

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 1694 S HB	Title: Coordinated transportation
-------------------------------	--

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 **						
Local Gov. Total						

Estimated Expenditures

Agency Name	2007-09			2009-11			2011-13		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Department of Transportation	.8	0	381,000	.4	0	287,500	.0	0	0
Total	0.8	\$0	\$381,000	0.4	\$0	\$287,500	0.0	\$0	\$0

Local Gov. Courts *									
Local Gov. Other **			280,000			280,000			280,000
Local Gov. Total			280,000			280,000			280,000

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Prepared by: Geri Beardsley, OFM	Phone: 360-902-9822	Date Published: Final 3/14/2007
---	-------------------------------	---

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

** See local government fiscal note

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1694 S HB	Title: Coordinated transportation	Agency: 405-Department of Transportation
-------------------------------	--	---

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	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.0
Fund					
Multimodal Transportation Account-State 218-1	83,500	297,500	381,000	287,500	0
Total \$	83,500	297,500	381,000	287,500	0

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: 03/09/2007
Agency Preparation: Brent Thompson	Phone: 360-705-7927	Date: 03/13/2007
Agency Approval: Paula Hammond	Phone: 360-705-7027	Date: 03/14/2007
OFM Review: Geri Beardsley	Phone: 360-902-9822	Date: 03/14/2007

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 proposed legislation reauthorizes the Agency Council on Coordinated Transportation (ACCT) to continue until June 30, 2010. ACCT was previously scheduled to sunset on June 30, 2007.

Section 2 of the legislation changes the duties of the council for the purpose of developing efficiencies in special needs transportation, eliminating local/regional and state barriers to coordination and providing more trips with the existing resources.

Section 3 requires that each regional planning organization submit an updated plan to the council beginning on July 1, 2007, and every other year thereafter.

Section 4 requires the council to submit a progress report describing the progress in attaining goals identified in the biennial work plan and highlighting any problems in achieving these goals to the legislature by December 1, 2009, and every other year thereafter.

Section 5 requires the joint transportation committee and the agency council on coordination transportation to review the legal, programmatic changes, and best practices necessary for providing effective coordination of special needs transportation services at the subregional level. A final report with recommendations shall be provided to the House of Representatives and Senate Transportation Committees by December 1, 2007.

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.

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.

Two positions, a Transportation Planning Specialist 3 and Office Assistant 2, and consultant services are assumed to be required to support the Council's efforts to promote the coordination of special needs transportation. The Governor's 2007-09 Transportation budget includes funding for these support costs.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
FTE Staff Years	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.4	
A-Salaries and Wages	40,800	42,000	82,800	40,800	
B-Employee Benefits	12,000	14,400	26,400	12,000	
C-Personal Service Contracts	20,000	220,000	240,000	220,000	
E-Goods and Services	6,000	15,900	21,900	10,000	
G-Travel	4,700	5,200	9,900	4,700	
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
Total:	\$83,500	\$297,500	\$381,000	\$287,500	\$0

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
Office Assistant 2	28,980	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	
Transportation Planning Specialist 3	61,500	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.3	
Total FTE's		0.8	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.0

III. C - Expenditures By Program (optional)

Program	FY 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
Public Transportation (V)	83,500	297,500	381,000	287,500	
Total \$	83,500	297,500	381,000	287,500	

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.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

Bill Number: 1694 S HB	Title: Coordinated transportation
-------------------------------	--

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

Legislation Impacts:

- Cities: As members of regional transportation planning organizations (or RTPOs).
- Counties: As members of regional transportation planning organizations.
- Special Districts: As members of regional transportation planning organizations.
- Specific jurisdictions only:
- 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: Each regional transportation planning organization is funded differently.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
City					
County					
Special District					
TOTAL \$					
GRAND TOTAL \$					

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY 2008	FY 2009	2007-09	2009-11	2011-13
City					
County		280,000	280,000	280,000	280,000
Special District					
TOTAL \$		280,000	280,000	280,000	280,000
GRAND TOTAL \$					840,000

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: David Elliott	Phone: (360) 725 5033	Date: 03/09/2007
Leg. Committee Contact:	Phone:	Date: 03/09/2007
Agency Approval: Steve Salmi	Phone: (360) 725 5034	Date: 03/13/2007
OFM Review: Geri Beardsley	Phone: 360-902-9822	Date: 03/14/2007

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 FROM THE PREVIOUS VERSION OF THE BILL:

The bill is refined and rewritten to focus the legislative intent. The renewal of the agency council is reduced from a 10-year extension to a three-year extension. The bill now calls for the Joint Transportation Committee (JTC) to play a role in the study and planning of special needs transportation. The bill maintains the reporting function by local governments to the agency council; the requirement is now found in Section 7 of the bill and is added to existing duties of the local planning bodies.

SUMMARY OF THE CURRENT VERSION OF THE BILL:

This bill would renew and extend for three years an agency council that provides state-level coordination of transportation for people with special needs. The council is made up of the Department of Transportation, the Department of Social and Health Services, and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Most of the bill modifies existing statute to extend the agency council, but the bill also removes prescriptive language concerning the function of the entity and grants rule-making authority.

Section 7 contains a requirement for regional transportation planning organizations (RTPOs) to submit a plan to the agency council in July of 2007 and every other year thereafter.

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 EXPENDITURE IMPACTS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT:

Both DOT and local RTPO representatives expect the fiscal impact of this version of the bill to be the same as the original version.

The bill will result in additional costs to local governments to meet new planning requirements. LGFN estimates expenditures ranging from \$168,000 to \$390,000 per biennium spread out over many local entities, including counties, cities, school districts, hospitals, tribal governments, social service providers, transportation agencies, and other organizations that participate in regional transportation planning organizations (RTPO) and metropolitan transportation organizations (MPOs). Each planning organization is funded differently and organized differently depending on the area and population served.

BACKGROUND:

An initial planning and report process occurred during 2006, and this was funded by \$450,000 from the Department of Transportation (DOT). The reports required by this bill are intended to update the 2006 plan on a biennial basis beginning July 2007. What is required by the report is not clear. The specific content will be defined by DOT under the new rule-making role created in this bill. The reports will be written by RTPO and MPO groups. There are 14 RTPOs in Washington State representing areas varying in size from part of one county to many counties. They are broken down further into transportation management areas (TMAs) serving more than 200,000 residents and MPOs serving fewer than 200,000 residents. All of the RTPO are "volunteer" organizations under state law. They are funded by a variety of methods (e.g., some by dues and others staffed by participating agencies) and once an RTPO or its constituent members have accepted state transportation funds they also have accepted planning responsibilities. RTPOs are made up of local city and county governments, nonprofit organizations, transit organizations, school districts, hospitals, tribal governments, social service providers, and other interested public and private agencies.

In order to update and report changes to their plan, each RTPO would need to undertake a series of public meetings intended to gather information about the state of special needs transportation in their region. The size of the report and depth of research will depend on the rules written by the agency council. Yakima's RTPO listed possible expenses as travel, meeting space, public outreach and publicity, research and data collection, document writing and production. Other RTPOs may need to hire consultants to complete the plan within the bill's timeline.

Estimates ranged from \$12,000 to \$25,000 per RTPO per biennium. This would yield a statewide figure of between \$168,000 and \$350,000 per biennium (\$12,000 x 14 RTPO and \$25,000 x 14 RTPO). Another funding formula suggested by staff at DOT was \$10,000 per county, which yields an estimate of \$390,000. The range reflects the variety of sizes and complexity of RTPO as well as the uncertainty about what will be required by any new rules adopted.

LGFN has selected an estimate of \$20,000 per RTPO or \$280,000 (20,000 x 14) as the fiscal note estimate. This figure represents the middle ground of estimates provided, and takes account of the diversity of organizations and uncertainty about the content. There will also be an impact attributable to the July 2007 deadline for the first required report which is deliverable to the agency council on the first day of the 2008 fiscal year.

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.

None

SOURCES FOR REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES:

Department of Transportation

Yakima regional transportation planning organization

Peninsula regional transportation planning organization

Association of Washington Cities