

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 5652 SB	Title: Environment/port districts
-----------------------------	--

Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures

Agency Name	2025-27				2027-29				2029-31			
	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total
Office of the Governor	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
University of Washington	2.0	506,650	506,650	506,650	2.0	506,650	506,650	506,650	2.0	506,650	506,650	506,650
Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
Total \$	2.0	506,650	506,650	506,650	2.0	506,650	506,650	506,650	2.0	506,650	506,650	506,650

Agency Name	2025-27			2027-29			2029-31		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Local Gov. Courts									
Loc School dist-SPI									
Local Gov. Other	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.								
Local Gov. Total									

Estimated Capital Budget Expenditures

Agency Name	2025-27			2027-29			2029-31		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Office of the Governor	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
University of Washington	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total \$	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0

Agency Name	2025-27			2027-29			2029-31		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Local Gov. Courts									
Loc School dist-SPI									
Local Gov. Other	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.								
Local Gov. Total									

Estimated Capital Budget Breakout

NONE

Prepared by: Ramona Nabors, OFM	Phone: (360) 742-8948	Date Published: Final 3/ 3/2025
--	---------------------------------	---

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 5652 SB	Title: Environment/port districts	Agency: 075-Office of the Governor
-----------------------------	--	---

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

NONE

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

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.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Alicia Kinne-Clawson	Phone: 360-786-7407	Date: 02/12/2025
Agency Preparation: Tracy Girolami	Phone: 360-890-5279	Date: 02/17/2025
Agency Approval: Jamie Langford	Phone: (360) 870-7766	Date: 02/17/2025
OFM Review: Val Terre	Phone: (360) 280-3073	Date: 02/17/2025

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Significant provisions of the bill and any related workload or policy assumptions that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency by section number.

Section 4(3) states that a qualifying port district must consider suggestions from the Office of Equity on mitigation techniques that will reduce or eliminate the environmental harms, and, maximize the environmental benefits, created by the significant port action on overburdened communities and vulnerable populations. The port district must also coordinate with the Office of Equity to identify policy and system barriers to meaningful engagement with communities as conducted by the office under RCW 43.06D.040(1)(b).

The Office of Equity estimates this work can be accomplished within current resources and therefore does not have a fiscal impact.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

NONE

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA.*

NONE

III. D - Expenditures By Program (optional)

NONE

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures

NONE

IV. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout

Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.

NONE

IV. D - Capital FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part IVB.*

NONE

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 5652 SB	Title: Environment/port districts	Agency: 360-University of Washington
-----------------------------	--	---

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
FTE Staff Years	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Account					
General Fund-State 001-1	253,325	253,325	506,650	506,650	506,650
Total \$	253,325	253,325	506,650	506,650	506,650

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

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.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Alicia Kinne-Clawson	Phone: 360-786-7407	Date: 02/12/2025
Agency Preparation: Christine Leibbrand	Phone: 4256475101	Date: 02/14/2025
Agency Approval: Michael Lantz	Phone: 2065437466	Date: 02/14/2025
OFM Review: Ramona Nabors	Phone: (360) 742-8948	Date: 03/03/2025

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Significant provisions of the bill and any related workload or policy assumptions that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency by section number.

Senate Bill 5652 would require qualifying port districts to obtain an assessment, called a cumulative impacts analysis (CIA), from the University of Washington's Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences (DEOHS). This report would assess likely adverse effects of any significant proposed actions at the port that would potentially impact overburdened and vulnerable communities. Further, the assessment must also include recommendations for mitigating impacts and must be done in consultation with the Department of Health (DOH) in the port's county, per Section 4.

Additionally, Section 4(4) requires UW's DEOHS to periodically assess port districts' mitigation strategies for effectiveness and provide publicly-available reports on the outcomes, costs, and benefits of implemented actions.

The work that DEOHS does here is independent of and supplemental to the Port's Environmental Impact Analysis.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

To conduct regular assessments of qualifying port districts' proposed actions and to periodically review port districts' mitigation strategies and efforts, DEOHS would need to engage in the following work in the six years after implementation

Year 1

- Develop an advisory committee, including community members, representatives from the qualifying port district, and experts to inform the scope and framework of the CIA with mitigation recommendations (CIA-m).
- Develop a project-specific website to make reports with mitigation recommendations and presentations available to the public
- Identify data gaps that limit the ability of DEOHS to comprehensively assess cumulative environmental health impacts
- Participate in the County DOH's "consultation process"

Year 2 - 6

- Maintain the baseline CIA-m by updating the baseline with assessments of qualifying proposed actions.
- If mitigations are implemented, do an assessment of mitigations efforts (i.e., review Port's strategies for effectiveness and report on outcomes, costs, and benefits of implemented actions).
- Participate in the County DOH's "consultation process"

In order to accomplish this scope of work, DEOHS anticipates needing the following FTE:

-0.1 FTE Associate Professor (Salary: \$164,155; Benefits Rate 24.9%), 0.1 FTE Assistant Professor (Salary: \$138,024; Benefits Rate: 24.9%), 0.1 FTE Clinical Salaried Associate Professor (Salary: \$121,668; Benefits Rate: 24.9%); 0.06 FTE Professor (Salary: \$197,484; Benefits Rate: 24.9%) and Assistant Professor 2 (Salary: \$138,024; Benefits Rate: 24.9%) to help develop plans and lead the assessments and consultation efforts, participate in the advisory committee, and identify data gaps.

-0.25 FTE Hourly Student Summer Employee (Salary: \$81,380, Benefits Rate: 23%), 0.5 FTE Postdoctoral Fellow (Salary: \$77,976; Benefits Rate: 24.9%), and 0.15 Research Scientist (Salary: \$99,996; Benefits Rate: 30.3%) to collect and analyze data that will be used to assess the impacts of ports' actions, co-author the reports, and collaborate with the County's Department of Health.

-0.5 FTE Outreach Specialist (Salary: \$84,000; Benefits Rate: 30.3%), 0.1 FTE Web/Graphic Designer (Salary: \$102,000; Benefits Rate: 30.3%), and 0.05 FTE Editor (Salary: \$72,000; Benefits Rate: 30.3%) to help create and publish the reports online in a manner that is publicly transparent.

The following expenses will also be needed in order to support this work:

- Computer server space with maintenance (\$1973/year)
- For travel, DEOHS will need to rent two UCars per quarter for an estimated 50 mile drive each. Those costs include the \$33.80 rental fee for each car and \$16.50 for each car for mileage (\$0.33/mi), translating to a \$100.60 cost for two cars for one quarter and a total cost of \$402 over the course of the year.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
001-1	General Fund	State	253,325	253,325	506,650	506,650	506,650
Total \$			253,325	253,325	506,650	506,650	506,650

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
FTE Staff Years	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
A-Salaries and Wages	198,169	198,169	396,338	396,338	396,338
B-Employee Benefits	52,781	52,781	105,562	105,562	105,562
C-Professional Service Contracts					
E-Goods and Other Services	1,973	1,973	3,946	3,946	3,946
G-Travel	402	402	804	804	804
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
9-					
Total \$	253,325	253,325	506,650	506,650	506,650

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA*

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
Assistant Professor	138,024	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Associate Professor	164,155	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Clinical Salaried Associate Professor	121,668	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Editor	72,000	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Outreach Specialist	84,000	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Postdoctoral Fellow	77,976	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Professor	197,484	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Research Scientist	99,996	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Student Hourly (Summer)	81,380	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Web/Graphic Designer	102,000	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total FTEs		2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

III. D - Expenditures By Program (optional)

NONE

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures

NONE

IV. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout

Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.

NONE

IV. D - Capital FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part IVB.*

NONE

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 5652 SB	Title: Environment/port districts	Agency: 468-Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office
-----------------------------	--	---

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

NONE

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

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.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Alicia Kinne-Clawson	Phone: 360-786-7407	Date: 02/12/2025
Agency Preparation: Dominga Soliz	Phone: 3606649173	Date: 02/14/2025
Agency Approval: Dominga Soliz	Phone: 3606649173	Date: 02/14/2025
OFM Review: Lisa Borkowski	Phone: (360) 742-2239	Date: 02/26/2025

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Significant provisions of the bill and any related workload or policy assumptions that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency by section number.

This bill adds a new section to the Port Districts Chapter requiring qualifying port districts to include environmental justice within strategic plans, adopt community engagement plans for engaging with overburdened communities and vulnerable populations, and take certain steps when considering significant port actions starting in 2026.

This bill does not appear to apply to the Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office (ELUHO) and its administrative appeals boards, the Pollution Control Hearings Board (PCHB), Shorelines Hearings Board (SHB), and Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB).

The bill does not provide jurisdiction to the ELUHO boards to review compliance with the act. No fiscal impact is anticipated to ELUHO and its boards.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

NONE

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA.*

NONE

III. D - Expenditures By Program (optional)

NONE

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures

NONE

IV. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout

Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.

NONE

IV. D - Capital FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part IVB.*

NONE

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Commerce

Bill Number: 5652 SB

Title: Environment/port districts

Part I: Jurisdiction-Location, type or status of political subdivision defines range of fiscal impacts.

Legislation Impacts:

- Cities:
- Counties: Indeterminate costs to coordinate with overburdened communities, vulnerable populations, and a qualifying port district as part of that district's community engagement plan. On-going costs to support such coordination for each significant action taken by a qualifying port district.
- Special Districts: Indeterminate costs to develop an environmental justice implementation plan, and a community engagement plan by January 1, 2026. There would be required consultation as part of this plan for any significant action taken by the port after this date. Applies to port districts operating an airport serving more than 900 scheduled jet aircraft flights per day.
- Specific jurisdictions only: Currently applies to King County and the Port of Seattle.

Variance occurs due to:

Part II: Estimates

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs: Environmental justice implementation plan and development of community engagement plan.
- Legislation provides local option: Use of funds to mitigate environmental impacts and cumulative environmental health impacts would be a local option.
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: The Port of Seattle would have considerable latitude in the scoping, design, planning, and implementation of the required environmental justice implementation plan and development of its community engagement plan. Costs could vary significantly depending on the scope and scale of the Port of Seattle's plans.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

None

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Jordan Laramie	Phone: 360-725-5044	Date: 02/18/2025
Leg. Committee Contact: Alicia Kinne-Clawson	Phone: 360-786-7407	Date: 02/12/2025
Agency Approval: Allan Johnson	Phone: 360-725-5033	Date: 02/18/2025
OFM Review: Ramona Nabors	Phone: (360) 742-8948	Date: 03/03/2025

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

Description of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.

This proposed legislation would require qualifying port districts to reduce environmental and health disparities by incorporating environmental justice into their strategic plans and community engagement practices. Environmental justice must be incorporated into a qualifying port district's strategic plans or other document significant planning documents, while a community engagement plan for addressing cumulative environmental health impacts of overburdened communities and vulnerable populations must be adopted by January 1, 2026. Any significant port action taken after this date, must include consultation with the county in which the qualifying port district is in, and overburdened communities and vulnerable populations.

Sec. 1 are definitions related to reducing environmental and health disparities for overburdened communities and vulnerable populations in qualifying port districts.

Sec. 2 establishes a requirement for environmental justice implementation plans for port district strategic plans. These plans must describe how the qualifying port district plans to apply and implement the principles of environmental justice to port district activities.

Sec. 3 requires a qualifying port district to create and adopt a community engagement plan by January 1, 2026, that details how the port plans to facilitate equitable participation and support meaningful and direct involvement of vulnerable populations and overburdened communities.

Sec. 4 establishes requirements that a qualify port district must take prior to any significant port actions after January 1, 2026. These include obtaining an impact assessment for the University of Washington, developing a public action plan that implements recommendations that mitigate or minimize potential cumulative environmental health impacts, consultation with overburdened communities and vulnerable populations as specified by the community engagement plan and lead by the county department of health where the qualifying port is located.

Sec. 5 authorizes qualified port districts to spend moneys in the district or general area to mitigate environmental impacts and cumulative environmental health impacts that arise from the port's operations.

Sec. 6 provides that Sec. 1 through Sec. 5 of this act would be a new chapter added to Title 53 RCW.

This act would go into effect 90 days after the session in which it is passed.

B. SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE IMPACTS

Expenditure impacts of the legislation on local governments with the expenditure provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Delineated between city, county and special district impacts.

The expenditure impact for this proposed legislation is indeterminate for qualifying port districts to comply with the planning and community engagement requirements of this act.

Using data from the Department of Transportation, the only qualifying port district is the Port of Seattle. Therefore, King County would also have responsibilities under Sec. 4 of this act to lead consultation efforts with overburdened communities and vulnerable populations prior to any significant port actions taken by the Port of Seattle.

The Port of Seattle would have considerable latitude in the scoping, design, planning, and implementation of the required environmental justice implementation plan and development of its community engagement plan. Costs could vary significantly depending on the scope and scale of the Port of Seattle's plans.

Indeterminate Costs:

Illustrative examples of costs:

This proposed legislation requires an environmental justice (EJ) implementation plans as part of a qualifying port district's strategic plans. These plans must describe how the port district plans to apply and implement the principles of EJ to port district activities. This act requires creating and adopting a community engagement plan by January 1, 2026, that details how the port plans to facilitate equitable participation and support meaningful and direct involvement of vulnerable populations and overburdened communities and establishes consultation requirements with these groups prior to any significant actions.

It should be noted that the planning costs associated with this act would be one time, although these plans may undergo periodic review depending on the needs of the port. However, community engagement would be required for every significant action which would have varying costs which depend on the number of significant actions as well as the scope and scale of the outreach.

For a similar range of costs for these activities:

In HB 2070 (2024) agency fiscal notes for this act estimated costs related to environmental justice impact statements as a component of State Environmental Policy Act environmental review for qualifying projects in overburdened communities. In addition to the reducing or mitigating cumulative impacts for overburdened communities and vulnerable populations, community engagement was a component of these impact statements. Agency estimates for each EJ impact statement had starting costs of approximately \$90,000 to more than \$270,000, depending on the complexity of the project review, project assessment, action that mitigated or minimized cumulative environmental health impacts, public involvement from these groups, and other factors. This work would likely take the work of external consultants.

In SB 5651 (2023) the Local Government Fiscal Note estimated the costs of a new Environmental Justice element proposed for the Growth Management Act, which would address how the entire comprehensive plan collectively addresses cumulative environmental health impacts faced by overburdened communities and vulnerable populations and how the plan advances the equitable distribution of environmental benefits. This new comprehensive plan element would have considered how a fully planning jurisdiction addressed all other elements to implement policies, goals, and objectives of EJ, which includes collaborating with overburdened communities and vulnerable populations. The Washington Association of Counties and the Association of Washington Cities both indicate that this work would involve extensive analysis and potentially updating existing elements to comply with the requirements of the new element. Additionally, it would take time to develop all the strategies, incorporate them throughout the plan, and then cross-reference them within the requirements of the new element. This new element had estimated costs between \$55,000 to \$250,000, and costs were on the higher end for counties and large cities.

Local Option:

Sec. 5 authorizes qualified port districts to spend moneys in the district or general area to mitigate environmental impacts and cumulative environmental health impacts that arise from the port's operations. Use of funds to mitigate environmental impacts and cumulative environmental health impacts would be a local option.

C. SUMMARY OF REVENUE IMPACTS

Revenue impacts of the legislation on local governments, with the revenue provisions identified by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of revenue sources. Delineated between city, county and special district impacts.

This proposed legislation is not anticipated to impact local government revenues.

SOURCES

Association of Washington Cities

Local Government Fiscal Note Program, FN 5651 SB (2023)

Local Government Fiscal Note Program, FN 2070 HB (2024)

Department of Transportation, Multimodal Mobility Dashboard Aviation -Passengers & Cargo (2025)

Washington State Association of Counties