

SENATE BILL REPORT

HB 1852

As of March 19, 2009

Title: An act relating to record checks using fingerprints.

Brief Description: Modifying provisions relating to record checks using fingerprints.

Sponsors: Representatives Appleton and Hinkle; by request of Washington State Patrol.

Brief History: Passed House: 2/23/09, 97-0.

Committee Activity: Early Learning & K-12 Education: 3/19/09.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EARLY LEARNING & K-12 EDUCATION

Staff: Brandon Roché (786-7405)

Background: School districts require new applicants, who will have regularly scheduled unsupervised access to children, to obtain a background record check through the Washington State Patrol (WSP) using fingerprints. There is currently an incremental fee schedule for record checks for classified and nonclassified school employees. Under this fee schedule private school employees, contractors, classified employees, and certification applicants are charged one fee (\$60.25) while school districts and educational service districts are charged another fee (\$50.25).

The Joint Task Force on Criminal Background Check Processes issued a report in January 2007, which included recommendations. One of the recommendations included eliminating incremental fees, which would allow all school employees and contractors to pay the same fee.

Summary of Bill: The requirement that the WSP charge only incremental fees for school district and educational service district employees is eliminated. All school employees and contractors must pay the same fee for a fingerprint-based criminal background check.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Available.

Committee/Commission/Task Force Created: No.

This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not a part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.

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

Staff Summary of Public Testimony: PRO: This is a matter of fairness. There's no reason why one group of employees should pay more than another. This is about parity. These fees will actually decrease next year.

Persons Testifying: PRO: Representative Appleton, prime sponsor; Jeff DeVere, WSP.