



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
**GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD**

1111 Israel Road SW, PO Box 40903, Olympia, WA 98504-0953  
Office (360) 664-9170 – Fax (360) 586-2253 – [www.gmhb.wa.gov](http://www.gmhb.wa.gov)

February 18, 2021

**TO:** All Parties in Case No. 21-3-0003c Futurewise, et al v. Pierce County

**FROM:** Deb Eddy, Presiding Officer

**SUBJECT:** Prehearing Conference, Board Request for Restatement of Issues

The Board hears petitions for review (PFR) of actions taken by local jurisdictions for compliance with the Growth Management Act. The statute limits jurisdictions to resolution of detailed issues presented in the PFR. RCW 36.70A.290(1). To ensure that the issues subject to review by us are appropriate, the Board has promulgated regulations addressing the statement of issues. These regulations include:

- Identifying the information required in the Petition for Review to include “[a] detailed statement of the issues presented for resolution by the board that specifies the provision(s) of the act or other statute allegedly being violated and, if applicable, the provision(s) of the document that is being appealed WAC 242-03-210(c).
- The role of the prehearing conference in to “[o]btain agreement as to the issues of law and fact presented and their clarification, simplification, limitation, or resolution, so as to frame the final issues to be decided by the board WAC 242-03-540(3).
- Processes to amend petitions for review, including the duty of the presiding officer at the prehearing conference to “work with the parties to clarify the issues raised in the petition for review.” The presiding officer may require a more complete or concise statement upon motion of a party or its own motion WAC 242-03-260(3)
- The duty and authority of the presiding officer to inspect the petition and determine “whether, on its face, compliance with the jurisdictional and standing requirements of the act is shown, and if compliance is not shown, to

recommend an action or to refer the issue to the board for resolution WAC 242-03-530(1).

I reviewed the Petitions for Review in consolidated case no. 21-3-0003c and found the issue statements to be extremely generalized. To that end, in the Notice of Hearing, I encouraged the parties to submit revised issue statements, which they did immediately prior to the prehearing conference. After review and discussion, the following agreements were identified by the Board:

- The restatement of the issue concerning SEPA brought forward by Futurewise and Summit-Waller Community Association, and North Clover Creek Community Council (Summit-Waller) was recognized as sufficient for inclusion in the Prehearing Order.
- The restatement of issues concerning the GMA presented by Petitioner Fretoc was recognized as sufficient for inclusion in the Prehearing Order.

Petitioner Futurewise and Summit-Waller submitted a revised set of issues which was discussed at length, in an effort to establish clearly the exact sections of the challenged ordinance which were in conflict with exact sections or language of the pre-existing comprehensive plan and county code. The parties did not find agreement on these issues, and Petitioner Futurewise indicated that they would not have time or opportunity to re-write their issues before my proffered date of close of business, Monday, February 22, 2021. No decision was made on the non-SEPA issues presented in the PFRs by these two Petitioners. Absent offering an amendment, Petitioner Futurewise indicated that they wished to continue with the issues presented in their original PFR. Petitioner Summit-Waller did not indicate a preference.

The existing issue statements before this Board at the conclusion of the prehearing conference, and which will be considered for inclusion in the prehearing order are attached here for reference. All of the issues are uneven in identification of specific sections (or subsections) of the GMA (Chapter 36.70A RCW) or the comprehensive plan policies or county code sections with which Pierce County has allegedly failed to comply, and the specific nature of the violation.

At present, I will dismiss the Futurewise and Summit-Waller issues attached here and presently before us for lack of specificity and clarity in the Prehearing Order in this case. However, I am presenting Petitioners Futurewise and Summit-Waller the opportunity, should they choose to avail themselves of it, to provide this Board with a restatement of issues that meet the requirements of the GMA and this Board's regulations by close of business, Monday, February 22, 2021. This is not an opportunity to expand the Petitioners' claims. No new issues or violations may be raised. Rather, the purpose is to provide a greater level of specificity for the benefit of the Board and the County.

To be clear, and to repeat the substance of the discussion held during the prehearing conference, a typical issue statement must clearly identify the nature of the violation of the GMA goals and requirements attributable to the challenged ordinance. It must encompass a complete thought about the nature of the alleged violation, so that the planning jurisdiction can fairly meet the charge. In general, issues could be worded as follows:

*Did Pierce County's adoption of Ordinance No. XXX fail to comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.\_\_\_\_ (fill in the section **and subsection**)\_\_\_\_, because . . .section XX of the ordinance conflicts with the policies set out in existing comprehensive plan policy XX (brief explanation of **why the amendment or process of its adoption fails to comply with the specific requirement.**)*

In the case of generalized arguments alleging inconsistency, in addition to the RCW citation, the issue must include identification of specific comprehensive plan policy or policies that were violated by identified actions taken in the challenged ordinance. Simply providing chapter headings is not sufficient to identify the existing policy with which the challenged ordinance is in conflict. The same general rule applies to identifying regulations with which the challenged action is in conflict. Please refer to the "[Growth Management Hearings Board Handbook](#)" available on the Board's website – [www.gmhb.wa.gov](http://www.gmhb.wa.gov) for further guidance on framing issues.

This Board is required to offer both petitioners and respondents management of the case and calendar to ensure that this Board's final order is issued within the statutory period of 180 days, RCW 36.70A.300. To that end, final evaluation, and action on the statement of issues for this case will be made based on the issues as attached here, unless superseded by any revised issues filed by Petitioners Futurewise and Summit-Waller by 5:00 p.m. Monday, February 22, 2021. The prehearing order will be issued shortly thereafter.

### **ISSUE STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY PETITIONER FUTUREWISE**

These issue statements appear in Petitioner Futurewise's original PFR.

2. Did Ordinance Nos. 2020-96s2, 2020-97s2, 2020-98s2, 2020-99s2, 2020-102s, and 2020-103s violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), and (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; or RCW 36.70A.290(2) because the ordinances were not coordinated with or consistent with the Growth Management Act goals and requirements, the comprehensive plans of jurisdictions with common borders, regional transportation priorities, the countywide planning policies, the multicounty planning policies, Vision 2040, or Vision 2050?
3. Did Ordinance Nos. 2020-96s2, 2020-97s2, 2020-98s2, 2020-99s2, 2020-102s, and 2020-103s violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (3), (8), (9), (10), and (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130(1); RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530 because the ordinances violate the Growth Management Act goals and the requirements for comprehensive plan and development regulation amendments including the conservation of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance and the protection of critical areas?

### **ISSUE STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY PETITIONER SUMMIT-WALLER**

These issue statement reflect Petitioner Summit-Waller's February 16, 2021, filing indicating joinder in the revised Statement of Issues presented by Petitioner Futurewise, on that same day, excluding issues related to Ordinances 98s2 and 99s2. Petitioner Summit-Waller stated that their issues relate to "that portion of the Mid-County Plan located on 121st Street located west of Waller Road and east of Aqueduct Road. Petitioners' issues include, in part, Pierce County's approval of high intensity urban uses in a rural area served by a primitive two-lane oil mat road, without sewer service, without transitional zoning, without concurrent services and infrastructure, and more than a 1000 feet from public transportation."

2. Do the following provisions of the *Pierce County Comprehensive Plan* Chapter 14 Appendix I: Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan as amended by Ordinance No. 2020-96s2 violate the statutes listed for the provisions because the amendments were not coordinated with or consistent with the listed Growth Management Act goals and requirements, the comprehensive plans of jurisdictions with common borders, regional transportation priorities, the countywide planning policies, the multicounty planning policies, Vision 2040, Vision 2050, the conservation of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance, or the protection of critical areas?

- 2.1 Do the Vision and the Purpose in Chapter 1 violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 2.2 Does Chapter 2: Land Use Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 2.3 Does Chapter 3: Community Character and Design Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 2.4 Does Chapter 5: Environment Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(10), RCW 36.70A.040(3), RCW 36.70A.060, RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6), RCW 36.70A.130, or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?
- 2.5 Does Chapter 6: Facilities and Services Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), RCW 36.70A.040(3), RCW 36.70A.060, RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (3), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.110, RCW 36.70A.130, RCW 36.70A.210, or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?
- 2.6 Does Chapter 7: Transportation Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?
- 2.7 Does Chapter 8: Plan Monitoring violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?
3. Do the following provisions of the *Pierce County Comprehensive Plan* Chapter 14 Appendix H: Mid-County Community Plan as amended by Ordinance No. 2020-97s2 violate the statutes listed for the provisions because the amendments were not coordinated with or consistent with the listed Growth Management Act goals and requirements, the comprehensive plans of jurisdictions with common borders, regional transportation priorities, the countywide planning policies, the multicounty planning policies, Vision 2040, Vision 2050, the conservation of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance, or the protection of critical areas?

- 3.1 Do the Vision and the Purpose of the Community Plan in Chapter 1 violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?
  - 3.2 Does Chapter 2: Land Use Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?
  - 3.3 Does Chapter 3: Community Character and Design Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?
  - 3.4 Does Chapter 5: Environment Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(10), RCW 36.70A.040(3), RCW 36.70A.060, RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6), RCW 36.70A.130, or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?
  - 3.5 Does Chapter 6: Facilities and Services Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), RCW 36.70A.040(3), RCW 36.70A.060, RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (3), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.110, RCW 36.70A.130, RCW 36.70A.210, or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?
  - 3.6 Does Chapter 7: Transportation Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?
  - 3.7 Does Chapter 8: Plan Monitoring violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?
- ~~4. Do the following provisions of the *Pierce County Comprehensive Plan* Chapter 14 Appendix D: Frederickson Community Plan as amended by Ordinance No. 2020-98s2 violate the statutes listed for the provisions because the amendments were not coordinated with or consistent with the listed Growth Management Act goals and requirements, the comprehensive plans of jurisdictions with common borders, regional transportation priorities, the countywide planning policies, the multicounty planning policies, Vision 2040, Vision 2050, the conservation of agricultural lands of long term commercial significance, or the protection of critical areas?~~

- 4.1 — ~~Do the Vision Statement and the Purpose and Use of the Community Plan in Chapter 1 violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?~~
- 4.2 — ~~Does Chapter 2: Land Use Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?~~
- 4.3 — ~~Does Chapter 3: Community Character and Design Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?~~
- 4.4 — ~~Does Chapter 5: Environment Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(10), RCW 36.70A.040(3), RCW 36.70A.060, RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6), RCW 36.70A.130, or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?~~
- 4.5 — ~~Does Chapter 6: Facilities and Services Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), RCW 36.70A.040(3), RCW 36.70A.060, RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (3), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.110, RCW 36.70A.130, RCW 36.70A.210, or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?~~
- 4.6 — ~~Does Chapter 7: Transportation Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?~~
- 4.7 — ~~Does Chapter 8: Plan Monitoring violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.530?~~
5. ~~Do the following provisions of the *Pierce County Comprehensive Plan* Chapter 14 Appendix J: South Hill Community Plan as amended by Ordinance No. 2020-99s2 violate the statutes listed for the provisions because the amendments were not coordinated with or consistent with the listed Growth Management Act goals and requirements, the comprehensive plans of jurisdictions with common borders, regional transportation priorities, the countywide planning policies, the multicounty~~

~~planning policies, Vision 2040, Vision 2050, the conservation of agricultural lands of long term commercial significance, or the protection of critical areas?~~

~~5.1 Do the Vision Statement and the Purpose and Use of the Community Plan in Chapter 1 violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.510?~~

~~5.2 Does Chapter 2: Land Use Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.510?~~

~~5.3 Does Chapter 3: Community Character and Design Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.510?~~

~~5.4 Does Chapter 5: Environment Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(10), RCW 36.70A.040(3), RCW 36.70A.060, RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6), RCW 36.70A.130, or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?~~

~~5.5 Does Chapter 6: Facilities and Services Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), RCW 36.70A.040(3), RCW 36.70A.060, RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (3), RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.110, RCW 36.70A.130, RCW 36.70A.210, or RCW 36.70A.290(2)?~~

~~5.6 Does Chapter 7: Transportation Element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.510?~~

~~5.7 Does Chapter 8: Plan Monitoring violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; or RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.510?~~

6. Do the provisions of the Pierce County Code amended by Ordinance No. 2020-102s violate the statutes listed for the provisions because the amendments were not coordinated with or consistent with the listed Growth Management Act goals and requirements, the comprehensive plans of jurisdictions with common borders, regional transportation priorities, the countywide planning policies, the multicounty



planning policies, Vision 2040, Vision 2050, the conservation of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance, or the protection of critical areas?

- 6.1 Does Section 3 and the amendments to Title 18A of the Pierce County Code, “Development Regulations – Zoning,” in Exhibit B violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 6.2 Do Section 4 and New Chapter 18A.16 of the Pierce County Code (PCC), “Centers and Corridors Use Table” and the other zoning amendments in Exhibit B violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 6.3 Do Section 5 and Title 18B of the Pierce County Code, “Development Regulations – Signs,” as amended and in Exhibit C violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 6.4 Do Section 6 and the amendments to Title 18J of the Pierce County Code, “Development Regulations – Design Standards and Guidelines,” as amended and in Exhibit D violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 6.5 Do Section 7 and new Section 18B.30.130 of the Pierce County Code, “Towne Center and Corridor Zones,” in Exhibit C violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 6.6 Do Section 8 and new Section 18J.17.025 of the Pierce County Code, “Exemptions,” in Exhibit D violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW

- 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 6.7 Do Section 10 and the amendments to Title 18A of the Pierce County Code, “Development Regulations – Zoning,” in Exhibit E violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 6.8 Do Section 11 and the amendments to Title 18J of the Pierce County Code, “Development Regulations – Design Standards and Guidelines,” in Exhibit F violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 6.9 Do Section 12, Section 18A.10.030 of the Pierce County Code, “Zoning Atlas,” or the zoning maps in Exhibit G violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
7. Do the provisions of the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and Ordinance No. 2020-103s violate the statutes listed for the provisions because the plan was not coordinated with or consistent with the listed Growth Management Act goals and requirements, the comprehensive plans of jurisdictions with common borders, regional transportation priorities, the countywide planning policies, the multicounty planning policies, Vision 2040, Vision 2050, the conservation of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance, or the protection of critical areas?
- 7.1 Does Section 2 and Chapter 2: Land Use Element in Exhibit A violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 7.2 Does Section 2 and Chapter 9: Housing Element in Exhibit A violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1), (2), (3), or (6); RCW 36.70A.100; RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210; RCW 36.70A.290(2); RCW 36.70A.510; or RCW 36.70A.530?
- 7.3 Does Section 2 and Chapter 12: Transportation Element in Exhibit A violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (3), (8), (10), or (12); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW

Memo to All Parties in Case No. 21-3-0003c

February 18, 2021

Page **11** of **11**

36.70A.060; RCW 36.70A.070; RCW 36.70A.070(1) or (6); RCW 36.70A.100;  
RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130; RCW 36.70A.210;  
RCW 36.70A.290(2); or RCW 36.70A.510?