

# Judicial Impact Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 1017 HB	<b>Title:</b> School siting	<b>Agency:</b> 055-Administrative Office of the Courts
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	--

## Part I: Estimates

**No Fiscal Impact**

*The revenue and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Responsibility for expenditures may be subject to the provisions of RCW 43.135.060.*

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.

Legislative Contact: Jacob Lipson	Phone: 360-786-7196	Date: 12/28/2016
Agency Preparation: Sam Knutson	Phone: 360-704-5528	Date: 01/06/2017
Agency Approval: Ramsey Radwan	Phone: 360-357-2406	Date: 01/06/2017
OFM Review:	Phone:	Date:

Request # 1017 HB-1

## **Part II: Narrative Explanation**

### **II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact on the Courts**

This bill would amend the Growth Management Act (GMA -- RCW 36.70A) by adding a new section to RCW 36.70A.280 allowing schools to be a permitted use in all land use zones including, but not limited to rural, urban, transitional or governmental areas. The current law restricts locating or expanding K-12 schools to urban areas unless they are providing rural-related education or serving rural students.

Section 2 would require counties, cities and towns to prioritize the siting of schools and school facilities over all other GMA goals, such as reducing sprawl, coordinated planning, environmental protection, public participation, preserving rural character, etc.

Sections 3 and 4 relate directly to the Growth Management Hearings Board by removing the Board's authority to hear petitions alleging non-compliance with provisions for school siting as provided in this bill.

This bill would create a new basis for a petition (alleged noncompliance for siting a school or school facility), expressly precluding the Growth Management Hearings Board from considering such petitions. The bill does not expressly move the petitions to superior courts.

Data provided by the Environmental Land Use Hearing Board shows that there were four cases heard by the Growth Management Hearings Board in the past five years.

### **II. B - Cash Receipts Impact**

### **II. C - Expenditures**

## **Part III: Expenditure Detail**

## **Part IV: Capital Budget Impact**