

HOUSE BILL REPORT

HB 1671

*As Reported By House Committee on:
Transportation
Transportation*

Title: An act relating to growth strategies.

Brief Description: Changing provisions relating to growth strategies.

Sponsor(s): Representatives R. Fisher, Riley, R. Meyers, Jacobsen, Heavey, Roland, Hine, O'Brien, Rust, Betrozoff, Paris, Scott, Fraser and Wineberry.

Brief History:

Reported by House Committee on:
Transportation, March 4, 1991, DPS;
Transportation, March 9, 1991, DP2S.

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION**

Majority Report: *That Substitute House Bill No. 1671 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.*
Signed by 20 members: Representatives R. Fisher, Chair; R. Meyers, Vice Chair; Betrozoff, Ranking Minority Member; Basich; Brough; Cantwell; Cooper; G. Fisher; Forner; Haugen; Heavey; Horn; R. Johnson; Jones; Kremen; Nelson; Prentice; Schmidt; Wilson; and Zellinsky.

Minority Report: *Without recommendation.* Signed by 6 members: Representatives Chandler, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Day; P. Johnson; Mitchell; Orr; and Wood.

Staff: Gene Baxstrom (786-7303).

Background: Legislation was enacted in 1990 relating to a variety of growth management issues. The 1990 Growth Management Act established a series of goals and requirements to guide comprehensive planning for 12 counties and the cities within those counties. Three additional counties were added to that group by virtue of the 1990 census and eight other counties have opted to plan under the act.

The Washington State Growth Strategies Commission was created by the governor in 1989 to address issues associated

with the rapid growth occurring in the state. That commission's final report made numerous recommendations regarding growth strategies. Those recommendations are largely embodied in House Bill 1025, the governor's request bill addressing growth management.

The 1990 Growth Management Act, HB 2929, included sections addressing legislative intent and mandatory elements of comprehensive plans. House Bill 1025 would amend these statutes and certain of the proposed changes related to transportation. Sections of HB 1025 affecting transportation issues were combined in House Bill 1671.

Current access controls to state highways are limited. Limited access highways are defined. Cities control access to state highways within city limits. Access to the remainder of the system is largely dealt with in terms of geometric consideration for points of access. Control of access to city and county roads rests with those jurisdictions.

The statutory criteria used by the County Road Administration Board, Transportation Improvement Board, and the Department of Transportation for selecting highway projects do not currently reflect many of the goals and objectives established in the 1990 growth strategies bill (ESHB 2929) and the 1990 Transportation Policy Plan.

Motor vehicles in Washington's metropolitan areas are a major source of emissions or air contaminants and traffic congestion on the state's roads and highways.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is a concept describing transportation strategies for reducing the number of vehicles on the roads and highways, particularly single-occupant vehicles. Examples of these strategies are car pools, van pools, employer-subsidized transit passes and parking fees at market rates.

Summary of Substitute Bill: House Bill 1671 originally contained portions of House Bill 1025, the governor's growth management proposal, which are related to transportation. These sections dealt with amendments to the Definitions, Planning Goals, and the Mandatory Elements of Comprehensive Plans sections of the Growth Management Act enacted in 1990. Substitute House Bill 1671 incorporates these sections and addresses other issues related to growth management and transportation. It includes elements related to public highway access management and incorporates House Bill 1754, related to transportation demand management (TDM), and House Bill 1816, implementing statewide transportation planning.

GROWTH STRATEGIES AND PLANNING

The goals of planning related to transportation are enhanced with greater specificity regarding coordination of facility development between jurisdictions, development of multi-modal systems, linkage of land use and transportation, protection of the environment, and system preservation.

In the transportation element of comprehensive plans, the level of service requirements is required to address mode split and vehicle occupancy goals. Identification of future transportation needs is expanded to include system management measures and facilities and management needed for regional or statewide purposes. Noise mitigation must also be addressed. The concurrency requirement for transportation facilities is modified to permit jurisdictions to reduce the level of service requirements on facilities if the level of service for non-single occupant vehicles is improved.

New communities must address transit-oriented site planning and TDM implementation. Special districts addressing capital programs, including transportation, must amend those plans to conform with comprehensive plans. Guidelines prepared by the Department of Community Development for state standards must address the integration of transportation and transit into land use planning and site planning. Citizen members are permitted on regional transportation planning organization policy boards.

The criteria for selection of rural arterial, urban arterial, and Transportation Improvement Account projects are amended and a new chapter is added to Title 47 RCW defining Department of Transportation (DOT) planning responsibilities.

The Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) and the County Road Administration Board (CRAB) will now additionally require cities and counties to evaluate projects based on (a) their ability to move people and goods, rather than vehicles; (b) their consistency with local and regional transportation and land use plans; (c) their consistency with state, regional, and local transit plans; and (d) their consistency with state, regional, and local freight plans.

The linkage between planning and construction programming is strengthened for the DOT. Although that linkage currently exists, it is not in statute and is not specifically defined. The creation of a planning chapter identifies the specific planning requirements and responsibilities of the department.

ACCESS CONTROL

The Department of Transportation (DOT) is directed to establish an access program for all state highways. Legislative findings recognize property owners' rights to reasonable access to the system but make those rights subordinate to the public right to a safe and efficient highway system. Permits are required for access to highways, except that unpermitted connections to state highways in use for one year prior to July 1, 1991, are grandfathered and existing permitted connections remain valid unless property use is changed.

By July 1, 1993, the DOT is to develop and adopt an access classification system in consultation with counties, cities and planning organizations. The rules must address local land use and zoning, transportation needs, access needs, and other considerations.

By December 31, 1992, city and county design standards committees are to develop guidelines for access regulation to city and county arterials. Cities and counties are authorized to develop access management policies which may be based on these guidelines. Projects funded through the Transportation Improvement Account, the Urban Arterial Trust Account, and the rural arterial program must be consistent with guidelines developed by the design standards committees.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM)

All public and private employers with 50 or more employees who commute during rush hour must develop a program for reducing the number of single-occupancy trips by their employees. The program applies to counties whose populations are greater than 150,000. Currently, King, Pierce, Snohomish, Clark, Spokane, Kitsap, Thurston and Yakima Counties are included. The program will be implemented in two phases: 1) major employers with 100 or more employees must reduce single-occupancy trips by 15 percent by 1994, 25 percent by 1996, and 35 percent by 1998; and 2) major employers with 50 to 99 employees must reduce single-occupancy trips by 15 percent by 1996, 25 percent by 1998, and 35 percent by 2000. Jurisdictions implementing a commute trip reduction plan may impose civil penalties.

A task force of representatives of local, state and private employers and private citizens will establish guidelines for the counties and cities to insure their consistent implementation of TDM goals. The task force may develop alternate but equivalent criteria for phase 1 and phase 2 major employers, which cannot meet the goals of this chapter

because of the unique nature of their business. The state Energy Office must create a technical assistance team to provide staff support for the task force, and to provide training, information and assistance to employers.

The Department of General Administration must coordinate with an interagency task force in developing a trip reduction plan for state facilities.

State agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, and local governments may not approve a transportation plan, program or project unless it conforms with the state implementation plan.

Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill: The original bill addressed only the Definitions and Planning Goals and Mandatory Elements of Comprehensive Plans sections of the Growth Management Act. A technical change is made in the definition of "special district." There is a more comprehensive identification of transportation goals addressing jurisdictional coordination, transportation/land use linkages, protection of the environment and preservation of the integrity of the system.

Transportation elements of comprehensive plans are amended to extend the transportation planning horizon to 20 years when practicable, add mode split and vehicle occupancy goals to system level of service standards, identify noise mitigation measures, and modify the concurrency requirement to allow for higher density development if service for non-single occupant vehicles is improved.

Access control and transportation demand management provisions are added.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

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

Testimony For: Access management provides for more effective use of public roadways. The growth management portions of the bill bring transportation planning into conformity with the goals and objectives of comprehensive planning. Transportation demand management provides a method to reduce traffic congestion and mitigate the adverse effects of auto emissions on the environment. Citizens should be allowed to serve on Regional Transportation Planning Organization Policy Boards. Transportation planning should have a longer planning horizon.

Testimony Against: None.

Witnesses: Craig Olson, Association of Washington Cities; Charlie Howard, Department of Transportation; Rick Wickman, Washington Association of Counties; Chris Leman, Transportation Alternatives Forum; Dick Goldsmith, Washington State Transit Association; and Kale Rosenberg, Washington State Association of Counties.

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION**

Majority Report: *That Second Substitute House Bill No. 1671 be substituted therefor, and the second substitute bill do pass.* Signed by 24 members: Representatives R. Fisher, Chair; R. Meyers, Vice Chair; Betrozoff, Ranking Minority Member; Basich; Brough; Cantwell; Cooper; Day; G. Fisher; Forner; Haugen; Horn; P. Johnson; R. Johnson; Jones; Kremen; Mitchell; Nelson; Orr; Prentice; Schmidt; Wilson; Wood; and Zellinsky.

Minority Report: *Without recommendation.* Signed by 2 members: Representatives Chandler, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; and Heavey.

Staff: Gene Baxstrom (786-7303).

Summary of Recommendation of Committee on Transportation Compared to Recommendation of Committee on Transportation: The second substitute bill eliminates the "Growth Strategies and Planning" elements which were in the first substitute. Only the "Access Control" and "Transportation Demand Management" elements are in the second substitute. Further, an amendment was added to the second substitute which requires the Department of Transportation to bear the expense of changes to a permitted access onto a state highway which is required for safety reasons.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Effective Date of Second Substitute Bill: The bill contains an emergency clause and takes effect July 1, 1991.

Testimony For: None.

Testimony Against: None.

Witnesses: None.