

**AWPHD SUMMARY MATRIX OF MUNICIPAL LAW CHANGES
2010 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

KEY MUNICIPAL LAW CHANGES IMPACTING PUBLIC HOSPITAL DISTRICTS

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Finance:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 2510/SB 6300</p> <p><i>Providing Explicit Mortgage Authority for Public Hospital Districts (PHDs)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current law is unclear regarding public hospital district (PHD) mortgage authority. • Through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development provides insurance for mortgages and loans for, among others, certain healthcare facilities. • The stated purpose of this federal insurance program is to encourage lenders to offer credit in areas and to borrowers who may not otherwise qualify for conventional loans. • It is important for PHDs to have explicit authority to pursue various financing options, including the option of issuing bonds in connection with a federal mortgage insurance program and granting a lien on PHD property pursuant to a mortgage or other security instrument under certain circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly authorizes a PHD issuing bonds in connection with a federal program providing mortgage insurance, including FHA mortgage insurance programs, to grant a lien on its property pursuant to a mortgage, deed of trust, security agreement, or any other security instrument allowed under applicable law. • Additional background: The FHA is authorized to insure mortgage loans for the construction, rehabilitation, replacement, and equipping of hospital facilities, as well as the refinancing of existing debt. In some situations, mortgage insurance obtained from the FHA or another federal agency will result in reduced financing costs for participating hospitals, and will make possible financing options that would otherwise not be available. <p>Legislation: HB 2510 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Law%202010/2510.SL.pdf)</p> <p>Companion Legislation: SB 6300</p> <p>Effective date: June 10, 2010</p> <p>Final Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House%20Final/2510%20HBR%20FBR%2010.pdf</p> <p>RCW provision impacted: RCW 70.44.060(5)</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Finance:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>SB 6218/HB 2451</p> <p><i>Allowing PHDs to Participate in the State Local Option Capital Asset Lending Program in Relation to Voter Approved Bonds Payable from Excess Property Tax Levies</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a state program that allows local governments to finance equipment or real estate needs through the State Treasurer’s Office subject to existing debt limitations and financial considerations. • When a local government receives voter approval to issue bonds payable from excess property tax levies, it is ineligible to use the financing program of the State Treasurer's Office. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHDs will be able to participate in the local option capital asset lending program through the State Treasurer’s Office, including with respect to voter approved bonds payable from excess property tax levies. • Allows PHDs and other local governments to use the State Treasurer’s Office pooled financing program for voter approved bonds payable from excess property tax levies. <p>Legislation: SB 6218 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Law%202010/6218.SL.pdf)</p> <p>Companion Legislation: HB 2451</p> <p>Effective date: June 10, 2010</p> <p>Final Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/Senate%20Final/6218%20SBR%20FBR%202010.pdf</p> <p>RCW provisions impacted: RCW 39.94.020(2), (4); RCW 39.94.030(2) – (4); RCW 84.52.056(1) – (4)</p>
<p>Public Records:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>SSB 6367/HB 2582</p> <p><i>Additional Option for PHDs in Responding to Requests for Public Records</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Public Records Act, an agency must respond to a request for records within five days by either: (1) providing the record; (2) acknowledging that the agency has received the request and providing a reasonable estimate of the time the agency will need to respond to the request; or (3) denying the request. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the current three options for responding to a request for public records, an agency – including PHDs – can now provide an internet address and link on the agency’s web site to the specific records requested. • If, however, the requester notifies the agency that he/she cannot access the records through the internet, the agency must provide copies of the record or allow the requester to view copies using an agency computer. <p>Legislation: SSB 6367 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Law%202010/6367-S.SL.pdf)</p> <p>Companion Legislation: HB 2582</p> <p>Effective date: June 10, 2010</p> <p>Final Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/Senate%20Final/6367-S%20SBR%20FBR%202010.pdf</p> <p>RCW provisions impacted: RCW 42.56.520(1) & (2)</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Election Laws:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>2SHB 2016</p> <p><i>Changes to Campaign Contribution and Disclosure Laws</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 42.17 RCW is a wide-ranging chapter regarding campaign disclosure and contribution laws. 2SHB 2016 changes several provisions related to campaign contribution and disclosure requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of particular note regarding 2SHB 2016 is a new section, Section 703, which prohibits municipal officers (which include PHD Commissioners) from speaking or appearing “in a public service announcement that is broadcast, shown, or distributed in any form whatsoever during the period beginning January 1st and continuing through the general election if that official or officer is a candidate.” At this point, the Public Disclosure Commission is in the process of preparing an interpretation regarding Section 703. Based on a PDC draft, the interpretation defines “municipal officer” to include those persons described in RCW 42.23.020(2), which includes “... all elected and appointed officers of a municipality, together with all deputies and assistants of such an officer, and all persons exercising or undertaking to exercise any of the powers or functions of a municipal officer.” Section 703 also provides that if the official or officer does not control the broadcast, showing, or distribution of a public service announcement (“PSA”) in which he or she speaks or appears, the official or officer shall contractually limit the use of the PSA to be consistent with this section prior to participating in the PSA. This new section does not apply to PSAs that are part of the regular duties of the office that only mention or visually display the office or office seal or logo and do not mention or visually display the name of the official or officer in the announcement. Note that some of the changes resulting from 2SHB 2016 are effective March 25, 2010 (including Section 703 above described), and others January 1, 2012. Given the complexity of the legislation, the AWPFD will be seeking further guidance from the PDC and otherwise and we will provide additional information on this topic in the coming months. <p>Legislation: 2SHB 2016 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Law%202010/2016-S2.SL.pdf)</p> <p>Effective dates: Some provisions, including Section 703 described above regarding PSAs are effective March 25, 2010 (also Sections 505 and 602); other provisions are effective January 1, 2012</p> <p>Final Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House%20Final/2016-S2%20HBR%20FBR%2010.pdf</p> <p>RCW provisions impacted: Several sections of chapter 42.17 RCW; also RCW 42.56.010(2) - (4)</p>

KEY PROPOSED MUNICIPAL LAW CHANGES THAT DID NOT PASS THIS SESSION

Numerous proposals came before the legislature in the 2010 session that would have made changes to municipal law and impacted public hospital districts (PHDs). Although the following proposals did not pass, they are worth noting because they may arise again in the future.

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Public Records:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>SB 6368/HB 2583</p> <p><i>Would have provided for voluntary conferences as an option prior to filing a court action for an alleged violation of the Public Records Act (PRA)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persons who are denied the opportunity to inspect or copy a public record may file a motion to show cause in superior court regarding why the agency has refused access to the record. • The burden of proof rests with the agency to establish that the refusal is consistent with the statute that exempts or prohibits disclosure. • Any person who prevails against an agency in an action in court seeking the right to inspect or copy any public record shall be awarded all costs, including reasonable attorney fees. • In addition, the court has the discretion to award such person no less than \$5 and no more than \$100 for each day the person was denied the right to inspect or copy the public record. The court's discretion lies in the amount per day, but the court may not adjust the number of days for which the agency is fined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have provided an additional option whereby, prior to filing a court action alleging a violation of the PRA, the requester and the agency could confer in person or by telephone regarding any dispute. • Would have provided discretion to the court to reduce or eliminate any award for costs, including daily penalties, in some circumstances if this option was pursued by the parties. <p>Legislation: SB 6368 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Bills/6368.pdf)</p> <p>Companion Legislation: HB 2583</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/Senate/6368%20SBA%20GO%2010.pdf</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Public Records:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 2736/SB 6383</p> <p><i>Would have established the Office of Open Records</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Public Records Act (PRA) requires that all state and local government agencies make all public records available for public inspection and copying unless they fall within certain statutory exemptions. The provisions requiring public records disclosure must be interpreted liberally and the exemptions narrowly in order to effectuate a general policy favoring disclosure. Disputes between requesters and agencies regarding PRA requests that cannot otherwise be resolved are generally resolved in court. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have established the Office of Open Records to provide impartial administrative reviews of appeals by persons or agencies entitled to relief under the PRA and to provide information relating to the implementation and enforcement of the PRA. The Office would have had authority to take various actions, including adopting rules pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) to provide clear guidelines for an appeal process before the Office resulting from decisions of agencies subject to the PRA. <p>Legislation: HB 2736 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/2736.pdf)</p> <p>Companion Legislation: SB 6383</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Analysis: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/2736%20HBA%20SGTA%2010.pdf</p>
<p>Public Records:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 1471</p> <p><i>Would have removed the records exemption for certain records addressing public sector collective bargaining</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Public Records Act (PRA) under RCW 42.56.280 provides that preliminary drafts, notes, recommendations, and intra-agency memorandums in which opinions are expressed or policies formulated or recommended are exempt under this chapter, except that a specific record is not exempt when publicly cited by an agency in connection with any agency action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have added a provision that would have made certain records not exempt under the PRA if such records are created or presented by an agency in the course of collective bargaining, or which are received from the bargaining representative by the agency in the course of collective bargaining, when the agency and the bargaining representative agree to the terms of a written collective bargaining agreement. <p>Legislation: HB 1471 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/1471.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Analysis: None provided by legislative staff of the Washington State Legislature.</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Public Records:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 2910/SB 6408</p> <p><i>Would have changed remedies for awards under the PRA</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Public Records Act (PRA), a person who prevails against an agency in an action in court seeking the right to inspect or copy any public record shall be awarded all costs, including reasonable attorney fees. • In addition, the court has the discretion to award such person no less than \$5 but not to exceed \$100 for each day he or she was denied the right to inspect or copy the public record. The court's discretion lies in the amount per day, but the court may not adjust the number of days for which the agency is fined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have changed the awarding of costs to a person who prevails in court against an agency in an action seeking the right to inspect or copy a public record or the right to receive a response to a public record request within a reasonable amount of time to allow greater discretion by the court. • Would have established that the court will no longer award a person who prevails against an agency in a PRA action an amount of not less than \$5 but not to exceed \$100 for each day that he or she was denied the right to inspect or copy the public record. Instead, the court would impose a fine, in the same dollar range, on the responsible agency. • Would have established that the fine be deposited in the Archives and Records Management Account to enhance the preservation and availability of the state's public records. • Would have established that a court may award a portion of the fine to the prevailing person in an amount that reimburses the person for any demonstrated financial loss caused by the failure of the agency to timely release the public record or respond to the request. <p>Legislation: HB 2910 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/2910.pdf)</p> <p>Companion Legislation: SB 6408</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Analysis: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/2910%20HBA%20SGTA%2010.pdf</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Public Records:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 3031</p> <p><i>Would have allowed an agency to require a requester to pay personnel costs for certain requests under the PRA</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Public Records Act (PRA), a person requesting a public record may not be charged by an agency for inspection of the record, nor may a fee be imposed on the requester for locating the record and making it available for copying. • An agency may charge a reasonable fee for actually providing a copy, or for the use by the requester of agency equipment in making a copy. The charge must be the actual per-page direct cost incurred for copying. If an agency chooses not to calculate the per-page cost, it may charge up to \$.15 per page. • For a large request, the agency may require a deposit not to exceed 10 percent of the estimated cost for providing copies. A request may be made available in installments, with each installment paid for when delivered. If an installment is not claimed, the agency is not obligated to fulfill the remainder of the request. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have allowed an agency in accordance with the PRA to require a requester to pay personnel costs for requests that require more than five person-hours in a calendar month to produce. • Would have established that such costs include time for searching and copying, and that costs are limited to actual salary and benefit costs for the personnel required to produce the records. • Would have established that such costs be paid before the records are released and the agency may require payment before a search for the records begins. <p>Legislation: HB 3031 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/3031.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Analysis: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/3031%20HBA%20SGTA%2010.pdf</p>
<p>Public Records:</p> <p>Legislation: SSB 6428</p> <p><i>Would have exempted from disclosure personal information used to identify a person filing a complaint with an agency</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Public Records Act (PRA), certain investigative, law enforcement, and crime victim information is exempt from public inspection and copying, such as information revealing the identity of persons who are witnesses to or victims of crime or who file complaints with investigative, law enforcement, and penology agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have expanded the definition of “investigative agency” to include any department in an agency whose official duties include investigating complaints and taking steps to remedy the issue raised if the investigation shows a remedy is warranted. <p>Legislation: SSB 6428 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Bills/6428-S.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/Senate/6428%20SBR%20GO%2010.pdf</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Public Records:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>SB 6530</p> <p><i>Would have increased access to public records by providing additional options for requesters and penalties against public agencies</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Public Records Act (PRA), if a state agency determines that a public record is exempt from disclosure, the requester may request the attorney general to review the matter. • If a person prevails against an agency in court regarding the right to inspect or copy any public record or the right to receive a response to a public record request within a reasonable amount of time, that person shall be awarded all costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, incurred in connection with such legal action. • In addition, the court has the discretion to award such person an amount not less than five dollars and not to exceed one hundred dollars for each day that he or she was denied the right to inspect or copy said public record. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have allowed requesters requesting records from any agency (not just state agencies), where the agency has determined that the record is exempt from disclosure, to request the attorney general to review the matter. • Would have provided that when a person prevails in court against an agency regarding the right to inspect or copy any public record or the right to receive a response to a public record request within a reasonable amount of time, the court would be required to award such person one hundred dollars for each day the requester was denied the right to inspect or copy said public record. <p>Legislation: SB 6530 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Bills/6530.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: None provided by legislative staff of the Washington State Legislature.</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Open Public Meetings:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>SSB 6685</p> <p><i>Would have imposed additional requirements on PHDs and other municipalities regarding notice for meetings and posting of information on web sites</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA), the governing body of a municipality (including PHDs) must provide the time for holding regular meetings by ordinance, resolution, bylaws, or by whatever other rule is required for the conduct of business by that body. • Special meetings may be called at any time by the presiding officer of the governing body of a municipality or by a majority of the members of the governing body. Notification of the meeting is delivered by written notice personally, by mail, by fax, or by electronic mail to each member of the governing body; to each local newspaper of general circulation; and to each local radio or television station on file with the governing body with a written request to be notified. This notice must be delivered personally, by mail, by fax, or by electronic mail at least 24 hours before the time of the meetings as specified in the notice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have made several changes regarding posting requirements for meetings of PHDs (and other municipalities in Washington) and other information, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The agenda of all regular meetings of the governing body of a PHD that owns or maintains a web site must be posted 72 hours before a meeting. ➤ The agenda of all special or emergency meetings must be posted 24 hours before a meeting. ➤ The posting must indicate if the agenda is in draft form. ➤ The text of any ordinance, rule, or regulation that is under consideration at the meeting must be included on the web site at the same time the agenda is posted. ➤ The minutes of all regular and special meetings of the governing body of a PHD that owns or maintains a web site must be posted within 15 business days after a meeting. The posting of the minutes must indicate whether or not the minutes are in draft form or adopted. ➤ All postings must remain on the web site for one calendar year. ➤ The above requirements would not apply to special purpose districts providing services to a population of less than one thousand. ➤ Every PHD that owns or maintains a public internet web site shall at all times have posted to it a roster of the names of all members of its governing body, identifying the positions, and constituency where applicable, of all members. The web site shall at all times provide both the start date and end date of the elective or appointed terms of all members. <p>Legislation: SSB 6685 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Bills/6685-S.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/Senate/6685%20SBR%20GO%2010.pdf</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Open Public Meetings:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>SB 6741</p> <p><i>Would have changed special meeting notice requirements to allow posting of a hyperlink to the written notice on the agency's web site</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA), a special meeting may be called by the presiding officer of the governing body of a public agency or by a majority of the members of the governing body by delivering written notice personally, by mail, fax or email, and to each local newspaper of general circulation, and to each local radio or television which has requested to be notified of special meetings. • This notice is to be delivered at least 24 hours before the special meeting. The notice is to include the time and place of the special meetings and the business to be transacted. • Notice of a special meeting is not required if the special meeting is called to deal with an emergency involving injury or damage to persons or property, or there is a likelihood that such damage will occur, and providing the required notice is impractical and would increase the likelihood of such injury or damage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have required notice of a special meeting to be posted on an agency's web site by posting a prominently placed hyperlink to the written notice on the agency's web site. • Would have provided that written notice of a special meeting is not required to be delivered to local newspapers. <p>Legislation: SB 6741 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Bills/6741.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/Senate/6741%20SBA%20GO%2010.pdf</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Elections:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>HB 2398/SB 6322</p> <p><i>Would have modified election notice provisions</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 35 days before each primary or general election, the county auditor is to give notice of the registration deadlines by one publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the county. • Also, not more than ten days nor less than three days before the primary, the county auditor must publish notice of the primary in one or more newspapers of general circulation within the county. The notice must include a list of persons who have filed a declaration of candidacy for that primary, instructions for voting the applicable ballot, the poll's hours, and a list of precinct polling places. The names of all candidates for nonpartisan office must be published separately. This is the only notice required for the holding of any primary. A similar notice requirement applies to any state, county, district, or municipal election, whether special or general. • As soon as practicable before the primary, special election, or general election, the county auditor must mail the local voters' pamphlet to every residence in each jurisdiction that has included information in the pamphlet. If more economical and better distribution would result, the county auditor may choose to mail the pamphlet to each registered voter in each jurisdiction that has included information in the pamphlet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have changed the timing for notice for any state, county, district, or municipal primary or election (special or general) such that notice would have to be given not more than 15 nor less than five days prior to the date of closing of the registration rolls online or mail-in registrations by the county auditor or officer conducting the election. • Would have added new requirements related to what must be contained in the notice published in the newspaper, or, alternatively, regarding mailing a local voters' pamphlet to each residence. <p>Legislation: HB 2398 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/2398.pdf)</p> <p>Companion Legislation: SB 6322</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/Senate/2398%20SBR%20GO%2010.pdf</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Elections:</p> <p>Legislation:</p> <p>HB 2405</p> <p><i>Would have modified the time in which a local measure's ballot title may be appealed</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A person dissatisfied with the ballot title for a local ballot measure that was formulated by a prosecuting attorney may at any time within ten days from the time of the filing of the ballot title, not including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, appeal to the superior court of the county where the question is to appear on the ballot, by petition setting forth the measure, the ballot title objected to, their objections to it, and praying for amendment of it. • The time of the filing of the ballot title, as used in this section in determining the time for appeal, is the time the ballot title is first filed with the county auditor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have changed the timing for appealing a local measure's ballot title by allowing such an appeal within ten days from the deadline for filing ballot measures (as opposed to ten days from the time the ballot title is first filed with the county auditor). <p>Legislation: HB 2405 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/2405.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: None provided by legislative staff of the Washington State Legislature.</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Elections:</p> <p>Legislation: SSB 6797</p> <p><i>Would have changed requirements related to voters' pamphlets</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For counties with a population of 100,000 or more a voters' pamphlet may be published by a county for primary and general elections. The pamphlet is to include: (1) elective offices and ballot measures of the county, and (2) elective offices and ballot measures of each unit of local government located entirely within the county that will appear on the ballot in that primary election. If the required appearance in a county's voters' pamphlet of the offices or measures of a unit of local government would create undue financial hardship for the unit of government, the legislative authority of the unit can petition the legislative authority of the county to waive this requirement. If the legislative authority finds publishing would create an undue hardship, the waiver may be provided so long as it is not later than 60 days before the publication of the pamphlet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have required, for counties with a population of 100,000 or more, that a voters' pamphlet be published by a county for primary, special, and general elections. Would have eliminated the financial hardship exception. <p>Legislation: SSB 6797 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Bills/6797-S.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/Senate/6797%20SBR%20WM%2010.pdf</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Elections and Tax:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 2578/SB 6216</p> <p><i>Would have required additional information for ballot propositions subject to voter approval under RCW 84.55.050 (election to authorize increase in regular property tax levy)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RCW 84.55.050 has specific requirements related to regular property tax levies, including with respect to what information must be included on the ballot proposition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have changed what is required for ballot propositions under RCW 84.55.050 such that for any levy that is subject to voter approval under that section, the ballot proposition would have also had to state the following: (i) The currently existing dollar rate, as of the date the proposition is subject to voter approval under this section; and (ii) The amount the proposed levy increase exceeds the currently existing dollar rate. <p>Legislation: HB 2578 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/2578.pdf)</p> <p>Companion Legislation: SB 6216</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: None provided by legislative staff of the Washington State Legislature.</p>
<p>Elections and Tax:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 3089</p> <p><i>Would have sought to improve transparency and provide greater information to property taxpayers</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments are required to follow specific procedures and provide certain information to taxpayers in imposing property taxes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have amended several statutory provisions and added new sections with the goal of enhancing the administrative process for property taxes to adequately protect taxpayers and to improve the transparency and fairness of the property tax system, particularly with respect to property valuations and tax levies. Would have established greater taxpayer protections in the valuation appeals process and provided more information to taxpayers. <p>Legislation: HB 3089 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/3089.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Analysis: None provided by legislative staff of the Washington State Legislature.</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Elections and Tax:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 2749</p> <p><i>Would have eliminated the non-supplant restrictions for multi-year lid lifts</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular property tax revenue for local governments is restricted to a growth rate of one percent plus new construction. However, voters may approve regular property tax increases above this one percent amount. This voter-approved increase is referred to as a lid lift. A lid lift may be for a single year or for multiple years, not exceeding six years. Multi-year lid lifts must be for a specific purpose, and multi-year lid lift funds may not supplant (replace) existing funds used for the purpose specified in the lid lift ballot proposition. In 2009, the Legislature eliminated this non-supplant restriction for any lid lift ballot proposition approved after July 26, 2009, except in King County, where the non-supplant restriction is eliminated only for ballot propositions approved in calendar years 2009, 2010, or 2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have completely eliminated the non-supplant restrictions for multi-year lid lifts. <p>Legislation: HB 2749 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/2749.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Analysis: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/2749%20HBA%20FIN%2010.pdf</p>
<p>Tax:</p> <p>Legislation: HB 2802</p> <p><i>Would have reviewed the local government fiscal note program</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This relates to a proposed new section to chapter 43.330 RCW. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have added a new section to chapter 43.330 RCW for the purpose of attempting to gain a better understanding of the potential fiscal impacts imposed by proposed legislation by having the State Department of Commerce, in consultation with local governments and the legislature, review the local government fiscal note program and report findings and recommendations to the legislature. <p>Legislation: HB 2802 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/2802.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Analysis: None provided by legislative staff of the Washington State Legislature.</p>

Topic(s)	Current Law	Changes
<p>Liability:</p> <p>Legislation: 2ESSB 6508</p> <p><i>Would have made changes to statutes governing wrongful death and survival causes of actions, including changes to the beneficiaries who are entitled to recover under these actions</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At common law, a person's cause of action for personal injuries did not survive the person's death, and there was no right of recovery for the wrongful death of a person. The Legislature has provided for such actions through interrelated statutes governing four types of wrongful death and survival actions: (1) general wrongful death; (2) wrongful death of a child; (3) general survival; and (4) special survival. • Wrongful death statutes provide a new cause of action on behalf of specified beneficiaries for damages they suffer as a result of the decedent's death. In contrast, survival actions do not create a new cause of action; rather they allow for the continuation of any causes of action that the decedent could have brought had he or she survived. A special survival action is limited to actions for injuries resulting in death while a general survival action applies to any injury suffered by the decedent prior to death. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have made changes to various provisions of the wrongful death and survival statutes, including changes regarding beneficiaries entitled to recovery under these actions. • Would have established a process under which the state would reimburse local governments for liability and defense costs incurred by local governments as a result of the act. <p>Legislation: 2ESSB 6508 (http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Bills/6508-S.E2.pdf)</p> <p>Status: Did not pass.</p> <p>Bill Report: http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/6508-S.E2%20HBR%20APH2%2010.pdf</p>