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Central question:
How can Washington State promote compatible civilian land use practices in support of its military bases?

The governor has tasked Commerce with producing a report to the legislature on civilian land use compatibility and military base missions.

The WA Growth Management Act (GMA) disallows land use development that is incompatible with military installations. (RCW 36.70A.0530)
Within existing resources, the Department of Commerce shall

- Examine the effects of incompatible land use surrounding military installations within Washington State and

- Conduct a comparative analysis of best practices from other states to mitigate conflicts between local jurisdictions and neighboring military installations due to incompatible land use.

The Department shall submit its analysis to the governor and the appropriate committees of the legislature by November 1, 2016.
WA law prohibits comprehensive plan or development regulation changes that would allow development incompatible with a base’s mission requirements.

Two parts to the requirements:

1. Consultation:
   • Notify base commander of proposed changes and, seek a written recommendation.
   • If no comment, changes are presumed compatible.

2. Compatibility:
   • Must not allow development that is incompatible.

Source legislation: RCW 36.70A.530
Finding -- 2004 c 28:

"The United States military is a vital component of the Washington State economy. The protection of military installations from incompatible development of land is essential to the health of Washington's economy and quality of life.
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"The United States military is a vital component of the Washington State economy. The protection of military installations from incompatible development of land is essential to the health of Washington's economy and quality of life.

"Incompatible development of land close to a military installation reduces the ability of the military to complete its mission or to undertake new missions, and increases its cost of operating.

"The department of defense evaluates continued utilization of military installations based upon their operating costs, their ability to carry out missions, and their ability to undertake new missions."

[2004 c 28 § 1.] / RCW 36.70A.530
Base Compatibility Study - Definitions

Defining “encroachment”

Encroachment is the term used by the Department of Defense (DoD) to describe incompatible uses of land, air, water, or other resources that have adverse cumulative impact on a military facility’s ability to carry out its testing and training mission.
Defining “base”

Military bases are physical installations, but their mission and training corridors involve areas beyond physical perimeter boundaries.
Base Compatibility Study - Findings

Core findings in the draft report

• Civilian-military land use compatibility is critical for an installation’s long-term viability.

• Our communities and military installations face compatibility concerns are common to other states and territories.

• Compatibility concerns reach beyond the base (airspace; waterways).

• Some states promote civilian-military compatibility through legislation.
Examples of Common Compatibility Issues

1. Development pressures adjacent to installations
2. Competing demands for infrastructure
3. Air/light pollution and airspace obstructions
4. Noise conflicts and communications interference
5. Mitigation for displaced endangered species

NOTE:
This list is not comprehensive.
Opportunities to Promote Compatibility

1. Foster civilian-military coordination
2. Technical assistance programs for compatibility
3. Defining military buffer areas in plans, codes, and permitting
4. Acquiring land, easements or development rights
5. Promoting best practices for endangered species management (on and off bases)

NOTE:
This list is not comprehensive.
Factors for Defining Military Buffer Areas

1. Physical installation property boundaries
2. Security perimeters (‘line-of-site’ security)
3. Noise buffers and Accident Potential Zones (APZs)
4. Critical training corridors; transportation routes
5. Working lands; habitat conservation areas
6. Telecommunication and radio airwaves

NOTE: This list is not comprehensive.
Base Compatibility Study - Conclusions

Incompatibility is avoidable through:

1. Strong stakeholder engagement
2. Wise land use policies, plans, codes, and permitting
3. Investments in open space, working lands and conservation areas.

NOTE:
This list is not comprehensive.
# Base Compatibility Study

## Project timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I: 1.0 First draft production</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Washington University (EWU) first draft</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>6/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWU revised second draft</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I: 2.0 Draft revision and stakeholder outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWU/Commerce co-produced draft posted online</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>7/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder outreach for draft report</td>
<td>In-process</td>
<td>7/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce presentation at JBLM/ADC NW forum</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>8/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMA quarterly membership meeting discussion</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>9/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I: 3.0 Report revision and presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open comment period for draft report</td>
<td>In-process</td>
<td>8/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report revision, based on feedback</td>
<td>In-process</td>
<td>8/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report provided to the WA State Legislature</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative session presentation and report review</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II: 1.0 Project review and analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off meeting for Phase II</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder outreach for final analysis</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II: 2.0 Project review and analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and analysis combined in final report</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report submitted to director's office</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report submitted to OFM</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report provided to the WA State Legislature</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Base Compatibility Study –
We need your advice

• How can Washington State promote compatible civilian land use practices in support of its military bases?

• What would you see added to the conversation?

Project website:
http://bit.ly/BaseStudy
Base Compatibility Study – We need your advice

How To Provide Your Comments:

• Project email: gmsbasecompatibility@commerce.wa.gov

• Project website: http://bit.ly/BaseStudy

Department of Commerce
Innovation is in our nature.
Critical questions for your input:

• How can Washington State promote compatible civilian land use practices in support of its military bases?

• What would you see added to the conversation?

How To Provide Your Comments:

• Project email: gmsbasecompatibility@commerce.wa.gov

• Project website: http://bit.ly/BaseStudy