

# SENATE BILL REPORT

## SB 5661

---

---

As Reported By Senate Committee On:  
Natural Resources, Parks & Shorelines, March 5, 2001

**Title:** An act relating to planning for recreational facilities.

**Brief Description:** Requiring growth management planning for recreational facilities.

**Sponsors:** Senators Finkbeiner and McDonald.

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:** Natural Resources, Parks & Shorelines: 2/26/01, 3/5/01 [DPS, DNP].

---

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, PARKS & SHORELINES

**Majority Report:** That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5661 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Jacobsen, Chair; Spanel, Vice Chair; Hargrove, Oke and Snyder.

**Minority Report:** Do not pass.

Signed by Senators Constantine and Morton.

**Staff:** David Johnson (786-7754)

**Background:** Under the Growth Management Act, a comprehensive plan by counties, and by cities that choose to create a plan, must include each of the following: (1) a land use element, (2) a housing element, (3) a capital facilities plan element, (4) a utilities element, (5) counties must adopt a rural element, and (6) a transportation element. The land use element is to address the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, aviation, utilities, public facilities and, other land uses.

**Summary of Substitute Bill:** Instead of being a part of the land use element of a comprehensive plan, recreation is added to the six elements of a comprehensive plan. The recreation element must show a comprehensive system of areas and public sites for passive and active recreation, parks, trails, beaches, playgrounds, sports fields, and other recreational areas. Both current locations and proposed developments must be shown.

**Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill:** The substitute bill removed the provision which required recreational uses to be allowed regardless of zoning designations. The substitute revised the examples of recreation sites.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

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

**Testimony For:** There is a tremendous need for more recreation planning and fields. There has been a lack of planning for recreation and open space. It is difficult to see land being used for turf farms instead of athletic fields. The farmland preservation bonds bought this land to keep open space, not for turf farms. There are not enough places for outdoor sports activities. The popularity of soccer is growing faster than the general population, especially as more girls begin to play. Land should be available for both humans and animals to use.

**Testimony Against:** Recreation planning is fine as part of the mix now and does not need to be its own element. This bill changes the rules for farmers after the fact. Many farmers could have sold their land for more if it were not agriculture land at the time of sale. Once agriculture land is converted to another use, it is lost forever; it won't go back to agriculture. Recreation should not be allowed to trump other zoning. Recreation and agriculture are both important and one should not have precedence over the other. Farms provide bird and wildlife habitat. We should have soccer fields, but not at the expense of shrinking agriculture.

**Testified:** PRO: Dave Shipway, North Shore Youth Soccer; Stew Konzen, Lake Washington Youth Soccer; Gene Peterson, WALAX, Washington LaCrosse; Will Knedlic; Tony Screws, Washington State Youth Soccer; CON: Mike Ryherd, American Planning Association, Washington Chapter; Steve Stuart, 1000 Friends of Washington; Ron Shultz, Audubon; Kristen Sawin, AWB; Linda Johnson, Washington Farm Bureau; Judy Taylor, Upper Green Valley; Marguerite Sutherland, PLAN; Rita Bailie, Rainier Audubon; Bob Tidball, Berry Farm; Michael Tanksley, Hollywood Hill Association; Caleb Kiedlik (neutral).