

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 5841

As Reported By Senate Committee On:
State & Local Government, June 19, 2001

Title: An act relating to establishing a schedule for review of comprehensive plans and development regulations adopted under the growth management act.

Brief Description: Establishing a schedule for review of comprehensive plans and development regulations adopted under the growth management act.

Sponsors: Senators Patterson, McCaslin, Gardner, Sheahan, T. Sheldon, Deccio, Haugen, Winsley and Hochstatter.

Brief History:

Committee Activity: State & Local Government: 2/22/01, 6/11/01, 6/19/01 [DPS, DNP].

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE & LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5841 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Patterson, Chair; Gardner, Haugen, Roach, T. Sheldon and Swecker.

Minority Report: Do not pass.

Signed by Senators Horn and Kline.

Staff: Eugene Green (786-7405)

Background: Each county or city that has adopted a comprehensive land use plan must review its plan and development regulations by September 1, 2002, and every five years thereafter. Every ten years a county or city must review its urban growth boundaries. These two reviews may be combined.

Summary of Substitute Bill: The Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED) must establish a schedule for counties and cities to review and, if needed, revise their comprehensive plans and development regulations. Counties and cities not planning under the Growth Management Act must use this schedule to review and revise policies and regulations regarding critical areas and natural resource lands. The schedule must provide for reviews and evaluations as follows:

(a) By the following dates, and every five years thereafter, for Clark, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, and Thurston counties and their cities: (i) December 1, 2003, critical areas. Amendments adopted as a result of this review are not effective until July 1, 2004; and (ii) July 1, 2004, comprehensive plans and development regulations, other than policies and regulations regarding critical areas. If any of these counties or their cities has conducted a review and evaluation of its comprehensive plan and development regulations and, on or after January 1, 2001, has taken action in response to this review, it shall be deemed to have

conducted the first review required by this act. Subsequent review and evaluation by such county or city must be conducted in accordance with the established time periods;

(b) By December 1, 2004, and every ten years thereafter, for Clallam, Jefferson, and Whatcom counties and their cities;

(c) By December 1, 2005, and every ten years thereafter, for Cowlitz, Island, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, and Skamania counties and their cities;

(d) By December 1, 2006, and every ten years thereafter, for Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Spokane, and Yakima counties and their cities; and

(e) By December 1, 2007, and every ten years thereafter, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and their cities.

Counties and cities may begin this process early and may be eligible for grants from CTED, subject to available funding, if they elect to do so.

Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill: The staggering of the schedule is changed and critical area ordinances are made part of the schedule for those counties and their cities that do not plan under the Growth Management Act.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

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

Testimony For: Cities and counties need more time to analyze the new census data. Also, many cities and counties have just recently completed their plans and it isn't cost beneficial to immediately do a new plan.

Testimony Against: Business likes certainty. Environmentalists want to make sure their concerns aren't postponed. A ten-year review period may be too long. There should be more integration between GMA plans and Shoreline Master plans.

Testified: Steve Francks, WA Assn. of Realtors (con); Paul Parker, WA Assn. of Counties (pro); Jim Halstrom, Master Builders of King and Snohomish Counties (con); Steve Wells, Office of Community Development (pro); Dave Williams, Assn. of WA Cities (pro); Mike Flynn, Realtors (con); Josh Baldi, WA Enviro Council (con); Bruce Wishart, People For Puget Sound (con); Steve Stuart, 1000 Friends of WA (concerns); Jodi Slavik, BIAW (con); Kristen Sawin, AWB (concerns); Larry Stout, Realtors (concerns); Carolyn Logue, NFIB (concerns).