

Land Use & Climate Change Advisory Committee
Meeting Highlights

October 17, 2008, 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Red Lion Hotel, 18220 International Boulevard, SeaTac, WA

Attendance

Committee Members:

Glenn Amster	Industrial & Office Properties
Josh Brown	Kitsap County
Mike Doherty	Clallam County
Linda Evans Parlette	State Senate
Jake Fey	City of Tacoma
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver
Bill LaBorde	Transportation Choices Coalition
Chris Marr	State Senate
Rich Munson	City of Spokane Valley
Sharon Nelson	State House of Representatives
Julie Nichols*	Building Industry Association of Washington
Merrill Ott	Stevens County
Keith Phillips	Governor's Office
April Putney**	Futurewise
Paul Roberts	City of Everett
Karen Rogers	City of Port Angeles
Bill Riley	Washington Realtors
Joe Tovar	American Planning Association (WA)
Taylor Washburn	Association of Washington Business
Josh Weiss	Washington Forest Protection Association
Daryl Williams	Tribal Representative

**Alternate for Andy Cook, Building Industry Association of Washington*

***Alternate for Roberta Lewandowski, Futurewise*

Absent:

Rod Brown	Washington Environmental Council
Andy Cook	Building Industry Association of Washington (Alternate present)
Kate Diamond	Association of Architects
Doug Ericksen	State House of Representatives
Roberta Lewandowski	Futurewise (Alternate present)
Dan Wood	Farm Bureau

Support:

Leonard Bauer	WA Department of Community Trade and Economic Development
Karen Larkin	WA Department of Community Trade and Economic Development
Joyce Phillips	WA Department of Community Trade and Economic Development

Rob Greenwood
Roma Call

Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd.
Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd.

Call to Order/Opening Remarks

Rob Greenwood invited members and visitors to introduce themselves. He reviewed the agenda and provided an overview of the meeting objectives.

Public Comments

John Worthington, a citizen working in the freight management field, provided a comment to the Committee regarding developing high speed Levx systems to link city centers, profit centers, and affordable parking, in order to avoid the conditions that will cause loss of revenue. His complete comment statement is attached to this summary.

Schedule and Final Report to Legislature

- Joyce Phillips, CTED, provided an update on the schedule for completing the LUCC report to the governor and legislature. She thanked the members who volunteered to assist with the analysis. The report will contain the elements required in ESSB 6580 as follows:
 - Descriptions of actions counties and cities are taking to address climate change issues;
 - Recommendations of changes, if any, to chapter 36.70A RCW and other relevant statutes that would enable state and local governments to address climate change issues and the need to reduce dependence upon foreign oil through land use and transportation planning processes;
 - Descriptions of existing and potential computer modeling and other analytic and assessment tools that could be used by counties and cities in addressing their proprietary and regulatory activities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or dependence upon foreign oil;
 - Consideration of positive and negative impacts to affordable housing, employment, transportation costs, and economic development that result from addressing the impacts of climate change at the local level;
 - Assessments of state and local resources, financial and otherwise, needed to fully implement recommendations resulting from the recommendations and tools needed.

Revised Policy Recommendations

- The group discussed the revised policy recommendation statements as provided to members on October 10th based on comments received by email and the September meeting discussion. Members had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and to provide their perspectives in preparation for final voting.
- Members discussed the appropriateness of including new text concerning protection from appeals in the policy recommendations. Since the new text was provided as a separate statement option for voting, the group agreed to proceed with the statements as written.
- A member suggested that the infrastructure funding recommendations should include the impacts of compact development to local law enforcement, emergency services, and the criminal and juvenile justice system. Others stated that if these local services were called out

in the recommendation, then other needs of local jurisdictions should be listed as well. The group decided not to include specific local services in the text.

- The group discussed the difference between requiring that local governments consider multimodal improvements or strategies versus encouraging that they consider them. Separate statements were developed to reflect these voting options. Members also discussed the need to include other regional and transportation entities in addition to state agencies for providing guidance on multimodal transportation in concurrency analysis. Changes were made to clarify the intent of this recommendation statement (Policy Recommendation 4A).
- A member commented that reducing “dependence on foreign oil” would be difficult to measure and therefore should not be included in the recommendation statements (even as this text was drawn directly from the LUCC’s enabling legislation – ESSB 6580). The group did not have time to reach consensus on this issue and instead decided to vote formally. The majority of voting members voted against taking out the text regarding “dependence on foreign oil” (see voting results attached).
- The group made additional minor edits to the statements in preparation for final voting.

Funding Recommendations

- Members discussed the funding recommendation statements as provided to members on October 10th. The statements were compiled from the Homework Assignment #3 responses and September meeting discussion. Members had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions on these statements and to provide their perspectives in preparation for final voting.
- A member asked legislative members to comment on the status of funding options for the next legislative session. Legislative members commented that prioritizing the funding recommendations according to those that represent the most critical needs would benefit legislators as they review the final report. The most accessible funding options are those already in existence, as well as those that create additional flexible tools for cities and counties. A legislative member suggested that stronger policy recommendations would better enable funding requests, as they would show a commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- A member suggested that the report include recognition of the national financial crisis and its effect on the state’s budget. CTED staff developed a draft statement (over the lunch break) for LUCC review. Members suggested changes to the statement, and a revised version was sent to the group for comment by email on 10/22/08. No comments on the statement were received (as of 11/05/08).
- A member suggested, and another seconded, that the report should include a comment that members are mindful and concerned about the loss of the corporate base in the state.
- A member suggested that Funding Recommendation 8 include a statement regarding state funds for transit (Funding Recommendation 8F) and the group supported this request.
- The group made additional minor edits to the statements in preparation for final voting.
- The group asked the representatives of the cities and counties to meet during the break to discuss funding priorities and report back to the full group for final voting. During the break, city and county representatives developed three priority areas for funding, and selected specific funding recommendation statements related to each of the areas as follows.

- Priority Area 1: No Backsliding on current funding to support GMA planning and implementation. Includes Funding Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 (assumes sufficient funding of infrastructure to meet local government obligations).
- Priority Area 2: Provide more flexible use of existing funding sources to support accommodating growth and density in urban areas. Includes Funding Recommendations 5 and 7.
- Priority Area 3: Provide opportunities for new funds to support local efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. (Intent is a shared state and local responsibility). Includes Funding Recommendations 4F, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8F, and 9A.

Formal Vote on All Recommendations

- A member proposed that the committee vote on policy recommendations first and funding recommendations second. The group held a procedural vote to determine the order of recommendations for final voting. Seven members voted yes to a vote on policy recommendations first, and 3 members voted no. Therefore, the group proceeded with voting on policy recommendations first, followed by a vote on funding recommendations.
- Members requested that the group vote on policy recommendations 6A and 6B along with the funding recommendations, since these recommendations are related to infrastructure funding. There were no objections to making this change for voting purposes.
- The group held a final vote on the policy and funding recommendations put forward. A report on the final recommendation statements and results of the final voting is attached.
- A member requested that the report include the results of the voting and the concepts discussed during voting. The intent is to ensure the Governor and Legislature are made aware of the range of perspectives held by LUCC members. All LUCC members supported this request.
- This was the final meeting of the LUCC Advisory Committee. Leonard Bauer, CTED, thanked everyone for participating in the process.

Land Use & Climate Change Advisory Committee
**Final Vote on Policy and Funding
 Recommendations**

The Land Use and Climate Change Advisory Committee made final revisions to its policy and funding recommendation statements at the October 17, 2008 meeting, and held a final vote on those statements. The final recommendation statements and results of the final vote are provided below. Note that Senator Evans Parlette made proxy votes for Representative Ericksen, who was absent. CTED will present the recommendations in its report to the governor and legislature, due by December 1st, 2008.

Policy Recommendation Statements and Results of Final Vote

Reduce Dependence on Foreign Oil Text

Members voted on a proposal to remove any text concerning goals to “reduce dependence on foreign oil”, since this outcome would be difficult to measure. The majority of voting members voted against taking out this text in the recommendation statements.

Voting Members		Take out “reduce dependence on foreign oil” text
Sharon	Nelson	N
Doug	Ericksen	Y
Linda	Evans Parlette	Y
Chris	Marr	N
Josh	Brown	N
Merrill	Ott	Y
Mike	Doherty	N
Jake	Fey	N
Paul	Roberts	N
Rich	Munson	Y
Karen	Rogers	Y
Jeanne	Harris	N
Daryl	Williams	N
Final Vote		8 No / 5 Yes

Growth Management Act Goal

Policy Recommendation 1A: (recommendations 1 and 2 below are identical with the exception of one additional sentence in 2, which is underlined.)

- **1: Amend the Environment Goal in the Growth Management Act (GMA) to include reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.** The LUCC recommends amending the environment goal to the GMA so local governments will consider greenhouse gas emissions and foreign oil dependence reduction strategies as part of their comprehensive planning under the GMA.

- 2: Amend the Environment Goal in the Growth Management Act (GMA) to include reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.** The LUCC recommends amending the environment goal to the GMA so local governments will consider greenhouse gas emissions and foreign oil dependence reduction strategies as part of their comprehensive planning under the GMA. Nothing in this amended goal authorizes a Growth Management Hearings Board or superior court to hear petitions alleging noncompliance with this new section of this act for a period of five years.

Policy Recommendation 1b: (recommendations 1 and 2 below are identical with the exception of one additional sentence in 2, which is underlined.)

- 1: Establish a new Growth Management Act (GMA) goal related to green house gas emission and dependence on foreign oil reduction.** The LUCC recommends addition of a new goal to the GMA so local governments will consider greenhouse gas emissions and foreign oil dependence reduction strategies as part of their comprehensive planning under the GMA.
- 2: Establish a new Growth Management Act (GMA) goal related to green house gas emission and dependence on foreign oil reduction.** The LUCC recommends addition of a new goal to the GMA so local governments will consider greenhouse gas emissions and foreign oil dependence reduction strategies as part of their comprehensive planning under the GMA. Nothing in this goal authorizes a Growth Management Hearings Board or superior court to hear petitions alleging noncompliance with this new section of this act for a period of five years.

Policy Recommendation 1c:

In the absence of a new goal in the GMA, there may be a need to amend existing GMA goals other than the environment goal.

Growth Management Act Goal

Voting Members		1A – 1	1A – 2	1B – 1	1B – 2	1C
Sharon	Nelson	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Doug	Ericksen	N	N	N	N	N
Linda	Evans Parlette	N	N	N	N	N
Chris	Marr	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Josh	Brown	N	N	Y	N	Y
Merrill	Ott	N	N	N	N	N
Mike	Doherty	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Jake	Fey	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y	N	N	N	N
Rich	Munson	Y	N	N	N	N
Karen	Rogers	Y	N	N	N	N
Jeanne	Harris	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Final Vote		9 Yes / 4 No	13 No	7 Yes / 6 No	13 No	7 Yes / 6 No

Local Government Coordination

Policy Recommendation 2A:

Amend the Countywide Planning Policy provisions of the Growth Management Act (GMA) to include climate change issues. The LUCC recommends amending RCW 36.70A.210(3) to include climate change, so that local governments fully planning under the Growth Management Act must amend their county-wide planning policies to include provisions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and dependence on foreign oil.

Policy Recommendation 2B: (recommendations 1 and 2 below are identical with the exception of one additional sentence in 2, which is underlined.)

- **1: Amend RCW 36.70A.100 (*Comprehensive Plans – Must be Coordinated*) to require that comprehensive plans of jurisdictions fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) are consistent with regional transportation plans.** The LUCC recommends that jurisdictions fully planning under the GMA be required to ensure their comprehensive plans are consistent with the regional transportation plans required under RCW 47.80.030 for the region within which they are located.
- **2: Amend RCW 36.70A.100 (*Comprehensive Plans – Must be Coordinated*) to require that comprehensive plans of jurisdictions fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) are consistent with regional transportation plans.** The LUCC recommends that jurisdictions fully planning under the GMA be required to ensure their comprehensive plans are consistent with the regional transportation plans required under RCW 47.80.030 for the region within which they are located. Nothing in these amended coordination requirements authorizes a Growth Management Hearings Board or superior court to hear petitions alleging noncompliance with this new section of this act for a period of five years.

NOTE that RCW 47.80.023 requires RTPOs to prepare regional transportation plans that are consistent with Countywide Planning Policies, local comprehensive plans, and the state transportation plan.

Local Government Coordination

Voting Members		2A	2B – 1	2B – 2
Sharon	Nelson	Y	Y	N
Doug	Ericksen	N	N	N
Linda	Evans Parlette	N	N	N
Chris	Marr	Y	Y	N
Josh	Brown	Y	N	N
Merrill	Ott	N	N	N
Mike	Doherty	Y	Y	N
Jake	Fey	Y	Y	N
Paul	Roberts	N	Y	N
Rich	Munson	N	N	N
Karen	Rogers	N	N	N
Jeanne	Harris	Y	Y	N
Daryl	Williams	Y	Y	N
Final Vote		7 Yes / 6 No	7 Yes / 6 No	13 No

State Environmental Policy Act

Policy Recommendation 3:

Encourage greater local government use of SEPA in a programmatic, non-project level manner that results in streamlining project-specific compact development in urban growth areas or urban centers.

Policy Recommendation 3A - B:

Fund the Planning Environmental Review Fund (PERF) to increase local government use of environmental review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) in an upfront, programmatic manner. Develop and enable local governments to use funding alternatives for upfront SEPA reviews, including creation of benefit districts and methods of cost distribution and cost recovery.

Policy Recommendation 3C:

Amend statutes to improve use of programmatic SEPA review, such as thorough non-project Environmental Impact Statements and adoption of subsequent development regulations or through Planned Actions, to allow for more sustainable development and streamlined permitting and remove need for project level review and appeal.

Policy Recommendation 3D:

Modify PERF criteria to encourage locating more compact and sustainable development in urban growth areas.

State Environmental Policy Act

Voting Members		3	3A-B	3C	3D
Sharon	Nelson	Y	Y	Y	Y
Doug	Ericksen	Y	Y	Y	Y
Linda	Evans Parlette	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chris	Marr	Y	Y	Y	Y
Josh	Brown	Y	Y	Y	Y
Merrill	Ott	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mike	Doherty	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jake	Fey	Y	Y	Y	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rich	Munson	Y	Y	Y	Y
Karen	Rogers	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jeanne	Harris	Y	Y	Y	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y	Y	Y	Y
Final Vote		13 Yes	13 Yes	13 Yes	13 Yes

Transportation Planning

Policy Recommendation 4:

Better enable GMA Transportation Concurrency to address all modes of transportation. The LUCC recommends encouraging and assisting local governments to develop multi-modal transportation concurrency methods.

Policy Recommendation 4A:

Direct state agencies, in conjunction with other regional and local transportation entities, to provide technical, non-binding guidance on multimodal transportation systems and how multimodal considerations can be included in and addressed during concurrency analysis at the local level.

Policy Recommendation 4B: (recommendations 1 and 2 below are identical with the exception of a one-word change, as highlighted, between them.)

- **1a: Amend the Growth Management Act (GMA) to require local governments to provide level of service (LOS) standards for all available or planned modes of transportation and to require local governments to consider multimodal improvements or strategies in their transportation concurrency regulations.** The LUCC recommends the Growth Management Act (GMA) be amended at RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) to require **consideration** of a multimodal approach as part of establishing levels of service standards and at RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) to require **consideration** of multimodal improvements or strategies as part of a local government’s concurrency analysis.
- **1b: Amend the Growth Management Act (GMA) to encourage local governments to provide level of service (LOS) standards for all available or planned modes of transportation and to encourage local governments to consider multimodal improvements or strategies in their transportation concurrency regulations.** The LUCC recommends the Growth Management Act (GMA) be amended at RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) to encourage **consideration** of a multimodal approach, as applicable, as part of establishing levels of service standards and at RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) to encourage **consideration** of multimodal improvements or strategies as part of a local government’s concurrency analysis.
- **2: Amend the Growth Management Act (GMA) to require local governments to provide level of service (LOS) standards for all available or planned modes of transportation and to require local governments to consider multimodal improvements or strategies in their transportation concurrency regulations.** The LUCC recommends the Growth Management Act (GMA) be amended at RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) to require **use** of a multimodal approach as part of establishing levels of service standards and at RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) to require consideration of multimodal improvements or strategies as part of a local government’s concurrency analysis.

Transportation Planning

Voting Members		4	4A	4B-1a	4B-1b	4B-2
Sharon	Nelson	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Doug	Ericksen	N	Y	N	N	N
Linda	Evans Parlette	Y	Y	N	N	N
Chris	Marr	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Josh	Brown	Y	Y	Y	N	N

Merrill	Ott	Y	Y	N	N	N
Mike	Doherty	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Jake	Fey	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Rich	Munson	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Karen	Rogers	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Jeanne	Harris	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Final Vote		12 Yes / 1 No	13 Yes	9 Yes / 4 No	13 No	7 No / 6 Yes

Developer Incentives

Policy Recommendation 5A:

Require state agencies to provide technical assistance to local governments that voluntarily choose to use various developer incentives to encourage compact development. The LUCC recommends state agencies provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions regarding the availability of and ways to achieve the increased use of various developer incentives that are currently allowed under existing state law and which could play an important role in achieving sustainable compact development and the state’s vehicle miles traveled reduction and greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets in urban growth areas or urban centers. The technical assistance could provide an array of potential developer incentives that could be offered by a local government, as well as an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each type of incentive. The guidance could identify model language and examples of jurisdictions that have or are using the incentive.

Policy Recommendation 5B:

Encourage the use of financing tools, such as tax incentives, for use by local governments to encourage compact development in urban centers or other targeted areas within urban growth areas. The LUCC recommends the legislature consider statutory amendments as needed that would provide financing tools to encourage compact development in urban growth areas or urban centers.

Developer Incentives

Voting Members		5A	5B
Sharon	Nelson	Y	Y
Doug	Ericksen	Y	Y
Linda	Evans Parlette	Y	Y
Chris	Marr	Y	Y
Josh	Brown	Y	Y
Merrill	Ott	Y	Y
Mike	Doherty	Y	Y
Jake	Fey	Y	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y	Y
Rich	Munson	Y	Y
Karen	Rogers	Y	Y
Jeanne	Harris	Y	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y	Y
Final Vote		13 Yes	13 Yes

Infrastructure Funding**Policy Recommendation 6A:**

Support the prioritization of existing infrastructure funds to areas promoting development and transportation choices that support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and dependence on foreign oil. The LUCC recommends that the Office of Financial Management, as part of its efforts to establish state infrastructure funding priorities, include consideration of prioritizing infrastructure funds to communities promoting sustainable development and transportation choices that support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and dependence on foreign oil. In this context, the LUCC believes it will be critical to maintain a baseline of infrastructure funding for all communities to ensure their basic services can meet required service levels, as well as ensure such priorities do not establish an inappropriate bias of funds moving to urban versus rural areas. Infrastructure funds for consideration should include those supporting transportation, sewer, drainage, drinking water, and telecommunications infrastructure.

Policy Recommendation 6B:

Support the prioritization of new infrastructure funds to areas promoting development and transportation choices that support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and dependence on foreign oil. The LUCC recommends authorization of new infrastructure funds for urban centers or urban growth areas to create or support mixed-use, transit-oriented, affordable infill projects that result in compact and sustainable development. If properly structured, these new funds should be in the form of loans which will be paid back into the Fund over time as the intended compact development becomes a reality.

Infrastructure Funding

Voting Members		6A	6B
Sharon	Nelson	Y	Y
Doug	Ericksen	N	N
Linda	Evans Parlette	N	N
Chris	Marr	Y	Y
Josh	Brown	N	Y
Merrill	Ott	N	Y
Mike	Doherty	Y	Y
Jake	Fey	Y	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y	Y
Rich	Munson	Y	Y
Karen	Rogers	Y	Y
Jeanne	Harris	Y	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y	Y
Final Vote		9 Yes / 4 No	11 Yes / 2 No

Transfer of Development Rights**Policy Recommendation 7:**

Support development of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program. The LUCC supports TDR as a potentially strong tool in encouraging compact development in urban centers (or other targeted areas within urban growth areas) while conserving agricultural and forestry resource lands and rural working natural resource lands. The LUCC recognizes the efforts of the TDR Committee to develop a

regional TDR program, and encourages the Committee to support an expansion of TDR program use within the state. In this context, the LUCC believes it is important to ensure funding is available to enable all interested communities to participate in such programs and that these programs provide for voluntary participation by local governments, additional funding be provided, there be appropriate market manipulation constraints in place, and to strike an effective balance between competing policy goals.

Transfer of Development Rights

Voting Members		7
Sharon	Nelson	Y
Doug	Ericksen	N
Linda	Evans Parlette	Y
Chris	Marr	Y
Josh	Brown	Y
Merrill	Ott	Y
Mike	Doherty	Y
Jake	Fey	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y
Rich	Munson	N
Karen	Rogers	Y
Jeanne	Harris	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y
Final Vote		11 Yes / 2 No

Funding Recommendation Statements and Results of Final Vote

Members prioritized the funding recommendations into three key areas. Priority Area 1 is related to Funding Recommendations 1, 2, and 3. Priority Area 2 is related to Funding Recommendations 5 and 7, and Priority Area 3 to Funding Recommendations 4F, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8F, and 9A. The statements and voting results of these recommendations are provided below. The LUCC also voted on Funding Recommendation 4C, but did not categorize 4C under any of the three priority areas.

Priority Area 1

- < No Backsliding on current funding to support GMA planning and implementation.
- < Includes Funding Recommendations 1, 2, 3.

Funding Recommendation 1: The LUCC recommends that additional financial and technical assistance resources must accompany any new responsibilities, obligations, or liabilities under GMA or other related statutes. Cities and counties will need additional resources to meet both the planning and capital/administrative demands associated with these new obligations. For example, if there is a modification to the current GMA Environment Goal, there should be additional fiscal and technical assistance resources for cities and counties conducting their “every seven year updates.”

Funding Recommendation 2: The LUCC recommends that the state maintain current general fund appropriations in support of mandated GMA plan updates and associated plan implementation within the cities and counties of Washington State. There must be no backsliding on commitments made to date to support these critical efforts.

Funding Recommendation 3: The LUCC recommends fully funding existing infrastructure investment sources such as the Public Works Trust Fund, the Community Economic Revitalization Board, Transportation Improvement Board, and SB 6050 (2005) (providing financial assistance to distressed cities, towns, and counties). These programs have the structures already in place, staffed and functioning. By simply fully funding these programs efficiencies will be gained, as local communities already are accustomed to the processes.

Funding Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Voting Members		#1	#2	#3
Sharon	Nelson	Y	Y	Y
Doug	Ericksen	Y	Y	Y
Linda	Evans Parlette	Y	Y	Y
Chris	Marr	Y	Y	Y
Josh	Brown	Y	Y	Y
Merrill	Ott	Y	Y	Y
Mike	Doherty	Y	Y	Y
Jake	Fey	Y	Y	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y	Y	Y
Rich	Munson	Y	Y	Y
Karen	Rogers	Y	Y	Y
Jeanne	Harris	Y	Y	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y	Y	Y
Final Vote		13 Yes	13 Yes	13 Yes

Priority Area 2

- < Provide more flexible use of existing funding sources to support accommodating growth and density in urban areas
- < Includes Funding Recommendations 5 and 7.

Funding Recommendation 5A: The LUCC recommends enhancing existing state infrastructure funding programs by bonding state dollars for legacy projects that promote compact development and facilitate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. This will leverage the funds and allow for more “room” to fund infrastructure needs. (“Legacy projects” are infrastructure projects that last 20 years or more, like sewers, water pipes, wastewater treatment facilities, bridges, etc., that can be paid for over time rather than all at once.)

Funding Recommendation 5B: The LUCC recommends enhancing existing state infrastructure funding programs by bonding state dollars for legacy projects. This will leverage the funds and allow for more “room” to fund infrastructure needs. (“Legacy projects” are infrastructure projects that last 20 years or more, like sewers, water pipes, wastewater treatment facilities, bridges, etc., that can be paid for over time rather than all at once.)

Funding Recommendation 7A: Provide more flexible use of existing funding sources and provide for additional use of funding to include compact development and facilitate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The LUCC recommends making existing infrastructure funding tools more useful. For example, reform the Real Estate Excise Tax (first and second quarter local REET do not fund the same things – make them the same).

Funding Recommendation 7B: Provide more flexible use of existing funding sources to support accommodating growth and density in urban areas. The LUCC recommends making existing infrastructure funding tools more useful. For example, reform the Real Estate Excise Tax (first and second quarter local REET do not fund the same things – make them the same).

Priority Funding Recommendations 5, 7

Voting Members		5A	5B	7A	7B
Sharon	Nelson	Y	N	Y	Y
Doug	Ericksen	N	N	N	N
Linda	Evans Parlette	N	N	N	N
Chris	Marr	Y	N	Y	N
Josh	Brown	Y	Y	N	Y
Merrill	Ott	N	Y	N	Y
Mike	Doherty	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jake	Fey	Y	Y	Y	N
Paul	Roberts	Y	N	Y	N
Rich	Munson	N	Y	Y	N
Karen	Rogers	Y	N	Y	N
Jeanne	Harris	Y	N	Y	N
Daryl	Williams	Y	Y	Y	N
Final Vote		9 Yes / 4 No	7 No / 6 Yes	9 Yes / 4 No	9 No / 4 Yes

Priority Area 3

- < Provide opportunities for new funds to support local efforts to reduce ghg reductions.
- < Includes Funding Recommendations 4F, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8F, and 9A.
- < Note: members voted on all recommendations under Priority Area 3 as a single “package” vote.

Funding Recommendation 4: The LUCC recommends enhancing general fund appropriations to support mandated plan updates and implementation of these plans within the cities and counties of Washington State. Specifically:

- **4F:** Establish a state revolving stormwater improvement fund (funded by a state and/or local vehicle tailpipe user fee) to finance capital stormwater needs.

Funding Recommendation 8: The LUCC recommends authorizing new local infrastructure funding tools targeted to urban centers (must take care in defining “urban centers”) creating compact, mixed use, transit-oriented, affordable infill projects (that exceed minimum residential density and employment density). Provide opportunities for new funds to support local efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

- **8A:** Enable Street Utility Authorities – enable cities/counties to charge a street utility fee (possibly based on trip generation or, for counties, enabling annexations of urban designated areas) to meet street maintenance needs.
- **8B:** Enable Transportation Benefit Districts – repeal the 10-year sunset on voter approved sales tax to enable bonding of this revenue stream.
- **8C:** Enable Local Improvement Districts.
- **8F:** Provide state funding for transit.

Funding Recommendation 9: The LUCC recommends authorizing new funding targeted to urban centers (must take care in defining “urban centers”) creating compact, mixed use, transit-oriented,

affordable infill projects (that exceed minimum residential density and employment density). Such areas could take the form of a “green jobs center” – a place or places where such jobs are sought, located, and that are provided with nearby workforce housing and transportation choices.

- **9A:** Direct a portion of any future cap and trade or carbon tax program revenue to support a fund (which would provide for infrastructure, as well as updating plans and regulations).

Funding Recommendations 4F, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8F, 9A

Voting Members		Package 4F, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8F, 9A
Sharon	Nelson	Y
Doug	Ericksen	N
Linda	Evans Parlette	N
Chris	Marr	Y
Josh	Brown	Y
Merrill	Ott	Y
Mike	Doherty	Y
Jake	Fey	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y
Rich	Munson	Y
Karen	Rogers	Y
Jeanne	Harris	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y
Final Vote		11 Yes / 2 No

Additional Vote on Funding Recommendation 4C.

Funding Recommendation 4: The LUCC recommends enhancing general fund appropriations to support mandated plan updates and implementation of these plans within the cities and counties of Washington State. Specifically:

- **4C:** Enhance the Brownfields Revolving Loan Program with additional state funds (current funding is federal at \$5.9m) and adding a grants component.

Funding Recommendation 4C

Voting Members		4C
Sharon	Nelson	Y
Doug	Ericksen	PASS
Linda	Evans Parlette	PASS
Chris	Marr	Y
Josh	Brown	PASS
Merrill	Ott	PASS
Mike	Doherty	Y
Jake	Fey	Y
Paul	Roberts	Y
Rich	Munson	Y
Karen	Rogers	Y
Jeanne	Harris	Y
Daryl	Williams	Y
Final Vote		9 Yes / 4 Pass

Public Comment
Provided to the LUCC Advisory Committee
October 17, 2008

John Worthington:

- With the lack of available public funding to match private funding for the purpose of developing public/private partnerships for grand civic spectacles in the city centers, the cities will not be able to develop the necessary draw that will be required to lure the people into the city centers or city limits. As a result of the lack of available public funding sources, the city centers will then mostly be made of residential housing. Residential encroachment of the city center, caused by the lack of public funding for public/private partnerships for grand civic spectacles, the city center will then lack 24/7 districts to generate revenue from retail sales and sales taxes.
- The lack of available public funding or proper ordinances, to develop substantial parking in the city center or city limits, for the purpose of linking with high speed rail services to other cities, will limit the development of high percentages of commuting to jobs outside the Cities. As a result the lack of cheap centrally located parking, and lane mile restrictions, city residents will be limited to employment within their Cities, therefore limiting the ability of residents to earn income outside the city, which will cause continuous relocation due to employment situations, and job availability. If city citizens do not have high speed commuter services along with cheap centrally located parking, and are forced into using up allotted lane miles for commuting, the citizen's recreational travel will be limited. Limiting recreational travel will restrict the revenue of other cities that count on regional tourism on a more frequent basis than tourism from outside the region.
- The end result will be citizens being ordinance into living in city centers that are bereft of civic spectacles, 24/7 districts, and cheap centrally located parking. These policies will not centralize a community. The Beneficiaries of this policy will be restricted to residential developers that will capitalize on the increase in square footage rates caused by the need created by a draconian fill in mandate, which did not have the available public capital to develop a city center capable of luring the people into the cities without social engineering. These residentially saturated city centers, bereft of civic spectacles, and 24/7 districts will not look enticing enough to local citizens, or look good enough on the post card to attract tourism from outside the region, resulting in substantial loss in revenue, at the expense of personal freedom.
- Developing high speed levx systems to link city centers, their profit centers, and cheap parking together will avoid the conditions that will cause loss of revenue, and ensure citizens do not use up allotted lane miles for the basic needs of commuting, attending large events, and commuting to employment. Developing levx systems from the ports to the customs warehousing will decrease commercial traffic, and expand port capacity away from valuable waterfront locations that could be used for 24/7 civic spectacles or residential housing. Levx is cheap enough to build enough transportation infrastructures to eliminate a far greater amount of greenhouse gases, than simply developing transit corridors, and coercing the public into them could ever do. We need to reduce fuel and food cost to give the people more of their own money, then let them spend that money in the various profit centers in various locations, in order to generate the sales tax revenue that will bolster our governments general funds, and enable the proper funding for continued civic infrastructure needs. The public is better served with this strategy.