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Committee formed in 2007 after leg committee debrief
- Need for deliberative process for introducing legislative

Researched other orgs, APA chapter legislative efforts

Process adopted in 2008, streamlined in 2010

Summary of Criteria

- **Content of Proposal**
  - Good planning, consistent with chapter goals, public interest, cost/benefit, local vs. statewide perspective

- **Feasibility of Running and Passing the Proposal**
  - Complexity, expertise, find partners and sponsors, timeliness, history of idea, legislative composition

- **Perception from Running the Bill**
  - APA role, partners reaction, collateral impacts
Summary of Timeline/Steps

- Solicit & Discuss Proposals (summer)
  - Solicit members ideas, Exec Committee review and recommendation, determination by Board

- Draft Bill (fall)
  - Form working group, coalition building, iterative process with Board, finalize, find sponsor & prefile

- Legislative Session
  - Lobbyist role, chapter officers testifying, working with partners, informal decision-making
Experience to Date

- **2007:** Climate Change Element (fails)
  - Outcome: seat at State climate change committee table

- **2008:**
  - Electronic Access to Comp Plans – denied
  - Freeze Ordinary “High Water” mark – denied
  - Create State GMA Plan – accepted
    - Evolves to white paper *Towards a State Smart Growth Strategy*
    - Outcome: HB 1967 Prohibs UGA Expansions in 100-yr flood zones

- **2009:**
  - Amend GMA 20 Year Land Supply Requirement – denied
  - SEPA Public Hearing Timing Technical Fix – denied
  - Subarea Plan Scope and Timing – approved (passes)
    - Outcome: Concept added to extension of GMA deadlines
  - Banning Fully Contained Communities – approved (fails)
    - Outcome: Legislative request
### Spring 2010 Review: ‘08-09 Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Floodplains ✓</th>
<th>Subarea Plans ✓</th>
<th>FCCs ✗</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor, but more than merely technical</td>
<td>Significant impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear public interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>No cost to locals</td>
<td>No cost to locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cost to locals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional flexibility</td>
<td>Long-term benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Western WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor, but more than merely technical</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant impact</td>
<td>Western WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cost to locals</td>
<td></td>
<td>No cost to locals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in APA and partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full expertise</td>
<td>Expertise in APA and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex and political</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not complex</td>
<td>Not complex, but political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortly after major floods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not tied to specific events or proposals</td>
<td>MPPs recent adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tied to specific events or proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snohomish FCC proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPs recent adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish FCC proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental coalition partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning specific activity</td>
<td>Major proposal – very political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA nexus</td>
<td></td>
<td>APA direct role</td>
<td>APA nexus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA nexus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA nexus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Proposals were beneficial and had nexus
- Process not overly impactful on chapter resources
- Process (and successes) created opportunities
2010 Proposals

- Planned Action EIS Funding – **approved**
  - Amends 82.02.020 to allow imposing fee
  - Strengthens successful tool by removing barrier

- Require AICP Planner on Hearings Board – **denied**
  - Good concept, not timely
  - Consolidation of Boards; Concept not picked up last year

- Ban New Fully Contained Communities – **approved**
  - HB 2412 remains alive – greater central PS region
  - Look for alternatives that address stakeholder concerns

- Many other requests from non-members
  - Six well exemption, hearings examiner incentive, others
Thank you.

For more information:
Webpage: washington-apa.org/programs/legcommittee/process/
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Overview

- Chapter’s legislative work program, including bill proposals for 2011 session – Ivan Miller
- GMA and plans for 2011 session from Washington State Department of Commerce – Leonard Bauer
Overview

- Chapter’s Smart Growth Strategy – 2010 success and challenges for 2011 – Joe Tovar
- Update from Olympia – Rep. Sharon Nelson (D) 34th District
- Input from audience and questions for panel
APA Washington’s Legislative Priorities

- Smart Growth Strategy
- Six principles to guide a smart growth strategy
- Ten recommendations for legislative action

Six Principles to Guide a Smart Growth Strategy

- Build on strong public support for environmental protection
- Create statutory clarity
- Promote efficient governance
- Focus state investments
- Promote housing affordability
- Provide resources for planning
Ten Recommendations for Legislative Action

■ **Amend RCW 36.70A.020 (10)** to recognize the role that compact urban development and multi-modal transportation can play in reducing greenhouse gas emissions

■ **Amend RCW 36.70A.070 (6)** to include multimodal transportation strategies in concurrency statutes; include transit-oriented development as a concurrency strategy
Ten Recommendations for Legislative Action

- Amend 47.80 to require that reductions in vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions be addressed regionally.
- Amend RCW 36.70A.480 and RCW 90.58 to eliminate the gap in the protection of shorelines of the state.
Ten Recommendations for Legislative Action (cont’d)

- Amend RCW 36.70A.190 to create "safe harbors" for local governments by making GMA-related WAC rules mandatory
- Amend RCW 36.70A.110 to prohibit the expansion of urban growth areas into floodplains
Ten Recommendations for Legislative Action (cont’d)

■ Amend RCW 36.70A.3201 to restore a balance between local decision making and compelling state interests

■ Amend RCW 36.70A.040 and .280 to require Special Purpose Districts to plan under the GMA
Ten Recommendations for Legislative Action (cont’d)

- Amend RCW 36.70A.103 and .280 to make state agencies subject to the GMA as part of a statewide smart growth strategy

- Provide new local revenue and financing options for cities and counties to support growth and natural resource preservation
Questions/Resources

- APA WA website: www.washington-apa.org
- Legislature website: www1.leg.wa.gov/legislature