

SENATE BILL REPORT

ESSB 6427

As Passed Senate, February 13, 2006

Title: An act relating to schedules for the review of comprehensive plans and development regulations for certain cities and counties.

Brief Description: Concerning schedules for the review of comprehensive plans and development regulations.

Sponsors: Senate Committee on Government Operations & Elections (originally sponsored by Senators Kastama, Mulliken, Morton and Rasmussen; by request of Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development).

Brief History:

Committee Activity: Government Operations & Elections: 1/24/06, 2/2/06 [DPS, DNP, w/oRec].

Passed Senate: 2/13/06, 45-0.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS & ELECTIONS

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 6427 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Kastama, Chair; Berkey, Vice Chair; Fairley, Haugen, McCaslin and Pridemore.

Minority Report: Do not pass.

Signed by Senators Benton and Mulliken.

Minority Report: That it be referred without recommendation.

Signed by Senator Roach, Ranking Minority Member.

Staff: Genevieve Pisarski (786-7488)

Background: The Growth Management Act (GMA) establishes a seven-year cycle for review and revision (update) of policies and development regulations concerning critical areas and resource lands, for all cities and counties, and of comprehensive plans and development regulations, for those cities and counties that fully plan under the GMA. In 2005, cities and counties with updates due in 2005, 2006, and 2007 were given an additional year to complete updates of requirements regarding protection of critical areas.

Summary of Bill: Smaller, slower-growing counties and cities are given additional time to complete their GMA updates. Counties with updates due in 2005, 2006, or 2007 that have a population of no more than 50,000 and a population increase of no more than 17 percent in the previous 10 years have 3 additional years to complete the update, including requirements to protect critical areas. Any cities with updates due in 2005, 2006, or 2007 that have a

population of no more than 5,000 and a population increase of the greater of either 100 persons or no more than 17 percent in the previous 10 years, likewise have 3 additional years.

A comprehensive plan can be amended more often than once a year for a planned action, as long as all public participation and notice requirements are observed.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Committee/Commission/Task Force Created: No.

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

Testimony For: Smaller jurisdictions should be able to use their resources on more pressing needs, if their circumstances haven't changed enough to deserve an update. There isn't enough development impact at stake in these jurisdictions. Funds and resources for updates should go to the larger, fast growing jurisdictions. The existing 1-year extension for critical areas shouldn't become permanent; and critical areas updates should be done sooner and ahead of the rest of the update. Critical areas updates should be included in the proposed 3-year extension.

Testimony Against: None.

Who Testified: PRO: Nancy Ousley, CTED; Kaleen Cottingham, Futurewise; Heath Packard, Audubon; Eric Johnson, WSAC; Dave Williams, AWC.

House Amendment(s): The House amendment adds clarification that eligibility for public works and water quality grants and loans, which the 1-year extensions given in 2005 left in place, remains in place and that the preferences for grants and loans that apply to counties and cities that update according to their original schedules will also apply to the smaller, slower-growing counties and cities that are getting 3-year extensions.