

SENATE BILL REPORT

HB 1001

As Passed Senate, March 30, 2017

Title: An act relating to utility easements on state-owned aquatic lands.

Brief Description: Concerning utility easements on state-owned aquatic lands.

Sponsors: Representatives Morris, Smith, Tarleton, Haler and Doglio.

Brief History: Passed House: 3/07/17, 97-0.

Committee Activity: Energy, Environment & Telecommunications: 3/21/17, 3/23/17 [DP].

Floor Activity:

Passed Senate: 3/30/17, 49-0.

Brief Summary of Bill

- Extends the statutory schedule that sets the charges for public utility lines crossing over state-owned aquatic lands from July 1, 2017, to July 1, 2030.
- Continues the required legislative review of easements granted for public utility lines every four years beginning December 31, 2021.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY, ENVIRONMENT & TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Majority Report: Do pass.

Signed by Senators Ericksen, Chair; Sheldon, Vice Chair; Carlyle, Ranking Minority Member; Brown, Hobbs, Short and Wellman.

Staff: Kimberly Cushing (786-7421)

Background: DNR Aquatic Lands Management. The Legislature has designated DNR as manager of state-owned aquatic lands. In managing these lands, DNR must support a balance of statutory goals including encouraging public access, fostering water-dependent uses, utilizing renewable resources, protecting the environment, and generating revenue.

Charges for Public Utility Line Crossings on Aquatic Lands. A statutory schedule sets the charges for local public utility line crossings on aquatic lands. For public utility lines owned by a nongovernmental entity, the charges are as follows:

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.

- \$5,000 for easement crossings of one mile or less;
- \$12,500 for easement crossings between one and five miles;
- \$20,000 for easement crossings of five or more miles; and
- a charge for administrative cost recovery, generally totaling 20 percent of the cost of the easement crossing.

These statutory charges are adjusted annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). DNR has 120 days to make a final decision on an application, and 60 days if the applicant requests expedited processing.

The statutory fee schedule expires July 1, 2017.

Summary of Bill: Charges for Public Utility Line Crossings on Aquatic Lands. The statutory schedule that sets the charges for public utility lines owned by a nongovernmental entity crossing state-owned aquatic lands remains in effect until July 1, 2030. The statutory charges are adjusted annually by the most recently published Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton CPI, instead of the Seattle-Everett SMSA, for the same period of the preceding year.

Legislative Review of Public Utility Line Crossings on Aquatic Lands. The Legislature must continue to review the granting of easements on state-owned aquatic lands for public utility lines every four years beginning December 31, 2021.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Available.

Creates Committee/Commission/Task Force that includes Legislative members: No.

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

Staff Summary of Public Testimony on Proposed Striking Amendment: *The committee recommended a different version of the bill than what was heard.* PRO: The underlying policy was created as a policy metric to determine whether easements were working or not. The third policy review just occurred. There had been a huge backlog at DNR to get easements for utilities because there was no system in place or a set fee. A deal was made in 2000 to (1) allow aquatics lands crossing, and (2) provide a flat rate for charges rather than a percent of revenue. This policy provides predictability for utilities' capital investments. Without this bill, the Commissioner could charge any amount the Commissioner chooses. The bill pushes out the performance review for six years. The Cherry Point aquatic reserve had a carve out for the pier, which the Commissioner changed on the way out the door. There is no legislative oversight for the aquatic reserve process.

CON: We have no concern with the underlying bill, but the striking amendment is out of scope. Expanding the aquatic reserve at Cherry Point is within the authority of the Commissioner. The expansion of the aquatic reserve followed the process in the law and the Commissioner reached a conclusion to expand the boundary. This is another attempt to circumvent treaty rights. The decision by the Commissioner followed a decision by the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) that the reserve would allow the tribe to fish in their usual

area. The marine area that the reserve serves is an important habitat. It is essential we protect what remains of fish habitats and precious natural resources. Overwhelming support was provided for expanding the reserve and few were in opposition. Years of significant study occurred and the Corps concluded after a rigorous and thoughtful analysis that a permit for the aquatic land lease would violate the tribe's right to harvest fish.

OTHER: We have no issue with the underlying bill. Aquatic reserves are an important tool for the state to protect the Puget Sound. Only eight aquatic reserves have been designated and all provide important habitat for high diversity of fish and wildlife in the Puget Sound. Cherry Point herring stock was once the largest in the Puget Sound but has declined by more than 90 percent since the 1970s. State law allows for DNR to create aquatic reserves. We want to work with the Legislature and the Commissioner to make sure important lands are protected.

Persons Testifying: PRO: Representative Jeff Morris, Prime Sponsor; Senator Doug Ericksen; Ron Main, Broadband Communications Association of WA.

CON: Irene Hinkle, citizen; Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky, Power Past Coal Coalition; Victor Johnson, Councilman, Lummi Nation; Craig Engelking, Lummi Nation; Judith Langhans, citizen; Peggy Bruton, citizen.

OTHER: Jeff Parsons, Puget Sound Partnership.

Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying: No one.