

# SENATE BILL REPORT

## SB 5637

---

As Reported By Senate Committee On:  
Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation, February 24, 1999

**Title:** An act relating to reconveyance of forest lands for municipal water supply protection purposes.

**Brief Description:** Authorizing the reconveyance of forest lands for municipal water supply protection purposes.

**Sponsors:** Senators Spanel, Gardner and Jacobsen.

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:** Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation: 2/18/99, 2/24/99 [DPS].  
**Ways & Means:** 3/3/99.

---

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, PARKS & RECREATION

**Majority Report:** That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5637 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Jacobsen, Chair; T. Sheldon, Vice Chair; Hargrove, Morton, Oke, Rossi, Snyder, Spanel and Stevens.

**Staff:** David Johnson (786-7754)

---

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS & MEANS

**Staff:** Kari Guy (786-7437)

**Background:** Forest land that has been acquired by the state from a county may be reconveyed to the county if it is needed for park uses. The park use must be in conformity with the state outdoor recreation plan. The land is conveyed back to the state if not used for park purposes. It has been suggested that this type of forest land should also be available to counties for the protection of municipal water supplies.

**Summary of Substitute Bill:** A county may request, with the agreement of municipalities affected, the return of forest land that it provided to the state to protect municipal water supplies. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) must reconvey the land to the county if doing so is in accordance with the regional water supply plan and individual water system plans. At DNR's request, the land is conveyed back to the state if it is no longer being used for municipal water supply protection purposes.

Logging of this sort of land must be done with the best watershed protection practices in mind.

**Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill:** The substitute bill added the requirement that municipalities concur with the request and that logging be done with watershed protection in mind.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

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

**Testimony For:** It is a helpful bill for cities. It will protect drinking water more than they are able to do now.

**Testimony Against:** The bill is unnecessary; sufficient protection of watersheds already exists. It would unfairly shift costs of excess protection to the general fund. It is contrary to the multiple use forestry DNR tries to practice.

**Testified:** Didi Little, City of Bellingham (pro); Paul Silver, DNR (con).