SENATE BILL REPORT

EHB 2287

AS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS, FEBRUARY 20, 1992

Brief Description: Changing provisions relating to port districts.

SPONSORS: Representatives Haugen, Wilson, Zellinsky, Ferguson, Paris and Spanel

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

Majority Report: Do pass as amended.
Signed by Senators McCaslin, Chairman; Roach, Vice Chairman; Madsen, and Sutherland.

Staff: Rod McAulay (786-7754)

Hearing Dates: February 20, 1992

BACKGROUND:

A port district may be created with the same boundaries as those of a county. At two different periods less than countywide port districts were allowed to be created, but this authority no longer exists.

SUMMARY:

A less than countywide port district with an assessed valuation of more than $75 million is allowed to be created in a county that already has a less than countywide port district.

The procedures to create a less than countywide port district resemble the procedures to create a countywide port district. A petition calling for the creation must be signed by voters residing in the proposed port district equal in number to at least 10 percent of the number of such voters who voted at the last county general election. The county legislative authority must hold a public hearing, may alter the proposed boundaries, and may cause a ballot proposition to be submitted to voters of the proposed port district authorizing its creation.

The initial port commissioners are elected at the same election, but the election of port commissioners is null and void if the port district is not created. Commissioner districts shall not be used to elect the initial port commissioners.

Appropriation: none

Revenue: none

Fiscal Note: none requested

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SENATE AMENDMENT:

Until January 1, 1955, one less than countywide port district may annex territory in an adjacent less than countywide port district which is within a city, the name of which is included as part of the annexing district, subject to approval of voters in the territory to be annexed.

TESTIMONY FOR:

Economic diversification would be provided in Oak Harbor area by developing a port.

TESTIMONY AGAINST: None

TESTIFIED: Representative Haugen; Linda Wright, Greater Oak Harbor Chamber of Commerce; Dave Rogers, Public Ports Association; Stan Stanley, Island County Economic Development Council