

# SENATE BILL REPORT

## SB 6268

---

As Reported By Senate Committee On:  
Government Operations & Elections, January 30, 2006

**Title:** An act relating to transportation concurrency under the growth management act.

**Brief Description:** Addressing transportation concurrency under the growth management act.

**Sponsors:** Senators Kastama, Pridemore and Kline.

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:** Government Operations & Elections: 1/17/06, 1/30/06 [DP-TRAN, DNP].

---

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS & ELECTIONS

**Majority Report:** Do pass and be referred to Committee on Transportation.

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

**Minority Report:** Do not pass.

Signed by Senators Roach, Ranking Minority Member; Benton and Mulliken.

**Staff:** Genevieve Pisarski (786-7488)

**Background:** The Growth Management Act requires local jurisdictions to prohibit approval of new development, if it causes the level of service on locally-owned transportation facilities to fall below locally-adopted standards, unless improvements are made or strategies to manage impacts are in place concurrent with the development, which means at the time of development or in the form of a financial commitment to complete them within six years. For island counties only, this concurrency requirement also applies to transportation facilities of statewide significance.

**Summary of Bill:** In addition to the existing requirement to prohibit approval of new development, if it causes the level of service on local facilities to fall below local standards, jurisdictions that plan under the Growth Management Act must also prohibit approval, if the level of service on state-owned transportation facilities falls below standards adopted by the state or by a regional transportation planning organization.

**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:** This proposal implements one of the original and major purposes of the Growth Management Act.

**Testimony Against:** This will force moratoriums on new development. If new development can't happen in an urban growth area, it will be pushed into rural areas or other urban growth areas; you can't stop it.

**Testimony Other:** The objective is good, but a different approach should be considered, such as strengthening some of the existing coordination and planning requirements that apply to local government, the Department of Transportation, and regional transportation planning organizations. This is an extremely complex subject that needs to be studied and strategized. This proposal has a sweeping effect. It needs financing strategies. There are problems with identifying which levels of service apply to a jurisdiction. Many local governments use SEPA mitigation fees to address transportation needs; it might be better to continue this practice. The methods and resources for implementing this proposal still haven't been analyzed.

**Who Testified:** PRO: Kaleen Cottingham, Futurewise.

CON: Bill Riley, Washington Realtors.

OTHER: Brian Smith, WSDOT; Ashley Probart, Association of Washington Cities; Eric Johnson, Washington Association of Counties; Leonard Bauer, CTED.