

# HOUSE BILL REPORT

## HB 1571

---

As Reported By House Committee On:  
Local Government  
Revenue

**Title:** An act relating to counties acquiring real property.

**Brief Description:** Raising the limit counties may levy to acquire property interests.

**Sponsors:** Representatives Ogden, Carlson, H. Myers, Peery, Springer and Brough.

**Brief History:**

Reported by House Committee on:  
Local Government, February 16, 1993, DP;  
Revenue, March 8, 1993, DP.

---

### HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

**Majority Report:** Do pass. Signed by 9 members:  
Representatives H. Myers, Chair; Bray, Vice Chair;  
Edmondson, Ranking Minority Member; Dunshee; R. Fisher;  
Rayburn; Romero; Springer; and Zellinsky.

**Minority Report:** Do not pass. Signed by 2 members:  
Representatives Horn; and Van Luven.

**Staff:** Steve Lundin (786-7127).

**Background:** Article VII, Section 2, of the state constitution, limits the cumulative rate of regular property taxes that may be imposed on any property in any year to an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the true and fair value of the property. Excess property tax levies may be imposed above the 1 percent limitation.

The following two regular property tax levies are not subject to these statutory cumulative rate limitations: (1) Voter approved regular property taxes of up to 50 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation for emergency medical service purposes may be imposed by a number of different taxing districts; and (2) regular property taxes of up to 6.25 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation may be imposed by counties to acquire conservation futures.

**Summary of Bill:** The maximum rate of property taxes that a county may impose to acquire conservation futures is increased from 6.25 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation to 10 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation.

**Fiscal Note:** Not requested.

**Effective Date:** Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

**Testimony For:** People support these taxes. In rapidly growing areas land values increase rapidly so you need to acquire necessary conservation areas as early as possible.

**Testimony Against:** None.

**Witnesses:** (Pro): Bill Dysert, citizen; Del Schleichert, Clark County Parks and Recreation Manager; and Vern Vegsey, citizen.

---

#### HOUSE COMMITTEE ON REVENUE

**Majority Report:** Do pass. Signed by 13 members: Representatives G. Fisher, Chair; Holm, Vice Chair; Foreman, Ranking Minority Member; Anderson; Brown; Cothorn; Leonard; Morris; Romero; Rust; Talcott; Thibaudeau; and Wang.

**Minority Report:** Do not pass. Signed by 3 members: Representatives Fuhrman, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Silver; and Van Luven.

**Staff:** Rick Peterson (786-7150).

**Summary of Recommendation of Committee on Revenue Compared to Recommendation of Committee on Local Government:** No new changes were recommended.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

**Effective Date:** Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

**Testimony For:** This bill would enable counties to acquire conservation futures. Despite the relatively small cost, the benefits are great for acquisition of shorelines and wetlands.

**Testimony Against:** None.

**Witnesses:** Rep. Ogden, prime sponsor; Bill Dygert, citizen; Del Schleichert, Clark County Parks and Recreation; Tim

Hatley, King County Council; Gene Duvernoy, citizen; and Vern Veysey, citizen (all in favor).