Appendix C
Other Related Statutes & Rules

Other Related Statutes

Planning Enabling Act, Chapter 36.70 RCW
Salmon Recovery, Chapter 75.46 RCW; RCW 90.71.005, 020, and 050
Shoreline Management Act of 1971, Chapter 90.58 RCW
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C RCW
Steelhead Recovery Pilot Program, RCW 75.56.050
Watershed Planning, Chapter 90.82 RCW

Related Washington Administrative Codes

Growth Management Act:

* Procedural criteria for adopting comprehensive plans and development regulations, Chapter 365-190 WAC
* Minimum guidelines to classify agriculture, forest, mineral lands, and critical areas, Chapter 365-195 WAC
* Procedures for management of growth management planning and environmental review fund, Chapter 365-185 WAC

Growth Management Hearings Boards, Chapter 242-02 WAC
Shoreline Management Act:

* Guidelines for Development of Master Program, Chapter 173-16 WAC
* State Master Program Approval/Amendment Procedures, Chapter 173-27 WAC
* Shoreline Management Permit and Enforcement Procedures, Chapter 173-27 WAC

State Environmental Policy Act Rules, Chapter 197-11 WAC
SEPA Handbook
Department of Commerce - Growth Management Act Amendments 1995-2015

Department of Commerce
Innovation is in our nature.

Growth Management Act Amendments 1995-2015

The Growth Management Act (GMA) in Washington has been amended numerous times since its original adoption in 1990. To help local governments in evaluating whether their adopted plans and development regulations "are complying with" the GMA, Growth Management Services at the Department of Commerce has developed the following list of recent amendments. This list summarizes amendments to Chapter 36.70A RCW ("The Growth Management Act" or "GMA"), as well as other related statutory amendments, enacted by the Washington State Legislature from 1995 to 2015.

Each amendment is listed below, by citation and original bill number, according to the year of adoption, and includes a brief description and identification of the local jurisdictions affected.

***Please note**: This list has been prepared as a technical assistance tool to briefly summarize legislative changes to the GMA and to assist local governments with their update process under RCW 36.70A.130. This summary is not intended to provide a complete interpretation of all GMA amendments. Other related statutes may also help implement the GMA, and this summary is not a definitive legal guide for all planning requirements.*

Legislative Session 2015

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2015	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A.035 **SB 5238 – Concerning public water systems' public participation notice provisions.** **Brief Description:** • The list of persons and entities that public participation requirements of GMA must, through notice procedures, must also be reasonably calculated to provide notice of proposed amendments to comprehensive plans and development regulations is expanded to include Group A public water systems that are required to develop water system plans. Group A water systems either have 15 or more service connections, regularly serve 25 or more people 60 or more days per year, or serve 1,000 or more people for two or more consecutive days.	Counties, Cities
RCW 37.70A.070 **ESB 5923 – Promoting economic recovery in the construction industry** **Brief Description:** • Obligates counties, cities, and towns that collect impact fees to, by September 1, 2016, adopt and maintain a system for the deferred collection of impact fees for single-family detached and attached residential construction. • Delays the starting of the six-year frame for satisfying transportation concurrency provisions of the Growth Management Act until deferred impact fees are due. • Establishes impact fee deferral reporting requirements for the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee and the Department of Commerce. • Makes all provisions effective September 1, 2016.	Counties, cities, and towns that collect impact fees

Legislative Session 2014

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2014	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A.040, .060, .280 **EHB 1224 – Providing a process for county legislative authorities to withdraw from voluntary planning under the GMA** **Brief Description:** • Allows a county that elected to fully plan under the Growth Management Act (GMA) and that has 20,000 or fewer inhabitants to reduce the planning obligations that it and the cities within must satisfy under the GMA. • Expires the authority of a county to reduce planning obligations for it and the cities within on December 31, 2015. • Establishes that a county action to reduce the planning obligations for it and the cities within may be invalidated if the county is not in compliance with certain planning requirements of GMA at the time of the county's reduction action, and if the county does not rece3ived a determination of compliance from the Department of Commerce (Commerce). • Makes compliance determinations by Commerce subject to review by the Growth Management Hearings Board. • Specifies that a county that reduces the planning obligations for it and the cities within must satisfy requirements for natural resource lands, critical areas, the use of best available science and the requirements established in the rural element of a comprehensive plan and the associated development regulations.	Counties, Cities
RCW 36.70A.367 **HB 1360 – Extending the deadline to designate one or more Industrial land banks** **Brief Description:** • Extends the deadline for certain counties planning under the Growth Management Act and with the authority to designate industrial land banks to identify and approve locations and then adopt regulations for industrial land banks until December 31, 2016, rather than December 31, 2014.	Counties, Cities
RCW 36.70A.460 **2SHB 2251 – Fish barrier removals** **Brief Description:** • Adds three new categories of fish habitat enhancement projects to the list of projects eligible for streamlined permitting under the Department of Fish and Wildlife's hydraulic project approval process. • Directs WDFW to convene a fish passage barrier removal board, with representatives from state agencies, local and tribal governments, and other interested entities to coordinate removal projects.	Counties, Cities
RCW 84.14.007, .010, .040, .060 **2SSB 6330 – Promoting affordable housing in unincorporated areas of rural counties within urban growth areas**	Counties

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2014	Cities/Counties Affected
Brief Description: • Rural counties may offer a property tax exemption for multi-family housing projects within unincorporated urban growth areas. • The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee must assess the performance of the tax preference with reference to the intent and public policy objective. • The property tax exemption for properties located in rural counties expires on January 1, 2020.	

Legislative Session 2013

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2013	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A.340 **SHB 1883– Simplifying and updating statutes related to fuel tax administration..** **Brief Description:** Amends various statutes to reflect the consolidation of the fuel tax statutes, including a change in the reference to the RCW chapter addressing fuel tax revenues that may be withheld from a city or county by the Governor upon a notification by the Growth Management Hearings Board of continued non-compliance with the GMA by that city or county.	Counties, Cities
RCW 36.70A.070 **ESHB 1652 – Impact fee payment Governor vetoed bill in its entirety** http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2013-14/Pdf/Bills/Vetoes/House/1652-S.VTO.pdf **Brief Description:** Would have required counties and cities to provide for deferred payment of impact fees, and would have delayed the starting of the six-year time frame for satisfying concurrency provisions for the Growth Management Act until after the county or city received full payment of all deferred impact fees.	Counties, Cities

RCWs 36.70A.200, 36.70A.300, 43.17.250, 43.155.070, 70.146.070
SSB 5399– Addressing the timing of penalties under the growth management act.
 	
Brief Description:
• Establishes that, state agencies, commissions, and governing boards may not penalize jurisdictions during the period of remand following a finding of noncompliance by the Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB) and the pendency of an appeal before GMHB or subsequent judicial appeals, unless GMHB makes a determination of invalidity, IF:
  • the local government has delayed the effective date of the action subject to the petition until after GMHB issues a final determination; or,
  • within 30 days of receiving notice of a petition for review by GMHB, the local government delays or suspends the effective date of the action until after GMHB issues a final determination in order to not be penalized.
• A local jurisdiction may not be deemed ineligible or otherwise penalized, in the award of a state agency grant or loan during the pendency of the appeal before GMHB, or during any subsequent judicial appeals under certain circumstances.
	Counties; Cities; state agencies, commissions, and governing boards

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2013	Cities/Counties Affected
RCWs 35.91, 35.91.020, 43.21C, 82.02.020 **ESHB 1717– Up-front environmental planning** **Brief Description:** • Authorizes local governments to recover reasonable expenses incurred in the preparation of non-project environmental impact statements (EIS) for infill actions that are categorically exempt from requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act, and for development or redevelopment actions that qualify as planned actions. • Requires that a county, city, or town enact an ordinance, prior to the collection of fees to cover reasonable expenses incurred in the preparation of the EIS, which establishes the total amount of expenses to be recovered through fees, and provides objective standards for determining the fee amount imposed upon each development proposal; provides a procedure by which an applicant may pay the fees under protest; and makes information available about the amount of the expenses designated for recovery. • Modifies provisions governing contracting between qualifying municipalities and real estate owners for the construction or improvement of water or sewer facilities by making the contracts mandatory, at the owner's request, and by allowing municipalities to collect associated fees.	Counties, Cities
RCW 34.05 **HB 1112– Concerning standards for the use of Science to support public policy** **Brief Description:** Directs the Department of Fish and Wildlife to identify the sources of information reviewed and relied on before taking a significant agency action. The requirement applies to actions including those resulting in species recovery plans, certain types of rulemaking, and guidance to support implementation of a rule or statute.	Department of Fish and Wildlife
RCW 34.05 **HB 1113 – Concerning standards for the use of Science to support public policy** **Brief Description:** Requires the Department of Ecology to identify peer-reviewed science, scientific literature, and other sources of information being relied upon before taking significant agency actions related to certain agency programs.	Department of Ecology
RCWs 39.102, 39.102.020, 39.102.140, 39.102.150, 39.102.904, 82.14.475 **E2SHB 1306 – Extending the expiration dates of the local infrastructure financing tool program** **Brief Description:** • Extends the expiration date of the Local Infrastructure Financing Tool program from June 30, 2039, to June 30, 2044. • Requires local jurisdictions to commence construction by June 30, 2017, to impose the state shared local sales and use tax. • Removes the requirement that a sponsoring local government issue indebtedness to receive a state sales and use tax credit.	Counties, Cities
RCWs 39.102, 39.102.020, 39.102.140, 39.102.150, 39.102.904, 82.14.475 **HB 1644 – Concerning transportation planning objectives and performance measures for local and regional agencies.**	Counties, Cities, Regional Transportation Planning

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2013	Cities/Counties Affected
Brief Description: • Allows local or regional agencies to establish transportation objectives and performance measures that correspond with state transportation objectives and performance measures. • Applies the same liability protection to the local or regional agencies that is currently available to the state.	Organizations

Legislative Session 2012

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2012	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A.180 **HB 2834 – Relating to providing cost savings for local governments by reducing a limited number of reporting requirements.** **Brief Description:** Eliminates a requirement obligating jurisdictions that fully plan under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to submit reports to the Department of Commerce every five years regarding the progress by that jurisdiction in implementing the GMA is eliminated. Other county and city reporting requirements are also eliminated.	Counties, Cities
RCW 90.58.190 **EHB 2671 – Clarifying procedures for appealing department of ecology final action on a local shoreline mater program by ensuring consistency with existing procedural provisions of the growth management act, chapter 36.70A RCW, the administrative procedure act, chapter 34.50 RCW, and the state environmental policy act, chapter 43.21C RCW.** **Brief Description:** Amends certain standards and procedures relating to the review of shoreline master programs by the Growth Management Hearings Board, Shoreline Hearings Board, and Superior courts.	Counties, Cities
RCW 36.70A.030 **SB 5292 – Exempting irrigation and drainage ditches from the definition of critical areas.** **Brief Description:** Within the definition of critical areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas do not include artificial features or constructs, including irrigation delivery systems, irrigation infrastructure, irrigation canals, or drainage ditches that lie within the boundaries of and are maintained by a port district or an irrigation district or company.	Counties, Cities
RCW 36.70A, 36.70A.130 **SB 5995 – Authorizing urban growth area boundary modifications for industrial land.** **Brief Description:** A city planning under the GMA may request that a county amend the UGA within which the city is located. A city's request to the county to amend the UGA should be done as part of the county's annual comprehensive plan amendment process and must meet the county's application deadline for that year's comprehensive plan amendment process. The requests are subject to certain conditions.	Counties located east of the crest of the Cascade Mountains with a population of more than 100,000 and less than 200,000. (Benton County)
RCW 43.21C	Counties, Cities

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2012	Cities/Counties Affected
SB 6082 – Regarding the preservation and conservation of agricultural resource lands. **Brief Description:** Department of Ecology will conduct rulemaking by December 31, 2013, to review and consider whether the current environmental checklist ensures consideration of potential impacts to agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance.	planning under the GMA are to designate and protect agricultural lands of long term commercial significance.
RCW 36.70A.490, 36.70A.500 **2ESSB 6406 – Modifying programs that provide for the protection of the state's natural resources.** **Brief Description:** By December 31, 2013, DOE must update the thresholds for all other project actions, create categorical exemptions for minor code amendments that do not lessen environmental protection, and propose methods for more closely integrating SEPA with the Growth Management Act. Other changes to SEPA and local development provisions include authorizing money in the Growth Management Planning and Environmental Review Fund to be used to make loans, in addition to grants, to local governments for specified purposes; and authorizing lead agencies to identify within an environmental checklist items that are adequately covered by other legal authorities, although a lead entity may not ignore or delete a question.	Counties, Cities

Legislative Session 2011

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2011	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A, 36.70A.130, 36.70A.280 **ESHB 1886 - Implementing Recommendations of the Ruckelshaus Center process**. **Brief Description**: The Voluntary Stewardship Program is established as an alternative to protecting critical areas on lands used for agricultural activities through development regulations adopted under RCW 36.60A.060. The Program must be designed to protect and enhance critical areas on lands used for agricultural activities through voluntary actions by agricultural operators. The Washington State Conservation Commission (Commission) is charged with administering the Program. Click here to view a description of the timelines in the Program.	All counties must decide if they are going to opt-in by January 22, 2012. Does not apply to incorporated cities or towns.
RCW 36.70A.080 **ESSB 5253 - Concerning tax increment financing for landscape conservation and local infrastructure.** **Brief Description:** Provides financing tool for certain cities in King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties to invest in infrastructure in designated receiving areas for transfers of development rights (TDR). Eligible cities are cities with a population of 22,500 or more in the three counties. Consistent with the regional TDR program in Chapter 43.362, transfers must be from county sending areas to incorporated city receiving areas.	King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties, and the Cities within.
RCW 36.70A.130, 36.70A.215	Counties, Cities

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2011	Cities/Counties Affected
ESHB 1478 **Delaying or modifying certain regulatory and statutory requirements affecting cities and counties.** **Brief Description:** Extends timeframes within which local government entities must comply with requirements pertaining to reviews, revisions, and evaluations under the Growth Management Act. The comprehensive plan and development regulation/critical areas ordinance review and revision schedule of the Growth Management Act is modified to require counties and cities to take such action every eight years, rather than every seven years, and to reallocate review and revision years for some jurisdictions. An additional two years for meeting the review and requirements is granted to smaller and slow growing counties and cities. The date by which the initial review and revision requirements must be completed for the first bloc of counties and cities is June 30, 2015, rather than December 1, 2014. County reviews of designated urban growth areas must also be completed according to this schedule, and evaluation requirements for the buildable lands program must be completed by counties and cities one year before the applicable review and revision deadline. Also included are extensions for the timelines for expending and encumbering impact fees; and shoreline master programs.	
RCW 36.70A.290 **SSB 5192 - Concerning provisions for notifications and appeals timelines under the shoreline management act.** **Brief Description**: Makes numerous technical changes to effective date provisions for shoreline master programs and to notification and timing requirements governing appeals under the Shoreline Management Act.	Counties and Cities
RCW 36.70A.340 **SSB 5797 -** Eliminating the urban arterial trust account. Brief Description: Merges the Urban Arterial Trust Account into the Transportation Improvement Account.	None

Legislative Session 2010

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2010	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A.480 **EHB 1653 - Clarifying the Integration of Shoreline Management Act policies with the Growth Management Act**. **Brief Description:** Modifies provisions in the Growth Management Act (GMA) pertaining to the integration of the GMA and the Shoreline Management Act. Establishes new provisions in the GMA pertaining to the regulation and protection of critical areas that are located within shorelines of the state. Declares an	All counties and cities with shorelines.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2010	Cities/Counties Affected
emergency and establishes a July 27, 2003, application date. Clarifies that, with certain exceptions, critical area regulations adopted under the GMA apply within Shoreline areas. These regulations apply until Ecology approves either a comprehensive, new shoreline management program (SMP) that meets Ecology's guidelines, or a SMP amendment specifically related to critical areas. The new law specifies that legally existing structures and uses in shoreline areas that are within protection zones created by local critical areas ordinances (CAOs) may continue as conforming uses. The law also provides criteria about how these structures and uses may be redeveloped or modified. In addition, the bill also addresses existing and ongoing farming practices.	
RCW 36.70A **ESHB 2538 - Regarding High-Density Urban Development - Encourages certain cities that plan under the GMA to include compact development in their comprehensive plans.** **Brief Description**: Requires the development of a non-project environmental impact statement for a compact development plan included in a comprehensive plan. Provides for immunity of appeals for proposals that are covered by a non-project environmental impact statement for the compact development area. Encourages establishment of a transfer of development rights program for cities that include compact development in their comprehensive plans. Provides funding incentives to assist with the cost of developing a non-project environmental impact statement for a compact development plan.	A city with a population greater than 5,000 that is required to plan under the GMA. A city of any size required to comply with the GMA and is located on the east side of the Cascade Mountain in a county with a population of 230,00 or less may elect to adopt subarea development elements.
Referenced throughout the RCW **E2SHB 2658** **Brief Description:** The "Department of Commerce" is created to replace the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development. By November 1, 2009, the Director is to develop a report, with analysis and recommendations for the Governor and appropriate legislative committees, on statutory changes for effective operation of the department. This is to be done in collaboration with the Office of Financial Management, the Governor's Office, the Economic Development Commission, and legislators from policy and fiscal committees. Input from a broad range of stakeholders is required. The Code Reviser is directed to prepare legislation for the 2010 legislative session that changes all statutory references from the "Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development" to the "Department of Commerce."	None.
RCW 36.70C.020 **HB 2740 - Regarding the definition of Land Use Decision in the Land Use Petition Act** **Brief Description:** Amends the Land Use Petition Act (LUPA) to clarify when the 21-day time limit for the filing of judicial appeals to local land use decisions begins.	A county or city processing motions for reconsideration under LUPA.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2010	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A **SHB 2935 - Regarding Environmental and Land Use Hearings Boards** **Brief Description**: Creates the Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office by consolidating the powers, duties, and functions of the Environmental Hearings Office and the Growth Management Hearings Boards. Reduces the number of state boards that conduct administrative review of environmental and land use decisions.	None.
RCW 36.70A.110, .130, .172, .250, .260, .270, .280, .290 **SSB 6214 - Restructuring the three Growth Management Hearings Boards into one Board** **Brief Description:** Consolidates the powers, duties, and functions of the three regional Growth Management Hearings Boards into a single, seven-member Growth Management Hearings Board. Specifies that petitions for review before the consolidated board must be heard and decided by a regional panel of three board members. Specifies provisions for the adjudicative and operational functioning of the consolidated board.	None.
RCW 36.70A.200 **SB 6279 - Clarifying Regional Transit Authority Facilities as Essential Public Facilities.** **Brief Description:** Adds regional transit authority facilities to the list of essential public facilities delineated under the GMA.	A county or city planning under GMA.
RCW 36.70A.5601 **SSB 6520 - Extending time to complete recommendations under RCW 36.70A.5601 conducted by the William D. Ruckelshaus Center** **Brief Description**: Extends a provision that temporarily prohibits counties and cities from amending or adopting certain changes to critical areas ordinances (CAOs) by one additional year to July 1, 2011. Specifies that counties and cities subject to the temporary prohibition are required to review and, if necessary, revise their applicable CAOs between July 1, 2011 and December 1, 2012. Grants the William D. Ruckelshaus Center, in completing its examination of the conflicts between agricultural activities and CAOs, one additional year to conclude certain examination tasks and a final report by September 1, 2010**.**	A county or city that intends to amend or adopt a CAO affecting agricultural lands.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2010	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A.130 **SSB 6611 - Extending the deadlines for the review and evaluation of comprehensive land use plan and development regulations for three years and addressing the timing for adopting certain subarea plans.** **Brief Description**: Establishes a new recurring seven-year review and revision schedule for comprehensive plans and development regulations adopted under the GMA, which includes jurisdictions that had a December 1, 2007 deadline that qualified for and used a former three year extension. (Note: These new deadlines take effect following the existing requirement by jurisdictions to complete the review of comprehensive plans and development regulations between December 1, 2004 and December 1, 2007). Establishes and modifies requirements applicable to subarea plans in provisions of the GMA that generally prohibit comprehensive plan amendments from occurring more frequently than annually. Such subarea plans must clarify, supplement, or implement jurisdiction-wide comprehensive plan policies, and may only be adopted after appropriate environmental review under SEPA. In addition, amendment of a comprehensive plan to take place more than once per year when the amendment is for a subarea plan for economic development located outside a 100-year floodplain in a county that completed a state-funded pilot project based on watershed characterization and local habitat assessment. **Cities/Counties Affected:** On or before December 1, 2014, and every seven years thereafter, for Clallam, Clark, Jefferson, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Thurston, and Whatcom counties and the cities within those counties; On or before December 1, 2015, and every seven years thereafter, for Cowlitz, Island, Lewis, Mason, San Juan, Skagit, and Skamania counties and the cities within those counties; On or before December 1, 2016, and every seven years thereafter, for Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Kittitas, Spokane, and Yakima counties and the cities within those Counties; On or before December 1, 2017, and every seven years thereafter, for Adams, Asotin, Columbia, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grays Harbor, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, Stevens, Wahkiakum, Walla Walla, and Whitman counties and the cities within those counties. Exceptions include a three-year extension for qualifying counties with fewer than 50,000 residents, qualifying cities with fewer than 5,000 residents, and provisions for jurisdictions making substantial progress with certain regulatory requirements.	See below first column Brief Description on SSB 6611 for Cities/Counties Affected for this bill.

Legislative Session 2009

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2009	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A **2SHB 1481 - Regarding Electric Vehicles, add section or chapter** **Brief Description:** Specifies that local government regulations of areas in the I-5 corridor from Snohomish County to Thurston County and the King County areas around SR- 520, I-405, and I-90 must allow for electric vehicle infrastructure, except in residential areas, by July of 2010. Requires the state, to the extent practicable, to install charging outlets capable of charging electric vehicles in each of the state's fleet parking and maintenance facilities, as well as in all state operated highway rest stops. Specifies that the Puget Sound Regional Council must seek federal or private funding related to planning for electric vehicle infrastructure deployment.	Snohomish, King, Pierce, and Thurston Counties and their cities, if within I-5, I-405, SR520, or I-90 corridors.
RCW 36.70A **ESHB 1959 –Concerning land use and transportation planning for marine container ports, add section or chapter.** **Brief Description**: Requires cities with a qualifying marine container port in their jurisdiction to include a container port element in their comprehensive plans. Authorizes cities with a qualifying port district to include a marine industrial port element in their comprehensive plans. Requires the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development to provide matching grant funds to cities to support development of the container port elements. Declares key freight transportation corridors that serve qualifying marine port facilities to be transportation facilities and services of statewide significance.	Cities of Seattle and Tacoma.
RCW 36.70A.030 **EHB 2242 – Creating a Department of Commerce, amend section** **Brief Description:** A Department of Commerce is created to replace the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development. By November 1, 2009, the Director is to develop a report, with analysis and recommendations for the Governor and appropriate legislative committees, on statutory changes for effective operation of the department. This is to be done in collaboration with the Office of Financial Management, the Governor's Office, the Economic Development Commission, and legislators from policy and fiscal committees. Input from a broad range of stakeholders is required. The Code Reviser is directed to prepare legislation for the 2010 session that changes all statutory references from the "Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development" to the "Department of Commerce."	None.
RCW 36.70A.110 **EHB 1967 – One hundred year floodplains** **Brief Description:** Prohibiting expansions of urban growth areas into one hundred year floodplains. A county, city, or town is generally prohibited from expanding an urban growth area into the 100-year floodplain of any river or river segment that is located west of the crest of the Cascade Mountains and has a mean annual flow of 1,000 or more cubic feet per second, except under certain specified circumstances.	Counties and cities west of Cascade Crest, if expanding urban growth areas into 100-year floodplains.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2009	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A.110, .115, .210 **SHB 1825 –Identifying specific facilities planning requirements under the growth management act, amend section** **Brief Description:** Each city within a county fully planning under the Growth Management Act must identify areas sufficient to accommodate the full range of needs and uses that will accompany projected urban growth. The land uses that must be identified include facilities for medical, governmental, institutional, commercial, service, retail, and other nonresidential uses. Countywide economic development and employment policies must include consideration of the future development of commercial and industrial facilities. A county or city that chooses to amend their comprehensive plan to accommodate projected housing and employment growth must also include sufficient land capacity to accommodate commercial and industrial uses.	Cities and counties fully planning under the Growth Management Act.
EHB 1464 – Concerning affordable housing incentive programs. **Brief Description:** Clarifies provisions governing affordable housing incentive programs that may be enacted or expanded in jurisdictions planning under the Growth Management Act	Cities and counties fully planning under the Growth Management Act. (optional)

Legislative Session 2008

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2008	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A **ESSB 6580- Add section or chapter – Governor partially vetoed in 2008** **relating to mitigating the impacts of climate change through the growth management act; amending 36.70A.280; adding a new section to chapter 36.70A RCW** **Brief Description:** Requires the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) to develop and provide counties and cities with advisory climate change response methodologies, a computer modeling program, and estimates of greenhouse gas emission reductions resulting from specific measures. Establishes a local government global warming mitigation and adaptation program. Prohibits Growth Management Hearings Boards from hearing petitions alleging non-compliance with the mitigation and adaptation program. Requires CTED to provide a climate change report to the Governor and the Legislature by December 1, 2008	None.

Legislative Session 2007

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2007	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A **SHB 1135: AN ACT Relating to aquifer conservation zones in qualifying island cities without access to potable water sources outside their jurisdiction; and adding a new section to chapter 36.70A RCW.** **Brief Description:** Allows any qualifying island city to designate one or more aquifer conservation zone to conserve and	Any qualifying island city that meets specified criteria.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2007	Cities/Counties Affected
protect potable water sources. Specifies that conservation zones may not be considered critical areas except to the extent that specific areas located within zones qualify for critical area designation and have been designated as such. Allows a city declaring one or more conservation zone to consider whether an area is within a zone when determining the residential density of that area. Specifies that residential densities within conservation zones, in combination with other densities of the city, must be sufficient to accommodate projected population growth.	
RCW 36.70A **Amending RCW 76.09.240** **SHB 1409: AN ACT Relating to the transfer of jurisdiction over conversion-related forest practices to local governments.** **Brief Description:** The process for transferring authority to approve or disapprove forest practices applications is repealed. A new mechanism with new dates is established. Some counties and cities are required to adopt forest practices approval ordinances by the end of 2008, while the other counties and cities retain the discretion to not assume the responsibility for approving forest practices. The requirements on local governments vary depending on whether a county plans under the Growth Management Act (GMA), although the path for transferring jurisdiction remains constant across all counties. The trigger for determining if a county or city is required to adopt these ordinances is the number of forest practices applications that have been submitted within the county for the time period between January 1, 2003, and December 31, 2005, and whether the county plans under the GMA. For counties planning under the GMA, if more than 25 Class IV applications had been filed to the DNR between those dates for properties within a specific county, then that county, and the cities within it, are required to adopt forest practices approval ordinances. If the number is less than 25, or if the county does not plan under the GMA, then the transfer of jurisdiction for approvals is optional for the county and its cities. Counties that do plan under the GMA, and their cities, are required to adopt ordinances covering Class IV forest practices applications on the same lands that non-GMA counties may address. They must also adopt ordinances for the approval of all four class types of forest practices when those applications are submitted for land located within an urban growth area. The only land over which the GMA-planning counties and cities are not required to assume jurisdiction are ownerships of 20 contiguous acres or more. A county or city may not assume the jurisdiction for forest practices approvals without bringing their critical areas and development regulations in compliance with the current requirements and notifying both the DNR and the DOE at least 60 days before adoption of the necessary ordinances.	Counties and cities meeting qualifying criteria.
RCW 36.70A **SSB 5248: Preserving the viability of agricultural lands.** **Brief Description**: Counties and cities may not amend or adopt critical areas ordinances (CAOs) as they specifically	All cities and counties, if proposing critical areas ordinance amendments.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2007	Cities/Counties Affected
apply to agricultural activities until July 1, 2010. This does not limit obligations of a county or city to comply with requirements pertaining to critical areas not associated with agricultural activities nor limit the ability of a county or city to adopt or employ voluntary measures or programs to protect or enhance critical areas associated with agricultural activities. Counties and cities subject to deferral requirements should implement voluntary programs to enhance public resources and the viability of agriculture, and must include measures to evaluate their success. By December 1, 2011, counties and cities subject to deferral are to review and revise CAOs to comply with the requirements of this chapter. Subject to the availability of funds, the Ruckelshaus Center is directed to commence, by July 1, 2007, a two-phase examination of the conflicts between agricultural activities and CAOs. The Center is to issue two reports of its fact-finding efforts and stakeholder discussions to the Governor and the appropriate legislative committees by December 1, 2007, and December 1, 2008. A report on the second phase including findings and legislative recommendations is to be issued to the Governor and to the Legislature by September, 1, 2009. The Center is to work to achieve agreement among participating stakeholders and to develop a coalition that can be used to support agreed upon changes or new approaches to protecting critical areas during the 2010 Legislative Session.	
RCW 36.70A **SB 6014: Authorizing industrial development on reclaimed surface coal mine sites.** **Brief Description:** Certain qualified counties planning under the GMA may designate a master planned location for major industrial activity outside UGAs on lands formerly used or designated for surface coal mining and supporting uses. Counties authorized to designate major industrial development on former surface coal mining uses must have had a surface coal mining operation in excess of 3,000 acres that ceased operation after July 1, 2006, and that is located within 15 miles of the I-5 corridor. Designation of a master planned location for major industrial activities is an amendment to the comprehensive plan of the county. The master planned location must be located on land formerly used or designated for surface coal mining and supporting uses, that consist of an aggregation of land of at least 1,000 acres, and that is suitable for manufacturing, industrial, or commercial business. The master planned location must include criteria for the provision of new infrastructure and an environmental review must be done at the programmatic level. Approval of a specific major industrial activity is conducted through a local master plan process and does not require comprehensive plan amendment. The development regulations adopted must provide that the site consist of 100 or more acres of land formerly used or designated for surface coal mining; must prevent urban growth in the adjacent nonurban areas; and limit commercial development.	Lewis County
36.70A.367 **SHB 1965: Authorizing major industrial development within industrial land banks.** **Brief Description:** The requirements for designating master planned locations for major industrial developments outside Urban Growth Areas are revised. A master planned location for major industrial developments may be approved through a two-step process: designation of a land bank area in the applicable comprehensive plan; and subsequent approval of specific major industrial developments through a	Counties meeting qualifying criteria.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2007	Cities/Counties Affected
local master plan process. The applicable comprehensive plan must identify locations suited to major industrial development because of proximity to transportation or resource assets. The comprehensive plan must identify the maximum size of the land bank area and any limitations on major industrial developments based on local factors, but the plan need not specify particular parcels or identify any specific use or user. In selecting locations for the land bank area, priority must be given to locations that are adjacent or in close proximity to a UGA. The environmental review for amendment of the comprehensive plan must be at the programmatic level and, in addition to a threshold determination, must include: ➢ a county-conducted inventory of developable land indicating that land suitable to site qualifying industrial development is unavailable within the UGA; and ➢ an analysis of the availability of alternative sites within UGAs and the long-term annexation feasibility of sites outside UGAs. Final approval of a land bank area must be by amendment to the comprehensive plan, but the amendment may be considered at any time. Approval of a specific major industrial development within the land bank area requires no further amendment of the comprehensive plan. **Development Regulations Amendments** In concert with the designation of a land bank area, a county must also adopt development regulations for review and approval of specific major industrial developments through a master plan process. The regulations governing the master plan process must ensure, at a minimum, that specific criteria, including the following, are met: ➢ urban growth will not occur in adjacent nonurban areas; ➢ development is consistent with development regulations adopted for protection of critical areas; ➢ required infrastructure is identified and provided concurrent with development. Such infrastructure, however, may be phased in with development; and an open record public hearing is held before either the planning commission or hearing examiner with notice published at least 30 days before the hearing date and mailed to all property owners within one mile of the site. **Termination and Eligibility Provisions** Separate eligibility criteria pertaining to population, unemployment, and geographic requirements for counties choosing to identify and approve locations for major industrial development in land banks are specified. Termination provisions with dates certain are deleted and replaced with provisions requiring, in part, that a county choosing to identify and approve locations for land banks must take action to designate one or more of these banks and adopt regulations meeting certain requirements on or before the last date to complete the county's next periodic comprehensive plan and development regulations review that occurs before December 31, 2014. The authority of a county to designate a land bank area in its comprehensive plan expires if not acted upon within these time limitations. Once a land bank area has been identified in a county's comprehensive plan, the authority of the county to process a master plan or site projects within an approved master plan does not expire. **Public Notification and Determination Requirements** New notification and written determination requirements are specified. Counties seeking to designate an industrial land bank must: ➢ Provide countywide notice, in conformity with specific public participation and notification provisions of the GMA, of the intent to designate an industrial land bank. These notices	

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2007	Cities/Counties Affected
must be published in one or more newspapers of general circulation that are reasonably likely to reach subscribers throughout the applicable county at least 30 days before the county legislative body begins the consideration process for siting a land bank; and ➢ Make written determinations of the criteria and rationale used by the county legislative body for siting a land bank.	
36.70A.450 **SB 5952 – Family day-care providers' home facility-County or city may not prohibit in residential or commercial area** **Brief Description:** Except as provided in subsections (2) and (3) of this section, no county or city may enact, enforce, or maintain an ordinance, development regulation, zoning regulation, or official control, policy, or administrative practice that prohibits the use of a residential dwelling, located in an area zoned for residential or commercial use, as a family day-care provider's home facility.	All cities and counties.

Legislative Session 2006

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2006	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A **ESHB 2984: Authorizing cities, towns, and counties to implement affordable housing incentive programs** **Brief Description:** The amendments: Authorize jurisdictions fully planning under the GMA to enact or expand affordable housing incentive programs. Establish optional provisions for enacted or expanded the programs. Specify that excise tax imposition limits do not limit local government authorities in the implementation of programs or the enforcement of related agreements. Local governments fully planning under the GMA may enact or expand affordable housing incentive programs, providing for the development of low-income housing units. Incentive programs may include, but are not limited to, provisions pertaining to: density bonuses within the urban growth area (UGA); height and bulk bonuses; mixed-use projects; fee waivers or exemptions; parking reductions; or expedited permitting, conditioned on the provision of low-income housing units.	Counties and cities fully planning under the Growth Management A ct (optional).
RCW 36.70A.130 **ESSB 6427: Relating to schedules for comprehensive plan and development regulation review for certain cities and counties** **Brief Description:** The timelines bill has two main features. First, it provides a time extension to small and slow-growing jurisdictions for updates to their comprehensive plans, development regulations, and critical areas ordinances. The bill contains qualifying criteria and clarification that jurisdictions making progress on their updates will be eligible for state grants, loans, pledges, and financial guarantees.	Counties and cities meeting qualifying criteria.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2006	Cities/Counties Affected
Second, it clarifies that amendments to comprehensive plans necessary to enact planned actions may occur more frequently than annually, provided that pursuit of the amendments are consistent with the jurisdictions adopted public participation program and notification is given to agencies that may comment on the proposed amendments. Part of the Governor's Land Use Agenda. CTED request legislation.	
RCW 36.70A.117 **SHB 2917: Identifying Accessory Uses on Agricultural Lands** **Brief Description:** The amendments: Revise GMA requirements regarding the use of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance by creating more permissive guidelines governing the range of accessory uses permitted on such lands. Provide counties and cities with greater flexibility in implementing innovative zoning techniques related to accessory uses of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. SHB 2917 clarifies that any accessory use a city or county may allow on designated agricultural lands of long-term significance must not interfere with and must support continuation of the overall agricultural use of the property and neighboring properties. It provides policy guidepost; requiring any nonagricultural accessory use to (1) be consistent with the size, scale, and intensity of the agricultural use of the property, (2) be located within the general area already developed, and (3) not convert more than one acre of land. Part of the Governor's Land Use Agenda. Washington State Department of Agriculture request legislation. Limit to one acre the amount of agricultural land that may be converted to nonagricultural accessory uses.	Counties and cities with designated agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance.

Legislative Session 2005

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2005	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A 2SHB 1565: Addressing transportation concurrency strategies Brief Description: The amendments specify that concurrency compliance improvements or strategies may include qualifying multimodal transportation improvements or strategies. They: • Require regional transportation plans that include provisions for regional growth centers to address concurrency strategies, measurements for vehicle level of service, and total multimodal capacity. • Require the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to administer a study to examine multimodal transportation improvements or strategies to comply with the concurrency requirements of the GMA. • Require the study to be completed by one or more regional transportation planning organizations (RTPOs) electing to participate in the study. Require WSDOT, in coordination with participating RTPOs, to submit a report of findings and recommendations to the appropriate committees of the Legislature by December 31, 2006.	RTPOs
RCW 36.70A.130 **ESHB 2171: Allowing counties and cities one additional year to comply with certain requirements of RCW 36.70A.130.**	Counties and cities meeting qualifying criteria.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2005	Cities/Counties Affected
Brief Description: Counties and cities required to satisfy the review and revision requirements of the GMA by December 1, 2005, December 1, 2006, or December 1, 2007, may comply with the requirements for development regulations that protect critical areas (critical areas regulations) one year after the applicable deadline provided in the statutory schedule. Jurisdictions complying with the review and revision requirements for critical areas regulations one year after the deadline must be deemed in compliance with such requirements. Except as otherwise provided, only those counties and cities in compliance with the statutory review and revision schedule of the GMA, and those counties and cities demonstrating substantial progress towards compliance with the schedule for critical areas regulations, may receive financial assistance from the public works assistance and water quality accounts. A county or city that is fewer than 12 months out of compliance with the schedule is deemed to be making substantial progress towards compliance. Additionally, notwithstanding other provisions, only those counties and cities in compliance with the review and revision schedule of the GMA may receive preferences for financial assistance from the public works assistance and water quality accounts. Until December 1, 2005, a county or city required to satisfy the review and revision requirements of the GMA by December 1, 2004, that is demonstrating substantial progress towards compliance with applicable requirements for its comprehensive plan and development regulations may receive financial assistance from the public works assistance and water quality accounts. A county or city that is fewer than 12 months out of compliance with the GMA review and revision schedule for its comprehensive plan and development regulations is deemed to be making substantial progress towards compliance.	
RCW 36.70A, 36.70A.030, 36.70A.060, 36.70A.130 **EHB 2241: Authorizing limited recreational activities, playing fields, and supporting facilities** **Brief Description**: The amendments: • Authorize the legislative authority of counties planning under RCW 36.70A.040 and meeting specified criteria (Snohomish) to, until June 30, 2006, designate qualifying agricultural lands as recreational lands. • Establish designation criteria, including specifying that qualifying agricultural lands must have playing fields and supporting facilities existing before July 1, 2004, and must not be in use for commercial agricultural production. • Specify activities that may be allowed on designated recreational lands.	Snohomish County
RCW 36.70A.200 **ESSB 5121: Assessing long-term air transportation needs.** **Brief Description:** The amendments: Require WSDOT to conduct a statewide airport capacity and facilities assessment and report results by July 1, 2006. Require WSDOT to conduct a 25-year capacity and facilities market analysis, forecasting demands for passengers and air cargo, and report results by July 1, 2007. After completion of the reports, the Governor is to appoint a ten member Aviation Planning Council to make recommendations on future aviation and capacity needs. The council expires July 1, 2009.	None
RCW 36.70A.070	Counties and cities

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2005	Cities/Counties Affected
SSB 5186: Increasing the physical activity of the citizens of Washington State **Brief Description:** Land use elements of comprehensive plans are encouraged to consider using approaches to urban planning that promote physical activity. The Transportation Element of a comprehensive plan must contain a pedestrian and bicycle component that includes identified planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors to enhance community access and promote healthy lifestyles. Comprehensive transportation programs must include any new or enhanced bicycle or pedestrian facilities identified in the Transportation Element. The Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission is to maintain policies that increase access to free or low-cost recreational opportunities for physical activities, within allowable resources. The Health Care Authority, in coordination with other agencies, is authorized to create a work-site health promotion program for state employees to increase physical activity and engage individuals in their health care decision-making. The Health Care Authority must report on progress by December 1, 2006.	fully planning under the Growth Management Act.
RCW 35A.15 **SB 5589: Providing for proceedings for excluding agricultural land from the boundaries of a charter or non-charter code city** **Brief Description**: The amendments create a method for property owners of agricultural land located within a code city to petition for exclusion from the incorporated area of that code city that does not require the issue to be submitted to the voters for approval. Property owners of agricultural land may petition the legislative body of a code city for exclusion from the incorporated area of that city. The petition must be signed by 100 percent of the owners of the land. In addition, if non-agricultural landowner residents reside within the subject area, the petition must also be signed by a majority of those residents who are registered voters in the subject area. The petition must also set forth a legal description of the territory to be excluded and be accompanied by a drawing that outlines the boundaries of the territory sought to be excluded. After such a petition is filed, the legislative body must set a date for public hearing on the petition within 60 days. Notice of the hearing must be published in at least one newspaper of general circulation in the city as well as in three public places within the territory proposed for exclusion. Interested persons are invited to appear and voice approval or disapproval of the exclusion. If the legislative body decides to grant the petition following the hearing, they must do so by ordinance. The ordinance may exclude all or any portion of the proposed territory but may not include in the exclusion any territory not described in the petition. The petition is not submitted to the voters for approval. The GMA defines “agricultural land” as land that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production and is primarily devoted to the commercial production of horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, dairy, apiary, vegetable, or animal products; or of berries, grain, hay, straw, turf, seed, Christmas trees not subject to certain excise taxes, finfish in upland hatcheries, or livestock.	Charter or non-charter code city.
RCW 36.70A.070 **SB 6037: Changing provisions relating to limited development of rural areas** **Brief Description**:	Counties with qualifying LAMIRDs.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2005	Cities/Counties Affected
The amendments modify GMA provisions for public services and facilities in qualifying limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRDs). Until August 31, 2005, an example of a public service or facility that is permitted within recreational and tourist use LAMIRDs is a connection to an existing sewer line where the connection serves only the recreational or tourist use and is not available to adjacent non-recreational or non-tourist use parcels.	

Legislative Session 2004

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2004	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A **ESSB 6401: Protecting military installations from encroachment of incompatible land uses** **Brief Description**: Legislative findings in the amendments recognize the importance of the United States military as a vital component of the Washington State economy, and it is identified as a priority of the state to protect the land surrounding military installations from incompatible development. Comprehensive plans, development regulations, and amendments to either should not allow development in the vicinity of a military installation that is incompatible with the installation's ability to carry out its mission requirements. A consultation procedure is established whereby counties and cities must notify base commanders during the process of adopting or amending comprehensive plans or development regulations that will affect lands adjacent to the installations.	Counties and cities with land adjacent to military installations.
RCW 35.61.160 **SB 6593: Prohibiting Discrimination Against Consumers' Choices in Housing** **Brief Description:** Cities, code cities, and counties generally are required to regulate manufactured homes in the same manner as all other homes. They may require new manufactured homes to meet requirements such as the following: (1) the foundation must meet the manufacturer's design standard, (2) the placement of concrete or a concrete product between the base of the home and the ground, and (3) thermal standards must be consistent with the standards for manufactured homes.	All counties and cities.
RCW 36.70A.170 **SB 6488: Ordering a study of the designation of agricultural lands in four counties** **Brief Description:** By December 1, 2004, CTED will prepare a report on designation of agricultural resource land in King, Lewis, Chelan, and Yakima counties. The report will cover how much land is designated, how much is in production, changes in these amounts since 1990, comparison with other uses, effects on tax revenue, threats to the agriculture land base, and measures to better maintain the base and the agriculture industry.	King, Lewis, Chelan, and Yakima counties are studied.
RCW 36.70A .070 **ESHB 2905: Modifying provisions for type 1 limited areas of more intensive rural development** **Brief Description**: Any development or redevelopment within one category of existing LAMIRDs must be principally	Counties that have designated Type 1 LAMIRDs.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2004	Cities/Counties Affected
designed to serve the existing and projected rural population. Building size, scale, use, or intensity of the LAMIRD development or redevelopment must be consistent with the character of the existing areas. Development or redevelopment may include changes in use from vacant land or a previously existing use if the new development conforms to certain requirements.	
RCW 36.70A.106 **SHB 2781: Changing provisions relating to expedited state agency review of development regulations** **Brief Description**: Proposed changes to development regulations by jurisdictions that plan under the GMA can receive expedited review by CTED and be adopted immediately thereafter, if timely comments regarding GMA compliance or other matters of state interest can be provided.	All counties and cities (optional).
RCW 36.70A.110 **SSB 6367: Protecting the integrity of national historical reserves in the UGA planning process** **Brief Description**: The existing requirement that cities and counties must include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth projected for the succeeding 20-year period does not apply to those UGAs contained totally within a national historical reserve. When a UGA is contained totally within a national historical reserve, a city may restrict densities, intensities, and forms of urban growth as it determines necessary and appropriate to protect the physical, cultural, or historic integrity of the reserve	Cities that are totally within a national historic reserve.
RCW 36.70A.177 **SB 6237: Providing nonagricultural commercial and retail uses that support and sustain agricultural operations on designated agricultural lands of long-term significance** **Brief Description**: Agricultural zoning can allow accessory uses that support, promote, or sustain agricultural operations and production, including compatible commercial and retail uses that involve agriculture or agricultural products or provide supplemental farm income.	Counties. (optional)
RCW 36.70A.367 **SSB 6534: Designating processes and siting of industrial land banks** **Brief Description**: The requirements for including master planned locations within industrial land banks and for siting specific development projects are separated so that designation of master planned locations may occur during the comprehensive planning process before a specific development project has been proposed. Some of the current criteria for designating a master planned location within an industrial land bank may be delayed until the process for siting specific development projects within a land bank occurs. Designating master planned locations within an industrial land bank is considered an adopted amendment to a comprehensive plan, and approval of a specific development project does not require any further amendment to a comprehensive plan.	Counties meeting qualifying criteria.
RCW 36.70B.080 **HB 2811: Modifying local government permit processing provisions**	Buildable Lands Counties: Clark,

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2004	Cities/Counties Affected
Brief Description: Existing requirements for timely and predictable procedures for processing permit applications by local governments are clarified. For the buildable lands jurisdictions, performance-reporting requirements are reinstated and changed to an annual basis. A report on the projected costs of this reporting with recommendations for state funding must be provided to the Governor and the Legislature by January 1, 2005.	King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Thurston and their cities with population > 20,000.
RCW 36.70 **SB 6476: Designating manufactured housing communities as nonconforming uses** **Brief Description**: Elimination of existing manufactured housing communities on the basis of their status as a nonconforming use is prohibited.	Cities and counties.
SSCR 8418: **Creating a joint select legislative task force to evaluate permitting processes** **Brief Description:** A joint select legislative task force is established to make recommendations regarding permitting processes by January 1, 2006, after evaluating local development regulations of selected jurisdictions among the "buildable lands" counties and their cities over 50,000. The task force is composed of the chairs and ranking minority members of the Senate Committee on Land Use and Planning and the House Local Government Committee. The Governor will be invited to participate and form a Five Corners Task Force. An advisory committee is also established to assist the task force and is composed of CTED, the Department of Ecology, the Office of Regulatory Assistance, a county, a city, the business community, the environmental community, agriculture, labor, the property rights community, the construction industry, ports, and federally recognized Indian tribes.	None.

Legislative Session 2003

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2003	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A **SSB 5602: Concerning the accommodation of housing and employment growth under local comprehensive plans** **Brief Description:** Counties and cities subject to the GMA are required to ensure that, taken collectively, actions to adopt or amend their comprehensive plans or development regulations provide sufficient capacity of land suitable for development within their jurisdictions. The requirement for sufficient capacity refers to accommodating a jurisdiction's allocated housing and employment growth as adopted in the applicable county-wide planning policies and consistent with the 20-year population forecast from the Office of Financial Management.	Counties and cities fully planning under the Growth Management Act.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2003	Cities/Counties Affected
RCW 36.70A.070 **SSB 5786: Clarifying the scope of industrial uses allowed in rural areas under the GMA** **Brief Description:** Industrial uses are permitted under the GMA in both industrial and mixed-use areas in certain types of LAMIRDs. Industrial uses within specified LAMIRDs are not required to be principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population in order to be lawfully zoned	Counties with qualifying LAMIRDs.
RCW 36.70A.110 **S HB 1755: Creating alternative means for annexation of unincorporated islands of territory** **Brief Description**: The amendments create an alternative method of annexation allowing jurisdictions subject to the buildable lands review and evaluation program of the GMA to enter into interlocal agreements to annex qualifying territory meeting specific contiguity requirements. It creates an alternative method of annexation allowing GMA buildable lands counties to enter into interlocal agreements with multiple municipalities to conduct annexation elections for qualifying territory contiguous to more than one city or town.	Snohomish, King, Pierce, Kitsap, Thurston, and Clark Counties and their cities.
RCW 36.70A.280 **SB 5507: Clarifying who has standing regarding growth management hearings board hearings** **Brief Description**: The requirement under the GMA for participation standing before a growth management hearings board is that a petitioner must have participated orally or in writing before the local government. An additional requirement to obtain participation standing is added and provides that only issues "reasonably relate" to issues that the aggrieved person previously raised at the local level can be considered by the board	Counties and cities fully planning under the Growth Management Act.
RCW 36.70A.367 **SB 5651: Authorizing land banks in certain counties with low population densities** **Brief Description:** The industrial land bank program under the GMA is amended to provide that counties meeting certain geographic requirements are eligible for the program based on population density criteria, rather than unemployment criteria. The amendments clarify that Jefferson and Clallam counties are eligible for the program under this provision.	Counties meeting qualifying criteria.
RCW 36.70A.450 **HB 1170: Limiting restrictions on residential day-care facilities** **Brief Description**: A county cannot zone against or otherwise prohibit the use of a residential dwelling as a family day-care facility in a residential or commercial zone. The county can require the family day-care facility to comply with safety and licensing regulations and zoning conditions that are imposed on other dwellings in the same zone.	Counties, cities and towns.
RCW 36.70A.480 **ESHB 1933: Integrating Shoreline Management Act and Growth Management Act provisions** **Brief Description:** The goals of the GMA, including the goals and policies of the Shoreline Management Act (SMA), continue to be listed without priority. Shorelines of statewide significance may include critical areas	Counties and cities subject to the Shoreline Management Act.

RCW, Bill Number, Brief Description for Legislative Session 2003	Cities/Counties Affected
as designated by the GMA, but shorelines of statewide significance are not critical areas simply because they are shorelines of statewide significance. Within shoreline jurisdiction, the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) will protect critical areas and regulations will be reviewed for compliance with the SMA. However, SMP regulations must provide a level of protection of critical areas at least equal to that provided by the county or city's adopted or thereafter amended critical areas ordinances.	
RCW 90.58.080 **SSB 6012: Establishing limits on the adoption of state shoreline guidance and setting a schedule for local adoption** **Brief Description:** The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) may adopt amendments to the shorelines guidelines no more than once per year and the amendments must be related to technical, procedural, or compliance issues. A staggered statutory schedule for the update of shoreline master programs, running from 2005 to 2014 and every seven years after the initial deadline, is established. Limits on grants from Ecology to local governments for master program reviews are removed and new requirements for the receipt of such grants are created	None.

Legislative Session 2002

RCW 36.70A.011: Findings – Rural lands
The amendment adds a new section containing legislative finds to support the amendment to the Rural Element requirements in RCW 36.70A.070.

RCW 36.70A.020: Planning goals
The amendments change the economic development goal to add the underlined words: Encourage economic development throughout the state that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, promote the retention and expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new businesses, recognize regional differences impacting economic development opportunities, and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the state's natural resources, public services, and public facilities.

The open space goal is amended to read as follows: Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks and recreation facilities.

RCW 36.70A.070: Comprehensive plans – Mandatory elements
The amendments:
Change the requirements for the Rural Element of comprehensive plans to (1) authorize limited expansion of small-scale businesses in the rural area, and (2) authorize new businesses in the rural area to use sites previously occupied by rural businesses.
Change the Housing Element to require the inventory of housing needs to include the number of housing units necessary to manage projected population growth.
Change the Capital Facilities Element to require the inclusion of parks and recreation facilities.
Require comprehensive plans to include an Economic Development Element and a Parks and Recreation Facilities Element if money to implement these requirements is appropriated by the Legislature.

RCW 36.70A.103: State agencies required to comply with comprehensive plans
The law is amended to cross-reference new provisions for siting secure community transition facilities for sex offenders.

RCW 36.70A.130: Comprehensive plans – Review amendments

The amendments change the deadlines for reviewing and updating comprehensive plans and development regulations adopted under the GMA and clarify the requirements relating to the reviews and updates.

RCW 36.70A.200: Siting of essential public facilities – Limitation on liability
The amendments clarify that the deadline for adopting a process for siting secure community transition facilities for sex offenders must be adopted by September 1, 2002, even though deadlines for GMA reviews and updates were changed in amendments to RCW 36.70A.130. It exempts noncompliance with the September 1, 2002, deadline from challenge before the growth management hearings boards and from economic sanctions under the GMA's enforcement provisions.

RCW 36.70A.367: Major industrial developments – Master planned locations
The amendment establishes a pilot program authorizing the designation of industrial land banks outside urban growth areas if specified requirements are satisfied.

Legislative Session 2001

RCW 36.70A.103: State agencies required to comply with comprehensive plans
The amendment authorizes the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) to site and operate a Special Commitment Center and a secure community transition facility to house persons conditionally released to a less restrictive alternative on McNeil Island. The state's authority to site an essential public facility under RCW 36.70A.200, in conformance with comprehensive plans and development regulations, is not affected, and with the exception of these two facilities, state agencies must comply with those plans and regulations.

RCW 36.70A.200: Siting of essential public facilities
The amendments add secure community transition facilities, as defined in RCW 71.09.020, to the list of essential public facilities typically difficult to site. Each city and county planning under RCW 36.70A.040 is required to establish a process, or amend its existing process, for identifying and siting essential public facilities, and to adopt and amend its development regulations as necessary to provide for the siting of secure community transition facilities. Local governments are required to complete this no later than the deadline set in RCW 36.70A.130. Any city or county not planning under RCW 36.70A.040 is required to establish a process for siting secure community transition facilities and amend or adopt development regulations necessary to provide the siting of these facilities.

RCW 36.70A.367: Major industrial developments – Master planned locations
The amendment extends the deadline for counties eligible to use the industrial land bank authority. Currently, Grant County and Lewis County satisfy all three criteria. Until December 2002 eligible counties may establish a process for designating a bank of no more than two master planned locations for major industrial activity outside a UGA. Eligible counties must meet statutory criteria initially specified for the authority terminating on December 1999.

Legislative Session 2000

RCW 36.70A.520: National historic towns
The amendment allows counties planning under RCW 36.70A.040 to authorize and designate national historic towns that may constitute urban growth outside UGAs, if specified conditions are satisfied. A GMA county may allocate a portion of its 20-year population projection to the national historic town to correspond to the projected number of permanent town residents.

RCW 36.70A.040: Who must plan – Summary of requirements – Development regulations must implement comprehensive plans
The amendment adds language stating that for the purposes of being required to conform to the requirements of the GMA, no county is required to include in its population count those persons confined in a correctional facility under the jurisdiction of the state Department of Corrections that is located in the county.

Legislative Session 1999

RCW 36.70A.035: Public participation – Notice provisions

The amendment adds school districts to list of entities and affected individuals to be provided with notice of comprehensive plan and development regulation amendment.

Legislative Session 1998

RCW 36.70A.040: Who must plan – Summary of requirements – Development regulations must implement comprehensive plans
The amendment adds the requirement for cities or counties to amend the Transportation Element to be in compliance with Chapter 47.80 RCW no later than December 31, 2000.

RCW 36.70A.060: Natural resource lands and critical areas – Development regulations
The requirement for notice on plats and permits issued for development activities near designated resource lands is expanded to activities within 500 feet, instead of 300 feet, of the resource lands. The notice for mineral lands is required to include information that an application might be made for mining-relating activities. Land Use Study Commission recommendation

RCW 36.70A.070: Comprehensive plans – Mandatory elements
The amendment requires cities or counties to include level of service standards for state highways in local comprehensive plans in order to monitor the performance of the system, to evaluate improvement strategies, and to facilitate coordination between the county's or city's six-year street, road, or transit program and WSDOT six-year investment program. Inventories of transportation are required to include state-owned transportation facilities.

RCW 36.70A.131: Mineral resource lands – Review of related designations and development regulations
A county or city is required to take into consideration new information available since the adoption of its designations and development regulations, including new or modified model development regulations for mineral resource lands prepared by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, CTED, or the Washington Association of Counties.

RCW 36.70A.200: Siting of essential public facilities
State or regional facilities and services of statewide significance as defined in Chapter 47.06 RCW are added to the list of essential public facilities under the GMA. Included in the definition, among others, are high speed rail, inter-city high speed ground transportation, and the Columbia/Snake navigable river system.

RCW 36.70A.210 County-wide planning policies
Transportation facilities of state-wide significance are added to the minimums that county-wide planning policies are to address.

RCW 36.70A.360: Master planned resorts
Master planned resorts are expressly authorized to use capital facilities, utilities, and services (including sewer, water, stormwater, security, fire suppression, and emergency medical) from outside service providers. Any capital facilities, utilities, and services provided on-site are limited to those meeting the needs of master planned resorts. Master planned resorts are required to bear the full costs related to service extensions and capacity increases directly attributable to the resorts.

RCW 36.70A.367: Major industrial developments
Additional counties (Lewis, Grant, and Clallam) are authorized to establish industrial land banks for two master planned locations by December 31, 1999. Sunset dates are extended for Clark and Whatcom counties to December 31, 1999.

RCW 36.70A.395: Environmental planning pilot projects
Technical corrections are made to eliminate references concerning reports to the Legislature that are no longer necessary or have expired.

RCW 36.70A.460: Watershed restoration projects – Permit processing – Fish habitat enhancement project
A fish habitat enhancement project meeting the criteria of this law is not subject to local government permits, inspections, or fees. Such projects, when approved and a hydraulic permit has been issued, are not required to complete a substantial

development permit under the SMA. Fish habitat enhancement projects that meet the criteria of this act are considered to be consistent with local shoreline master programs.

Legislative Session 1997

RCW 36.70A.030: Definitions
The definition of urban growth is amended to expand the listed incompatible primary uses of land to include the following: rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. Additionally, the following is added: A pattern of more intense rural development, as provided in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d), is not urban growth.

The following terms "rural character," "rural development," and "rural governmental services" are defined.

The following: or "urban services" is added to the definition of "urban governmental services." (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.035: Public participation – Notice provisions
Requirements for GMA counties and cities to adopt procedures for notifying property owners and other affected or interested parties of proposed amendments to comprehensive plans and development regulations are added. The procedures generally follow the notice requirements currently in the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). (ESB 6094 amendments)

The requirement is added that a county or city considering an amendment to a comprehensive plan or a development regulation needs to allow for public comment on the proposed change before adoption. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.070: Comprehensive plans – Mandatory elements
Provisions that are to apply to the Rural Element are specified. (ESB 6094 amendments.)

RCW 36.70A.110: Comprehensive plans – Urban growth areas
"Urban growth areas" is deleted from subsection (2) and the following is added: "and each city within the county" so it now reads: based on OFM projections, "…the county and each city within the county shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected…" (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.130: Comprehensive plans – Review – Amendments
Language related to the 2002 review requirement is added to the GMA: No later than September 1, 2002, and at least every five years thereafter, a county or city shall take action to review and, if needed, revise its comprehensive land use plan and development regulations to ensure that the plan and regulations are complying with the requirements of this chapter. The review and evaluation required by this subsection may be combined with the review required by subsection (3) of this section. (ESB 6094 amendments)

An amendment to the Capital Facilities Element of the comprehensive plan is allowed if it occurs concurrent with the adoption or amendment of a county or city budget.

RCW 36.70A.165: Property designated as greenbelt or open space – Not subject to adverse possession
Adverse possession is prohibited on property designated as open space to a public agency or homeowner's association. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.177: Agricultural lands – Innovative zoning techniques
The amendment allows a variety of innovative zoning techniques in designated agriculture lands of long-term commercial significance. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.215: Review and evaluation program
The Buildable Lands Program is created. Six Western Washington counties and the cities located within their boundaries are to establish a monitoring and evaluation program to determine if the actual growth and development is consistent with what

was planned for in the county-wide planning policies and comprehensive plans. Measures, other than expanding UGAs, must be taken to correct any inconsistencies. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.270: Growth management hearings boards – Conduct, procedure, and compensation
It amends the boards' procedures for distribution of rules and decisions to follow the Administrative Procedures Act, Chapter 34.05 RCW, specifically including the provisions of RCW 34.05.455 governing ex parte communications. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.290: Petitions to the growth management hearings boards – Evidence
The board is to render written decisions articulating the basis for its holdings. The board is not to issue advisory opinions on issues not presented to the board in the statement of issues, as modified by any prehearing order. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.295: Direct judicial review
The superior court is allowed to directly review a petition for review if all parties to a case before a board agreed to direct review in the superior court. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.300: Growth management hearings boards – Final orders
The boards may extend the time for issuing a decision beyond the 180-day period to allow settlement negotiations to proceed if the parties agree to the extension. The boards may: (1) allow up to 90-day extensions that may be renewed; (2) establish a compliance schedule that goes beyond 180 days for a plan or development regulation that does not comply with the GMA if the complexity of the case justifies it; and (3) require periodic updates on progress towards compliance as part of the compliance order. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.302: Determination of invalidity – Vesting of development permits – Interim controls
A clarification is made on which permits invalidity orders apply to. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.320: Presumption of validity – Burden of proof – Plans and regulations
The burden is shifted to the petitioner to demonstrate that any action by a respondent is not in compliance with the requirements of the GMA. The board is required to 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 the GMA. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.3201: Intent – Finding
Local comprehensive plans and development regulations require counties and cities to balance priorities and consider local circumstances. The ultimate responsibility for planning and implementing a county's or city's future rests with that community. The boards are to apply a more deferential standard of review to actions of counties and cities than the previous "preponderance of the evidence" standard. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.330: Noncompliance
The board is enabled to modify a compliance order and allow additional time for compliance in the appropriate circumstances. The board is directed to take into account a county's or city's progress toward compliance in making its decision as to whether to recommend the imposition of sanctions by the Governor. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.335: Order of invalidity issued before July 27, 1997
A county or city subject to an order of invalidity issued prior to the effective date of the act may request the board to review its order in light of the changes to the invalidity provisions. If requested, the board is required to rescind or modify an order to make it consistent with the act's changes. (ESB 6094 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.362: Master planned resorts – Existing resort may be included
Counties planning under the GMA may include some existing resorts as master planned resorts under a GMA provision that allows counties to permit master planned resorts as urban growth outside of UGAs. An existing resort is defined as a resort that was in existence on July 1, 1990, and developed as a significantly self-contained and integrated development that includes various types of accommodations and facilities.

RCW 36.70A.367: Major industrial developments – Master planned locations
Whatcom County is authorized, in consultation with its cities, to establish a process for designating land to be in an industrial land bank, according to certain conditions.

RCW 36.70A.500: Growth management planning and environmental review fund – Awarding of grants – Procedures
CTED is directed to encourage participation in the Planning and Environmental Review Fund (PERF) by other public agencies through the provision of grant funds. CTED is required to develop the grant criteria, monitor the grant program, and select grant recipients in consultation with state agencies participating in the grant program. Grants from PERF are to be provided for proposals designed to improve the project review process and which encourage the use of GMA plans to meet the requirements of other state programs. (ESB 6094 amendments)

Legislative Session 1996

RCW 36.70A.070: Comprehensive plans – Mandatory elements
General aviation airports are added to subsection (6)(i) relating to required subelements of a Transportation Element as defined by this section.

RCW 36.70A.270: Growth management hearings boards – Conduct, procedure, and compensation
The boards are required to publish their decisions and arrange for reasonable distribution of them. The Administrative Procedures Act (APA) is to be used for the boards' procedures, unless it
conflicts with RCW 36.70A. The APA also is to be used to determine whether a board member or hearing examiner will be disqualified.

RCW 36.70A.280: Matters subject to board review
A clarification is made on who may file petitions with the boards (i.e., standing).

RCW 36.70A.305: Expedited review
Courts are to expedite reviews on invalidity determinations made by the boards. Hearings on the issues are to be scheduled within 60 days of the date set for submitting the board's record.

RCW 36.70A.367: Major industrial developments – Master planned locations
The GMA is amended to allow a pilot project to designate an urban industrial bank outside UGAs. A county is allowed to establish the pilot project if it has a population of more than 250,000 and if it is part of a metropolitan area that includes a city in another state with a population of more than 250,000 (Clark County). The urban industrial land banks are to consist of no more than two master planned locations. Priority is to be given to locations that are adjacent to or in close proximity to a UGA. The same criteria are to be met that are required under the existing major industrial development process in the GMA, except that specific businesses to locate on the site(s) need not be identified ahead of the designation. The pilot project terminates on December 31, 1998.

RCW 36.70A.510: General aviation airports
General aviation airports are added to the list of items that all local governments must include in the land use elements of their comprehensive plans. General aviation airports include all airports in the state (i.e., public use facilities).

Legislative Session 1995

RCW 36.70A.030: Definitions
A definition of "wetlands" is added to the Shoreline Management Act that is identical to the definition under the GMA. Excluded from the wetlands definitions under both acts are wetlands created after July 1, 1990, that were unintentionally created as the result of road construction.

RCW 36.70A.040: Who must plan – Summary of requirements – Development regulations must implement comprehensive plans
The percentage of population increase required to trigger planning under the GMA is changed from 10 percent to 17 percent for a ten-year period for counties with a population of 50,000 or more.

RCW 36.70A.070: Comprehensive Plans – Mandatory elements
The following underlined text is added in subsection (5): The Rural Element shall permit appropriate land uses that are compatible with the rural character of such lands and provide for a variety of rural densities and uses and may also provide for clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements, and other innovative techniques that will accommodate rural uses not characterized by urban growth.

The word "recognizing" is changed to "ensuring" for what the Housing Element must do as noted in the act so it now reads: "…ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods." "Mandatory provisions" and "single-family residences" are added to the following: "…include a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences.

RCW 36.70A.110: Comprehensive Plans – Urban growth areas
Counties are allowed to designate UGAs outside of cities. A UGA determination may include a reasonable land market supply factor and is to permit a range of urban densities. The term "in general" was added to the GMA statement that indicates urban services are to be provided by cities.

RCW 36.70A.130: Comprehensive plans – Review
Cities and counties are to broadly disseminate to the public, a public participation program.

The provision is added that amendments may be considered more than once a year under the following circumstances: (1) emergency compliance with a growth management hearings board order, (2) the initial adoption of a subarea plan, and (3) the adoption or amendment of a Shoreline Master Program according to chapter 90.58 RCW.

The requirement of public participation is added to the emergency amendment process already permitted by the GMA and the resolution of a growth management hearings board or court order as an amendment permitted outside of the comprehensive plan amendment cycle. (ESHB 1724 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.140: Comprehensive Plans – Ensure public participation
The requirement of a public participation program that identifies procedures is added. Local governments must also provide public participation that is effective when responding to a board order of invalidity. (ESHB 1724 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.172: Critical areas – Designation and protection – Best available science to be used
The state's goals and policies for protecting critical areas functions and values are clarified. Local governments are required to include the "best available science" in developing policies and development regulations to protect the functions and values of critical areas as defined in the GMA and must give special consideration to preserving or enhancing anadromous fisheries.

RCW 36.70A.175: Wetlands to be delineated in accordance with manual
Ecology is directed to adopt by a rule a manual for the delineation of wetlands regulated under the SMA and GMA. The manual is based on the 1987 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency manual as amended through January 1, 1995.

RCW 36.70A.280: Matters subject to board review
Shoreline master programs or amendments adopted under Chapter 90.58 RCW are added as subjects for growth management hearings board review. (ESHB 1724 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.290: Petitions to growth management hearings boards – Evidence
The publication date for a Shoreline Master Program or amendment is established to be the date when the Shoreline Master Program or amendment is approved or disapproved by Ecology.

RCW 36.70A.300: Growth management hearings boards – Final orders
The Shoreline Master Program and amendments are added to final order procedures.

A finding of noncompliance is not to affect the validity of comprehensive plans or development regulations. The parameters of an invalidity determination by the boards, including vesting issues, are established.

RCW 36.70A.320: Presumption of validity
The Shoreline Element of a comprehensive plan and applicable development regulations adopted by a city or county are governed by Chapter 90.58 RCW and are not presumed valid upon adoption in the same manner as comprehensive plan and development regulations in general. (ESHB 1724 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.330: Noncompliance
Invalidity text is added. The board is allowed to reconsider its final order and decide: (a) if a determination of invalidity has been made, whether to rescind or modify its determination as provided by RCW 36.70A.300(2), or (b) if no invalidity determination has been made, whether to issue a determination as provided by RCW 36.70A.300(2).

Language is added that a person with standing may participate in a hearing of compliance or noncompliance. (ESHB 1724 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.365: Major industrial developments
Counties planning under the GMA are allowed to establish, in consultation with cities, a process for authorizing the siting of major industrial developments outside UGAs. Such a development may be approved if certain criteria are met.

RCW 36.70A.385: Environmental planning pilot projects
References for the "Department of Community Development" to changed to "department."

RCW 36.70A.450: Family day-care provider's home facility – City may not prohibit in residential or commercial area
The agency responsible for certifying that a family day-care provider's facility provides a safe passenger loading area is changed from the Washington State Department of Licensing to the Office of Child Care Policy of DSHS.

RCW 36.70A.460: Watershed restoration projects – Permit processing – Fish habitat enhancement project
The Washington Conservation Commission is directed to develop a single application process by which all permits for watershed restoration projects may be obtained by a sponsoring agency for its project, to be completed by January 1, 1996. Each agency is required to name an office or official as a designated recipient of project applications and inform the commission of the designation. All agencies of state and local government are required to accept the single application developed by the commission.

RCW 36.70A.470: Project review – Amendment suggestion procedure – Definitions - GMA integrated project and environmental review is to be conducted under the newly created provisions of Chapter 36.70B RCW.

RCW 36.70A.480: Shorelines of the state
Under the GMA, (1) the goals and policies of the SMA become one of the goals of the GMA under RCW 36.70A.020, and (2) the goals and policies of a Shoreline Master Program for a county or city are required to become an element of the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan. All other portions of the Shoreline Master Program including regulations are required to become part of the county's or city's development regulations. Additionally, shoreline master programs are to continue to be amended or adopted under the procedures of the SMA (Chapter 90.58 RCW).

RCW 36.70A.481: Construction
Nothing in RCW 36.70A.480 (shorelines of the state) is to be construed to authorize a county or city to adopt regulations applicable to shorelands as defined in RCW 90.58.030 that are inconsistent with the provisions of Chapter 90.58 RCW. (ESHB 1724 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.490: Growth Management Planning and Environmental Review Fund – Established
Moneys in the fund are required to be used to make grants to local governments for the purposes set forth in RCW 43.21C.031. (ESHB 1724 amendments)

RCW 36.70A.500: Growth Management Planning and Environmental Review Fund – Awarding of grants – Procedures

Procedures are established for dispersing funds. (ESHB 1724 amendments)

Chapter 36.70B RCW: Regulatory reform - Regulatory reform amendments are made to streamline permitting procedures in the state. (ESHB 1724 amendments)