

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 5252

AS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 25, 1991

Brief Description: Funding school building security monitors.

SPONSORS: Senators Saling, Murray, Johnson, Skratek, Metcalf, A. Smith, L. Smith, Rinehart, von Reichbauer, Talmadge, Moore, Craswell, Gaspard, Thorsness, Sellar, McCaslin, Wojahn and Pelz.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 5252 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass and be referred to Committee on Ways & Means.

Signed by Senators Bailey, Chairman; Erwin, Vice Chairman; Anderson, Craswell, Metcalf, Murray, Oke, Pelz, Rinehart, A. Smith, and Talmadge.

Staff: Susan Mosborg (786-7439)

Hearing Dates: February 13, 1991; February 25, 1991

BACKGROUND:

The Omnibus Alcohol and Controlled Substance Abuse Act of 1989 included a \$3 million appropriation from the drug enforcement and treatment account to fund school building security personnel. This provided matching grants to 21 school districts. The appropriation language allowed grants of up to 75 percent of the district's total yearly expenditure on school security and 1990 amendatory language prohibited supplanting.

SUMMARY:

Funds are appropriated from the general fund for matching grants to enhance security in secondary schools. School districts may apply for grants of up to 75 percent of the district's total yearly expenditure for school security. The grants may be used only to employ or contract building security personnel and pay the costs of equipment and supplies involved in their employment.

Of the total \$3.3 million appropriation, \$2.75 million is provided solely for grants to districts that employed or contracted school security personnel for school hours during the 1988-89 school year.

The grants are not to be considered levy reduction funds.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE:

The grant program is funded by the drug enforcement and education account, as originally provided in the 1989 Omnibus Alcohol and Controlled Substances Act.

Unnecessary language stating that the school security grants shall not be deemed levy reduction funds is removed.

Appropriation: \$3.3 million to the Superintendent of Public Instruction

Revenue: none

Fiscal Note: requested February 5, 1991

TESTIMONY FOR:

Funds provided for school security personnel in the 1989 biennial budget were well spent. School districts were able to curtail drug and gang activity and prevent them from getting completely out of hand.

Kids respect and respond to security presence, if there are an adequate number of security personnel. Ten years ago students did not want police officers on campus but now they do. The first question asked by parents new to a school pertains to the safety of the campus.

Security at after-school activities has allowed students to continue participating in extra-curricular activities that were eroding because the events were not safe. Loss of extra-curricular activities destroys a school.

Greater staffing has caused the number of incidents reported to increase. Funding for school security personnel should at least be maintained and preferably increased.

TESTIMONY AGAINST: None

TESTIFIED: Dave Westberg, Stationary Engineers; Errol Graves, Greg Brashear, Seattle Public Schools; Sue Leabo, Ethelda Burke, Thomas Shearer, Terry Meisenburg, Tacoma Public Schools