

RCW 39.34.180 Criminal justice responsibilities—Interlocal agreements—Termination. (1) Each county, city, and town is responsible for the prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, and incarceration of misdemeanor and gross misdemeanor offenses 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. The court of any county, city, or town that wishes to offer probation supervision services may enter into interlocal agreements under subsection (6) of this section to provide those services.

(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, 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 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 each select one arbitrator, and the initial two arbitrators pick a third arbitrator. This subsection does not apply to the extent that the interlocal agreement is for probation supervision services.

(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. This subsection does not apply to the extent that the interlocal agreement is for probation supervision services. The city or county shall provide a copy of the written notice to terminate an agreement for the provision of court services to the administrative office of the courts not less than one year prior to the expiration of the agreement.

(5) For cities or towns that have not adopted, in whole or in part, criminal code or ordinance provisions related to misdemeanor and gross misdemeanor crimes as defined by state law, this section shall have no application until July 1, 1998.

(6) Municipal courts or district courts may enter into interlocal agreements for pretrial and/or postjudgment probation supervision services pursuant to ARLJ 11. Such agreements shall not affect the jurisdiction of the court that imposes probation supervision, need not

require the referral of all supervised cases by a jurisdiction, and may limit the referral for probation supervision services to a single case. An agreement for probation supervision services is not valid unless approved by the presiding judge of each participating court. The interlocal agreement may not require approval of the local executive and legislative bodies unless the interlocal agreement requires the expenditure of additional funds by the jurisdiction. If the jurisdiction providing probation supervision services is found liable for inadequate supervision, as provided in RCW 4.24.760(1), or is impacted by increased costs pursuant to the interlocal agreement, the presiding judge of the jurisdiction imposing probation supervision shall consult with the executive authority of the jurisdiction imposing probation supervision and determine whether to terminate the interlocal agreement for probation supervision services. All proceedings to grant, modify, or revoke probation must be held in the court that imposes probation supervision. Jail costs and the cost of other sanctions remain with the jurisdiction that imposes probation supervision.

The administrative office of the courts, in cooperation with the district and municipal court judges association and the Washington association of prosecuting attorneys, shall develop a model interlocal agreement. [2024 c 61 s 6; 2021 c 41 s 2; 2001 c 68 s 4; 1996 c 308 s 1.]

Effective date—1996 c 308: "This act shall take effect January 1, 1997." [1996 c 308 s 2.]