

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 6228

AS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, FEBRUARY 4, 1994

Brief Description: Revising provisions relating to definitions of agricultural and forest land of long-term commercial significance.

SPONSORS: Senators Haugen, Anderson, Owen, Hargrove, Sellar, Oke, McAuliffe and M. Rasmussen

SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 6228 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Owen, Chairman; Hargrove, Vice Chairman; Amondson, Franklin, Oke, Sellar, L. Smith and Snyder.

Staff: Vic Moon (786-7469)

Hearing Dates: January 26, 1994; February 4, 1994

BACKGROUND:

The Growth Management Act defined lands of long-term commercial significance. Definitions of those lands have caused problems in the continued operation of forest management on commercial forest lands covered by the act.

SUMMARY:

The analysis is the definition of forest lands under the Growth Management Act means land currently devoted to commercial timber production. Long-term commercial significance is defined to apply to land that has the growing capacity, productivity, soil and economic viability for long-term commercial production.

Language relating to the designation under the Growth Management Act requires the use of the new definitions provided by this statute.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE:

The legislative intent provides that long term protection be given to lands which grow timber. Clarification of definitions will not require all counties covered by the Growth Management Act to redo their plans.

Forest land is defined to mean lands devoted to growing commercial timber. "Long-term commercial significance" means land that has growing capacity, productivity, soil composition and economic viability for long-term production

based on the land's nearness to population areas, surrounding uses and parcel sizes.

Appropriation: none

Revenue: none

Fiscal Note: requested January 17, 1994

TESTIMONY FOR:

Several counties have not interpreted the forest land requirements of the Growth Management Act correctly. The law needs to be clarified.

TESTIMONY AGAINST (original bill):

The counties would have to redo all their plans under this proposal.

TESTIFIED: Paul Parker, WA State Association of Counties (con); Jeff Parsons, National Audubon Society (con); Jennifer Belcher, Commissioner of Public Lands; Lucy Steers, 1000 Friends of Washington (con); Ralph Mackey, WEC (con); Pat Harper (pro); Tim Boyd, WFPA (pro); Noel Higa, Higa Engineering (pro); Keith Dearborn, Bogle & Gates (pro); Peter Overton, WFFA (pro)