

# Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5331 S SB	<b>Title:</b> Historic county courthouse
-------------------------------	--

## Estimated Cash Receipts

Agency Name	2005-07		2007-09		2009-11	
	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total
Office of State Treasurer	Non-zero but indeterminate cost. Please see discussion."					
Community, Trade, and Economic Development	0	20,000,000	0	(800,000)	0	(1,600,000)
<b>Total \$</b>	0	20,000,000	0	(800,000)	0	(1,600,000)

Local Gov. Courts *						
Local Gov. Other **		5,700,000		9,400,000		4,700,000
Local Gov. Total		5,700,000		9,400,000		4,700,000

## Estimated Expenditures

Agency Name	2005-07			2007-09			2009-11		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Office of State Treasurer	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Community, Trade, and Economic Development	1.2	0	20,238,214	1.2	0	237,214	.0	0	237,214
<b>Total</b>	1.2	\$0	\$20,238,214	1.2	\$0	\$237,214	0.0	\$0	\$237,214

Local Gov. Courts *									
Local Gov. Other **			40,000			80,000			80,000
Local Gov. Total			40,000			80,000			80,000

--

<b>Prepared by:</b> Robin Campbell, OFM	<b>Phone:</b> 360-902-0575	<b>Date Published:</b> Final 4/19/2005
---	-------------------------------	---

\* See Office of the Administrator for the Courts judicial fiscal note

\*\* See local government fiscal note

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5331 S SB	<b>Title:</b> Historic county courthouse	<b>Agency:</b> 090-Office of State Treasurer
-------------------------------	--	--

## Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

### Estimated Cash Receipts to:

**Non-zero but indeterminate cost. Please see discussion.**

### Estimated Expenditures from:

	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
<b>Fund</b>					
<b>Total \$</b>					

*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:	Phone:	Date: 03/28/2005
Agency Preparation: Dan Mason	Phone: 360-902-9090	Date: 03/31/2005
Agency Approval: Dan Mason	Phone: 360-902-9090	Date: 03/31/2005
OFM Review: Deborah Feinstein	Phone: 360-902-0614	Date: 03/31/2005

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

*Briefly describe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.*

SSB 5331 creates the historic county courthouse account. Earnings from investments will be credited to the general fund.

Earnings from investments:

The amount of earnings by an account is a function of the average daily balance of the account and the earnings rate of the investment portfolio. The average daily balance is a function of the beginning balance in the account and the timing & amount of receipts, disbursements, & transfers during the time period in question. Accordingly, even with a beginning balance of zero, two accounts with the same overall level of receipts, disbursements, and transfers can have different average balances, and hence differing earnings.

There will be an impact to the earnings; however, the actual earnings will be determined more by the impact to the average daily balance than the amount of increases or decreases in receipts, disbursements, and transfers. Currently, estimated earnings are indeterminable. Without projected monthly estimates of receipts, disbursements, and transfers, OST is unable to estimate the changes to the average balance of the account and the impact to earnings.

Based on the March 2005 Revenue Forecast, the net rate for estimating earnings for FY 05 is 2.19%, FY 06 is 3.04%, and FY 07 is 3.30%. Approximately \$21,900 in FY 05, \$30,400 in FY 06, and \$33,000 in FY 07 in net earnings and \$5,000 in OST management fees would be gained or lost annually for every \$1 million increase or decrease in average daily balance.

Debt Limit:

There may be an impact on the Debt Service Limitation calculation. Any change to the earnings credited to the general fund will change, by an equal amount, General State Revenues.

### II. B - Cash receipts Impact

*Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.*

SSB 5331 creates the historic county courthouse account. Earnings from investments will be credited to the general fund.

### II. C - Expenditures

*Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.*

## Part III: Expenditure Detail

### III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
FTE Staff Years					
<b>Total:</b>					

## Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

**Part V: New Rule Making Required**

*Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.*

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5331 S SB	<b>Title:</b> Historic county courthouse	<b>Agency:</b> 103-Community, Trade & Economic Develop
-------------------------------	--	--

## Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

### Estimated Cash Receipts to:

FUND	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
Public Works Assistance Account-State 058-1				(800,000)	(1,600,000)
Historic County Courthouse Account-State NEW-1	2,000,000	18,000,000	20,000,000		
<b>Total \$</b>	2,000,000	18,000,000	20,000,000	(800,000)	(1,600,000)

### Estimated Expenditures from:

	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
FTE Staff Years	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.0
<b>Fund</b>					
Public Works Assistance Account-State 058-1	2,000,000	18,000,000	20,000,000	0	0
Historic County Courthouse Account-State NEW-1	119,607	118,607	238,214	237,214	237,214
<b>Total \$</b>	2,119,607	18,118,607	20,238,214	237,214	237,214

*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:	Phone:	Date: 03/28/2005
Agency Preparation: Loren Doolittle	Phone: 360-586-3072	Date: 03/29/2005
Agency Approval: Nancy Ousley	Phone: (360)725-3003	Date: 03/31/2005
OFM Review: Robin Campbell	Phone: 360-902-0575	Date: 04/01/2005

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

*Briefly describe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.*

Section 1. Identifies 28 of the state's 39 county courthouses currently operating as county seats as historic buildings. Acknowledges that capital improvements to these courthouses are needed to protect their safety and their historic and architectural integrity.

Section 2. Creates a new historic county courthouse grant program for the protection and preservation of the state's historic county courthouses. Creates the historic county courthouse account in the state treasury. Moneys deposited into the account may be spent only after appropriation. Expenditures from the account shall be used exclusively to fund the historic county courthouse grant program. Directs the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP) to administer the historic county courthouse grant program. Limits program administration costs to 1% of the expenditures from the account. All other expenditures from the account are to be for grants to be made to counties for the protection and preservation of courthouses. If available funding exceeds eligible courthouse grant requests, historic county-owned facilities such as libraries, museums, and hospitals may apply for grants using the same criteria. Counties receiving grants are required to provide an equal amount of matching funds from public or private sources. OAHP is directed to establish a 12-member advisory council, manage the grants program, and provide technical assistance to the counties, ensuring that projects comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation.

Section 3. Appropriates \$20 million, or as much thereof as necessary, for the 2005-2007 biennium from the public works assistance account to the historic county courthouse account.

### II. B - Cash receipts Impact

*Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.*

Assumes a transfer of a maximum of \$20 million for the biennium from the Public Works Assistance Account to the new Historic County Courthouse Account.

Transferring \$20 million from the Public Works Assistance Account to the new Historic County Courthouse Account will reduce the available funding for public works loans by \$20 million. Loan principal and interest repayment that would have been generated on the \$20 million is projected for Fiscal Year (FY) 06 - \$0, FY 07 - \$0, FY 08 - \$300,000, FY 09 \$500,000, FY 10 \$700,000, and FY 11, \$900,000. The projected principal and interest repayment represents funding above the initial \$20 million that will not be available to local governments for future loans in ensuing biennia.

### II. C - Expenditures

*Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.*

OAHP annually reviews 4,300 federal projects, 1,500 State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) checklists or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) documents, issues 40 archaeological permits, collects data on 2,400 historic and archaeological sites, and consults on 200 Forest Practice applications with existing staff. There is no staff available to manage a program of this size.

One FTE would be required to develop requests for proposals, establish and staff the 12-member advisory committee, provide technical assistance during the application process, review proposals for adequacy and to ensure the projects meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, work with the Advisory Committee on final selection of grant awards, develop scopes of work for the grant contracts, administer the contracts, and provide on-going technical assistance to the award recipients. This position will need to have experience in historic preservation/architectural standards in order to provide technical assistance to the grantees on historic rehabilitation standards and to ensure the

Request # 600-134-1

Bill # 5331 S SB

conditions of the grant award are being met.

Annual costs are based upon salary of \$57,252 and benefits of \$14,313 for a Technical Specialist 3, and .1 salaries of \$4,526 and benefits of \$1,132 for a Grants Management Analyst and/or Secretary Lead to provide administrative support to the program, \$4,500 in one-time equipment costs, attorney general costs of \$2,000, general goods and services of \$1,800 for the Technical Specialist 3, and agency administration costs of \$31,584. Assuming that more contracts will be awarded and more projects completed in the the second year, travel and attorney general costs are projected to increase in the second year. Goods and services includes attorney general fees and \$1,800 a year in general costs.

The bill does not specify the Advisory Committee's role. However, it is assumed that the Advisory Committee is intended to be an independent review board that will review the request for proposals and make recommendations as to final grant awards. No travel costs are included in projected expenditures for costs incurred by the committee members.

Annual administrative costs are projected at \$119,607 first fiscal year, and \$118,607 for subsequent fiscal years, and will exceed the 1% administrative expenditure cap. Other capital grant programs, such as Building for the Arts, are capped at 3%. Assuming that some counties will not be able to meet the 50% match required, requested grant amounts will vary by county, and that not all projects can be complete within given time frames, it is estimated that between 8 to 15 grants will be awarded.

### Part III: Expenditure Detail

#### III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
FTE Staff Years	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	
A-Salaries and Wages	61,778	61,778	123,556	123,556	123,556
B-Employee Benefits	15,445	15,445	30,890	30,890	30,890
C-Personal Service Contracts					
E-Goods and Services	3,800	5,800	9,600	11,600	11,600
G-Travel	2,500	4,000	6,500	8,000	8,000
J-Capital Outlays	4,500		4,500		
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers	2,000,000	18,000,000	20,000,000		
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements	31,584	31,584	63,168	63,168	63,168
<b>Total:</b>	\$2,119,607	\$18,118,607	\$20,238,214	\$237,214	\$237,214

#### III. B - 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 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
Grants Mgmt Analyst/Secy Sr	45,264	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	
Prog Mgr/Tech Spec 3	57,252	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Various - 100 Agency Administration	41,600	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	
<b>Total FTE's</b>		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.0

#### III. C - Expenditures By Program (optional)

Program	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
Agency Administration (100)	31,584	31,584	63,168	63,168	63,168
Local Government (600)	2,088,023	18,087,023	20,175,046	174,046	174,046
<b>Total \$</b>	2,119,607	18,118,607	20,238,214	237,214	237,214

## Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

Identify acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and describe potential financing methods

Construction Estimate	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
Acquisition					
Construction					
Other	1,880,393	17,881,393	19,761,786	19,762,786	19,762,786
<b>Total \$</b>	<b>1,880,393</b>	<b>17,881,393</b>	<b>19,761,786</b>	<b>19,762,786</b>	<b>19,762,786</b>

The County Court House Study identified \$93 million needed to complete restoration on Washington's county courthouses. This bill would provide for approximately 20% of those costs. It is assumed that in the first fiscal year an estimated \$1.8 million of project construction work would be accomplished; with the bulk of construction project work being accomplished in the second fiscal year at \$17.8 million. It is anticipated that two to four project grants will be funded in this first year based upon the provision in section two of the bill for reimbursing projects completed as of January 1, 2003. These project grants are projected to range from between \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. In the second year of the program, it is assumed that county agencies will have prepared and documented rehabilitation needs and translated that documentation into actual budgets and project drawings. Therefore, based upon expected completed project planning, six to twelve projects are projected to be funded in the second year with award amounts ranging from \$250,000 to \$1,000,000.

Should a following biennium be funded at \$20 million, construction project work costs are approximated at \$9.8 million per fiscal year, \$19.7 million for a second biennium. Total assumed project grants would be \$19,761,786 for the first biennium, and \$19,762,786 second biennium, based on anticipated county applications, subsequent grant awards, and administration costs.

Transferring \$20 million from the Public Works Assistance Account to the new Historic County Courthouse Account will reduce the available funding for public works loans by \$20 million. Loan interest that would have been generated on the \$20 million is projected for Fiscal Year (FY) 06 - \$0, FY 07 - \$0, FY 08 - \$300,000, FY 09 \$500,000, FY 10 \$700,000, and FY 11, \$900,000. The projected principal and interest repayment represents funding above the initial \$20 million that will not be available to local governments for future loans in ensuing biennia.

## Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

No rulemaking required.



# LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5331 S SB	<b>Title:</b> Historic county courthouse
-------------------------------	--

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

**Legislation Impacts:**

- Cities: Appropriation of funds from the public works assistance account reduces availability of low-interest loans to cities (see expenditure impacts).
- Counties: All grants under the new program would go to counties. Also, appropriation of funds from the public works assistance account reduces availability of low-interest loans to counties (see expenditure impacts).
- Special Districts: Appropriation of funds from the public works assistance account reduces availability of low-interest loans to districts (see expenditure impacts).
- Specific jurisdictions only: Counties with eligible courthouses.
- Variance occurs due to:

**Part II: Estimates**

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs:
- Legislation provides local option:
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time:

**Estimated revenue impacts to:**

Jurisdiction	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
City					
County	1,000,000	4,700,000	5,700,000	9,400,000	4,700,000
Special District					
<b>TOTAL \$</b>	1,000,000	4,700,000	5,700,000	9,400,000	4,700,000
<b>GRAND TOTAL \$</b>					19,800,000

**Estimated expenditure impacts to:**

Jurisdiction	FY 2006	FY 2007	2005-07	2007-09	2009-11
City		25,200	25,200	50,400	50,400
County		2,400	2,400	4,800	4,800
Special District		12,400	12,400	24,800	24,800
<b>TOTAL \$</b>		40,000	40,000	80,000	80,000
<b>GRAND TOTAL \$</b>					200,000

**Part III: Preparation and Approval**

Fiscal Note Analyst: Dahra Latham	Phone: 360-725-5036	Date: 04/13/2005
Leg. Committee Contact:	Phone:	Date: 03/28/2005
Agency Approval: Louise Deng Davis	Phone: (360) 725-5034	Date: 04/19/2005
OFM Review: Robin Campbell	Phone: 360-902-0575	Date: 04/19/2005

## Part IV: Analysis

### A. SUMMARY OF BILL

*Provide a clear, succinct description of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.*

The bill would create the historic county courthouse account in the state treasury, and direct the office of archaeology and historic preservation (OAHP) to create procedures for distributing money from the account to counties for the protection or preservation of their historic courthouses. The bill would also appropriate twenty million dollars from the public works assistance account to the new account.

---

Section one states legislative findings.

Section two creates the account and provides that:

--OAHP would administer the program, and could use up to one percent of funds in the account for administrative expenses.

--Eligible counties are those whose courthouses are eligible for listing on the Washington Heritage Register.

--Counties receiving grants must provide equal matching funds.

--An application process must be established by October 1, 2005.

--Grants may be used for protection and preservation of courthouses but not for maintenance. (See Section (2)(4) for details.)

--OAHP must establish an advisory board of specified membership. (See Section (2)(5) for details.)

--If available funds exceed eligible courthouse grant recipients, historic county-owned facilities such as libraries, museums, and hospitals may apply for grants using the same criteria.

Section three makes the appropriation.

### B. SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE IMPACTS

*Briefly describe and quantify the expenditure impacts of the legislation on local governments, identifying the expenditure provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.*

The bill's expenditure impacts would fall into two groups: those created by the availability of grant funding for courthouse restoration, and those created by the removal of \$20 million from the public works assistance account (PWAA).

#### GRANT IMPACTS:

##### -- Administration Costs and Baseline Spending --

It is assumed that the office of archaeology and historic preservation would retain 1% of the appropriation for administrative costs, as the bill permits. In that case, \$19.8 million would be distributed in grants to counties. The bill would require that all grant funds be spent on courthouse restoration. In addition, counties receiving grants would be required to match grant funds in a one-to-one ratio. Consequently, total restoration spending would equal twice the amount of the grants, or \$39.6 million. However, some courthouse restoration work will be completed whether grants are available or not, and this spending is not part of the impact of the bill. Baseline county spending -- spending for courthouse restoration if the bill does not pass -- is assumed to be \$10 million (or \$1,667,000 per year) during the fiscal note period. The net increase in spending would then be \$29.6 million.

##### -- Timing of Grant Expenditures --

OAHP estimates that \$1 million would be disbursed in FY 2006 in grants for work that has already been completed. County funds to match these grants have already been expended, and this fiscal note does not account for them. It is assumed that the remaining \$18.8 million in grant dollars would be disbursed from FY 2007 to FY 2010, and that during those years the counties would spend \$18.8 million in grant funds and \$18.8 million in matching funds, or \$37.6 million (\$9.4 million in each year). After accounting for baseline spending, this is a net increase of \$7,733,000 per year from FY 2007 to FY 2010.

##### -- Reduced Spending in Later Years --

It is assumed that, if the bill does not pass, counties will perform \$10 million of restoration work during the fiscal note period, or an average

of \$1,667,000 per fiscal year. The availability of grants would change the timing of work as well as the level of work. Counties are expected to perform some restoration work earlier, thus moving some spending from the end of the fiscal note period, or from years after FY 2011, forward into FY 2007-2010. Assuming that all grant and matching funds are expended by the end of FY 2010, and that the work which would otherwise have been done in FY 2011 would be completed earlier as a result of the grant program, this creates a reduction of spending in FY 2011 equal to the assumed baseline spending of \$1,667,000.

#### PWAA IMPACTS:

The bill would appropriate (Section (3)) \$20 million from the public works assistance account, thus reducing the sum available for loans from that account. Funds in the account are lent out to local governments at interest rates approximately 4% below the rates available on the bond market. The Public Works Board estimates that loans are distributed among cities, counties and special purpose districts in approximately the following ratio:

Cities - 63%

Counties - 6%

Special Purpose Districts - 31%.

If local governments replaced twenty million dollars of loans from the public works assistance account with the same amount of debt at a 4% higher interest rate, the result would be an increase in interest payments of \$800,000 per year. This amount, split among cities, counties and special purpose districts in the ratio above, would create increased annual interest costs of \$504,000 for cities, \$48,000 for counties, and \$248,000 for special purpose districts. However, it is likely that local governments would defer or forgo most affected projects rather than issuing bonds to pay for them. If 5% of affected projects were to go forward with bond funding, the resulting increase in annual interest costs would be \$25,200 for cities, \$2,400 for counties, and \$12,400 for special purpose districts, or a total of \$40,000.

In addition, because interest earned on funds in the public works assistance account exceeds administration costs, these funds increase by approximately 0.5% annually. Reducing the balance in the account by twenty million dollars would reduce the interest earned annually by approximately \$100,000. Over time, this would result in a balance reduction in addition to the original appropriation. Expenditure figures in this note do not account for this effect.

It is also likely that some deferred projects would be undertaken later at a higher cost. No attempt has been made to quantify such impacts.

#### ASSUMPTIONS:

Five percent of affected projects would go forward with bond funding.

#### SOURCES:

Public Works Board  
Association of Washington Cities  
Washington State Association of Counties  
Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

### **C. SUMMARY OF REVENUE IMPACTS**

*Briefly describe and quantify the revenue impacts of the legislation on local governments, identifying the revenue provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of revenue sources. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.*

The bill includes (Section (3)) an appropriation of twenty million dollars into the newly created historic county courthouse account. A minimum of 99% of these funds, or 19.8 million dollars, would be distributed in the form of one-to-one matching grants to counties with eligible historic courthouses. How the grants would be distributed among those counties is unknown.

The 28 counties with historic courthouses are: Benton, Chelan, Clallam, Clark, Columbia, Douglas, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Grays Harbor, Island, Jefferson, King, Klickitat, Lewis, Mason, Okanogan, Pacific, Pend Oreille, San Juan, Skagit, Skamania, Snohomish, Spokane, Stevens, Wahkiakum, and Walla Walla.

The bill would require (Section (2)(4)) that the office of archaeology and historic preservation create application procedures for the grants by October 1, 2005. However, counties could apply for grant funding for any work completed after January 1, 2003. Some counties are expected to apply immediately for grants to cover work they have already done, and this would result in approximately \$1,000,000 in

disbursements in FY 2006. It is assumed that the remainder of the initial appropriation would be obligated for specific projects in FY 2007, and actually disbursed to counties from FY 2007-FY 2010.

This note does not account for the possibility of additional, future appropriations to the account.

**ASSUMPTIONS:**

The initial appropriation, except for one million dollars disbursed in FY 2006, would be obligated for specific projects in FY 2007, and actually disbursed to counties from FY 2007-FY 2010.

The office of archaeology and historic preservation (OAHP) would retain 1% of the appropriation for administrative costs.

NOTE: Lead agency note accounts for all grant funds being expended by OAHP at the time they would be obligated (in FY 2007).

**SOURCES:**

Public Works Board  
Association of Washington Cities  
Washington State Association of Counties  
Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation