

1 **SHB 2676** - H AMD

2 By Representative Hatfield

3 On page 1, after the enacting clause, strike the remainder of the
4 bill and insert the following:

5 "Sec. 1. RCW 36.70A.130 and 1997 c 429 s 10 are each amended to
6 read as follows:

7 (1)(a) Each comprehensive land use plan and development
8 regulations shall be subject to continuing review and evaluation by the
9 county or city that adopted them. (~~Not later than September 1, 2002,~~
10 ~~and at least every five years thereafter,~~) A county or city shall take
11 action to review and, if needed, revise its comprehensive land use plan
12 and development regulations to ensure ((that)) the plan and regulations
13 ((are complying)) comply with the requirements of this chapter
14 according to the time periods specified in subsection (4) of this
15 section. A county or city not planning under RCW 36.70A.040 shall take
16 action to review and, if needed, revise its policies and development
17 regulations regarding critical areas and natural resource lands adopted
18 according to this chapter to ensure these policies and regulations
19 comply with the requirements of this chapter according to the time
20 periods specified in subsection (4) of this section. The review and
21 evaluation required by this subsection may be combined with the review
22 required by subsection (3) of this section.

23 (b) Any amendment of or revision to a comprehensive land use plan
24 shall conform to this chapter(~~,~~ ~~and~~). Any ((change)) amendment of or

1 revision to development regulations shall be consistent with and
2 implement the comprehensive plan.

3 (2)(a) Each county and city shall establish and broadly
4 disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying
5 procedures whereby proposed amendments or revisions of the
6 comprehensive plan are considered by the governing body of the county
7 or city no more frequently than once every year (~~except that~~).
8 Amendments may be considered more frequently than once per year under
9 the following circumstances:

10 (i) The initial adoption of a subarea plan;

11 (ii) The adoption or amendment of a shoreline master program under
12 the procedures set forth in chapter 90.58 RCW; and

13 (iii) The amendment of the capital facilities element of a
14 comprehensive plan that occurs concurrently with the adoption or
15 amendment of a county or city budget.

16 (b) Except as otherwise provided in (a) of this subsection, all
17 proposals shall be considered by the governing body concurrently so the
18 cumulative effect of the various proposals can be ascertained.
19 However, after appropriate public participation a county or city may
20 adopt amendments or revisions to its comprehensive plan that conform
21 with this chapter whenever an emergency exists or to resolve an appeal
22 of a comprehensive plan filed with a growth management hearings board
23 or with the court.

24 (3) Each county that designates urban growth areas under RCW
25 36.70A.110 shall review, at least every ten years, its designated urban
26 growth area or areas, and the densities permitted within both the
27 incorporated and unincorporated portions of each urban growth area. In
28 conjunction with this review by the county, each city located within an
29 urban growth area shall review the densities permitted within its
30 boundaries, and the extent to which the urban growth occurring within
31 the county has located within each city and the unincorporated portions
32 of the urban growth areas. The county comprehensive plan designating
33 urban growth areas, and the densities permitted in the urban growth
34 areas by the comprehensive plans of the county and each city located
35 within the urban growth areas, shall be revised to accommodate the
36 urban growth projected to occur in the county for the succeeding
37 twenty-year period. The review required by this subsection may be
38 combined with the review and evaluation required by RCW 36.70A.215.

1 (4) The department shall establish a schedule for counties and
2 cities to conduct the review and evaluation required by subsection (1)
3 of this section. The schedule established by the department shall
4 provide for the reviews and evaluations to be completed as follows:

5 (a) On or before July 1, 2004, and every ten years thereafter, for
6 Clark, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, and Thurston counties and the
7 cities within those counties;

8 (b) On or before December 1, 2004, and every ten years thereafter,
9 for Clallam, Jefferson, and Whatcom counties and the cities within
10 those counties;

11 (c) On or before December 1, 2005, and every ten years thereafter,
12 for Cowlitz, Island, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, and Skamania
13 counties and the cities within those counties;

14 (d) On or before December 1, 2006, and every ten years thereafter,
15 for Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Spokane, and Yakima
16 counties and the cities within those counties; and

17 (e) On or before December 1, 2007, and every ten years thereafter,
18 for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor,
19 Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens,
20 Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within
21 those counties.

22 (5) Nothing in this section precludes a county or city from
23 conducting the review and evaluation required by this section before
24 the time limits established in subsection (4) of this section.
25 Counties and cities may begin this process early and may be eligible
26 for grants from the department, subject to available funding, if they
27 elect to do so.

28 (6) A county or city subject to the time periods in subsection
29 (4)(a) of this section that, pursuant to an ordinance adopted by the
30 county or city establishing a schedule for periodic review of its
31 comprehensive plan and development regulations, has conducted a review
32 and evaluation of its comprehensive plan and development regulations
33 and, on or after January 1, 2001, has taken action in response to that
34 review and evaluation shall be deemed to have conducted the first
35 review required by subsection (4)(a) of this section. Subsequent
36 review and evaluation by the county or city of its comprehensive plan
37 and development regulations shall be conducted in accordance with the
38 time periods established under subsection (4)(a) of this section."

1 Correct the title accordingly.

EFFECT: Changes the next review date after the initial review to ten years for Clark, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, and Thurston counties and removes the requirement that the state treasurer withhold portions of revenues entitled to any of these six counties or their cities if the timelines for review and evaluation of comprehensive plans are not met. Also removes the requirement that best available science be used when cities or counties review their comprehensive plans, and for non-GMA jurisdictions, when updating regulations for critical areas and natural resource lands.