

# SENATE BILL REPORT

## SB 5022

---

---

As Reported By Senate Committee On:  
Land Use & Planning, February 14, 2003

**Title:** An act relating to comprehensive plan amendment procedures; and amending RCW 36.70A.130.

**Brief Description:** Authorizing Growth Management Act counties and cities to establish a procedure for consideration of comprehensive plan amendments no more frequently than once every six months.

**Sponsors:** Senators Parlette, Haugen, Zarelli, Hale, Stevens, Mulliken and T. Sheldon.

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:** Land Use & Planning: 2/6/03, 2/14/03 [DPS, DNP].

---

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON LAND USE & PLANNING

**Majority Report:** That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5022 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Mulliken, Chair; Morton and T. Sheldon.

**Minority Report:** Do not pass.

Signed by Senator Kline.

**Staff:** Tim Watterson (786-7441)

**Background:** Current statute restricts counties and cities subject to the Growth Management Act (GMA) from considering amendments to their comprehensive plans more frequently than once per year, except for initial adoption of a plan, adoption or amendment of a shoreline master program element, or amendment of a capital facility element occurring concurrently with budget adoption.

**Summary of Substitute Bill:** The governing body of a GMA county or city may by ordinance or resolution establish a procedure for consideration of amendments no more frequently than twice per calendar year.

**Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill:** The substitute bill changes the comprehensive plan amendment authorization from "no more frequently than once every six months" to "no more frequently than twice per calendar year."

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Not requested.

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

**Testimony For:** This will provide a more timely response to citizens, and a quicker response for economic development proposals. It should be "twice per year" rather than restricted to "once per year" as existing or "once every six months" as in the original bill. It provides an option for counties and cities, not a requirement.

**Testimony Against:** Existing "once per year" allows comprehensive consideration rather than piecemeal. There is better public involvement if amendment occurs once per year. There is an advantage to private interests if more frequent amendment occurs.

**Testified:** Senator Parlette, sponsor; Larry Angell, Chelan County (pro); Ron Walter, Chelan County Commissioner (pro); Kevin Hughes, Snohomish County (pro); Genesee Adkins, 1000 Friends of Washington (con).