б

ESSB 5659 - H AMD 424 By Representative Ericksen

FAILED 04/18/2003

1 On page 10, after line 19, insert the following:

- 2 "Sec. 6. RCW 36.70A.280 and 1996 c 325 s 2 are each amended to 3 read as follows:
 - (1) A growth management hearings board shall hear and determine only those petitions alleging either:
 - (a) That a state agency, county, or city planning under this chapter is not in compliance with the <u>procedural</u> requirements of this chapter <u>as they relate to the adoption of comprehensive plans and development regulations</u>, chapter 90.58 RCW as it relates to the adoption of shoreline master programs or amendments thereto, or chapter 43.21C RCW as it relates to <u>the adoption of plans</u>, development regulations, or amendments((<u>, adopted</u>)) under RCW 36.70A.040 or chapter 90.58 RCW; or
 - (b) That the twenty-year growth management planning population projections adopted by the office of financial management pursuant to RCW 43.62.035 should be adjusted.
 - (2) A petition may be filed only by: (a) The state, or a county or city that plans under this chapter; (b) a person who has participated orally or in writing before the county or city regarding the matter on which a review is being requested; (c) a person who is certified by the governor within sixty days of filing the request with the board; or (d) a person qualified pursuant to RCW 34.05.530.
 - (3) For purposes of this section "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, state agency, governmental subdivision or unit thereof, or public or private organization or entity of any character.
 - (4) When considering a possible adjustment to a growth management planning population projection prepared by the office of financial management, a board shall consider the implications of any such adjustment to the population forecast for the entire state.

The rationale for any adjustment that is adopted by a board must be documented and filed with the office of financial management within ten working days after adoption.

If adjusted by a board, a county growth management planning population projection shall only be used for the planning purposes set forth in this chapter and shall be known as a "board adjusted population projection". None of these changes shall affect the official state and county population forecasts prepared by the office of financial management, which shall continue to be used for state budget and planning purposes.

- **Sec. 7.** RCW 36.70A.290 and 1997 c 429 s 12 are each amended to 12 read as follows:
 - (1) All requests for review to a growth management hearings board shall be initiated by filing a petition that includes a detailed statement of issues presented for resolution by the board. The board shall render written decisions articulating the basis for its holdings. The board shall not issue advisory opinions on issues not presented to the board in the statement of issues, as modified by any prehearing order.
 - (2) All petitions relating to whether ((or not an adopted)) the adoption of a comprehensive plan, development regulation, or permanent amendment thereto, is in compliance with the goals and requirements of this chapter or chapter 90.58 or 43.21C RCW must be filed within sixty days after publication by the legislative bodies of the county or city.
 - (a) Except as provided in (c) of this subsection, the date of publication for a city shall be the date the city publishes the ordinance, or summary of the ordinance, adopting the comprehensive plan or development regulations, or amendment thereto, as is required to be published.
 - (b) Promptly after adoption, a county shall publish a notice that it has adopted the comprehensive plan or development regulations, or amendment thereto.

Except as provided in (c) of this subsection, for purposes of this section the date of publication for a county shall be the date the county publishes the notice that it has adopted the comprehensive plan or development regulations, or amendment thereto.

(c) For local governments planning under RCW 36.70A.040, promptly after approval or disapproval of a local government's shoreline master program or amendment thereto by the department of ecology as provided in RCW 90.58.090, the local government shall publish a notice that the shoreline master program or amendment thereto has been approved or disapproved by the department of ecology. For purposes of this section, the date of publication for the adoption or amendment of a shoreline master program is the date the local government publishes notice that the shoreline master program or amendment thereto has been approved or disapproved by the department of ecology.

- (3) Unless the board dismisses the petition as frivolous or finds that the person filing the petition lacks standing, or the parties have filed an agreement to have the case heard in superior court as provided in RCW 36.70A.295, the board shall, within ten days of receipt of the petition, set a time for hearing the matter.
- (4) The board shall base its decision on the record developed by the city, county, or the state and supplemented with additional evidence if the board determines that such additional evidence would be necessary or of substantial assistance to the board in reaching its decision.
- 21 (5) The board, shall consolidate, when appropriate, all petitions 22 involving the review of the same comprehensive plan <u>adoption</u> or the 23 same development regulation or regulations <u>adoption</u>.
 - Sec. 8. RCW 36.70A.302 and 1997 c 429 s 16 are each amended to read as follows:
 - (1) A board may determine that part or all of a comprehensive plan or development regulations are invalid if the board:
- 28 (a) Makes a finding of noncompliance and issues an order of remand 29 under RCW 36.70A.300;
 - (b) Includes in the final order a determination, supported by findings of fact and conclusions of law, that the ((continued validity of part or parts of the plan or regulation would substantially interfere with the fulfillment of the goals of)) adoption of the plan or regulation was not in compliance with this chapter; and
 - (c) Specifies in the final order the particular ((part or parts of

the plan or regulation)) adoption actions that are determined to be invalid, and the reasons for their invalidity.

- (2) A determination of invalidity is prospective in effect and does not extinguish rights that vested under state or local law before receipt of the board's order by the city or county. The determination of invalidity does not apply to a completed development permit application for a project that vested under state or local law before receipt of the board's order by the county or city or to related construction permits for that project.
- (3)(a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (2) of this section and (b) of this subsection, a development permit application not vested under state or local law before receipt of the board's order by the county or city vests to the local ordinance or resolution that is determined by the board not to substantially interfere with the fulfillment of the goals of this chapter.
- (b) Even though the application is not vested under state or local law before receipt by the county or city of the board's order, a determination of invalidity does not apply to a development permit application for:
- (i) A permit for construction by any owner, lessee, or contract purchaser of a single-family residence for his or her own use or for the use of his or her family on a lot existing before receipt by the county or city of the board's order, except as otherwise specifically provided in the board's order to protect the public health and safety;
- (ii) A building permit and related construction permits for remodeling, tenant improvements, or expansion of an existing structure on a lot existing before receipt of the board's order by the county or city; and
- (iii) A boundary line adjustment or a division of land that does not increase the number of buildable lots existing before receipt of the board's order by the county or city.
- (4) If the ordinance that adopts a plan or development regulation under this chapter includes a savings clause intended to revive prior policies or regulations in the event the new plan or regulations are determined to be invalid, the board shall determine under subsection (1) of this section whether the prior policies or regulations are valid during the period of remand.

(5) A county or city subject to a determination of invalidity may adopt interim controls and other measures to be in effect until it adopts a comprehensive plan and development regulations that ((comply)) are adopted in compliance with the requirements of this chapter. A development permit application may vest under an interim control or measure ((upon determination by the board that the interim controls and other measures do not substantially interfere with the fulfillment of the goals of this chapter)).

- (6) A county or city subject to a determination of invalidity may file a motion requesting that the board clarify, modify, or rescind the order. The board shall expeditiously schedule a hearing on the motion. At the hearing on the motion, the parties may present information to the board to clarify the ((part or parts of the)) comprehensive plan or development regulations adoption actions to which the final order applies. The board shall issue any supplemental order based on the information provided at the hearing not later than thirty days after the date of the hearing.
- $(7)((\frac{1}{2}))$ If a determination of invalidity has been made and the county or city has enacted an ordinance or resolution $(\frac{1}{2})$ adopting the invalidated $(\frac{1}{2})$ plan or regulation or establishing interim controls on development affected by the order of invalidity, after a compliance hearing, the board shall modify or rescind the determination of invalidity if it determines under the standard in subsection (1) of this section that the plan $(\frac{1}{2})$ regulation, $(\frac{1}{2})$ amended or made subject to such) or interim controls $(\frac{1}{2})$ adoption complies with the requirements of this chapter.
- (((b) If the board determines that part or parts of the plan or regulation are no longer invalid as provided in this subsection, but does not find that the plan or regulation is in compliance with all of the requirements of this chapter, the board, in its order, may require periodic reports to the board on the progress the jurisdiction is making towards compliance.))
- **Sec. 9.** RCW 36.70A.320 and 1997 c 429 s 20 are each amended to read as follows:

(1) Except as provided in subsection (5) of this section, comprehensive plans and development regulations, and amendments thereto, adopted under this chapter are presumed valid upon adoption.

- (2) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (4) of this section, the burden is on the petitioner to demonstrate that any action taken by a state agency, county, or city under this chapter is not in compliance with the requirements of this chapter.
- (3) In any petition under this chapter, the board, after full consideration of the petition, shall determine whether there is compliance with the requirements of this chapter. In making its determination, the board shall consider the criteria adopted by the department under RCW 36.70A.190(4). The board shall find compliance unless it determines that the action by the state agency, county, or city is clearly erroneous in view of the entire record before the board and in light of the goals and requirements of this chapter.
- (4) A county or city subject to a determination of invalidity made under RCW 36.70A.300 or 36.70A.302 has the burden of demonstrating that the ordinance or resolution it has enacted in response to the determination of invalidity ((will no longer substantially interfere with the fulfillment of the goals of)) was adopted in compliance with this chapter under the standard in RCW 36.70A.302(1).
- 22 (5) The shoreline element of a comprehensive plan and the 23 applicable development regulations adopted by a county or city shall 24 take effect as provided in chapter 90.58 RCW.
- **Sec. 10.** RCW 90.58.190 and 1995 c 347 s 311 are each amended to read as follows:
 - (1) The appeal of the department's decision to adopt a master program or amendment pursuant to RCW 90.58.070(2) or 90.58.090(4) is governed by RCW 34.05.510 through 34.05.598.
 - (2)(((a) The department's decision to approve, reject, or modify a proposed master program or amendment adopted by a local government planning under RCW 36.70A.040 shall be appealed to the growth management hearings board with jurisdiction over the local government. The appeal shall be initiated by filing a petition as provided in RCW 36.70A.250 through 36.70A.320.

(b) If the appeal to the growth management hearings board concerns shorelines, the growth management hearings board shall review the proposed master program or amendment for compliance with the requirements of this chapter and chapter 36.70A RCW, the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines, and chapter 43.21C RCW as it relates to the adoption of master programs and amendments under chapter 90.58 RCW.

- (c) If the appeal to the growth management hearings board concerns a shoreline of statewide significance, the board shall uphold the decision by the department unless the board, by clear and convincing evidence, determines that the decision of the department is inconsistent with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines.
- (d) The appellant has the burden of proof in all appeals to the growth management hearings board under this subsection.
- (e) Any party aggrieved by a final decision of a growth management hearings board under this subsection may appeal the decision to superior court as provided in RCW 36.70A.300.
- (3))(a) The department's decision to approve, reject, or modify a proposed master program or master program amendment by a local government ((not planning under RCW 36.70A.040)) shall be appealed to the shorelines hearings board by filing a petition within thirty days of the date of the department's written notice to the local government of the department's decision to approve, reject, or modify a proposed master program or master program amendment as provided in RCW 90.58.090(2).
- (b) In an appeal relating to shorelines, the shorelines hearings board shall review the proposed master program or master program amendment and, after full consideration of the presentations of the local government and the department, shall determine the validity of the local government's master program or amendment in light of the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines.
- (c) In an appeal relating to shorelines of statewide significance, the shorelines hearings board shall uphold the decision by the department unless the board determines, by clear and convincing evidence that the decision of the department is inconsistent with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the applicable guidelines.

- (d) Review by the shorelines hearings board shall be considered an adjudicative proceeding under chapter 34.05 RCW, the Administrative Procedure Act. The aggrieved local government shall have the burden of proof in all such reviews.
- (e) Whenever possible, the review by the shorelines hearings board shall be heard within the county where the land subject to the proposed master program or master program amendment is primarily located. The department and any local government aggrieved by a final decision of the hearings board may appeal the decision to superior court as provided in chapter 34.05 RCW.
- ((4+)) (3) A master program amendment shall become effective after the approval of the department or after the decision of the shorelines hearings board to uphold the master program or master program amendment, provided that the board may remand the master program or master program adjustment to the local government or the department for modification prior to the final adoption of the master program or master program amendment."
- 18 Correct the title.

--- END ---