

# HOUSE BILL REPORT

## HB 2370

---

---

### As Reported By House Committee On: Government Operations

**Title:** An act relating to authorizing counties to remove themselves from the planning requirements of the growth management act.

**Brief Description:** Allowing counties with less than seventy-five thousand population to opt out of growth management planning requirements.

**Sponsors:** Representatives Honeyford, Grant, Buck, Koster, D. Schmidt, Smith, Sheldon, Clements, Johnson, Benton, Skinner, Fuhrman, Basich, Sherstad, Hargrove, Boldt, Campbell, McMorris, Pennington, Thompson, Mulliken and McMahan.

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:**

Government Operations: 1/24/96, 1/31/96 [DP].

---

### HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

**Majority Report:** Do pass. Signed by 8 members: Representatives Reams, Chairman; Cairnes, Vice Chairman; Goldsmith, Vice Chairman; Hargrove; Honeyford; Hymes; Mulliken and D. Schmidt.

**Minority Report:** Do not pass. Signed by 6 members: Representatives Rust, Ranking Minority Member; Scott, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Conway; R. Fisher; Scheuerman and Wolfe.

**Staff:** Steve Lundin (786-7127).

**Background:** The Growth Management Act was enacted in 1990 and 1991 to establish a few requirements for all counties and cities in the state and a larger number of requirements for counties and cities in the state planning under all of the requirements of the act.

A county is required to plan under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act if either of the two population and 10-year growth rates apply to the county:

- the county has a population of 50,000 or more and had or has either of the following growth rates: (1) prior to May 16, 1995, the county population

increased by 10 percent or more over the preceding 10-year period; or (2) on or after May 16, 1995, the county population increased by 17 percent or more over the preceding 10-year period; or

- the county that has a population of less than 50,000 and the population of the county has increased by 20 percent or more over the preceding 10 years.

In addition, the governing body of a county may adopt a resolution requiring the county to plan under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act.

A city plans under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act if the county in which it is located is subject to those requirements.

Once a county is required to plan under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act, the county and cities in the county remain subject to the requirement of planning under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act.

Twenty-nine out of 39 counties in the state plan under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act. Of these 29, the following 18 counties have populations of less than 75,000: Island, Lewis, Clallam, Grant, Chelan, Walla Walla, Mason, Franklin, Stevens, Kittitas, Douglas, Jefferson, Pacific San Juan, Pend Oreille, Ferry, Columbia, and Garfield.

**Summary of Bill:** Any county with a population of less than 75,000 may adopt a resolution removing the county, and the cities in the county, from the requirement to plan under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act, if the resolution is filed with the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development prior to December 31, 1996, or within 60 days after the county is notified that it meets the population and growth factors to be required to plan under all the requirements of the act. If such a county timely adopts the resolution, it reverts to planning under only the few requirements of the Growth Management Act applicable to all counties and cities.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Not requested.

**Effective Date:** Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

**Testimony For:** This will set rural people free. We have no urban growth in Pacific County. The hearings boards are top-down planning.

**Testimony Against:** Cities should be given a voice in any opt out. These counties were given a lot of state money to plan. What happens to that money?

**Testified:** Representative Honeyford, prime sponsor; Bryan Harrison, Pacific County Department of Community Development; Pat Hamilton, Pacific County Commissioners; Mike Ryherd, 1,000 Friends of Washington; and Scott Merriman, Washington Environmental Council.