

SENATE BILL REPORT

SJM 8018

As Reported By Senate Committee On:
Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation, February 2, 2000

Brief Description: Requesting the passage of the conservation and reinvestment act.

Sponsors: Senators Jacobsen, Kline and Spanel.

Brief History:

Committee Activity: Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation: 2/2/2000 [DP].

SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, PARKS & RECREATION

Majority Report: Do pass.

Signed by Senators Jacobsen, Chair; Hargrove, Morton, Oke, Rossi, Snyder and Spanel.

Staff: David Johnson (786-7754)

Background: The Conservation and Reinvestment Act (H.R. 701) would, if enacted, authorize and fund \$2.8 billion in federal spending per year for natural resource conservation and restoration (including the Land and Water Conservation Fund), historic preservation, and funding for parks and recreational activities. It is estimated that Washington would receive approximately \$54 million of the funds per year.

Summary of Bill: The Legislature asks that Congress and the President enact H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Testimony For: Washington will probably receive \$54 million annually for fish, wildlife, and coastal preservation. This money would go to state, local and tribal governments. These added funds come at a time of great need to address pressing needs of restoration of endangered species and the habitats they depend on. Full and permanent funding of the land and water conservation fund would be a great benefit. This money is not a tax, it is an allocation of current funds that are part of the royalties from outer continental shelf oil and gas exploration and drilling. The bill requires just compensation for taking of property. The bill emphasizes purchases from willing buyers. The bill would pay counties for lost tax revenue from land taken out of private ownership.

Testimony Against: The congressional legislation will change in the coming months and we should not endorse something that we can't know the contents of when it is finally enacted. This would increase the transfer of more private land into public ownership. Between that, the current extensive amount of publicly owned land, and the Growth Management Act, the amount of land available for individuals to have available to them will

become too small. There are too many strings attached to the money. Currently there is a lack of proper management on public land. Money should be channeled to proper management not acquisition of land. Counties will lose tax revenues from land put into public ownership.

Testified: Doug Camerzind, LOEC (con); Rocky Beach, WDFW (pro); Joe LaTourrette, AHR (pro); Karla Kay Fullerton, WCA (con); Len Barson, Nature Conservancy (pro).