H-0823.1			

## HOUSE BILL 1590

\_\_\_\_\_

State of Washington 60th Legislature 2007 Regular Session

By Representatives Goodman, Rodne, Curtis, Eddy, Pearson, Springer, Linville, Roach, Jarrett, Priest, Clibborn, Ericks, Chandler, Schual-Berke, Dunshee, Upthegrove, Sells, Miloscia, Hurst, Williams, Newhouse, Simpson and Kenney

Read first time 01/23/2007. Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

- 1 AN ACT Relating to administration of the courts of limited
- 2 jurisdiction; amending RCW 3.50.003, 3.50.005, 3.50.020, 3.50.805,
- 3 39.34.180, and 10.14.150; adding a new section to chapter 3.50 RCW;
- 4 providing an effective date; and declaring an emergency.
- 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:
- 8 <u>(1) "City" means an incorporated city or town.</u>
- 9 (2) "Contracting city" means any city that contracts with a hosting 10 jurisdiction for the delivery of judicial services.
- 11 (3) "Mayor((-,))" ((as used in this chapter,)) means the mayor, city
  12 manager, or other chief administrative officer of the city.
- 13 (4) "Hosting jurisdiction" means a county or city designated in an
- 14 interlocal agreement as receiving compensation for providing judicial
- 15 services to a contracting city.
- 16 Sec. 2. RCW 3.50.005 and 1984 c 258 s 101 are each amended to read
- 17 as follows:
- 18 The legislature finds that ((there is a multitude of statutes

p. 1 HB 1590

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)) continuing to permit 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 host jurisdiction in any such agreement must be located within reasonable proximity to any contracting city or cities. For purposes of this section, "reasonable proximity" shall be determined after consideration of the factors set forth in RCW 39.34.010. The interlocal agreement shall provide that a 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 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

HB 1590 p. 2

municipal court shall also have the jurisdiction as conferred by 1 2 statute. The municipal court is empowered to forfeit cash bail or bail bonds and issue execution thereon; and in general to hear and determine 3 all causes, civil or criminal, including traffic infractions, arising 4 5 under such ordinances and to pronounce judgment in accordance therewith. A municipal court participating in the program established 6 7 by the administrative office of the courts pursuant to RCW 2.56.160 shall have jurisdiction to take recognizance, approve bail, and arraign 8 defendants held within its jurisdiction on warrants issued by any court 9 10 of limited jurisdiction participating in the program.

## 11 **Sec. 5.** RCW 3.50.805 and 2005 c 433 s 35 are each amended to read 12 as follows:

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

2930

31

32

3334

35

36

37

- (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, or traffic infractions that are filed in district or municipal court as a result of the termination. agreement shall provide for periodic review and renewal of the terms of If the ((municipality)) city and the county or the agreement. ((municipality)) city 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 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.
- (2) A ((municipality)) city operating a municipal court under this chapter may not repeal in its entirety that portion of its municipal

p. 3 HB 1590

code defining crimes while retaining the court's authority to hear and 1 determine traffic infractions under chapter 46.63 RCW unless the 2 ((municipality)) city has reached an agreement with the county under 3 chapter 39.34 RCW under which the county is to be paid a reasonable 4 5 amount for costs associated with prosecution, adjudication, and sentencing in criminal cases, or traffic infractions that are filed in 6 7 district court as a result of the repeal. The agreement shall provide for periodic review and renewal of the terms of the agreement. 8 ((municipality)) city and the county are unable to agree on the terms 9 10 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 11 RCW. Pending conclusion of the arbitration proceeding, the terms of 12 the agreement shall remain in effect. The ((municipality)) city and 13 14 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 15 16 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, or traffic infractions that are 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 ((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 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.

- 34 **Sec. 6.** RCW 39.34.180 and 2001 c 68 s 4 are each amended to read as follows:
- 36 (1) Each county, city, and town is responsible for the prosecution, 37 adjudication, sentencing, and incarceration of misdemeanor and gross

HB 1590 p. 4

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

29

3031

32

33

misdemeanor offenses and traffic infractions committed by adults in 1 2 their respective jurisdictions, and referred from their respective law enforcement agencies, whether filed under state law or city ordinance, 3 and must carry out these responsibilities through the use of their own 4 courts, staff, and facilities, or by entering into contracts or 5 interlocal agreements under this chapter to provide these services. 6 7 Nothing in this section is intended to alter the responsibilities of each county for the prosecution, adjudication, 8 sentencing, and incarceration for not more than one year of felony 9 10 offenders, nor shall this section apply to any offense initially filed by the prosecuting attorney as a felony offense or an attempt to commit 11 12 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.

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

29

30

31

36

37

- (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 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.
- 32 (4) A city or county that wishes to terminate an agreement for the 33 provision of court services must provide written notice of the intent 34 to terminate the agreement in accordance with RCW 3.50.810 and 35.20.010.
  - (5) For cities or towns that have not adopted, in whole or in part, criminal code or ordinance provisions related to misdemeanor and gross

p. 5 HB 1590

- misdemeanor crimes as defined by state law, this section shall have no application until July 1, 1998.
  - Sec. 7. RCW 10.14.150 and 2005 c 196 s 1 are each amended to read as follows:

- (1) The district courts shall have jurisdiction and cognizance of any civil actions and proceedings brought under this chapter, except the district court shall transfer such actions and proceedings to the superior court when it is shown that the respondent to the petition is under eighteen years of age.
- (2) Municipal courts ((may exercise)) shall have jurisdiction and cognizance of any civil actions and proceedings brought under this chapter ((by adoption of local court rule)), except the municipal court shall transfer such actions and proceedings to the superior court when it is shown that the respondent to the petition is under eighteen years of age.
- (3) Superior courts shall have concurrent jurisdiction to receive transfer of antiharassment petitions in cases where a district or municipal court judge makes findings of fact and conclusions of law showing that meritorious reasons exist for the transfer. The municipal and district courts shall have jurisdiction and cognizance of any criminal actions brought under RCW 10.14.120 and 10.14.170.
- 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, 2007.

--- END ---

нв 1590 р. 6