7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

20

21

HOUSE BILL 1643

2025 Regular Session State of Washington 69th Legislature

By Representative Barkis

Read first time 01/28/25. Referred to Committee on Transportation.

- AN ACT Relating to supporting transportation system improvements 1 2 addressing utility facility removal and relocation responsibilities; amending RCW 47.44.020, 36.55.060, 35A.47.040, 3 35.23.251, 35.27.330, and 35.99.060; and creating a new section. 4
- 5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:
- <u>NEW SECTION.</u> **Sec. 1.** The legislature finds that public roadways are increasingly constructed, altered, repaired, and improved in the public interest as part of development agreements. When this is the case, the legislature believes that a governmental entity requiring a project that is in the public interest to be completed as part of a development agreement should be authorized to require utility relocation at the expense of the franchise holder. The legislature recognizes that, at times, it may be expedient for a governmental entity to require a roadway system improvement to be made instead of assessing an impact fee and undertaking the work itself. The legislature believes that whether a utility franchise holder required to bear the costs of utility relocation should not be determined on the basis of who is undertaking the project, but 19 rather, on the basis of the extent to which the general public will benefit from the project. Therefore, the legislature intends to authorize the Washington state department of transportation,

HB 1643 p. 1

- 1 counties, cities, and towns to require utility franchise holders to
- 2 pay the expense of utility relocation when a public roadway project
- 3 that is in the public interest is undertaken by a private entity as
- 4 part of a development agreement.

8

9

11

1213

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

29

- 5 **Sec. 2.** RCW 47.44.020 and 2001 c 201 s 6 are each amended to 6 read as follows:
 - (1) If the department of transportation deems it to be for the public interest, the franchise may be granted in whole or in part, with or without hearing under such regulations and conditions as the department may prescribe, with or without compensation, but not in excess of the reasonable cost for investigating, handling, and granting the franchise. The department may require that the utility and appurtenances be so placed on the highway that they will, in its opinion, least interfere with other uses of the highway.
 - (2) If a hearing is held, it must be conducted by the department, and may be adjourned from time to time until completed. The applicant may be required to produce all facts pertaining to the franchise, and evidence may be taken for and against granting it.
 - (3) (a) The facility must be made subject to removal when necessary for the construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of the highway and at the expense of the franchise holder, except that the state shall pay the share of the cost of the removal ((whenever)) in the amount the state is entitled to receive ((proportionate)) in the form of reimbursement ((therefor)) from the United States ((in the cases and in the manner set forth in RCW 47.44.030)).
 - (b) Facility removal or relocation at the expense of the franchise holder may be required when necessary for the construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of the highway, subject to the exception in (a) of this subsection, when:
- 30 <u>(i) The project is carried out by a private entity as a condition</u> 31 <u>of development; and</u>
- (ii) The department finds that the project is in the public interest and has been included in a published local or state plan or program.
- 35 <u>(c)</u> Renewal upon expiration of a franchise must be by 36 application.
- 37 (d) For the purposes of this subsection, "public interest" means 38 of general benefit to the public.

p. 2 HB 1643

- 1 (4) A person constructing or operating such a utility on a state highway is liable to any person injured thereby for any damages 2 incident to the work of installation or the continuation of the 3 occupancy of the highway by the utility, and except as provided 4 above, is liable to the state for all necessary expenses incurred in 5 6 restoring the highway to a permanent suitable condition for travel. A 7 person constructing or operating such a utility on a state highway is also liable to the state for all necessary expenses incurred in 8 inspecting the construction and restoring the pavement or other 9 related transportation equipment or facilities to 10 a permanent 11 condition suitable for travel and operation in accordance with 12 requirements set by the department. Permit and franchise holders are also financially responsible to the department for trenching work not 13 14 completed within the contractual period and for compensating for the loss of useful pavement life caused by trenching. No franchise may be 15 16 granted for a longer period than ((fifty)) 50 years, and no exclusive 17 franchise or privilege may be granted.
 - (5) The holder of a franchise granted under this section is financially responsible to the department for trenching work not completed within the period of the permit and for compensating for the loss of useful pavement life caused by trenching. In the case of common trenching operations, liability under this subsection will be assessed equally between the franchisees. The assessed parties may thereafter pursue claims of contribution or indemnity in accord with such fault as may be determined by arbitration or other legal action.

1920

21

22

2324

25

2627

28

2930

31

3435

36

3738

- Sec. 3. RCW 36.55.060 and 2007 c 31 s 6 are each amended to read as follows:
- (1) Any person constructing or operating any utility on or along a county road shall be liable to the county for all necessary expense incurred in restoring the county road to a suitable condition for travel.
- 32 (2) No franchise shall be granted for a period of longer than 33 ((fifty)) 50 years.
 - (3) No exclusive franchise or privilege shall be granted.
 - (4) (a) The facilities of the holder of any such franchise shall be removed at the expense of the holder thereof, to some other location on such county road in the event it is to be constructed, altered, or improved or becomes a primary state highway and such

p. 3 HB 1643

- 1 removal is reasonably necessary for the construction, alteration, or 2 improvement thereof.
- 3 (b) Facility removal or relocation at the expense of the franchise holder may be required when a road is to be constructed, 4 altered, repaired, or improved, and:
- 6 (i) The project is carried out by a private entity as a condition 7 of development; and

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

29

30 31

32 33

34

- (ii) The county finds that the project is in the public interest 8 and has been included in a published local or state plan or program. 9
- 10 (c) For the purposes of this subsection, "public interest" means of general benefit to the public. 11
- 12 (5) Counties shall, in the predesign phase of construction projects involving relocation of sewer and/or water facilities, 13 consult with public utilities operating water/sewer systems in order 14 to coordinate design. 15
- 16 Sec. 4. RCW 35A.47.040 and 1967 ex.s. c 119 s 35A.47.040 are each amended to read as follows: 17
 - (1) Every code city shall have authority to permit and regulate under such restrictions and conditions as it may set by charter or ordinance and to grant nonexclusive franchises for the use of public streets, bridges, or other public ways, structures, or places above or below the surface of the ground for railroads and other routes and facilities for public conveyances, for poles, conduits, tunnels, towers, and structures, pipes and wires and appurtenances thereof for transmission and distribution of electrical energy, signals, and other methods of communication, for gas, steam, and liquid fuels, for water, sewer, and other private and publicly owned and operated facilities for public service. The power hereby granted shall be in addition to the franchise authority granted by general law to cities.
 - (2) (a) Except as provided in RCW 35.99.060(3)(a), facility removal or relocation at the expense of the franchise holder is permitted when right-of-way is to be constructed, altered, or improved, including when a project is carried out by a private entity and:
- 35 (i) The project is necessary for the construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of public streets, bridges, or other public 36 ways, structures, or places above or below the surface of the ground; 37 38 and

HB 1643 p. 4

(ii) The city finds that the project is in the public interest,
will serve a transportation purpose, and has been included in a
published local or state plan or program.

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

1314

2526

27

28

29

- (b) For the purposes of this subsection, "public interest" means of general benefit to the public.
- (3) No ordinance or resolution granting any franchise in a code city for any purpose shall be adopted or passed by the city's legislative body on the day of its introduction nor for five days thereafter, nor at any other than a regular meeting nor without first being submitted to the city attorney, nor without having been granted by the approving vote of at least a majority of the entire legislative body, nor without being published at least once in a newspaper of general circulation in the city before becoming effective.
- 15 <u>(4)</u> The city council may require a bond in a reasonable amount 16 for any person or corporation obtaining a franchise from the city 17 conditioned upon the faithful performance of the conditions and terms 18 of the franchise and providing a recovery on the bond in case of 19 failure to perform the terms and conditions of the franchise.
- 20 <u>(5)</u> A code city may exercise the authority hereby granted, 21 notwithstanding a contrary limitation of any preexisting charter 22 provision.
- 23 **Sec. 5.** RCW 35.23.251 and 1965 c 7 s 35.24.250 are each amended to read as follows:
 - (1) No ordinance or resolution granting any franchise for any purpose shall be passed by the city council on the day of its introduction, nor for five days thereafter, nor at any other than a regular meeting nor without first being submitted to the city attorney.
- 30 <u>(2)</u> No franchise or valuable privilege shall be granted unless by 31 the vote of at least five members of the city council.
- 32 (3) The city council may require a bond in a reasonable amount 33 for any person or corporation obtaining a franchise from the city 34 conditioned for the faithful performance of the conditions and terms 35 of the franchise and providing a recovery on the bond in case of 36 failure to perform the terms and conditions of franchise.
- 37 <u>(4)(a) Except as provided in RCW 35.99.060(3)(a), facility</u>
 38 <u>removal or relocation at the expense of the franchise holder is</u>
 39 <u>permitted when right-of-way is to be constructed, altered, or</u>

p. 5 HB 1643

- improved, including when a project is carried out by a private entity
 and:
- (i) The project is necessary for the construction, alteration,
 repair, or improvement of public streets, bridges, or other public
 ways, structures, or places above or below the surface of the ground;
 and
- 7 (ii) The city finds that the project is in the public interest,
 8 will serve a transportation purpose, and has been included in a
 9 published local or state plan or program.
- 10 (b) For the purposes of this subsection, "public interest" means
 11 of general benefit to the public.
- 12 **Sec. 6.** RCW 35.27.330 and 2009 c 549 s 2063 are each amended to 13 read as follows:

1516

17

18

1920

21

22

2324

25

2627

28

- (1) No ordinance or resolution granting any franchise for any purpose shall be passed by the council on the day of its introduction, nor within five days thereafter, nor at any other than a regular meeting, and no such ordinance or resolution shall have any validity or effect unless passed by the vote of at least three councilmembers. The town council may require a bond in a reasonable amount from any persons and corporations obtaining a franchise from the town conditioned for the faithful performance of the conditions and terms of the franchise and providing a recovery on the bond in case of failure to perform the terms and conditions of the franchise.
- (2) (a) Except as provided in RCW 35.99.060(3) (a), facility removal or relocation at the expense of the franchise holder is permitted when right-of-way is to be constructed, altered, or improved, including when a project is carried out by a private entity and:
- (i) The project is necessary for the construction, alteration,
 repair, or improvement of public streets, bridges, or other public
 ways, structures, or places above or below the surface of the ground;
 and
- (ii) The town finds that the project is in the public interest,
 will serve a transportation purpose, and has been included in a
 published local or state plan or program.
- 36 (b) For the purposes of this subsection, "public interest" means 37 of general benefit to the public.

p. 6 HB 1643

Sec. 7. RCW 35.99.060 and 2000 c 83 s 6 are each amended to read 2 as follows:

- (1) Cities and towns may require service providers to relocate authorized facilities within the right-of-way when reasonably necessary for construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of the right-of-way for purposes of public welfare, health, or safety.
- (2) Cities shall notify service providers as soon as practicable of the need for relocation and shall specify the date by which relocation shall be completed. In calculating the date that relocation must be completed, cities shall consult with affected service providers and consider the extent of facilities to be relocated, the services requirements, and the construction sequence for the relocation, within the city's overall project construction sequence and constraints, to safely complete the relocation. Service providers shall complete the relocation by the date specified, unless the city, or a reviewing court, establishes a later date for completion, after a showing by the service provider that the relocation cannot be completed by the date specified using best efforts and meeting safety and service requirements.
- (3) Service providers may not seek reimbursement for their relocation expenses from the city or town requesting relocation under subsection (1) of this section except:
- (a) Where the service provider had paid for the relocation cost of the same facilities at the request of the city or town within the past five years, the service provider's share of the cost of relocation will be paid by the city or town requesting relocation;
- (b) Where aerial to underground relocation of authorized facilities is required by the city or town under subsection (1) of this section, for service providers with an ownership share of the aerial supporting structures, the additional incremental cost of underground compared to aerial relocation, or as provided for in the approved tariff if less, will be paid by the city or town requiring relocation; and
- 34 (c) Where the city or town requests relocation under subsection 35 (1) of this section solely for aesthetic purposes, unless otherwise 36 agreed to by the parties.
 - (4) Where a project in subsection (1) of this section is primarily for private benefit and where the requirements of RCW 35A.47.040(2), 35.23.251(4), and 35.27.330(2) are not met, the private party or parties shall reimburse the cost of relocation in

p. 7 HB 1643

the same proportion to their contribution to the costs of the project. Service providers will not be precluded from recovering their costs associated with relocation required under subsection (1) of this section, provided that the recovery is consistent with subsection (3) of this section and other applicable laws.

(5) A city or town may require the relocation of facilities at the service provider's expense in the event of an unforeseen emergency that creates an immediate threat to the public safety, health, or welfare.

--- END ---

p. 8 HB 1643