

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 5352

As Reported By Senate Committee On:
State & Local Government, February 4, 1999

Title: An act relating to terms of members of boundary review boards.

Brief Description: Removing the term limit for members of boundary review boards.

Sponsors: Senator McCaslin.

Brief History:

Committee Activity: State & Local Government: 2/1/99, 2/4/99 [DPS].

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE & LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5352 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Patterson, Chair; Gardner, Vice Chair; Horn, Kline and McCaslin.

Staff: Diane Smith (786-7410)

Background: Boundary Review Boards (BRBs) were created by the Legislature in 1967 to help guide and control the creation and growth of municipalities in metropolitan areas. In counties of one million or more population, BRBs consist of 11 members. In counties of less than one million population, BRBs consist of five members.

Appointments to BRBs are made by the Governor, the county appointing authority, the mayors of the cities and towns of the county and by BRBs from among nominees of the special districts of the county. The terms of the members of the boards are four years running from February first of the year in which the terms commence, except for the term of the member representing the special districts, which runs from March first.

No board member may serve more than eight consecutive years. If no appointment is made by the appropriate appointing authority, the size of the board is reduced by one member for each position that remains vacant or unappointed.

Summary of Substitute Bill: The limitation to eight consecutive years as the maximum that may be served by any board member is removed.

Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill: The substitute bill has an emergency clause.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Effective Date: The bill has an emergency clause and takes effect immediately.

Testimony For: This bill is essential in order to maintain continuity and expertise on the BRBs. A board member must study continuously the GMA changes, local comprehensive plans, Growth Management Hearings Board decisions and new state law. Few people are willing to do this. Experienced board members are very important in bringing new board members up to speed.

Testimony Against: This provides for longevity for people without a provision to remove them. With GMA, proposed annexations are agreed in comprehensive plans so BRBs are not needed.

Testified: Clark Sites, Alda Wilkinson, Miriam Graves, Boundary Review Board (pro); Mike Ryherd, City of Anacortes (con).