EDITOR'S PREFACE*

Guidance For Growth: A Symposium on Washington State's Growth Management Act

How Washington State, and the Puget Sound region in particular, will accommodate the population growth projected for the next twenty years is one of the most important and pressing issues facing this region. Primarily in response to the gridlock traffic that has become symptomatic of this growth, the Washington State Legislature in 1990 and 1991 adopted the Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA was designed to be the mechanism by which the state's growth would be controlled. The full impact of the GMA, however, has yet to be determined. The recent economic recession has had a dramatic impact on its implementation. In particular, many local jurisdictions lack the funds necessary to comply with the GMA's requirements, while others struggle to comply with its deadlines. In fact, many individuals have lobbied the Washington State Legislature to scale back some of the development restrictions imposed by the GMA in light of the recession. Nevertheless, the GMA remains intact today, and jurisdictions are currently working to adopt new land use plans in accordance with its requirements.

On November 6, 1992, the University of Puget Sound

---

* The Editor in Chief wishes to thank Melisa Evangelos, Brian Holtzclaw, and the other members of the Editorial Board whose commitment to the law review made this issue possible.


School of Law and the University of Puget Sound Law Review sponsored a Symposium on the GMA at the Rialto Theater in Tacoma, Washington. The Symposium was intended to provide information about the GMA's requirements and to address some of the major issues arising under the GMA through panel discussions. The various panels included individuals from the legal profession as well as individuals with backgrounds in urban planning, government, and the environmental sciences to provide a broad prospective on the issues. Specifically, the following issues were addressed in panel discussions: the history of growth planning and Washington State's GMA; transportation planning, concurrency requirements, and impact fees; the process and procedure of the GMA; urban growth areas; protection of critical areas and natural resource lands; and constitutional issues.

3. The following individuals participated on this panel: Richard L. Settle, Professor of Law at the University of Puget Sound School of Law and Of Counsel with the Seattle, Washington, law firm of Foster Pepper & Shefelman; Robert H. Freilich, Professor of Law at the University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law and a partner in the law firm of Freilich, Leitner, Carlisle & Shortlidge; John M. DeGrove, Director of the Florida Atlantic University and Florida International University Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems; Jerome L. Hillis, a principal in the Seattle, Washington, law firm of Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson; Steve Hodes, formerly with the Executive Policy Department for former Washington State Governor Booth Gardner; Richard L. Morrill, a professor with the University of Washington Departments of Geography and Environmental Studies; and Dennis McLerran, City Attorney for Port Townsend, Washington.  

4. The following individuals participated on this panel: Thomas M. Walsh, a partner in the Seattle, Washington, law firm of Foster Pepper & Shefelman; Richard D. Ford, a partner in the Seattle, Washington, law firm of Preston Thorgrimson Shidler Gates & Ellis; Ruth Fisher, a member of the Washington State Legislature and the Chair of the House of Representatives Transportation Committee; Mary McCumber, Executive Director of the Puget Sound Regional Council; and John DeGrove. 

5. The following individuals participated on this panel: Richard L. Settle; Henry McGee, Professor of Law at the University of California, Los Angeles School of Law; Marcia Gamble-Hadley, King County Housing Partnership; and J. Richard Aramburu, an attorney in private practice in Seattle, Washington. 

6. The following individuals participated on this panel: Keith W. Dearborn, a partner in the Seattle, Washington, law firm of Bogle & Gates; Edward J. Sullivan, a partner in the Portland, Oregon, office of Preston Thorgrimson Shidler Gates & Ellis; Mike McCormick; Richard Morrill; Robert H. Freilich; and Dr. Allen D. Copsey, Science Advisor for the Seattle Audubon Society. 

7. The following individuals participated on this panel: Alison Moss, a partner in the Seattle, Washington, law firm of Bogle & Gates; Jeffrey M. Eustis, an attorney in private practice in Seattle, Washington; John M. DeGrove; Mike McCormick; Dr. Alan D. Copsey; and Jan Pauw, Senior Legal Counsel for Weyerhaeuser Company. 

8. The following individuals participated on this panel: Dennis McLerran; John M. Groen, Pacific Legal Foundation; and Jeffrey M. Eustis.
The purpose and goal of the Symposium Issue is to address the issues that practitioners and local governments currently face, in addition to issues that may arise in the future, as the GMA's requirements are implemented. In this issue, Professor Richard L. Settle and Charles G. Gavigan provide an overview of the GMA's requirements and examine the legislative history that led to the enactment of the GMA. Professor Robert H. Freilich, Elizabeth A. Garvin, and Mark S. White address transportation planning. The GMA's concurrency requirements are examined by Thomas M. Walsh and Roger A. Pearce, with particular attention given to the impact of these requirements on transportation planning.

The constitutional issues that may arise under the GMA are addressed from various viewpoints by Jeffrey M. Eustis, John M. Groen and Richard M. Stephens, and Elaine Spencer. As to wildlife and critical areas, Dr. Alan D. Copsey addresses the issue of protecting wildlife habitat and Alison Moss and Beverlee E. Silva discuss the wetlands regulatory framework under the GMA. An empirical study of local jurisdictions' critical areas ordinances enacted pursuant to the GMA is provided by Professor Gary Pivo. Keith W. Dearborn and Ann M. Gygi's article assesses the role of urban growth areas under the GMA. Finally, Wm. H. Nielsen, M. Peter Philley, and Chris Smith Towne provide an overview of the process and procedure for disputes that are brought before the Growth Planning Hearings Boards.

The University of Puget Sound Law Review would like to thank Dean Jim Bond and the faculty for their support, Professor Richard L. Settle for his guidance and advice, and the individuals who participated both as panelists and authors in making this Symposium possible. We hope that the articles in the Symposium Issue will provide practitioners, local governments, and courts with insight and understanding as to the GMA's requirements and to the issues that must be addressed as the GMA is implemented.
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