

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 1178 2S HB	Title: Associate development org
--------------------------------	---

Estimated Cash Receipts

Agency Name	2007-09		2009-11		2011-13	
	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total
Total \$						

Local Gov. Courts *						
Local Gov. Other **		6,371,966		6,586,882		6,537,272
Local Gov. Total		6,371,966		6,586,882		6,537,272

Estimated Expenditures

Agency Name	2007-09			2009-11			2011-13		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development	1.1	6,600,000	6,600,000	1.1	6,814,916	6,814,916	1.1	6,765,306	6,765,306
Total	1.1	\$6,600,000	\$6,600,000	1.1	\$6,814,916	\$6,814,916	1.1	\$6,765,306	\$6,765,306

Local Gov. Courts *									
Local Gov. Other **	Non-zero but indeterminate cost. Please see discussion.								
Local Gov. Total									

--

Prepared by: Mike Woods, OFM	Phone: 360-902-9819	Date Published: Final 3/13/2007
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---

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

** See local government fiscal note

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1178 2S HB	Title: Associate development org	Agency: 103-Community, Trade & Economic Develop
--------------------------------	---	--

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

FUND					
Total \$					

Estimated Expenditures from:

	FY 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
FTE Staff Years	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Fund					
General Fund-State 001-1	3,300,000	3,300,000	6,600,000	6,814,916	6,765,306
Total \$	3,300,000	3,300,000	6,600,000	6,814,916	6,765,306

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: 03/07/2007
Agency Preparation: Phyllis Cole	Phone: 360-725-4051	Date: 03/07/2007
Agency Approval: Karen McArthur	Phone: 36-0725-4027	Date: 03/12/2007
OFM Review: Mike Woods	Phone: 360-902-9819	Date: 03/13/2007

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.

The second substitute bill, like the first substitute, differs from the original bill with the addition of three words, “workforce development councils,” to the list of organizations that a contracting associate development organization (ADO) must work with.

The second substitute bill adds a sixth section making the act null and void if appropriations are not provided by June 30, 2007.

There is no change in the fiscal impact among any of these three versions of this bill.

Sections in the original bill (and both substitute versions) that have fiscal impact:

Section 2

Amends the responsibilities for the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) related to contracting and supporting ADOs. The department would no longer be responsible for determining the scope of services delivered by ADOs. New language in the section details the scope of services to be delivered by ADOs under these contracts, as follows:

- Offering direct business planning assistance to businesses that need support to stay in business, expand, or relocate to Washington.
- Serving as a conduit to partner organizations.
- Providing information on permitting and tax issues related to operating/expanding businesses in Washington.
- Marketing Washington to expand and recruit new businesses.
- Developing and executing regional plans to attract businesses from out of state and to increase foreign investment.
- Supporting regional economic research and regional planning to implement economic development strategies that support increased living standards in Washington.
- Collecting and reporting data to inform local, regional and state strategy and policy decisions regarding business and economic development.

Deleted sections 2(3) and 2(4) remove CTED requirements regarding establishment of service delivery regions throughout the state and the contents and selection criteria for contracts with ADOs. The new scope of services described above updates these requirements and brings them more in line with current economic development strategies. The deletions neither increase nor decrease service delivery costs.

Section 3

This section requires that every two years CTED include development of specific performance targets as part of the contracting process with each ADO.

Subsection (2) (a) requires CTED to annually review the performance of each ADO against agreed upon performance measures.

Subsection (2) (b) requires the development of a remediation plan for each ADO that fails to achieve more than one-half of the agreed upon performance targets. It also defines the purpose and the content of a required remedial plan and the consequences if an ADO fails to make progress once the remedial plan is developed.

Subsection (2) (c) requires CTED to terminate the contract for one year with any ADO that fails after remediation and allows CTED to contract with the same ADO or a successor ADO after the one-year termination has elapsed.

Section 4

Establishes a new allocation formula for determining the amount of pass-through funding each rural and each urban ADO contractor would receive through CTED. The formulas are based on the population density of each county. Rural counties are those with fewer than 100 people per square mile. Urban counties are those with more than 100 people per square mile.

- Rural counties would receive a base allocation of \$30,000 per year plus an additional allocation of \$0.70 per capita.
- Urban counties would receive an annual allocation of \$1 per capita, capped at \$400,000 annually.
- ADOs in rural and urban counties are required to match the per capita allocation with local funds.

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.

None.

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.

Assumptions:

Section 4

The attachment to this fiscal note contains three worksheets. The first, titled “FY 08-13 Projected ADO Funding,” applies the population density based allocation formula included in Section 4 of the bill and shows how much ADO pass-through funding would be allocated by county. It also shows the total fiscal impact of the increased pass-through funding by fiscal year. The allocation formula in Section 4 would increase ADO pass-through funding above current funding levels by \$6.4 million in the 2007-09 Biennium, and \$6.6 million in the 2009-11 Biennium, and \$6.5 million in the 2011-13 Biennium.

Pass-through funding totaling \$2,965,000 that is currently designated for ADOs during FY08 and FY09 would be redirected to meet the funding requirements of the bill. This funding includes \$2,136,000 allocated by formula to ADOs to provide core and special rural economic development services; \$809,000 allocated by a tiered formula to ADOs to provide business retention and expansion services, and; \$20,000 previously used by CTED to purchase common software for use by ADOs. The worksheet titled ”FY06 & 07 ADO Allotments” summarizes the pass-through formulas and the worksheet titled “FY06 & 07 ADO & BRE Funding” provides county level detail about the funding formulas currently in use. Although not referenced in this bill, \$6.6 million is included in the Governor’s Proposed 2007-2009 Biennial Operating Budget for increased ADO funding.

It is assumed the number of ADO contracts would increase from the current level of 32 to 39 because increased funding levels would make it possible to support an ADO organization in each county.

The pass through grants are the following: FY08 \$3,178,483; FY09 \$3,193,483; FY10 \$3,285,941; FY11 \$3,300,941; FY12 \$3,261,136; FY13 \$3,276,136

Section 3

Program management and administrative funding that is currently designated in CTED’s 2005-2007 biennial budget to support the ADO pass-through program totals \$123,294. This includes .6 FTE per year and a two-year total of \$74,855 for program management costs and a two-year total of \$48,439 for administrative costs. (See the worksheet titled “FY06 & 07 ADO Allotments” for details of budgeted costs.) This funding and FTE level will be redirected to support the ADO contracting as described in the bill.

However, increased levels of pass-through funding as well as increased levels of performance accountability will impact current CTED program management staffing levels. To meet Section 3 responsibilities, additional staffing will be required to do the following:

- In the front end of the contracting process, help develop the new performance based contracting approach and to revise existing contracting processes and materials to accommodate enhanced accountability requirements.
- Workshops that provide opportunities to consult with ADOs during the development phase and to train ADOs on reporting procedures will be necessary to launch the new system and engage ADOs in making the system work well.
- Negotiating individual performance-based contracts with each ADO will create new contract management and economic development technical assistance workload.

-Following contract execution, more intensive monitoring of each contract will be required to ensure performance targets are met and to provide technical assistance when modifications of service delivery methods and approaches are required. Assumption: Based on past experience working with ADOs, it is estimated that 10 percent of the ADO contracts (i.e., 4 contracts) would require remediation assistance by the end of the first year of the contract period. It is estimated that five percent of the ADO contracts (i.e., 2 contracts) would be terminated at the end of the second year of the biennium for failure to meet their remedial plan. These estimates are based on challenges ADOs face that may affect accomplishment of performance targets required under subsections (3)(a)-(3)(c). For example:

- Turnover of ADO executive directors or key staff can often delay achievement of performance expectations (e.g., 12 ADOs had turnover in their executive director staff positions during the 2005-2007 Biennium).
- Local perceptions of unsatisfactory performance can lead to a county decision to change the organization designated as the ADO (e.g. 2 counties changed their ADO designations during the 2005-2007 Biennium).
- Difficulty meeting match expectations can be an indicator of insufficient local resources to meet performance targets (e.g., 5 ADOs are currently at risk of not meeting match expectations for the 2005-2007 Biennium).

To address new program management workload under this section, an additional 1.0 FTE CTED Specialist 3 is needed to assist with the following:

- Developing the implementation strategy for the new funding allocation approach, including consulting with ADOs on service delivery approaches, strategies, tools and techniques;
- Developing performance measures that can be used meaningfully across regions to allow for statewide evaluation as required in Section 3;
- Negotiating contract work plans with up to 20 of 39 ADO contractors each biennium (the remaining 19 contracts will be negotiated by currently funded CTED staff);
- Serving as the economic development point of contact for those ADOs; annually compare performance outcomes with targets for these organizations;
- Help ADO contract management staff and ADOs design technically-focused remedial plans for any of the 39 ADO contractors that do not meet performance targets;
- Reviewing amendments for economic development service delivery implications;
- Providing technical assistance to those ADOs requiring assistance making service delivery strategy adjustments to meet performance targets;
- Working with those jurisdictions where there is necessity to explore alternative service delivery approaches or alternative organization models.

Salary and Benefits: \$78,047 for 1.0 FTE per year for FY08-FY13

Goods and Services (G&S)

FY 08: \$37,470

- standard G&S: \$34,625
- space and utilities: \$1,591
- non-standard G&S: \$1,254: includes costs for printing

FY 09: \$22,470

- standard G & S \$19,626
- space and utilities \$1,591
- non-standard G & S \$1,253: added costs for printing

FY 10 – FY13: \$29,970 for each fiscal year

- standard G & S \$27,126
- space and utilities \$1,591
- non-standard G & S \$1,253: added costs for printing

Note: Standard goods and services costs include supplies and materials, employee development and training, agency administration, mandatory state seat of government and Department of Personnel charges, and CTED agency

Request # 200700-188-1

Bill # 1178 2S HB

administration. CTED agency administration costs are allocated to programs depending on the complexity and/or volume of work required for each program. The cost indicators used to determine complexity and volume of work are: the number of contracts administered, the number of FTEs working on a program, and the number of separate budget reporting codes (i.e., separate cost centers or accounts). CTED administration provides general standard governmental services including, but not limited to: budgeting, accounting, payroll, and purchasing services; personnel and employee services; internal information technology systems, desktop and network support services; facilities management services; legislative and public affairs services; policy and risk management services; and other support services.

Travel for the CTED Specialist 3 is \$6,000 for each fiscal year.

Total program management and administration costs, including redirected current funding and new funding for these purposes is \$173,801 for FY 08 and \$177,528 for FY 09. These annual funding levels stay constant in subsequent biennia. The increase in pass-through grant costs for the 2007-2009 Biennium is \$6,371,965. The increase in program management and administration costs for the 2007-2009 Biennium is \$228,035. The total amount of new funding required to implement the bill in the 2007-2009 Biennium is \$6.6 million. The Governor's proposed operating budget includes \$6,600,000 and covers increased pass-through, program management and administrative costs for the 2007-09 Biennium.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
FTE Staff Years	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
A-Salaries & Wages	60,036	60,036	120,072	120,072	120,072
B-Employee Benefits	18,011	18,011	36,022	36,022	36,022
C-Personal Serv Contr					
E-Goods and Services	37,470	22,470	59,940	59,940	59,940
G-Travel	6,000	6,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits Services	3,178,483	3,193,483	6,371,966	6,586,882	6,537,272
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursement					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursement					
Total:	\$3,300,000	\$3,300,000	\$6,600,000	\$6,814,916	\$6,765,306

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 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
Comm, Trade and Econ Dev	60,036	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Specialist 3						
Various Administrative Services	55,515	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total FTE's		1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1

III. C - Expenditures By Program (optional)

Program	FY 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
Agency Administration (100)	22,294	22,294	44,588	44,588	44,588
Economic Development (700)	3,277,706	3,277,706	6,555,412	6,770,328	6,720,718
Total \$	3,300,000	3,300,000	6,600,000	6,814,916	6,765,306

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

None.

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.

None.

FY08-13 Projected ADO Funding

ADO/County	Land Area in Square Miles	2006 Population Projection	2006 Density Per Sq. Mile	2010 Population Projection	2010 Density Per Sq. Mile	Proposed Annual Base Allocation for Rural Co's.	2007-09 Proposed Per Capita Allocation	2011-13 Proposed Per Capita Allocation	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
									Total Annual Allocation FY 08	Total Annual Allocation FY 09	New Total Allocation FY 10 PerCap \$.7 Rural \$1 Urban w/cap	New Total Allocation FY 11	New Total Allocation FY 12	New Total Allocation FY 13
Adams Co.	1,925	17,300	9	18,502	10	\$ 30,000	\$ 12,110	\$ 12,951	\$ 42,110	\$ 42,110	\$ 42,951	\$ 42,951	\$ 42,951	\$ 42,951
Asotin Co.	636	21,000	33	22,582	36	\$ 30,000	\$ 14,700	\$ 15,807	\$ 44,700	\$ 44,700	\$ 45,807	\$ 45,807	\$ 45,807	\$ 45,807
Benton Co.	1,703	153,465	90	161,236	95	\$ 30,000	\$ 107,426	\$ 112,865	\$ 137,426	\$ 137,426	\$ 142,865	\$ 142,865	\$ 142,865	\$ 142,865
Chelan Co.	2,922	70,100	24	75,993	26	\$ 30,000	\$ 49,070	\$ 53,195	\$ 79,070	\$ 79,070	\$ 83,195	\$ 83,195	\$ 83,195	\$ 83,195
Clallam Co.	1,745	65,526	38	67,754	39	\$ 30,000	\$ 45,868	\$ 47,428	\$ 75,868	\$ 75,868	\$ 77,428	\$ 77,428	\$ 77,428	\$ 77,428
Clark Co.	628	403,500	643	432,479	689	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000
Columbia Co.	869	4,100	5	4,100	5	\$ 30,000	\$ 2,870	\$ 2,870	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870
Cowlitz Co.	1,139	100,592	88	107,903	95	\$ 30,000	\$ 70,414	\$ 75,532	\$ 100,414	\$ 100,414	\$ 105,532	\$ 105,532	\$ 105,532	\$ 105,532
Douglas Co.	2,159	36,845	17	42,302	20	\$ 30,000	\$ 25,792	\$ 29,611	\$ 55,792	\$ 55,792	\$ 59,611	\$ 59,611	\$ 59,611	\$ 59,611
Ferry Co.	2,204	7,998	4	8,384	4	\$ 30,000	\$ 5,599	\$ 5,869	\$ 35,599	\$ 35,599	\$ 35,869	\$ 35,869	\$ 35,869	\$ 35,869
Franklin Co.	1,242	57,046	46	61,552	50	\$ 30,000	\$ 39,932	\$ 43,086	\$ 69,932	\$ 69,932	\$ 73,086	\$ 73,086	\$ 73,086	\$ 73,086
Garfield Co.	711	2,451	3	2,510	4	\$ 30,000	\$ 1,716	\$ 1,757	\$ 31,716	\$ 31,716	\$ 31,757	\$ 31,757	\$ 31,757	\$ 31,757
Grant Co.	2,676	83,584	31	88,331	33	\$ 30,000	\$ 58,509	\$ 61,832	\$ 88,509	\$ 88,509	\$ 91,832	\$ 91,832	\$ 91,832	\$ 91,832
Grays Harbor Co.	1,917	70,894	37	71,000	37	\$ 30,000	\$ 49,626	\$ 49,700	\$ 79,626	\$ 79,626	\$ 79,700	\$ 79,700	\$ 79,700	\$ 79,700
Island Co.	209	75,920	363	80,650	386	\$ -	\$ 75,920	\$ 80,650	\$ 75,920	\$ 75,920	\$ 80,650	\$ 80,650	\$ 80,650	\$ 80,650
Jefferson Co.	1,809	28,825	16	30,892	17	\$ 30,000	\$ 20,178	\$ 21,624	\$ 50,178	\$ 50,178	\$ 51,624	\$ 51,624	\$ 51,624	\$ 51,624
King Co.	2,126	1,801,651	847	1,861,042	875	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000
Kitsap Co.	396	243,400	615	257,841	651	\$ -	\$ 243,400	\$ 257,841	\$ 243,400	\$ 243,400	\$ 257,841	\$ 257,841	\$ 257,841	\$ 257,841
Kittitas Co.	2,297	34,314	15	36,742	16	\$ 30,000	\$ 24,020	\$ 25,719	\$ 54,020	\$ 54,020	\$ 55,719	\$ 55,719	\$ 55,719	\$ 55,719
Klickitat Co.	1,873	20,596	11	21,626	12	\$ 30,000	\$ 14,417	\$ 15,138	\$ 44,417	\$ 44,417	\$ 45,138	\$ 45,138	\$ 45,138	\$ 45,138
Lewis Co.	2,408	73,903	31	77,493	32	\$ 30,000	\$ 51,732	\$ 54,245	\$ 81,732	\$ 81,732	\$ 84,245	\$ 84,245	\$ 84,245	\$ 84,245
Lincoln Co.	2,311	10,200	4	10,386	4	\$ 30,000	\$ 7,140	\$ 7,270	\$ 37,140	\$ 37,140	\$ 37,270	\$ 37,270	\$ 37,270	\$ 37,270
Mason Co.	961	54,752	57	58,604	61	\$ 30,000	\$ 38,326	\$ 41,023	\$ 68,326	\$ 68,326	\$ 71,023	\$ 71,023	\$ 71,023	\$ 71,023
Okanogan Co.	5,268	41,979	8	44,061	8	\$ 30,000	\$ 29,385	\$ 30,843	\$ 59,385	\$ 59,385	\$ 60,843	\$ 60,843	\$ 60,843	\$ 60,843
Pacific Co.	975	21,017	22	21,257	22	\$ 30,000	\$ 14,712	\$ 14,880	\$ 44,712	\$ 44,712	\$ 44,880	\$ 44,880	\$ 44,880	\$ 44,880
Pend Oreille Co.	1,401	12,474	9	13,674	10	\$ 30,000	\$ 8,732	\$ 9,572	\$ 38,732	\$ 38,732	\$ 39,572	\$ 39,572	\$ 39,572	\$ 39,572
Pierce Co.	1,676	750,386	448	788,580	471	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000
San Juan Co.	175	15,847	91	17,316	99	\$ 30,000	\$ 11,093	\$ 12,121	\$ 41,093	\$ 41,093	\$ 42,121	\$ 42,121	\$ 42,121	\$ 42,121
Skagit Co.	1,735	115,270	66	123,807	71	\$ 30,000	\$ 80,689	\$ 86,665	\$ 110,689	\$ 110,689	\$ 116,665	\$ 116,665	\$ 116,665	\$ 116,665
Skamania Co.	1,657	10,600	6	11,068	7	\$ 30,000	\$ 7,420	\$ 7,748	\$ 37,420	\$ 37,420	\$ 37,748	\$ 37,748	\$ 37,748	\$ 37,748
Snohomish Co.	2,080	679,179	325	728,957	349	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000
Spokane Co.	1,764	446,417	253	466,417	264	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000
Stevens Co.	2,478	41,310	17	46,585	19	\$ 30,000	\$ 28,917	\$ 32,610	\$ 58,917	\$ 58,917	\$ 62,610	\$ 62,610	\$ 62,610	\$ 62,610
Thurston Co.	727	238,980	329	258,687	356	\$ -	\$ 238,980	\$ 258,687	\$ 238,980	\$ 238,980	\$ 258,687	\$ 258,687	\$ 258,687	\$ 258,687
Wahkiakum Co.	264	3,959	15	4,169	16	\$ 30,000	\$ 2,771	\$ 2,918	\$ 32,771	\$ 32,771	\$ 32,918	\$ 32,918	\$ 32,918	\$ 32,918
Walla Walla Co.	1,271	57,986	46	60,030	47	\$ 30,000	\$ 40,590	\$ 42,021	\$ 70,590	\$ 70,590	\$ 72,021	\$ 72,021	\$ 72,021	\$ 72,021
Whatcom Co.	2,120	183,471	87	195,504	92	\$ 30,000	\$ 128,430	\$ 136,853	\$ 158,430	\$ 158,430	\$ 166,853	\$ 166,853	\$ 166,853	\$ 166,853
Whitman Co.	2,159	40,586	19	41,149	19	\$ 30,000	\$ 28,410	\$ 28,804	\$ 58,410	\$ 58,410	\$ 58,804	\$ 58,804	\$ 58,804	\$ 58,804
Yakima Co.	4,296	227,985	53	237,435	55	\$ 30,000	\$ 159,590	\$ 166,205	\$ 189,590	\$ 189,590	\$ 196,205	\$ 196,205	\$ 196,205	\$ 196,205
TOTAL	66,922	6,325,408	--	6,658,600	--	\$ 930,000	\$ 3,738,483	\$ 3,845,941	\$ 4,668,483	\$ 4,668,483	\$ 4,775,941	\$ 4,775,941	\$ 4,751,136	\$ 4,751,136
Projected Total FY 08-09 Pass-Through (per above)									\$ 4,668,483	\$ 4,668,483	\$ 4,775,941	\$ 4,775,941	\$ 4,751,136	\$ 4,751,136
Current FY 06-07 (Base) Pass-Through (see attached)									\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,475,000
Difference=Increase in Pass-Through/FY									\$ 3,178,483	\$ 3,193,483	\$ 3,285,941	\$ 3,300,941	\$ 3,261,136	\$ 3,276,136
Total=Increase in Pass-Through/Biennium									\$6,371,965.00		\$6,586,881.80		\$6,537,271.40	
Current Prog. Mgt. & Admin Costs (see attached)									\$59,783	\$63,511	\$59,783	\$63,511	\$59,783	\$63,511
Additional Prog. Mgmt. & Admin. Costs/Impact (see FN)									\$114,018	\$114,017	\$114,017	\$114,017	\$114,017	\$114,017
Total=Projected Prog. Mgmt. & Admin. /FY									\$173,801	\$177,528	\$173,800	\$177,528	\$173,800	\$177,528
Total=Fiscal Impact of Pass-Through, Prog. Mgmt. & Admin/FY									\$ 3,292,501	\$ 3,307,500	\$ 3,399,958	\$ 3,414,958	\$ 3,375,153	\$ 3,390,153
Total=Fiscal Impact of Pass-Through, Prog. Mgmt. & Admin/Biennium									\$6,600,000		\$6,814,916		\$6,765,305	

*Base Allocation \$30K will be allocated only to Rural Counties

*Rural Co's receive base plus \$.07 Per Capita Allocation for Rural Counties (<100 pop. Per. sq.mi.)

*Urban Counties (>100 PPSM) receive a locally-matched \$1 per capita allocation, with \$400k max.

*2006 & 2010 Population data based on figures posted on www.chosswashington.com, from OFM as of Nov. 2006

*San Juan's pop. density in 2012 is projected to be >100 based on the assumption that growth during the 2 years between 2010 and 2012 will occur at the same rate projected for the 4 year period between 2006 and 2010.

Amount Over the \$6.6m budget goal >

\$0

\$214,916

\$165,305

FY06 & 07 ADO Allotments

76102 ADO Grants

Budgeted Pass Through Funding	Formula	SFY 2006 Year 1	SFY 2007 Year 2	Total for Bien
ADO Core Funding	39 counties x \$40,000	\$780,000	\$780,000	\$1,560,000
ADO Rural Funding	32 counties x \$18,000	\$288,000	\$288,000	\$576,000
BRE Funding & Software	per matrix as of 10-7-05 *	\$402,000	\$407,000	\$809,000
BRE Software		\$20,000		\$20,000
Total Pass Through Budgeted		\$1,490,000	\$1,475,000	\$2,965,000

*difference supported additional software and user training/data entry costs

Budgeted Program Management Costs		SFY 2006 Year 1	SFY 2007 Year 2	Total for Bien
A - Salaries	Equals .6 FTE	\$27,452	\$28,165	\$55,617
B - Benefits		\$7,720	\$8,118	\$15,838
C - Contracts		\$0	\$0	\$0
E - Goods & Services		\$500	\$500	\$1,000
G - Travel		\$1,200	\$1,200	\$2,400
Total Program Mgt. Costs Budgetd		\$36,872	\$37,983	\$74,855

Budegeted Program 100 - Administration Costs		SFY 2006 Year 1	SFY 2007 Year 2	Total for Bien
Administration Costs		\$22,911	\$25,528	\$48,439
Total Admin Costs Budgeted		\$22,911	\$25,528	\$48,439

Total Costs Budgeted 2005 - 2007	\$1,549,783	\$1,538,511	\$3,088,294
---	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

FY 06 & 07 ADO & BRE Funding

ADO Contractor	Total Core Dollars	Total Rural Dollars	Total ADO Dollars	BRE Tier 1 Program	BRE Tier 2 Program	BRE Tier 3 Program	Total BRE Dollars	Total ADO & BRE Dollars
Enterprise Seattle (King)	40,000	-	40,000	50,000			50,000	90,000
Snohomish Co. EDB	40,000	-	40,000	50,000			50,000	90,000
Tacoma-Pierce Co. EDB	40,000	-	40,000	50,000			50,000	90,000
Spokane Area EDC	40,000	-	40,000	45,000			45,000	85,000
Columbia River EDC (Clark)	40,000	-	40,000	50,000			50,000	90,000
- Skamania Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000	-			-	58,000
Bellingham-Whatcom EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000	50,000			50,000	108,000
Yakima Co. Dev. Assoc.	40,000	18,000	58,000	50,000			50,000	108,000
Kitsap Co. EDC	40,000	-	40,000	50,000			50,000	90,000
EDA of Skagit Co.	40,000	18,000	58,000	50,000			50,000	108,000
Thurston Co. EDC	40,000	-	40,000	50,000			50,000	90,000
TRIDEC (Benton & Franklin for ADO & BRE)	80,000	18,000	98,000		42,000		42,000	140,000
- Franklin (Rural only)		18,000	18,000					18,000
Lewis Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000		78,000		78,000	136,000
- Cowlitz Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000		-		0	58,000
- Mason Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000		-		0	58,000
- Pacific Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000		-		0	58,000
Port of Walla Walla	40,000	18,000	58,000		14,000		14,000	72,000
Palouse EDC (Asotin, Garfield, Columbia, Whitman)	160,000	72,000	232,000			14,000	14,000	246,000
Grays Harbor Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000		34,000		34,000	92,000
Port of Chelan	40,000	18,000	58,000		44,000		44,000	102,000
- Port of Douglas Co.	40,000	18,000	58,000		-		0	58,000
- Economic Alliance (Okanog)	40,000	18,000	58,000		-		0	58,000
Jefferson Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000		34,000		34,000	92,000
- Clallam EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000		-		0	58,000
Grant Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000		14,000		14,000	72,000
Island District EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000			10,000	10,000	68,000
- San Juan Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000			-	0	58,000
Tri-County EDB (Ferry, Pend Oreille, Stevens)	120,000	54,000	174,000			10,000	10,000	184,000
Phoenix Group (Kittitas)	40,000	18,000	58,000			5,000	5,000	63,000
Klickitat Co. EDA	40,000	18,000	58,000				0	58,000
Adams Co. EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000				0	58,000
Lincoln Co. ADO	40,000	18,000	58,000				0	58,000
Lower Columbia EDC	40,000	18,000	58,000				0	58,000
Subtotals	1,560,000	576,000	2,136,000	495,000	260,000	39,000	794,000	2,930,000

Note: Spokane Area EDC chose 10% reduction to not use Synchronist

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

Bill Number: 1178 2S HB	Title: Associate development org
--------------------------------	---

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

Legislation Impacts:

- Cities:
- Counties:
- Special Districts:
- Specific jurisdictions only: Associate Development Organizations (ADOs) and their respective counties and other participating governments
- Variance occurs due to:

Part II: Estimates

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs:
- Legislation provides local option: Counties are not required to create ADOs; currently 32 of 39 counties have ADOs.
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: Effect of bill subject to Null and Void clause. Unique circumstances of individual communities may require varying amounts of time and planning resources to complete the ADOs' performance measurement requirements of Section 3.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
City					
County					
Special District	3,178,483	3,193,483	6,371,966	6,586,882	6,537,272
TOTAL \$	3,178,483	3,193,483	6,371,966	6,586,882	6,537,272
GRAND TOTAL \$					19,496,120

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Indeterminate Impact

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Gary Reid	Phone: (360) 725 3044	Date: 03/07/2007
Leg. Committee Contact:	Phone:	Date: 03/07/2007
Agency Approval: Steve Salmi	Phone: (360) 725 5034	Date: 03/08/2007
OFM Review: Mike Woods	Phone: 360-902-9819	Date: 03/08/2007

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

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

CHANGES IN THE SECOND SUBSTITUTE OVER THE FIRST SUBSTITUTE:

Addition of Section 6, null and void clause if bill not specifically funded by June 30,2007.

CHANGES IN THE SUBSTITUTE OVER THE ORIGINAL BILL:

Section 2 adds "workforce development councils" as participating organizations.

SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL BILL:

Section 2 amends the responsibilities for the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) related to contracting and supporting associate development organizations (ADOs). CTED would no longer be responsible for determining the scope of services delivered by ADOs. New language in the section details the scope of services to be delivered by ADOs under these contracts, as follows:

- Offering direct business planning assistance to businesses that need support to stay in business, expand, or relocate to Washington.
- Serving as a conduit to partner organizations.
- Providing information on permitting and tax issues related to operating/expanding businesses in Washington.
- Marketing Washington to expand and recruit new businesses.
- Developing and executing regional plans to attract businesses from out of state and to increase foreign investment.
- Supporting regional economic research and regional planning to implement economic development strategies that support increased living standards in Washington.
- Collecting and reporting data to inform local, regional, and state strategy and policy decisions regarding business and economic development.

Deleted subsections 2(3) and 2(4) remove CTED requirements regarding establishment of service delivery regions throughout the state and the contents and selection criteria for contracts with ADOs. The new scope of services described above updates these requirements and brings them more in line with current economic development strategies. The deletions neither increase nor decrease service delivery costs.

Section 3 requires that every two years CTED include development of specific performance targets as part of the contracting process with each ADO.

- Section 3 (2) (a) requires CTED to annually review the performance of each ADO against agreed upon performance measures.
- Section 3 (2) (b) requires the ADO to development of a remediation plan for each ADO that fails to achieve more than one-half of the agreed upon performance targets. It also defines the purpose and the content of a required remedial plan and the consequences if an ADO fails to make progress once the remedial plan is developed.
- Section 3 (2) (c) requires CTED to terminate the contract for one year with any ADO that fails after remediation and allows CTED to contract with the same ADO or a successor ADO after the one-year termination has elapsed.

Section 4 establishes a new allocation formula for determining the amount of pass-through funding each rural and each urban ADO contractor would receive through CTED. The formulas are based on the population density of each county. Rural counties are those with fewer than 100 people per square mile. Urban counties are those with more than 100 people per square mile.

- ADOs in rural counties would receive a base allocation of \$30,000 per year plus an additional allocation of \$0.70 per capita.
- ADOs in urban counties would receive an annual allocation of \$1 per capita, capped at \$400,000 annually.
- ADOs in rural and urban counties are required to match the per capita allocation with local funds.

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.

CHANGES IN THE SECOND SUBSTITUTE FROM THE FIRST SUBSTITUTE:

The addition of the null and void clause in Section 6 makes the effect of the bill contingent upon specific funding being provided in the Omnibus Appropriations Act by June 30, 2007.

EXPENDITURE IMPACTS OF ORIGINAL AND FIRST SUBSTITUTE BILL:

The bill's expenditure impact to local governments is indeterminate. The unique circumstances of individual communities may require varying amounts of time and planning resources to complete the Associate Development Organizations' (ADOs') performance measurement requirements of Section 3 of the proposed bill. Expenditure impacts for local governments are the same for HB 1178 and SHB 1178.

DISCUSSION:

ADOs will incur the following costs associated with the requirements of the proposed bill:

- Costs associated with developing and implementing performance measures.

- The cost of developing a remediation plan if necessary.
- Costs concerning reorganization following termination for nonperformance.

Contracting ADOs shall provide the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) with measures of their performance. Annual reports must include information on the impact of the contracting organization on employment, wages, tax revenue, and capital investment. Specific measures must be developed in the contracting process between CTED and the contracting organization every two years.

Performance measures should be consistent across regions to allow for statewide evaluation. Comparison of agreed thresholds and actual performance must occur annually.

Contracting organizations that fail to achieve the agreed performance targets in more than one-half of the agreed measures shall develop remediation plans to address performance gaps. The remediation plans must include revised performance thresholds specifically chosen to provide evidence of progress in making the identified service changes.

Contracts and state funding would be terminated for one year for organizations that fail to achieve the agreed upon progress toward improved performance. During the year in which termination for nonperformance is in effect, organizations shall review alternative delivery strategies to include reorganization of the contracting organization, merging of previous efforts with existing regional partners, and other specific steps toward improved performance. At the end of the period of termination, CTED may contract with the associate development organization or its successor as it deems appropriate.

COST ESTIMATES:

The Kitsap Economic Development Council has researched a software tool called IMPLAN to carry out performance measurements. Approximate cost is \$1,000. Additional costs would be attributed to staff time necessary to track and input data, estimated at 2 to 4 hours per week (\$40 to \$108 per week). Quarterly and annual reports would take an estimated 8 to 16 hours per report (\$160 - \$432 per report). There would be an initial outlay of time to input specific goals and targets that would not be repeated with an estimated time of 16 hours (\$320 to \$432). This estimate assumes the work will be performed by mid-level project management or mid-level budget personnel.

SOURCE:

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED)
Kitsap Economic Development Council
Association of Washington Cities 2006 Salary and Benefits Survey

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.

CHANGES IN THE SECOND SUBSTITUTE OVER THE FIRST SUBSTITUTE:

The addition of Section 6, which makes the bill null and void if not specifically funded by June 30, 2007, also makes potential revenue impacts of the bill indeterminate at this time.

REVENUE IMPACTS OF ORIGINAL AND FIRST SUBSTITUTE:

Associate Development Organizations (ADOs) will see revenue impacts as a result of this bill. Revenue estimates for local governments are the same for HB 1178 and SHB 1178.

DISCUSSION:

Section 4 establishes a new allocation formula for determining the amount of pass-through funding each rural and each urban ADO contractor would receive through CTED. The formulas are based on the population density of each county. Rural counties are those with fewer than 100 people per square mile. Urban counties are those with more than 100 people per square mile.

- ADOs in rural counties would receive a base allocation of \$30,000 per year plus an additional allocation of \$0.70 per capita.
- ADOs in urban counties would receive an annual allocation of \$1 per capita, capped at \$400,000 annually.
- ADOs in rural and urban counties are required to match the per capita allocation with local funds.

The allocation formula in Section 4 would increase ADO pass-through funding above current funding levels by \$6.4 million in the 2007-09 biennium, and \$6.6 million in the 2009-11 biennium, and \$6.5 million in the 2011-13 biennium. Pass-through funding totaling \$2,965,000 that is currently designated for ADOs during FY08 and FY09 would be redirected to meet the funding requirements of the bill. This funding includes \$2,136,000 allocated by formula to ADOs to provide core and special rural economic development services; \$809,000 allocated by a tiered formula to ADOs to provide business retention and expansion services; and \$20,000 previously used by CTED to purchase common software for use by ADOs.

Although not referenced in this bill, \$6.6 million is included in the Governor's Proposed 2007-2009 Biennial Operating Budget for increased ADO funding. It is assumed the number of ADO contracts would increase from the current level of 32 to 39 because increased funding levels would make it possible to support an ADO organization in each county.

ADO FUNDING ESTIMATES (Per Fiscal Year (FY)):

	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
Proposed Additional Funding per Section 4:	\$ 3,178,483	\$ 3,193,483	\$ 3,285,941	\$ 3,300,941	\$ 3,261,136	\$ 3,276,136
Current Base Pass-Through:	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,475,000
Projected Total Pass-Through:	\$ 4,668,483	\$ 4,668,483	\$ 4,775,941	\$ 4,775,941	\$ 4,751,136	\$ 4,751,136

SOURCE:

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED)