation system in the City of Kent. It operates as a decision making tool, providing a framework for making decisions about the transportation system.

The Transportation Element identifies the current inventory of transportation facilities in the City of Kent; provides information about various impacts on the City’s transportation system from outside agencies that influence the City’s ability to implement its Land Use Plan; and reviews a range of implementation actions which would provide sufficient transportation capacity to support its vision of growth, economic prosperity, and environmental stewardship. This section is accompanied by a list of the City’s transportation system improvement projects (Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan) anticipated through 2009.

Although the GMA (RCW 36.70A.070) includes specific requirements for the Transportation Element, flexibility is written into the GMA so that jurisdictions can tailor their transportation plans to their own visions, goals, and needs, as long as they continue to demonstrate consistency with the regional transportation plan, Destination 2030. In addition to requiring consistency with the Land Use Element and identifying financial resources devoted to transportation improvements, the Transportation Element also:

- Identifies the land use assumptions used in estimating travel;
- Estimates local traffic impacts to state-owned transportation facilities resulting from land use assumptions;
- Inventories transportation facilities and services;
- Identifies level-of-service standards for each transportation mode, including state owned transportation facilities;
- Identifies state and local system needs to meet current and future demands;
- Establishes an analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources (if probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, a discussion of...
how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level-of-service standards will be met);
- Shows intergovernmental coordination efforts; and
- Identifies demand management strategies.

**THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM**

The transportation system serves citizens in traveling to their jobs, schools, social activities, and recreational activities. It connects families with neighbors and neighborhood services. The transportation system is the backbone of our economy and a key component to our economic competitiveness. It includes highways, local roads, sidewalks, bike paths, transit, and rail.

In citizen opinion surveys conducted by an independent research organization on behalf of the City, transportation has been the number one concern of the majority of Kent citizens surveyed for the last four (4) years in a row. Transportation is an issue that links in some way to almost every planning decision made by individuals and by businesses. Continued residential and economic growth in Kent will require targeted capacity improvements along with innovative methods to improve the efficiency of the current system.

One key theme of this element is recognizing the importance of freight movement to the economy of Kent as well as being the economic engine for the Puget Sound Region. Improving the mobility of trucks and rail will support the efficient flow of goods and services as well as provide thousands of jobs for Kent citizens.

Another primary theme of this Transportation Element is that citizens should have a variety of viable transportation choices. It acknowledges that not every trip is a home/work trip and not every trip requires an automobile. Some trips are for pleasure and may include walking or bicycling with friends and family members and some trips are more efficient by transit.

While Kent continues to be a leader in finding ways to improve the delivery of transit services to suburban populations, it also recognizes that all bus trips take place on roads. Techniques that improve roadway efficiency also benefit transit efficiency. Access management, technological systems improvements, clustered land use development, and transportation demand management techniques can all dramatically affect the congestion on city streets.

The City is more than an economic and commercial center for the Puget Sound Region. It is also home to over 84,000 residents and is the seventh largest city in the State of Washington,
by population. Those citizens deserve a transportation system that emphasizes safety, mobility and access in an environmentally sensitive context. The Transportation Element acknowledges that in the future, increasing numbers of people may not be physically or financially able to drive. As transportation costs continue to grow, and while much of our population moves into middle-age and retirement, continued dependency on driving for all trips may not be sustainable. Consequently, this Transportation Element examines all modes of mobility, expands the spectrum of choices, endeavors to do a better job of informing people about travel choices, and resolves to enhance the efficiency of the existing transportation investments.

The City's Land Use Element proposes to manage growth by guiding new development into the urbanized areas, along already developed transportation corridors, and into the downtown Urban Center. This is consistent with the State's Growth Management Act of 1990 and the Puget Sound Regional Council's Destination 2030 Plan which require that public facilities develop concurrently with intensified land use changes. This Transportation Element examines the ways in which the clustering of complementary land uses can enhance the availability, efficiency and effectiveness of the transportation system. It analyzes the financial costs to the citizens of Kent for each of the future development scenarios and also considers the opportunity-cost of development choices. It explores an array of techniques for improving mobility for all social, work, and civic activities into the foreseeable future.

**PLANNING CONTEXT**

The City of Kent conducts its transportation planning efforts within the context of regional, state, and county regulations and codified planning documents. The structure provided by these agencies and planning documents guides the Transportation Element. Below lists the documents, the entity responsible for the document, and a brief description of the content as it relates to transportation planning.

**Growth Management Act (GMA) (State)**

The Growth Management Act of 1990 (RCW 36.70A) requires jurisdictions to designate areas for urban growth where services already exist and to then direct growth to those designated areas. Where new growth occurs local governments must ensure that public facilities such as schools, transportation facilities, and sewer systems precede or accompany (within six years) growth. It calls for consistency of plans and projects among regional, state and neighboring jurisdictions. In addition to construction of new capital facilities, transportation facilities may include transit service, transportation demand management.
(TDM) policies, transportation system management (TSM) components, and non-motorized facilities. This transportation element identifies strategies for accommodating future population and economic growth through increased reliance on these alternative modes along with infrastructure capacity growth.

**Destination 2030 (PSRC)**

Destination 2030, adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council on May 24, 2001, lays out a program for maintaining the regional vision of growth management by supporting compact urban land use development connected by a high capacity transportation system. Destination 2030’s multi-county planning policies call for jurisdictions to develop a transportation system that emphasizes accessibility, includes a variety of mobility options, and enables the efficient movement of people, goods, and freight, and information. This Transportation Element demonstrates Kent’s commitment to accepting urban growth and ensuring that regional transit services and alternative modes of transportation play key roles in managing that growth today and into the future. Kent is an active partner in the planning and development of alternative transportation systems both on a regional and sub-county level. The City of Kent transportation system maximizes multimodal access to transit, freight, and automobile facilities, as well as providing emphasis on improved bicycle and pedestrian linkages.

**Countywide Planning Policies (CPP) (King County)**

King County’s CPP’s, developed by the Growth Management Planning Council, are a vision for the future which defines a balanced transportation system as one that promotes all modes of travel, including automobiles, trucks, rail, transit, pedestrians, and bicycles. It suggests that comprehensive plans should include timelines for improvements, focusing on maintenance and preservation of existing infrastructure with additions as necessary to accommodate future growth. It encourages the creation of alternative funding sources when jurisdiction revenues fall short of projected needs. Sources may include developer contributions, impact fees, and Local Improvement Districts (LIDS). This Transportation Element identifies intermodal transportation facilities in Kent, concurrency strategies, and inter-jurisdictional coordination techniques to ensure consistency and cooperation.

**King County Metro Six Year Plan**

The City of Kent was an active participant in developing the current Metro Transit Six Year Plan. The Mayor served as a voting member of the Regional Transit Committee and provided Kent staff assistance to the Suburban Cities Association for research and documentation in support of suburban transit service. The City has welcomed infill
development and concentrated multifamily development along transit routes in order to promote the use of public transit as a feasible alternative to automobile trips.

The City synchronizes traffic signals along the most heavily used transit routes and encourages all new private development to provide safe walking routes to, and waiting areas for, transit facilities. The City incorporates transit supportive language into new development policies and standards.

The current King County Metro Transit Six Year Plan calls for 40% of all new transit dollars during the six year planning period to be spent in the South County area. The City of Kent is ready with plans and priorities for as many new transit service hours as the County will provide.

**Six Year Transit Development Plan (Sound Transit)**

Sound Transit’s Six Year Transit Development Plan envisions a comprehensive system of rail and bus services and facilities to accommodate growth in the region. Sound Transit’s Plan calls for eighteen (18) Commuter Rail (*Sounder*) trains to operate between Lakewood and Seattle (each stopping at the Kent Transit Center) by 2006. The City of Kent identifies this commuter rail service as an important element in accommodating future transportation demand in the jurisdiction, and incorporates the existence of convenient passenger train service into land use decisions and infrastructure needs assessments.

Kent created an innovative commuter shuttle program designed specifically to support Sound Transit and Metro Transit commuter routes. This circulating shuttle, begun in February 2003, meets each commuter train and delivers passengers to remote worksites. It is the first of its kind in this region and provides that final link between the regional long distance transit provider and the local workplace.
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TRANSPORTATION GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal TR-1:
Coordinate land use and transportation planning to meet the needs of the City consistent with the Growth Management Act.

Policy TR-1.1: Locate commercial, industrial, multifamily, and other uses that generate high levels of traffic in designated activity centers around intersections of principal or minor arterials or around freeway interchanges.

Policy TR-1.2: Coordinate new commercial and residential development in Kent with transportation projects to assure that transportation facility capacity is sufficient to accommodate the new development, or a financial commitment is in place to meet the adopted standard within six years, before allowing it to proceed.

Policy TR-1.3: Fund development of the roads necessary for a complete arterial system serving all travel needs in the City and potential annexation area through participation by new residential, commercial, and industrial development.

Policy TR-1.4: Manage access along all principal and minor arterial corridors, and access points to residential, commercial, and industrial development. Consolidate access points during development review, as part of road improvement projects, or as part of land use redevelopment projects.

Policy TR-1.5: Ensure consistency between land use and transportation plans so that land use and adjacent transportation facilities are compatible.

Policy TR-1.6: Phase implementation of transportation plans concurrently with growth to allow adequate transportation facilities and services to be in place concurrent with development, or, if the transportation network cannot be expanded to accommodate the adopted land use plan and the adopted level-of-service, for financial, geographic, or other reasons, re-examine land use, level-of-service, and economic inputs to establish a balance.

Policy TR-1.7: Ensure the transportation system is developed consistent with the anticipated development of the land uses, and acknowledge the influence of providing transportation facilities to accelerate or delay the development of land uses, either by type or area.
Policy TR-1.8: Promote land use patterns which support public transportation and ensure the development includes transit-friendly features.

STREET SYSTEM GOALS & POLICIES

Goal TR-2: Provide a balanced transportation system that recognizes the need for major road improvements to accommodate multiple travel modes. Create a comprehensive street system that provides reasonable circulation for all users throughout the City.

Policy TR-2.1: Assign a functional classification to each street in the City based on factors including travel demand of motorized and non-motorized traffic, access to adjacent land use and connectivity of the transportation network.

Policy TR-2.2: Coordinate implementation of street construction standards for each functional classification with policies in the Transportation Element to provide attractive, safe facilities that complement the adjacent land use and emergency response and operation.

TRAFFIC FLOW GOALS & POLICIES

Goal TR-3: Reduce disruptions which degrade the safety and reasonable functioning of the local transportation system.

Policy TR-3.1: Develop strategies to improve smooth traffic flows in areas experiencing extreme congestion by employing strategies that better accommodate various modes of travel including automobiles, transit, trains, pedestrian and bicycle modes.
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The following documents, reports, and statutes have been instrumental in the preparation of the Comprehensive Plan and the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update. These documents are incorporated by reference in the Plan. All documents are available for public review at the City of Kent Community Development Department, 400 West Gowen Street, Kent, Washington, (253) 856-5454.

GENERAL

Washington State Growth Management Act
- EHSB 2929 (1990)
- RSHB 1025 (1991)

Washington State Growth Management Act – Amendments
- ESHB 1724 (1995)
- SEB 6094 (1997)
- HB 1487 (1998)
- ESSB 6151 (2001)
- SSB 6012 (2003)
- ESHB 1933 (2003)
- SHB 1755 (2003)
- SSB 5602 (2003)
- SSB 5841 (2003)

King County Countywide Planning Policies
- King County Council Ordinance #10450 (Adoption)
- Kent City Council Resolution #1326 (Ratification)
- King County Council Ordinance #14656 (Adopted)
- Growth Management Planning Council Motion #01-2 (Ratified)

City of Kent Growth Management Strategy Inter-Departmental Work Program (December 1991)

Kent Growth Management Planning Goals
- Resolution #1325 (September 1992)

Intermediate Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Resolution #1334 (November 1992)
Interim Potential Annexation Area
  • Resolution #1360 (May 1993)

Potential Annexation Area Designation
  • Interlocal Agreement between the Cities of Renton and Kent Relating to Potential Annexation Area Designation (July 1995)
  • Interlocal Agreement between the Cities of Auburn and Kent Relating to Potential Annexation Area Designation (July 1995)
  • Interlocal Agreement between King County and the Cities of Federal Way and Kent Relating to Potential Annexation Area Designation (November 1995)

**LAND USE ELEMENT**

1989 Downtown Kent Plan Land Use Goals and Policies

West Valley Industrial Study (September 1986)

Green-Duwamish Watershed Nonpoint Action Plan (January 1991)

Kent Land Use Inventory--Final Report and Supporting Documents (November 1991)


Proposal to the King County Growth Management Planning Council for Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers (September 1992)

Adoption of Critical Areas Regulations
  • Ordinance #3109 and Resolution #1354 (May 1993)
  • Ordinance #3312 (September 1996)


Wellhead Protection Plan
  • Resolution #1563 (February 2000)

Establishment of Kent Household and Employment Targets for the Countywide Planning Policies - (October and December 1993, and April 2003)


Kent Downtown Plan Implementation Program (January 1991)
U.S. Census – 2000
Urban Separators – CPA-2000-1
  • Ordinance #3551 (July 2000)

Agricultural Lands Amendment – CPA-2000-3
  • Ordinance #3612 (August 2002)

2000 King County Benchmark Report (2000)
The 2001 King County Benchmark Report (2001)
Buildable Lands and Targets Report (2001)

COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

Multifamily Design Review Handbook
  • Ordinance #3014 (April 1994)

Kent Downtown Design Guidelines – Central Avenue District (May 1999)

Downtown Design Review
  • Ordinance #3525 (September 2000)


HUMAN SERVICES ELEMENT


HOUSING ELEMENT


CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

City of Kent Water System Plan for City of Kent (2000)
City of Kent 2000 Comprehensive Sewer Plan (2001)
City of Kent Performance Measurement Report (2001)

City of Kent Fire Department Standards of Coverage (2003)

City of Kent Fire & Life Safety Strategic Plan (August 2001)


City of Kent Surface Water Design Manual (May 2002)

City of Kent Police Strategic Plan—Draft (2003)

City of Auburn Comprehensive Sewer Plan (2001)

City of Auburn Comprehensive Water Plan (2001)


Soos Creek Water and Sewer District Sewer Comprehensive Plan (1996)

Soos Creek Water and Sewer District Water Comprehensive Plan (1996)

Lakehaven Utility District Comprehensive Wastewater System Plan Executive Summary (1997)

Lakehaven Utility District Comprehensive Water System Plan Executive Summary (1997)

King County Water District #111 Water System Comprehensive Plan (1997)

King County Regional Wastewater Services Plan – Operational Master Plan (1999)

Midway Sewer District Comprehensive Sewer System Plan (2000)

Highline Water District Comprehensive Water System Plan (2002)


Auburn School District No 408 Capital Facilities Plan 2003-2009

Federal Way Public Schools Capital Facilities Plan 2003/04

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

City of Kent Transportation Improvement Program 2004-2009
Puget Sound Regional Council – VISION 2020 (March 1993)

South Corridor Commuter Rail Project Tacoma-to-Seattle Draft Technical Report (December 1997)

Sound Transit Tacoma-to-Seattle Commuter Rail Draft EA and Environmental Checklist (December 1997)

Tacoma-to-Seattle Commuter Rail (Kent Commuter Rail Station Parking Garage) (December 1998)

Puget Sound Regional Council – Destination 2030 (May 2001)
  • Implementing Destination 2030 (July 2003)

King County – METRO 6-Year Transit Development Plan 2003 – 2008 (February 2003)

Sound Transit Service Implementation Plan (2003)

PARKS ELEMENT

Interim Comprehensive Parks, Recreation & Community Services Plan (June 2000)

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Kent Strategic Economic Development Summit (February 2002 and August 2003)


PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mayor's Committee on Growth Management--Final Report (May 1991)

Report of the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Impact Fees:
  • General Policy Issue Recommendations (November 1991)

  • Resolution #1318 Supporting VPS Results and Directing Implementation Program (July 1992)

Visioning Program Implementation Plan (Approved by the City Council November 1992)
Public Forums on Kent Growth Management Planning Goals (August 1992)

Public Open Houses on Comprehensive Plan/EIS Scoping (October 1993)

Video/Questionnaires on Comprehensive Plan Alternatives (March/April 1994)

Interim Comprehensive Parks, Recreation & Community Services Plan
- Citywide Telephone Surveys (1999 and 2000)
- Self-selecting Survey Associated with Displays at Kent Downtown Library, Kent Commons, Resource Center, Senior Activity Center, and City Hall (2000)

Docket outreach (2000-2002)

Consolidated Plan Citizen Oversight Committee (2001)

Council Planning Committee – Presented GMA update requirements, reviewed Framework Policies, received direction for update (March 2002)

Innovative Housing Workshop
- Preference Survey of all Workshop Participants (September 2002)

Miscellaneous
- Articles in the utilities bills “In Box” information sheet
- Articles in the Kent Reporter
- Planning Services Website

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

Determination of Nonsignificance for Critical Areas Regulations--ENV-92-13 and ENV-92-75 (March and October 1992)

Determination of Nonsignificance for Kent Planning Goals--ENV-92-70 (September 1992)

Determination of Significance and Notice of Scoping for the Comprehensive Plan-- ENV-93-51 (October 1993)

Comprehensive Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (July 1994)

Comprehensive Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (January 1995)

Comprehensive Plan Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (February 4, 1997)
- Adjunct to the Downtown Strategic Action Plan
MAPS

All maps utilize the City of Kent GIS (Geographic Information System) data bases as maintained by the Public Works - Engineering/Design Division. They maintain the following data layers that are present in nearly all maps within the Comprehensive Plan: street center line and street names; railroad main lines and spurs, major and minor waterways, lake bodies, city limits; and potential annexation area. If appropriate, specific GIS data will be listed for each map.

Figure 4.1 - Potential Annexation Area

Figure 4.2 - Zoning Districts
- Zoning designation maintained in consort with Community Development

Figure 4.3 - Hazard Area
- Ordinance #3342 (September 1996)

Figure 4.4 - Inventoried Wetlands
- 2002 inventory of wetlands contracted by Public Works and digitized by the Engineering/Design Division

Figure 4.5 - Agricultural Resource Land
- King County Natural Resources & Parks – Water and Land Resource Division – Farmland Preservation Program

Figure 4.6 - Vacant and Redevelopable Land
- Buildable Lands Inventory conducted by Community Development – Planning Services Division (2001)

Figure 4.7 - Watersheds
- Kent Surface Water Design Manual (May 2002)
- Flow Control Application Map – Public Works

Figure 4.8 - Land Use Map
- GIS layer maintained by Community Development and Public Works – Engineering/Design Division based on land use decisions

Figure 8.1 - Police Services & Facilities
- City of Kent Police Strategic Plan

Figure 8.2 - Fire & Life Safety Services & Facilities
- Kent Fire & Life Safety Strategic Plan (August 2001)

Figure 8.3 - Sewer Service Areas & Facilities
- City of Auburn – Comprehensive Sewer Plan (2001)
- 2000 Comprehensive Sewer System Plan – Midway Sewer District (2001)
- 2000 Kent Comprehensive Sewer Plan (2001)

Figure 8.4 - Storm Drainage Service Area
- Ordinance #3534 (December 2000)

Figure 8.5 - Water Supply Service Areas & Facilities
- City of Auburn – Comprehensive Sewer Plan (2001)
- King County Water District #111 – 1997 Water System Comprehensive Plan (1998)
- Water System Plan for City of Kent (2000)
Figure 8.6 – Educational Service Areas & Facilities
  ▪ Federal Way Public Schools 2003/2004 Capital Facilities Plan

Figure 9.1 – Principal Arterials Highways
  ▪ Puget Sound Regional Council
  ▪ Washington State Department of Transportation

Figure 9.2 – Railroads

Figure 9.3 – Bicycle Facilities
  ▪ Data collected by Kent Bicycle Advisory Board (2003)

Figure 10.1 – Parks and Recreation Facilities
  ▪ Parks and Facility Guide (2001) - Parks, Recreation and Community Services

Figure 10.2 – Neighborhood Park Service Areas
  ▪ Neighborhood Parks Service Area Map - Maintained by Parks, Recreation and Community Services

Figure 10.3 – Existing Trails
  ▪ Trail Guide (1999) - Parks, Recreation and Community Services

Figure 10.4 – Recreation Facilities and Schools
  ▪ Parks and Facility Guide (2001) - Parks, Recreation and Community Services

Figure 11.1 – Puget Sound Energy Electrical System
  ▪ Communication with Puget Sound Energy

Figure 11.2 – Puget Sound Energy Natural Gas
  ▪ Communication with Puget Sound Energy

Figure 11.3 – Telecommunications
  ▪ Communication with Qwest Incorporated
  ▪ Kent Community Development permitting process