

# HOUSE BILL REPORT

## ESHB 2816

---

As Passed House  
February 14, 1994

**Title:** An act relating to establishing a process for creating regional services frameworks.

**Brief Description:** Providing a planning process for county-wide provision of regional services.

**Sponsors:** By House Committee on Local Government (originally sponsored by Representatives H. Myers and Reams).

**Brief History:**

Reported by House Committee on:  
Local Government, February 4, 1994, DPS;  
Passed House, February 14, 1994, 93-5.

---

### HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

**Majority Report:** The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 8 members: Representatives H. Myers, Chair; Springer, Vice Chair; Reams, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; R. Fisher; Moak; Rayburn; Van Luven and Zellinsky.

**Minority Report:** Do not pass. Signed by 2 members: Representatives Edmondson, Ranking Minority Member; and Horn.

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

**Background:** Every portion of the state is included in a county. Counties are a unique form of local government that are both:

- o Political subdivisions of the state, acting on behalf of the state throughout the county; and
- o General purpose units of local government with authority to provide a wide range of services and facilities and to adopt general regulations.

Cities and towns are general purpose units of government providing a wide variety of services and facilities. Many different types of special districts exist providing limited services and facilities.

**Summary of Bill:** On or before March 1, 1995, every county with a population of 150,000 or more must convene a meeting of cities and special districts within the county to develop a process for establishing service agreements. Other counties may convene such a meeting. Whenever another county grows to a population of at least 150,000 after March 1, 1995, the county must convene such a meeting.

Each county with a population of 150,000 or more must have adopted a service agreement by January 2, 1997, and any county that later grows to that population must adopt a services agreement within two years of initially reaching that population.

A service agreement addressing children and family services shall enhance coordination and be consistent with a comprehensive plan in children and family services that is prepared under other legislation being considered this year.

A service agreement among local governments must describe the governmental service or services that are addressed, the geographic area covered by the agreement, and which local government or governments provide each of the addressed services. A term may be established for the agreement. A service agreement may provide for the transfer of money between local governments in relationship to their obligations for providing services. A service agreement may include dispute resolution arrangements, may describe how binding joint land-use planning and development regulations are established, how common development standards are established, and how capital improvement plans are coordinated, and may designate additional area-wide governmental services to be provided by the county.

A service agreement becomes effective when approved by: (1) The county legislative authority; (2) the governing bodies of at least a simple majority of the cities located within the geographic area that includes at least 75 percent of the population of all the cities located within the geographic area; and (3) the governing bodies of at least a simple majority of the special districts located in the geographic area that provide the service, if any. A service agreement must be adopted by the county legislative authority following a public hearing.

A service agreement may include areas located in more than a single county.

**Fiscal Note:** Not requested.

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

**Testimony For:** This provides for a flexible process by which local governments may provide governmental services in a more efficient and cost effective manner. This is basically the local governmental service agreement proposal from the Local Governance Study Commission.

**Testimony Against:** None.

**Witnesses:** Frank Ruano, citizen; Chuck Williams and Busse Nutley, Clark County; Doug Sutherland, Pierce County; Randy Scott, Spokane County; Jim White, Mayor of Kent, Judy Buckholder, Toppenish City Council; and Stan Finkelstein, Association of Washington Cities.