

HOUSE BILL REPORT

SHB 1921

As Passed House:

March 14, 1995

Title: An act relating to existing general aviation airport land use encroachment planning.

Brief Description: Providing for existing general aviation airport land use encroachment planning.

Sponsors: By House Committee on Transportation (originally sponsored by Representatives Benton, Elliot, Chopp, Thompson, Carlson, D. Schmidt, Ogden and Mason).

Brief History:

Committee Activity:

Transportation: 3/1/95, 3/3/95 [DPS].

Floor Activity:

Passed House: 3/14/95, 60-37.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Majority Report: The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 21 members: Representatives K. Schmidt, Chairman; Benton, Vice Chairman; Mitchell, Vice Chairman; Skinner, Vice Chairman; R. Fisher, Ranking Minority Member; Hatfield, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Backlund; Blanton; Buck; Cairnes; Chopp; Elliot; Hankins; Johnson; Koster; Ogden; Patterson; Romero; D. Schmidt; Scott and Tokuda.

Minority Report: Do not pass. Signed by 4 members: Representatives Horn; McMahan; Quall and Robertson.

Staff: Brian McMorrow (786-7304).

Background: Counties and cities planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) must develop comprehensive plans that include a transportation element and a land use element. GMA requires that the transportation and land use elements be consistent with each other, but it does not require planners to protect general aviation airports from incompatible land uses.

Summary of Bill: If a county has a publicly or privately-owned general aviation airport that operates for the benefit of the public, it must adopt a comprehensive airport land use plan. The plan must protect the airport from incompatible land uses, and it must be incorporated into the local comprehensive land use plan. Counties must then submit the document to the Department of Transportation (DOT) for review.

The county may develop a plan by one of three methods. (1) It may create an airport land use commission, consisting of seven members who represent cities, counties, the aviation community and the public; (2) it may use an existing governmental entity; or (3) it may contract with the DOT.

Counties do not have to develop a comprehensive airport land use plan if one of the following two conditions applies: (1) if a county has only one general aviation airport owned by a city or town, and it incorporates in its local comprehensive plan federal criteria relating to airport safety; or (2) if a county adopts a resolution finding that there are no noise, public safety or land use problems affecting the general aviation airport in the county, and the county transmits a copy of the resolution to the DOT.

The DOT may require any county with a general aviation airport that has not established a commission to establish one if it finds that the county has not fulfilled the requirements of the act.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Requested on February 27, 1995.

Effective Date of Bill: The bill contains an emergency clause and takes effect immediately.

Testimony For: Many of the state's publicly and privately-owned general aviation airports are being threatened from encroachment by incompatible land uses.

Testimony Against: This is an unfunded mandate, and local governments can already perform these tasks under GMA.

Testified: Bill Brubaker, Department of Transportation Aviation Division (pro); Ted Wirch, Washington Pilots Association (pro); Dale DeTour, Clark County Airport owner and Airport Management Association (pro); Larry Gillett, Northwest Antique Airplane Club (pro); Gary Getch, North South Airport Association (pro); Stan Finkelstein, Association of Washington Cities (con); Curt Eschels, Washington State Association of Counties (con); Tim Brooks, Kenmore Air Harbor (pro); Susie Tracy, Washington Airport Management Association (pro, with amendment); and Mark Triplett, self (pro, with amendment).