

SENATE BILL REPORT

ESB 6448

AS PASSED SENATE, FEBRUARY 14, 1992

Brief Description: Allowing counties under 100,000 in population to discontinue planning under the growth management act.

SPONSORS: Senators Sellar, Barr, Hayner, McCaslin, Saling, Thorsness, L. Smith, Amondson, Craswell, Patterson, Bailey, Owen and Vognild

SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

Majority Report: Do pass.

Signed by Senators McCaslin, Chairman; Roach, Vice Chairman; and Matson.

Staff: Eugene Green (786-7405)

Hearing Dates: February 5, 1992

BACKGROUND:

Comprehensive planning and development regulations under the Growth Management Act are mandatory for all counties, and the cities within such counties that meet either of the following criteria: (1) a population over 50,000 and a population growth rate of more than 10 percent in the previous 10 years; or (2) a growth rate of more than 20 percent in the previous 10 years, regardless of population. Any county may choose to opt under the provisions of the act, but may not later remove itself from the requirements of the act. Twenty-six counties and the cities within these counties currently plan under the act.

Some counties and cities within those counties have found the requirements of the act to be burdensome on their human and financial resources. They would like the ability to consider opting out from under the provisions of the act. Also, some citizens feel the act places undue restrictions on their property.

SUMMARY:

Counties with a population of less than 200,000 are authorized to remove themselves from the requirements of the Growth Management Act by adoption of a resolution by June 1, 1993. The following counties would be eligible for this authorization: Benton, Chelan, Clallam, Columbia, Douglas, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Island, Jefferson, Kitsap, Kittitas, Mason, Pacific, Pend Oreille, San Juan, Skagit, Thurston, Walla Walla, Whatcom, and Yakima (all but King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Clark).

Appropriation: none

Revenue: none

Fiscal Note: none requested

TESTIMONY FOR:

The Growth Management Act costs too much; places undue restrictions on our property; and takes decision-making away from citizens.

TESTIMONY AGAINST:

We need the Growth Management Act to protect our quality of life.

TESTIFIED: Jim Jenkins, Mike Fox, Mason County Property Owners Alliance (pro); Gordon Jacobson