# JUDICIAL IMPACT FISCAL NOTE

Bill Number: 5790 SSB PL	<b>Title:</b> GMA Economic Dev. Element	Agency: 055 – Admin Office of the Courts (AOC)
	Element	

### Part I: Estimates

#### ☑ No Fiscal Impact

#### **Estimated Cash Receipts to:**

	FY 2018	FY 2019	2017-19	2019-21	2021-23
Total:					

#### Estimated Expenditures from:

STATE	FY 2018	FY 2019	2017-19	2019-21	2021-23
FTE – Staff Years					
Account					
General Fund – State (001-1)					
State Subtotal					
COUNTY					
County FTE Staff Years					
Account					
Local - Counties					
Counties Subtotal					
CITY					
City FTE Staff Years					
Account					
Local – Cities					
Cities Subtotal					
Local Subtotal					
Total Estimated					
Expenditures:					

The revenue and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Responsibility for expenditures may be subject to the provisions of RCW 43.135.060.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

□ If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form parts I-V

□ If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).

□ Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.

Legislative Contact:	Phone:	Date:
Agency Preparation: Sam Knutson	Phone: 360-704-5528	Date: 4/19/2017
Agency Approval: Ramsey Radwan	Phone: 360-357-2406	Date:
OFM Review:	Phone:	Date:

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

This bill would make specific contents of the economic development elements of the Growth Management Act (GMA) comprehensive plans discretionary, rather than requirements of cities and counties planning under the GMA.

The bill would allow, in certain rural counties with economic deterioration, economic development that deviates from prescriptive interpretations of the GMA.

The bill would allow counties to reduce restrictions on economic development opportunities if there is stagnation or deterioration of economic development.

The bill would provide that if competing goals of the GMA would restrain economic development in the GMA planning jurisdictions experiencing economic deterioration, the GMHB and courts must give great deference to local elected officials' allocation of resources and development choices to prioritize economic development.

## Part II.A – Brief Description of what the Measure does that has fiscal impact on the Courts

**Note:** This version of the bill differs from the previous version by removing Section 4(5) that would require appeals of rural county "limited areas of more intensive rural development" designations to be directly reviewed by a superior court rather than the Growth Management Hearings Board.

No fiscal impact to the courts.