

SENATE BILL REPORT

SSB 6393

As Passed Senate, February 15, 2002

Title: An act relating to interlocal agreements for jail services.

Brief Description: Expanding authority for interlocal agreements for jail services.

Sponsors: Senate Committee on Judiciary (originally sponsored by Senators Kline, Deccio, Haugen, Honeyford, Eide, Kastama and Horn).

Brief History:

Committee Activity: Judiciary: 1/28/02, 2/7/02 [DPS].

Passed Senate: 2/15/02, 44-2.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 6393 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Kline, Chair; Kastama, Vice Chair; Costa, Hargrove, Johnson, Long, McCaslin, Poulsen, Roach, Thibaudeau and Zarelli.

Staff: Aldo Melchiori (786-7439)

Background: Persons convicted of an offense punishable by incarceration in a city or county jail may be confined in the jail of other cities or counties pursuant to a contract for jail services. Contracts for jail services may be made between a county and a city located within that county or between counties. A person convicted of an offense may be incarcerated in the jail of any city or county if they have a contract for jail services.

Summary of Bill: Contracts for jail services may be made between a county and a city, regardless of whether the city is within the county, or among counties and cities. A person charged with an offense may also be incarcerated in the jail of any city or county if they have a contract for jail services.

A jurisdiction which has contracted for its defendants to be held in a jail of another county or city shall be responsible for the reasonable costs of personal contact between defendants, who have not been convicted, and their appointed defense counsel. The jurisdiction may meet this obligation by: (a) paying the reasonable costs of mileage to the defense counsel, (b) transporting the defendant to meet with counsel, or (c) providing video-conference facilities at the jail and a facility within the jurisdiction that is reasonably available to the defendant and defense counsel.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

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

Testimony For: Twenty-nine cities have worked together to support this bill. Some cities are already doing this with tenuous statutory authority.

Testimony Against: None.

Testified: PRO: Larry Erickson, Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs; Mike Doubleday, City of Bellevue; John McFarland, City of Tukwila; Judge Peter Lukevich, District and Municipal Court Judges Assn.; Judge Jean Rietschel, Seattle Municipal Court.