${\bf Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary}$

BillNumber: 5853SB Title: Racialprofiling

${\bf Estimated Cash Receipts}$

GF-State	Total	GF-State	Total	GF-State	Total
_	GF-State	GF-State Total	GF-State Total GF-State	GF-State Total GF-State Total	GF-State Total GF-State Total GF-State

LocalGov.Courts*			
LocalGov.Other**			
LocalGov.Total			

Estimated Expenditures

AgencyName	2001-03			2003-05			2005-07		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
WashingtonState	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Patrol									
CriminalJustice	.5	0	560,700	.5	0	535,700	.5	0	535,700
TrainingCommission									
Total:	0.5	\$0	\$560,700	0.5	\$0	\$535,700	0.5	\$0	\$535,700

LocalGov.Other** 758,332 758,332	
	758,332
LocalGov.Total 758,332 758,332	758,332

Preparedby:	LindaSwanson,OFM	Phone:	DatePublished:
		360-902-0541	Revised4/10/2001

 $^{{\}rm * See Office of the Administrator for the Court sjudicial fiscal note} \\$

^{**} Seelocalgovernmentfiscalnote

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

BillNumber:	5853SB	Title: Racialpr	ofiling		Agency:	225-WashingtonState Patrol
artI:Estin	nates			<u>'</u>		
√ NoFisca	lImpact					
	otsandexpenditureestin anges(ifappropriate),a		entthemostlikelyfiscalim _e	pact.Factorsimpacting	theprecisiono	ftheseestimates,
	ableboxesandfollowo	-	etions:			
	npactisgreaterthan\$5		thecurrentbienniumori	nsubsequentbiennia	,completeen	tirefiscalnote
Iffiscalin	npactislessthan\$50,0	00perfiscalyearinthe	ecurrentbienniumorinsi	ubsequentbiennia,co	mpletethispa	ageonly(PartI).
Capitalb	udgetimpact,complet	ePartIV.				
	newrulemaking,com					
Kequiles	mewrutemaking,com	pieterantv.				
LegislativeC	ontact:			Phone:		Date: 02/09/2001
AgencyPrep	aration: AngelaPe	terson		Phone: 753-57	63	Date: 02/21/2001
AgencyAppı	coval: CaptainS	tevenT.Jewell		Phone: (360)75	53-0588	Date: 02/21/2001
OFMReview	· Garry Aug	etin		Phone: 360-90	2-0564	Date: 02/22/2001

Request# WSP-065-1 Bill# <u>5853SB</u>

PartII:NarrativeExplanation

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 work load or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

SenateBill5853,anditscompanionmeasure,HouseBill2017,wouldrequiretrafficenforcementagenciestosubmitan annualreporttotheCriminalJusticeTrainingCommission(CJTC)ontraffic-stopracialprofiling.Theinitialreportis dueonJuly1,2002exceptforagenciesalreadycompilingracialprofilingdata.

DataistobereportedonformsprovidedbyCJTCbyeachtrafficenforcementagencytoCJTCthatincludesthe following:

- 1. The number of individuals stopped for routine trafficen forcement.
- 2. Identifying characteristics of the individual stopped, including the race, ethnicity, age and gender.
- 3. Identifying the traffic infraction or violation that led to the stop.
- 4. Whetherasearchwasconducted as a result of the stop.
- 5. The legal basis for the search, including whether consent was obtained, whether a can ine unit was alerted, and whether the rewas a probable cause or reasonable suspicion to suspect a crime.
- Whetheranarrestwasmadeorawrittencitationwasissued.

II.B-CashreceiptsImpact

Brieflydescribeandquantifythecashreceiptsimpactofthelegislationontherespondingagency, identifying the cashreceipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenues our ces. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cashreceipts impact is derived. Explain how work load assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

II.C-Expenditures

Brieflydescribetheagencyexpendituresnecessarytoimplementthislegislation(orsavingsresultingfromthislegislation),identifyingbysection numbertheprovisionsofthelegislationthatresultintheexpenditures(orsavings). Brieflydescribethefactualbasisoftheassumptionsandthe methodbywhichtheexpenditureimpactisderived. Explainhowworkloadassumptionstranslateintocostestimates. Distinguishbetweenonetime andongoingfunctions.

The Washington State Patrolhas been engaged in collecting statistical data on racial profilings ince October 1999 and already collects most of the data elements required by this bill. However, additional programming of the agency's Time and Activity System will be necessary to collect the remaining elements. The programming change needed is minimal and can be accomplished by the agency's Financial Systems Development Section. The cost of the additional programming can be absorbed within the current budget resources.

PartIII:ExpenditureDetail

PartIV:CapitalBudgetImpact

PartV:NewRuleMakingRequired

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

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

BillNumber: 5853SB	Title: F	Racialprofiling		A	gency: 227-WaS JusticeTra	
PartI:Estimates NoFiscalImpact						
EstimatedCashReceiptsto:			_	_	_	
Fund						
	Total					
EstimatedExpendituresfrom:						
		FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FTEStaffYears		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Fund Dublic Sofaturand Education		202.950	267.950	560 700	525 7 00	F2F 700
PublicSafetyandEducation Account-State 02V-1		292,850	267,850	560,700	535,700	535,700
	Cotal	292,850	267,850	560,700	535,700	535,700
Thecashreceiptsandexpenditureestimat andalternateranges(ifappropriate),ared	explainedin	PartII.	likelyfiscalimpact.F	actorsimpactingthe	orecisionoftheseestima	tes,
Checkapplicableboxesandfollowcor	•					
Iffiscalimpactisgreaterthan\$50,0 formPartsI-V.	•	•		•		
Iffiscalimpactislessthan\$50,000	perfiscaly	earinthecurrentbio	enniumorinsubseq	uentbiennia,comp	letethispageonly(Par	tI).
Capitalbudgetimpact,complete	PartIV.					
√ Requiresnewrulemaking,comple	etePartV.					
LegislativeContact:				Phone:	Date: 02	/09/2001
AgencyPreparation: BrianElliott	į			Phone: 360-459-6	342 Date: 02	2/09/2001
AgencyApproval: VirgilSwee	ney			Phone: 360-459-6	342 Date: 02	2/15/2001
OFMReview: RandiWario	ck			Phone: 360-902-0	570 Date: 02	2/21/2001

Request# 2001-11A-1 Bill# <u>5853SB</u>

PartII:NarrativeExplanation

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

Brieflydescribe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related work load or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

This bill requires that the Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC) compiled efined information collected on an annual basis from trafficen forcement agencies. This bill also requires CJTC to provide an annual report that is to be used in various manners defined in section 2, subsection 2. CJTC will need to develop and distribute at raffic-stop racial profiling formannually to every trafficen forcement agency in the state of Washington and ensure that forms are received from every agency. CJTC will also need to enter into a contract with an outside vendor for the creation of a database to compile all of the data.

II.B-CashreceiptsImpact

Brieflydescribeandquantifythecashreceiptsimpactofthelegislationontherespondingagency, identifying the cashreceipts 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 cashreceipts impact is derived. Explain how work load 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 work load assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

1/20faFTEwillbeneededforthecreationofformstobesentouttoalltrafficenforcementagencies,ensurereturnof formsfromagencies,andinputofdataintodatabase.A1/2timeofficeassistantearning\$1,190amonthwillbeableto performtheseduties.Theannualexpendituresforthispositionwillbe\$14,280(1,190x12months)insalaryand\$3,570 (14,280x25%)inbenefits.

Thecreation of the database will be contracted to an outside vendor and is anticipated to cost \$25,000.

Theanalysis and creation of a report of the collected data will also be contracted to a noutside vendor. The analysis will need to take into account norming, demographic data, and current census information. Without this comparative and analytical approachitis unknown as to whether the information gathered would be a dequately analyzed. As note dearlier this task will need to be contracted out to a university of private firmatanest imated cost of \$250,000 per year. This estimate is based upon discussions with Nicholas P. Loveridge who is the Director of the Division of Government al Studies and Services at Washington State University (WSU) and Michael Gaffney who is the Research Coordinator at the Division of Governmental Studies and Services at WSU. By requesting the reporting agencies to send the raw data to the Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC), the data can be analyzed to produce the information requested by the legislature. This process will preclude the identification of any individual of ficer when the analysis is conducted. The process should be the same whether or not the data is reported to the CJT Cort of the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC).

One very important item that needs to be mentioned which would change some of the above information is if the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) gathers this information by expanding the current Uniform Crime Report (UCR), then a second form would not be necessary. The current UCR reporting form could be modified to include the elements noted in the legislative proposal. The rewould still be a cost to process the information and the analysis would still have to be done by a third party such as a university or other external agency. The advantage to this would be found not only in one less form but also in WASPC being the repository of such information which might be used for other purposes in the future. Since this is not within the scope of the bill at this time,

the CJT Chasnot provided the fiscal analysis reflecting this possibility.

PartIII:ExpenditureDetail

III.A-ExpendituresByObjectOrPurpose

	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FTEStaffYears	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
A-SalariesandWages	14,280	14,280	28,560	28,560	28,560
B-EmployeeBenefits	3,570	3,570	7,140	7,140	7,140
C-PersonalServiceContracts	275,000	250,000	525,000	500,000	500,000
E-GoodsandServices					
G-Travel					
J-CapitalOutlays					
M-InterAgency/FundTransfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-DebtService					
S-InteragencyReimbursements					
T-Intra-AgencyReimbursements					
Total:	\$292,850	\$267,850	\$560,700	\$535,700	\$535,700

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{III.B-FTEDetail:} & \textit{ListFTEsbyclassification} and \textit{corresponding} annual \textit{compensation.} \textit{Totals} \textit{need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA.} \\ \end{tabular}$

JobClassification	Salary	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
OfficeAssistant	2,380	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5
Total		.5	.5	.5	.5	.5

PartIV:CapitalBudgetImpact

PartV:NewRuleMakingRequired

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

Beginning July 1, 2002, except for trafficen for cementagencies already compiling the information required by this section, every trafficen for cementagency in this state shall provide an annual report to the Criminal Justice Training Commission, on forms provided by the commission. Section 2 subsection 1 defines the information that is to be on the forms and reported. Section 2 also states that the Criminal Justice Training Commission will compile all of the information received from the trafficen for cementagencies and provide a report that will be a valuable to o linear valuable to one control of the control

Revised

LOCALGOVERNMENTFISCALNOTE

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

BillNumber: 5853SB	Title: Racialpro	filing			
PartI:Jurisdiction- Locat	tion,typeorstatus	ofpoliticalsubdivi	siondefinesrangeo	ffiscalimpacts.	
LegislationImpacts:					
√ Cities:					
Counties:					
SpecialDistricts:					
Specificjurisdictionsonly:					
Varianceoccursdueto:					
— PartII:Estimates					
Nofiscalimpacts.					
Expendituresrepresentone-timeco	sts:				
Legislationprovideslocaloption:					
Keyvariablescannotbeestimatedwi	ithcertaintyatthistim	e:			
Fatimataduayanyaimmaatata					
Estimatedrevenueimpactsto:	<u> </u>	5 770000	0004.00		2005.07
Jurisdiction City	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
County					
SpecialDistrict					
TOTAL					
GRANDTOTAL					
Estimated expenditure impacts to:					
Jurisdiction	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
~:	MOEO 050	0050.050	0500 500	Ø500 500	ΦΕΩΩ ΕΩΩ

Jurisdiction	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
City	\$250,250	\$250,250	\$500,500	\$500,500	\$500,500
County	\$128,916	\$128,916	\$257,832	\$257,832	\$257,832
SpecialDistrict					
TOTAL	\$379,166	\$379,166	\$758,332	\$758,332	\$758,332
GRANDTOTAL			•	•	\$2,274,996

PartIII:PreparationandApproval

FiscalNoteAnalyst: LouiseDavis	Phone: (360)725-5034	Date:	04/09/2001
Leg.CommitteeContact:	Phone:	Date:	02/09/2001
AgencyApproval: ValRichey	Phone: 360-725-5036	Date:	04/09/2001
OFMReview: LindaSwanson	Phone: 360-902-0541	Date:	04/10/2001

Page1of2 BillNumber: 5853SB

PartIV: Analysis A.SUMMARYOFBILL

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

This bill would require every trafficen forcement agency in the state (except for those already compiling the required information) to provide an annual report to the criminal justice training commission, on forms provided by the commission, of the following:

- -thenumberofindividuals stopped for routine trafficen forcement, whether or not a citation or warning was issued;
- -identifyingcharacteristicsoftheindividualstopped,includingtheraceorethnicity,approximateage,andgender;
- -thenatureoftheallegedtrafficinfractionorviolationthatledtothestop;
- -whetherasearchwasinstitutedasaresultofthestop;
- -thelegalbasisforthesearch,includingwhetherconsentwasobtained,whetheracanineunitwasalerted,andwhethertherewasprobable causeorreasonablesuspiciontosuspectacrime; and
- -whetheranarrestwasmade, or a written citation is sued, as a result of the stop or search.

Theinformationshallbereported to the Criminal Justice Training Commission (which would compile the above information) with codes used to identify are as of patrol within the jurisdiction.

B.SUMMARYOFEXPENDITUREIMPACTS

Brieflydescribeandquantifytheexpenditureimpactsofthelegislationonlocalgovernments, identifying the expenditure provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.

The estimated local government expenditure impacts of collecting data attraffic stops, including administrative costs for data entry, would be a total of \$379,166 annually, as follows:

Cityimpact: \$250,250 for policed epartments CountyImpact: \$128,916 for sheriff's offices

These numbers are revised from previous estimates using an average of 5 minutes per traffic stop, based on surveys conducted in the early months of 2000. Subsequent estimates based on the May 2000 implementation of a traffic stop data collection program by the Washington State Patrol, and confirmed by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, indicate an approximate 30 seconds for recording traffic stop data (not including time for data entry of collected information).

(Seeattachedspreadsheetfordiscussion.)

C.SUMMARYOFREVENUEIMPACTS

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. Deline at each extension of the legislation of the legislati

None.

Page2of2 BillNumber: 5853SB

Summary of Expenditure Impacts for HB 2017/SB 5853 regarding monitoring traffic-stop racial profiling:

The estimated local government expenditure impacts of this bill for collecting and recording data from traffic stops would be a total of \$379,166 annually, as follows:

City impact: \$250,250 for police departments County Impact: \$128,916 for sheriff's offices

Assumptions:

Number of traffic stops: According to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC), local government law enforcement officers make approximately 1,000,000 traffic stops per year. This analysis assumes there would be no change in the number of traffic stops as a result of this bill.

It is unclear whether the information to be gathered relates only to the driver of the vehicle or to all occupants of the vehicle. This analysis assumes that only information related to the driver of the vehicle would be collected.

Number of law enforcement agencies: WASPC indicates that there are 281 law enforcement agencies in the state and 9192 commissioned officers, as summarized in the following table.

	Number of agencies	Number of officers
Police departments	202	5783
Sheriff departments	39	2975
Tribes	28	185
Colleges & universities	7	119
Ports & airports	5	130
Total	281	9192

This analysis includes only police and sheriff departments, which comprising 95% of all law enforcement officers.

Data collection costs:

Data to be collected: Six information items would be recorded under the provisions of this bill. There may be additional administrative information required by each department such as the code that will be used to identify the area of patrol within the jurisdiction of the traffic enforcement agency. The agencies may also require additional administrative information such as officer and/or department identification. Several departments indicated that a major portion of their stops are currently "verbal stops" that require no paperwork. This bill would require paperwork to be collected and data to be entered for each of these stops.

Average time per stop: In early 2000, ten local law enforcement agencies provided estimates of the amount of officer time required to collect the information. These departments ranged in size from four officers to 179 officers. The estimates of these departments ranged from 5 to 15 minutes, with the majority indicating this bill would add 5 minutes to each traffic stop. Based in part on discussion with the Washington State Patrol, which implemented a program to collect traffic stop information in May 2000, and also consultation with WASPC, this analysis uses a revised estimate of 0.5 minutes per stop.

Hourly rate: An average hourly total compensation figure was determined from the 1999 Police/Fire Compensation Survey published by the Association of Washington Cities. This survey covers all cities with populations over 5,000 and all counties with populations over 10,000. The weighted average hourly compensation was determined to be \$27.50 (including benefits and overhead at 30%).

Average cost per stop: Assuming five minutes per stop required by law enforcement officers to collect the data, at \$27.50 per hour, the annual cost would be \$229,166 (1,000,000 stops times 0.5 minutes divided

by 60 minutes times \$27.50 hourly compensation). The estimated cost of data collection would be allocated as follows:

	Number of	Percent of	Number of	Data collection
	officers	officers	stops	annual cost
Police departments	5783	66%	660,000	\$151,250
Sheriff's offices	2975	34%	340,000	\$77,916
Total	8758	100%	1,000,000	\$229,166

Data entry costs:

Under this bill law enforcement agencies would submit the information recorded by officers in an annual report to the Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC), which be responsible for compilation and analysis of the data (see Criminal Justice Training Commission Fiscal Note). The CJTC plans to send each law enforcement agency a computer program that would allow the agency to enter the 6 required information items in the same format and send this data in electronic form to the CJTC. It is estimated that the required data entry would take approximately 30 seconds per record by a records clerk at approximately \$18 per hour (based on 1999 salary surveys). For 1 million records, the estimated cost would be 1,000,000 records x 0.5 minutes x \$18 per 60 minutes = \$150,000. Based on the 66-34 allocation of officers between cities and counties, city police departments would incur 66% x 150,000 = \$99,000 of data entry costs, and county sheriff's offices, \$51,000.

Total costs to local governments for data collection and data entry under this bill:

	Annual data	Annual data entry	Total annual data
	collection costs	costs	collection and entry costs
Police departments	\$151,250	\$99,000	\$250,250
Sheriff's offices	\$77,916	\$51,000	\$128,916
Total	\$229,166	\$150,000	\$379,166