H-4335.1	

HOUSE BILL 3082

2006 Regular Session State of Washington 59th Legislature

By Representatives Rodne, Springer, Priest, Wood, Lantz and Nixon

Read first time 01/19/2006. Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

- AN ACT Relating to administration of the courts of limited 1
- 2 jurisdiction; amending RCW 3.50.003, 3.50.005, 3.50.020, 3.50.055,
- 3.50.805, and 39.34.180; adding a new section to chapter 3.50 RCW; 3
- providing an effective date; and declaring an emergency. 4
- 5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:
- 6 Sec. 1. RCW 3.50.003 and 1984 c 258 s 125 are each amended to read 7 as follows:
- (("Mayor," as used in this chapter,)) (1) "City" means an 8 incorporated city or town. 9
- 10 (2) "Contracting city" means any city that contracts with a hosting jurisdiction for the delivery of judicial services. 11
- (3) "Mayor" means the chief administrative officer of the city. 12
- 13 (4) "Hosting jurisdiction" means a county or city designated in an
- interlocal agreement as receiving compensation for providing judicial 14
- 15 services to a contracting city.
- 16 Sec. 2. RCW 3.50.005 and 1984 c 258 s 101 are each amended to read
- as follows: 17
- 18 ((The legislature finds that there is a multitude of statutes

HB 3082 p. 1

governing the municipal courts of the state. This situation is confusing and misleading to attorneys, judges, court personnel, and others who work with the municipal courts. The legislature therefore finds that a reorganization of the municipal courts of the state would allow those courts to operate in a more effective and efficient manner)) The legislature finds that permitting cities to contract with counties or other cities for judicial services will allow cities to provide more cost-effective services and encourage the creation of regional courts of limited jurisdiction that provide the full range of judicial functions and that are open and accessible to the citizens of the state of Washington. This chapter provides a court structure which may be used by cities and towns with a population of four hundred thousand or less which choose to operate under this chapter.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 3. A new section is added to chapter 3.50 RCW to read as follows:

A city may meet the requirements of RCW 39.34.180 by entering into an interlocal agreement with the county in which the city is located or with one or more cities. The interlocal agreement shall provide that the judge of the hosting jurisdiction sit as the municipal court judge for the contracting city or cities and hear those cases specified in RCW 39.34.180.

Sec. 4. RCW 3.50.020 and 2005 c 282 s 14 are each amended to read 23 as follows:

The municipal court shall have exclusive original jurisdiction over traffic infractions arising under city ordinances and exclusive original criminal jurisdiction of all violations of city ordinances duly adopted by the city ((in which the municipal court is located)) and shall have original jurisdiction of all other actions brought to enforce or recover license penalties or forfeitures declared or given by such ordinances or by state statutes. A hosting jurisdiction shall have exclusive original criminal and other jurisdiction as described in this section for all matters filed by a contracting city. The municipal court shall also have the jurisdiction as conferred by statute. The municipal court is empowered to forfeit cash bail or bail bonds and issue execution thereon; and in general to hear and determine all causes, civil or criminal, including traffic infractions, arising

HB 3082 p. 2

- under such ordinances and to pronounce judgment in accordance therewith. A municipal court participating in the program established by the administrative office of the courts pursuant to RCW 2.56.160 shall have jurisdiction to take recognizance, approve bail, and arraign defendants held within its jurisdiction on warrants issued by any court of limited jurisdiction participating in the program.
- **Sec. 5.** RCW 3.50.055 and 1993 c 317 s 4 are each amended to read 8 as follows:
- 9 Notwithstanding RCW 3.50.040 and 3.50.050, judicial positions may 10 be filled only by election ((under the following circumstances:

- (1) Each full time equivalent judicial position shall be filled by election. This requirement applies regardless of how many judges are employed to fill the position. For purposes of this section, a full-time equivalent position is thirty-five or more hours per week of compensated time.
- (2) In any city with one or more full time equivalent judicial positions, an additional judicial position or positions that is or are in combination more than one half of a full-time equivalent position shall also be filled by election)) in cities having a population of more than sixty thousand. A hosting jurisdiction shall be required to fill a judicial position by election if its population, added to the population of one or more contracting cities, exceeds sixty thousand.
- **Sec. 6.** RCW 3.50.805 and 2005 c 433 s 35 are each amended to read as follows:
- (1) A ((municipality)) city operating a municipal court under this chapter shall not terminate that court or terminate an interlocal agreement entered into under section 3 of this act unless the ((municipality)) city has reached an agreement with the appropriate county or another ((municipality)) city under chapter 39.34 RCW under which the county or ((municipality)) city is to be paid a reasonable amount for costs associated with prosecution, adjudication, and sentencing in criminal cases and/or traffic infractions filed in district or municipal court as a result of the termination. The agreement shall provide for periodic review and renewal of the terms of the agreement. If the ((municipality)) city and the county or ((municipality)) city are unable to agree on the terms for renewal of

p. 3 HB 3082

the agreement, they shall be deemed to have entered into an agreement to submit the issue to arbitration under chapter 7.04A RCW. Pending conclusion of the arbitration proceeding, the terms of the agreement shall remain in effect. The ((municipality)) city and the county or ((municipality)) city have the same rights and are subject to the same duties as other parties who have agreed to submit to arbitration under chapter 7.04A RCW. A ((municipality)) city that has entered into agreements with other ((municipalities)) cities that have terminated their municipal courts may not thereafter terminate its court unless each ((municipality)) city has reached an agreement with the appropriate county or city in accordance with this section.

1 2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

2829

3031

32

3334

35

3637

38

(2) A ((municipality)) city operating a municipal court under this chapter may not repeal in its entirety that portion of its municipal code defining crimes while retaining the court's authority to hear and determine traffic infractions under chapter 46.63 RCW unless the ((municipality)) city has reached an agreement with the county under chapter 39.34 RCW under which the county is to be paid a reasonable amount for costs associated with prosecution, adjudication, and sentencing in criminal cases <u>and/or traffic infractions</u> filed in district court as a result of the repeal. The agreement shall provide for periodic review and renewal of the terms of the agreement. ((municipality)) city and the county are unable to agree on the terms for renewal of the agreement, they shall be deemed to have entered into an agreement to submit the issue to arbitration under chapter 7.04A RCW. Pending conclusion of the arbitration proceeding, the terms of the agreement shall remain in effect. The ((municipality)) city and the county have the same rights and are subject to the same duties as other parties who have agreed to submit to arbitration under chapter 7.04A RCW.

(3) A ((municipality)) city operating a municipal court under this chapter may not repeal a provision of its municipal code which defines a crime equivalent to an offense listed in RCW 46.63.020 unless the ((municipality)) city has reached an agreement with the county under chapter 39.34 RCW under which the county is to be paid a reasonable amount for costs associated with prosecution, adjudication, and sentencing in criminal cases and/or traffic infractions filed in district court as a result of the repeal. The agreement shall provide for periodic review and renewal of the terms of the agreement. If the

HB 3082 p. 4

- ((municipality)) city and the county are unable to agree on the terms for renewal of the agreement, they shall be deemed to have entered into an agreement to submit the issue to arbitration under chapter 7.04A RCW. Pending conclusion of the arbitration proceeding, the terms of the agreement shall remain in effect. The ((municipality)) city and the county have the same rights and are subject to the same duties as other parties who have agreed to submit to arbitration under chapter 7.04A RCW.
- **Sec. 7.** RCW 39.34.180 and 2001 c 68 s 4 are each amended to read 10 as follows:

- (1) Each county, city, and town is responsible for the prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, and incarceration of misdemeanor and gross misdemeanor offenses and traffic infractions committed by adults in their respective jurisdictions, and referred from their respective law enforcement agencies, whether filed under state law or city ordinance, and must carry out these responsibilities through the use of their own courts, staff, and facilities, or by entering into contracts or interlocal agreements under this chapter to provide these services. Nothing in this section is intended to alter the statutory responsibilities of each county for the prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, and incarceration for not more than one year of felony offenders, nor shall this section apply to any offense initially filed by the prosecuting attorney as a felony offense or an attempt to commit a felony offense.
 - (2) The following principles must be followed in negotiating interlocal agreements or contracts: Cities and counties must consider (a) anticipated costs of services; and (b) anticipated and potential revenues to fund the services, including fines and fees, criminal justice funding, and state-authorized sales tax funding levied for criminal justice purposes.
 - (3) If an agreement as to the levels of compensation within an interlocal agreement or contract for gross misdemeanor and misdemeanor services cannot be reached between ((a city and county)) the parties, then either party may invoke binding arbitration on the compensation issued by notice to the other party. In the case of establishing initial compensation, the notice shall request arbitration within thirty days. In the case of nonrenewal of an existing contract or

p. 5 HB 3082

interlocal agreement, the notice must be given one hundred twenty days prior to the expiration of the existing contract or agreement and the existing contract or agreement remains in effect until a new agreement is reached or until an arbitration award on the matter of fees is made. The ((city and county)) parties each select one arbitrator, and the

initial two arbitrators pick a third arbitrator.

6 7

8

9

10

- (4) A city or county that wishes to terminate an agreement for the provision of court services must provide written notice of the intent to terminate the agreement in accordance with RCW 3.50.810 and 35.20.010.
- 11 (5) For cities or towns that have not adopted, in whole or in part, 12 criminal code or ordinance provisions related to misdemeanor and gross 13 misdemeanor crimes as defined by state law, this section shall have no 14 application until July 1, 1998.
- NEW SECTION. Sec. 8. This act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, or support of the state government and its existing public institutions, and takes effect July 1, 2006.

--- END ---

HB 3082 p. 6