

SENATE BILL REPORT

SSB 5038

AS PASSED SENATE, FEBRUARY 15, 1994

Brief Description: Creating a procedure for local government service agreements.

SPONSORS: Senate Committee on Government Operations (originally sponsored by Senators Haugen and Winsley)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5038 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Haugen, Chairman; Drew, Vice Chairman; Loveland, McCaslin, Oke, Owen and Winsley.

Staff: Eugene Green (786-7405)

Hearing Dates: February 2, 1994; February 4, 1994

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BACKGROUND:

The Local Governance Study Commission was established in 1985 to study local government in the state and make recommendations to the Legislature. This commission had 21 members, and three ex-officio, nonvoting, members. The 21 members included four Senators, four Representatives, four city-elected officials, four county-elected officials, and five persons representing special districts. The ex-officio, nonvoting, members were the director of the Department of Community Development, who chaired the meetings, and the executive directors of the Association of Washington Cities and the Washington State Association of Counties. A major recommendation of the commission was the establishment of a process for local governments to enter into binding local government service agreements for the provision of local governmental services and the development of local policies, that could include the transfer of services and revenues between existing local governments.

SUMMARY:

The county legislative authority of every county with a population of 150,000 or more must convene a meeting by March 1, 1995, to develop a process for the establishment of service agreements. Other counties may utilize these provisions. On or before January 1, 1997, a service agreement must be adopted in each county under this chapter or a progress report must be submitted to the appropriate committees of the Legislature.

It is noted that, in general, cities are the units of local government most appropriate to provide urban governmental services and counties are the unit of local government most appropriate to provide regional governmental services.

Nothing contained in this chapter alters the duties, requirements, and authorities of cities and counties contained in the Growth Management Act.

A service agreement must describe: (a) the governmental service or services addressed by the agreement; (b) the geographic area covered by the agreement; (c) which local government(s) are to provide each of the governmental services addressed by the agreement; and (d) the term of the agreement.

The agreement becomes effective when approved by: (a) the county legislative authority; (b) the governing body or bodies of at least a simple majority of the total number of cities covered by the agreement, which cities include at least 75 percent of the total population of all cities within the agreement; and (c) a simple majority of special purpose districts covered by the agreement. The participants may agree to use another formula.

A service agreement may include, but is not limited to:

- (1) Dispute resolution arrangement;
- (2) Joint land-use planning and development regulations;
- (3) Common development standards between the county and cities;
- (4) Coordination of capital improvement plans of the county, cities, and special purpose districts;
- (5) Effect of service agreement on growth management plans;
- (6) Intergovernmental revenue transfers based on service obligations; and
- (7) Designation of additional area-wide governmental services to be provided by the county.

The process to establish service agreements should assure that all directly affected local governments and Indian tribes at their option are allowed to be heard on issues relevant to them.

Appropriation: none

Revenue: none

Fiscal Note: available

TESTIMONY FOR:

Fulfills recommendation of Local Governance Study Commission.

TESTIMONY AGAINST: None

TESTIFIED: Gary Lowe, WA Association of Counties; Stan Finkelstein, Association of WA Cities; Karen Miller, Snohomish County Council; Tom Cowan, San Juan County Board of Commissioners; Jim White, Judy Buckholder, Stan Finkelstein, AWC

HOUSE AMENDMENT(S):

Language is added to include service agreements relating to children and family services. This agreement shall enhance coordination and be consistent with the comprehensive plan developed under SHB 2319 or 2SSB 6174 (Section 3).

When an arbitrator considers what a county can charge a city for providing court services, the arbitrator is limited to considering those additional costs borne by the county in providing those services.