

HOUSE BILL REPORT

ESB 5019

As Reported By House Committee On:
Government Operations

Title: An act relating to industrial developments.

Brief Description: Relating to industrial developments.

Sponsors: Senator Snyder.

Brief History:

Committee Activity:

Government Operations: 3/21/95, 3/22/95 [DPA].

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Majority Report: Do pass as amended. Signed by 14 members: Representatives Reams, Chairman; Goldsmith, Vice Chairman; L. Thomas, Vice Chairman; Rust, Ranking Minority Member; Scott, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; R. Fisher; Hargrove; Honeyford; Hymes; Mulliken; D. Schmidt; Sommers; Van Luven and Wolfe.

Staff: Steve Lundin (786-7127).

Background: The Growth Management Act was enacted in 1990 and 1991, establishing a variety of requirements for certain counties, and the cities located in those counties.

Among other requirements, each county planning under all requirements of the Growth Management Act, in cooperation with the cities located within its boundaries, develops a countywide planning policy to guide the comprehensive plans that the county and those cities develop.

A county planning under all of the requirements of the Growth Management Act must designate urban growth areas within the county inside of which urban growth shall occur and outside of which urban growth shall not occur. Every city must be included within an urban growth area. Other areas may be included in an urban growth area if they are already characterized by urban growth or are adjacent to such areas. The county uses a 20-year population forecast prepared by the Office of Financial Management as the basis for designating its urban growth areas.

Summary of Amended Bill: A county planning under all of the requirements of the Growth Management Act may establish a process for approving major industrial areas outside of urban growth areas. The county must consult with cities consistent with the provisions of the countywide planning policy in establishing this process. A "major industrial area" is defined as a master planned location for a specific manufacturing, or industrial business, or a specific commercial business other than retail commercial development or multi-tenant office parks, that:

- o Requires a parcel of land so large that no suitable parcels without critical areas are available within any urban growth area; or
- o Is a natural-resource-based industry requiring location near agricultural land, forest land, or mineral resource land upon which it is dependent.

A variety of factors must be met before such development may be sited outside of an urban growth area, including: (a) Infrastructure is provided and/or applicable impact fees have been paid; (b) transit-oriented site planning and traffic demand management programs are implemented; (c) buffers and environmental protection are provided; (d) development regulations discourage urban growth in adjacent non-urban areas; and (e) an inventory of developable land has been conducted and the county finds that land suitable to site major industrial development is unavailable within the urban growth area. Priority shall be given to applications for sites adjacent to or in close proximity to the urban growth area.

Final approval shall be considered an adopted amendment to the comprehensive plan, but shall not be considered to be an amendment for purposes of the limitation that a comprehensive plan may be amended no more often than once a year.

Amended Bill Compared to Engrossed Bill: The requirement on infrastructure and impact fees is altered so that either the infrastructure has been provided, or applicable impact fees have been paid, or both, rather than both the infrastructure has been provided and impact fees established.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

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

Testimony For: This is an agreed to draft. Sometimes an urban growth area does not include sufficient land for large industrial projects. With the changes in the bill, questions have been removed.

Testimony Against: None.

Testified: Michael Davolio, American Planning Association; Donald March, National Association of Industrial and Office Properties; Dan Sexton, V.A. Plumbers; Dave Williams, Association of Washington Cities; and Paul Parker, Washington State Association of Counties.