

HOUSE BILL REPORT

SSB 6085

*As Reported By House Committee on:
Local Government*

Title: An act relating to boundary review boards.

Brief Description: Providing for waiver of review of water and sewer extensions by boundary review board.

Sponsor(s): By Senate Committee on Governmental Operations (originally sponsored by Senators Bauer, McCaslin, Sutherland, Sellar, Madsen and Vognild).

Brief History:

Reported by House Committee on:
Local Government, February 28, 1992, DPA.

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

Majority Report: *Do pass as amended.* Signed by 15 members: Representatives Haugen, Chair; Cooper, Vice Chair; Ferguson, Ranking Minority Member; Mitchell, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Bray; Edmondson; Franklin; Horn; Nealey; Nelson; Rayburn; Roland; Wood; Wynne; and Zellinsky.

Staff: Steve Lundin (786-7127).

Background: Boundary review boards are created by state law in King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Spokane counties. A boundary review board may be created in any other county.

Various boundary changes proposed by cities, towns, or certain special districts, including incorporations, dissolutions, consolidations, or annexations of territory, are potentially subject to review by a boundary review board. In addition, certain extensions of water or sewer service by cities, towns, or certain special districts beyond their boundaries are subject to potential review by a boundary review board. After reviewing such an action, a boundary review board may approve, modify and approve, or reject the proposed action.

The jurisdiction of a boundary review board may be invoked by an affected unit of local government, the county, or by petition of a certain percentage of property owners or voters who reside near to the proposed boundary change. In

addition, a boundary review board, on its own motion may invoke its jurisdiction on the extension of a larger than six inch in diameter water line, or larger than eight inch in diameter sewer line, by a city, town, or special district beyond its boundaries.

Various factors are listed in statute for a boundary review board to consider when rendering a decision. Various objectives are listed in statute to guide boundary review board decisions.

The Growth Management Act was enacted in 1991 and 1992. This act requires some counties and cities to adopt a comprehensive plan and development regulations addressing a variety of subjects and also requires every county and city in the state to take certain actions.

Summary of Amended Bill: The county legislative authority of a county that is required or chooses to plan under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act may waive the authority of a boundary review board to invoke its own jurisdiction on extensions of water lines that are larger than six inch in diameter, or extensions of sewer lines that are larger than eight inch in diameter, by a city, town, or special district beyond its boundaries.

The decisions of a boundary review board that is located in a county that is required or chooses to plan under all the requirements of the Growth Management Act must comply with the goals of the Growth Management Act, urban growth area requirements under the Growth Management Act, and countywide policy plan adopted by the county under the Growth Management Act.

Amended Bill Compared to Substitute Bill: The requirement was added for compliance with part of the Growth Management Act. Language was deleted concerning matters that must be filed with the Boundary Review Board. It was clarified which counties could remove the authority of boundary review boards to invoke their own jurisdiction over utility extensions.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

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

Testimony For: This goes along with the Growth Management Act. Why should a boundary review board be able to invoke its own jurisdiction.

Testimony Against: None against amended version.

Witnesses: (Pro): Tom Burkholder, citizen; Bill Huyette, BIAW; Stan Finkelstein, Association of Washington Cities; and Ed Larsen, Snohomish County. (Con - original): Dick Schoon, King County Boundary Review Board; and Jim Daniels, Boundary Review Board, Pierce County.