

MultipleAgencyFiscalNoteSummary

BillNumber: 1818SHB

Title: Studentsafety

EstimatedCashReceipts

AgencyName						
	GF-State	Total	GF-State	Total	GF-State	Total
Total:						
LocalGov.Courts*						
LocalGov.Other**						
LocalGov.Total						

EstimatedExpenditures

AgencyName	2001-03			2003-05			2005-07		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
CriminalJustice TrainingCommission	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Superintendentof PublicInstruction	2.0	9,748,394	9,748,394	2.0	10,669,146	10,669,146	1.5	10,669,146	10,669,146
Total:	2.0	\$9,748,394	\$9,748,394	2.0	\$10,669,146	\$10,669,146	1.5	\$10,669,146	\$10,669,146

LocalGov.Courts*									
LocalGov.Other**			1,396,048			2,792,096			2,792,096
LocalGov.Total			1,396,048			2,792,096			2,792,096

Preparedby: JulieSalvi,OFM

Phone:

360-902-0542

DatePublished:

Final4/16/2001

* SeeOfficeoftheAdministratorfortheCourtsjudicialfiscalnote

** Seelocalgovernmentfiscalnote

IndividualStateAgencyFiscalNote

BillNumber: 1818SHB	Title: Studentsafety	Agency: 227-WaStCriminal JusticeTrainComm
----------------------------	-----------------------------	---

PartI:Estimates

☒ NoFiscalImpact

Thecashreceiptsandexpenditureestimatesonthispagerepresentthemostlikelyfiscalimpact.Factorsimpactingtheprecisionoftheseestimates, andalternateranges(ifappropriate),areexplainedinPartII.

Checkapplicableboxesandfollowcorrespondinginstructions:

- ☐ Iffiscalimpactisgreaterthan\$50,000perfiscalyearinthecurrentbienniumorinsubsequentbiennia,completeentirefiscalnote formPartsI-V.
- ☐ Iffiscalimpactislessthan\$50,000perfiscalyearinthecurrentbienniumorinsubsequentbiennia,completethispageonly(PartI).
- ☐ Capitalbudgetimpact,completePartIV.
- ☒ Requiresnewrulemaking,completePartV.

LegislativeContact:	Phone:	Date: 03/16/2001
AgencyPreparation: BrianElliott	Phone: 360-459-6342	Date: 03/19/2001
AgencyApproval: VirgilSweeney	Phone: 360-459-6342	Date: 03/19/2001
OFMReview: RandiWarick	Phone: 360-902-0570	Date: 03/19/2001

PartII:NarrativeExplanation

II.A-BriefDescriptionOfWhatTheMeasureDoesThatHasFiscalImpact

Brieflydescribe,bysectionnumber,thesignificantprovisionsofthebill,andanyrelatedworkloadorpolicyassumptions,thathaverevenueor expenditureimpactontherespondingagency.

ThismeasurehasnofiscalimpactrelatingtotheCriminalJusticeTrainingCommission.

II.B-CashreceiptsImpact

Brieflydescribeandquantifythecashreceiptsimpactofthelegislationontherespondingagency,identifyingthecashreceiptsprovisionsbysection numberandwhenappropriatedetailoftherevenuesources.Brieflydescribethefactualbasisoftheassumptionsandthethodbywhichthe cashreceiptsimpactisderived.Explainhowworkloadassumptionstranslateintoestimates.Distinguishbetweenonetimeandongoingfunctions.

II.C-Expenditures

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

PartIII:ExpenditureDetail

PartIV:CapitalBudgetImpact

PartV:NewRuleMakingRequired

Identifyprovisionsofthemeasurethatrequiretheagencytoadoptnewadministrativerulesorrepeal/reviseexistingrules.

Section4ofthisbillstatesthatarepresentativeoftheCriminalJusticeTrainingCommissionwillbeontheSchoolSafety CenterAdvisoryCommittee.TheSchoolSafetyCenterAdvisoryCommitteeshalldevelopatrainingprogram,usingthe bestpracticesinschoolsafety,forallschoolsafetypersonnel.

IndividualStateAgencyFiscalNote

BillNumber: 1818SHB	Title: Studentsafety	Agency: 350-SuptofPublic Instruction
----------------------------	-----------------------------	---

PartI:Estimates

☐ NoFiscalImpact

EstimatedCashReceiptsto:

Fund					
Total					

EstimatedExpendituresfrom:

	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FTEStaffYears	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5
Fund					
GeneralFund-State 001-1	4,409,181	5,339,213	9,748,394	10,669,146	10,669,146
Total	4,409,181	5,339,213	9,748,394	10,669,146	10,669,146

Thecashreceiptsandexpenditureestimatesonthispagerepresentthemostlikelyfiscalimpact.Factorsimpactingtheprecisionoftheseestimates, andalternateranges(ifappropriate),areexplainedinPartII.

Checkapplicableboxesandfollowcorrespondinginstructions:

- ☒ Iffiscalimpactisgreaterthan\$50,000perfiscalyearinthecurrentbienniumorinsubsequentbiennia,completeentirefiscalnote formPartsI-V.
- ☐ Iffiscalimpactislessthan\$50,000perfiscalyearinthecurrentbienniumorinsubsequentbiennia,completethispageonly(PartI).
- ☐ Capitalbudgetimpact,completePartIV.
- ☒ Requiresnewrulemaking,completePartV.

LegislativeContact:	Phone:	Date: 03/16/2001
AgencyPreparation: BruceMrkvicka	Phone: 360-664-2433	Date: 03/16/2001
AgencyApproval: JenniferPriddy	Phone: 360-586-2356	Date: 04/02/2001
OFMReview: JulieSalvi	Phone: 360-902-0542	Date: 04/03/2001

PartII:NarrativeExplanation

II.A-BriefDescriptionOfWhatTheMeasureDoesThatHasFiscalImpact

Brieflydescribe,bysectionnumber,thesignificantprovisionsofthebill,andanyrelatedworkloadorpolicyassumptions,thathaverevenueor expenditureimpactontherespondingagency.

SeeattachmentHB1818_A

II.B-CashreceiptsImpact

Brieflydescribeandquantifythecashreceiptsimpactofthelegislationontherespondingagency,identifyingthecashreceiptsprovisionsbysection numberandwhenappropriatehethedetailoftherevenuesources.Brieflydescribethefactualbasisoftheassumptionsandthethodbywhichthe cashreceiptsimpactisderived.Explainhowworkloadassumptionstranslateintoestimates.Distinguishbetweenonetimeandongoingfunctions.

II.C-Expenditures

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

SeeattachmentsHB1818_BALLOC,HB1818_BCENTER,HB1818_BCOMM,andHB1818_BHOTLINE

PartIII:ExpenditureDetail

III.A-ExpendituresByObjectOrPurpose

	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FTEStaffYears	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5
A-SalariesandWages	86,825	86,825	173,650	173,650	173,650
B-EmployeeBenefits	20,872	20,872	41,744	41,744	41,744
C-PersonalServiceContracts	953,000	949,000	1,902,000	1,898,000	1,898,000
E-GoodsandServices	19,680	19,680	39,360	39,360	39,360
G-Travel	28,278	28,278	56,556	56,556	56,556
J-CapitalOutlays					
M-InterAgency/FundTransfers					
N-Grants,Benefits&ClientServices	3,300,526	4,234,558	7,535,084	8,459,836	8,459,836
P-DebtService					
S-InteragencyReimbursements					
T-Intra-AgencyReimbursements					
Total:	\$4,409,181	\$5,339,213	\$9,748,394	\$10,669,146	\$10,669,146

III.B-FTEDetail: ListFTEsbyclassificationandcorrespondingannualcompensation.TotalsneedtoagreewithtotalFTEsinPartI andPartIIIA.

JobClassification	Salary	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
Director	58,265	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
OfficeAssistantSenior(01011)	28,560	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	.5
Total		2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5

PartIV:CapitalBudgetImpact

PartV:NewRuleMakingRequired

Identifyprovisionsofthemeasurethatrequiretheagencytoadoptnewadministrativerulesorrepeal/revisesexistingrules.

Ruleswillberequiredtoimplementalloperationalsectionsofthislegislation.

Attachment HB1818_A

Board means the local school district board of directors.

Comprehensive safe school plan means a plan covering prevention, intervention, all hazards and crisis response, and post-crisis recovery. Staff, students, parents, the community, law enforcement, and emergency preparedness shall be involved in the development and implementation of the plan.

Center means the school safety center.

Advisory Committee means the school safety center advisory committee.

SPI means the superintendent of public instruction

Section 3§1 requires, to the extent funds are appropriated, the board to have a policy requiring each school in it's district to develop a written comprehensive safe school plan.

Section 3§2 provides that the boards establish a process for the approval of individual school comprehensive safe school plan s. After the individual comprehensive safe school plan is adopted, there will be a process in place to inform students, staff, volunteers, and parents of its contents.

Section 3§3 requires each school to annually conduct an evaluation of its comprehensive safe school plan and conduct reviews, drills, or simulated practices in coordination with local fire, law enforcement, medical, and emergency preparedness agencies. School districts shall provide information on this evaluation and implementation of the comprehensive safe schools plan.

Section 3§4 requires each school to maintain a copy its comprehensive safe school plan and documentation of yearly reviews, drills, or simulated practices in the office of the school principal and shall make a copy of the report available upon written request.

Section 4 creates a school safety center and a school safety center advisory committee.

The center shall:

- A. Disseminate successful models of school safety plans and cooperative efforts;
- B. Provide assistance to schools to establish a comprehensive safe school plan;
- C. Select models of cooperative efforts that have been proven successful;
- D. Act as an information dissemination and resource center when an incident occurs in a school district either in Washington or in another state;
- E. Coordinate activities relating to school safety; review and approve manuals and curricula used for school safety models and training; and,
- F. Develop and maintain a school safety information web site.

The center shall be established in the SPI.

The advisory committee shall include SPI and representatives of educators, classified staff, principals, superintendents, administrators, the American society for industrial security, the state criminal justice training commission, and others deemed appropriate and approved by the school safety center advisory committee. The groups they represent shall choose the members of the committee. In addition, the Washington association of sheriffs and police chiefs shall appoint representatives of law enforcement to participate on the school safety center advisory committee. The advisory committee shall select a chair.

Attachment HB1818_A

The advisory committee shall develop a training program, using the best practices in school safety, for all school safety personnel.

Section 5 provides that, to the extent funds are appropriated, SPI shall contract for a school safety hotline. SPI, with the recommendation of the advisory committee, will develop a request for proposal to obtain these services.

Section 6 establishes that, to the extent funds are appropriated, at a minimum a school district shall receive \$2,000 if a per pupil formula is established to support districts activities to develop and implement a comprehensive safe school plan.

Attachment HB1818_B

The following two tables summarize the fiscal impact of this measure for the 2001-03 biennium.

Component	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount
Safety Planning Allocation		3,299,290		4,233,322
Safe School Center	2.0	143,986	2.0	143,986
Advisory Committee		22,905		22,905
Safe Schools Hotline		943,000		939,000
<hr/>				
Total		4,409,181		5,339,213

Component	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount
A Salary and Wages	2.0	86,825	2.0	86,825
B Employee Benefits		20,872		20,872
C Contract Services		953,000		949,000
E Goods and Services		19,680		19,680
G Travel		28,278		28,278
N Grants		3,300,526		4,234,558
<hr/>				
Total		4,409,181		5,339,213

Attachment HB1818_BALLOC

Funding will need to be allocated to school districts to meet the requirements of **Section 3** and the activities required to implement the plan. The estimated cost of meeting the requirements¹ set forth in this section is estimated to be \$4,000 over a two-year cycle or an average of \$2,000 per year. It is assumed that this funding will be allocated on a uniform basis using FTE equivalent enrollment. **Section 5** requires that the FTE allocation formula provide a minimum floor of \$2,000 per school district.

The calculation of the per FTE allocation is determined as follows:

Calculation of per FTE Allocation Rate			
Category	Number of Buildings	Plan Cost	Allocation Cost by Category of Building
High School	310	\$2,000	620,000
JHigh/Middle School	328	\$2,000	656,000
Elementary Schools	1,118	\$2,000	2,236,000
Complete Schools	30	\$2,000	60,000
Alternative Schools	201	\$2,000	402,000
Unclassified Schools	84	\$2,000	168,000
BASE	2,071		4,142,000
FTE ENROLLMENT			947,814.39
PER FTE RATE			4.37

An analysis of FTE enrollment by school district indicates that an additional \$127,765 needs to be provided to ensure that, at a minimum, each school district receives \$2,000.

In summary, the following table displays the calculations to determine the cost allocated over the next six years.

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
FTE Enrollment	942,733	938,425	938,425	938,425	938,425	938,425
Rate Per Pupil	4.37	4.37	4.37	4.37	4.37	4.37
Formula Allocation	4,124,113	4,100,917	4,100,917	4,100,917	4,100,917	4,100,917
\$2,000 Floor Allocation	127,765	127,765	127,765	127,765	127,765	127,765
Total Allocation	4,251,878	4,228,682	4,228,682	4,228,682	4,228,682	4,228,682
Fiscal Year Deferral	(850,376)	(845,736)	(845,736)	(845,736)	(845,736)	(845,736)
School Year Carryforward	0	850,376	845,736	845,736	845,736	845,736
Fiscal Year Amount	3,299,290	4,233,322	4,228,682	4,228,682	4,228,682	4,228,682

¹ The requirements are basically prepare a plan, approve it, inform stakeholders, annually practice and evaluate the plan, and maintain records related to all of the preceding.

Attachment HB1818_BCENTER

The safe schools center will be responsible for:

- A. Disseminating successful models of school safety plans and cooperative efforts;
- B. Providing assistance to schools to establish a comprehensive safe school plan;
- C. Selecting models of cooperative efforts that have been proven successful;
- D. Acting as an information dissemination and resource center when an incident occurs in a school district either in Washington or in another state;
- E. Coordinating activities relating to school safety; review and approve manuals and curricula used for school safety models and training; and,
- F. Developing and maintaining a school safety information web site.

This will require one full-time professional position (Center Coordinator) and one full-time support position. Funding for \$10,000 in contract services will be required to produce the web page, maintain the information that is posted to the site, as well as acquiring materials .

Objt	FTE	Annual Amount
		Amount
Center Coordinator (WMS)	1.00	58,265
Office Assistant Senior (01011/31K)	1.00	28,560
A Salaries	2.00	86,825
Center Coordinator (WMS)		12,238
Office Assistant Senior (01011/31K)		8,634
B Employee Benefits		20,872
C Contract Services		10,000
E Goods and Services		5,900
G Travel		8,500
Indirect Costs		11,889
TOTAL		143,986

Contract Services: \$10,000 is provided each year for development and maintenance of an agency School Safety web page. This would include the actual cost of producing the web page as well as acquiring materials to post on the Web. In the case of developing the web page, it is estimated that the cost of modifying the agency web page would require 40 hours at the rate of \$125 per hour. The on-going cost of preparing and posting materials to the Web would require 100 hours at \$50 per hour in the first year and 200 hours at \$50 per hour in the second year.

Goods and Services: \$10,900 is a standard amount necessary to cover the direct and indirect expenses of a professional position. This is based on an analysis of expenditures of existing positions and would cover such things as basic purchase of supplies and materials (\$1,525), communications expenses (\$2,175), and printing and reproduction costs (\$2,200).

Travel: \$8,500 is a standard amount necessary to cover the travel expenses of a professional position for approximately 61 days or 27% of a standard work year.

Attachment HB1818_BCOMM

The advisory committee would have representation from at least nine groups. Assuming that each one of these groups would select two members to be on the advisory committee, there would then be a total of eighteen members. The advisory committee would be primarily responsible for developing a model-training plan.

Assuming that staff from each of the groups would provide assistance in developing the training program, the major cost associated with this effort at SPI would be supporting the travel costs of the advisory committee. If the group meets once every two months without any meeting in the summer, the total number of meetings would be 5. Three of these meetings would be for one day. The other two would be two days in length..

Type	Number	Days	Total Days	
Organizational	2	2	4	
Regular	3	1	3	
Extra Days		0	0	
Sub-Total	5		7	
Travel	Number	Units	Rate	Cost
Subsistence & Lodging	56 ¹	Days	\$105 ²	\$5,880
Air Transportation	20	Trips	\$221 ³	4,420
Private Auto Mileage	22,400 ⁴	Miles	\$0.345	7,728
Other Expenses				1,750
Sub-Total				\$19,778
Compensation				
Teacher/ESA Sub.	12	Days	\$103 ⁵	1,236
Citizen/Parent	0	Days	\$50	0
Sub-Total				1,236
Indirect Cost (9%)				1,891
Total				22,905

¹ 4 members would receive 1 day per meeting for extended travel time (Spokane & Walla Walla). All 18 members would receive 1 day for the two two-day meetings. (4 members x 1 day) x 5 meetings + (18 members x 2 two-day meetings) = 56 days

² Assumes a weighted average of per diem rates for Thurston, King, Spokane, and Yakima counties. The weighting assumes that there will as many meetings in Thurston County as there are in total for King, Spokane, or Yakima. The calculation is as follows (3 x \$96 (Thurston County) + \$155 (King) + \$101 (Spokane) + \$85 (Yakima))/6 = \$105

³ Composite rate for four members traveling extended distance which would be equal to 20 round trips. This is equal to the round-trip airfare from Spokane (\$126) and Walla Walla (\$316).

⁴ Assumes a round trip mileage of 320 miles for each member not traveling by air. (14 members x 5 meetings x 320 miles = 35,200)

⁵ Substitute days for 4 teachers or ESAs during the September, October, and November meetings (4 x 3 = 12). This rate is based on a review of the requests for substitute reimbursements during May 2000. The actual rates varied from a low of \$70 per day to a high of \$143. Most frequently the rates tended to from \$80 to \$122 per day. If this rate were to be used to adjust any budget drivers for apportionment purposes, a much more extensive survey would be required.

Attachment HB1818_BHOTLINE

Section 5 requires SPI, to the extent funds are appropriated, to contract for a state-wide school emergency hotline service. Similar services are currently operating in other states and the cost is approximately \$1 per student. In summary, the following table displays the calculations to determine the cost allocated over the next six years.

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
FTE Enrollment	942,733	938,425	938,425	938,425	938,425	938,425
Rate Per Pupil	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
FY Cost	\$943,000	\$939,000	\$939,000	\$939,000	\$939,000	\$939,000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

Bill Number: 1818SHB

Title: Studentsafety

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

Legislation Impacts:

- ☒ Cities:
- ☒ Counties:
- ☒ Special Districts:
- ☐ Specific jurisdiction 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: The number of school districts already conducting these comprehensive plans and the additional costs associated with local government participation in model plan development.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
City					
County					
Special District					
TOTAL					
GRAND TOTAL					

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
City		\$558,419	\$558,419	\$1,116,838	\$1,116,838
County		\$558,419	\$558,419	\$1,116,838	\$1,116,838
Special District		\$279,210	\$279,210	\$558,420	\$558,420
TOTAL		\$1,396,048	\$1,396,048	\$2,792,096	\$2,792,096
GRAND TOTAL					\$6,980,240

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Jovi Sanchez	Phone: (360)725-5032	Date: 03/17/2001
Leg. Committee Contact:	Phone:	Date: 03/16/2001
Agency Approval: Val Richey	Phone: 360-725-5036	Date: 04/13/2001
OFM Review: Linda Swanson	Phone: 360-902-0541	Date: 04/16/2001

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

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

SHB 1818 relates to schools safety.

Section 2 provides that schools safety improvement shall include: 1) a comprehensive safe school plan and implementation of the plans prevention, 2) intervention, 3) all hazard and crisis response, and 4) post crisis recovery. Additionally, staff, students, parents, the community, law enforcement, and emergency preparedness shall be involved in the development and implementation of the plan.

Section 3 proposes that to the extent funds are appropriated, each local school board shall develop a written comprehensive plan and establish a policy. The school district board of directors shall approve the plans by September 1, 2002. Additionally, the school shall conduct an evaluation of its comprehensive safe school plan with reviews drills, or simulated practices in coordination with law enforcement officers, firefighters, and emergency management agencies.

Section 4 establishes a schools safety center within appropriated funds and a schools safety advisory committee which will include, but is not limited to, representatives of educators, other school staff, administrators, the American Society for Industrial Security, the State Criminal Justice Training Commission, law enforcement agencies, and others deemed appropriate. Local government officials may be requested to participate in the advisory committee.

Section 5 proposes a schools safety toll free hotline for which OSPI will contract with an independent vendor within appropriated funds.

Section 6 indicates that within appropriated funds a per student allocation will be distributed to each school district. No school district may be allocated less than \$2000.

Section 7 establishes a null and void of June 30, 2001 if funding for this act is unavailable.

SUBSTITUTE BILL COMPARED TO ORIGINAL BILL:

SHB 1818 contains provisions requiring a schools safety center, a schools safety advisory committee, and a schools safety hotline. A per pupil allocation is required, and a minimum per district allocation of \$2000 is required.

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.

Local governments would incur an estimated \$1,396,048 in expenditures. The costs account for law enforcement officers, local fire department, and emergency management agencies to conduct comprehensive evaluations of schools safety plans, and for local government participation in the schools safety advisory committee. [Note: The costs for local government to assist in the development of a comprehensive schools safety model plan are indeterminate and not detailed in this analysis].

ASSUMPTION AND BACKGROUND

Under the provisions of this bill, local governments (e.g. law enforcement officers, firefighters, and local emergency management agencies) are required to assist in the development and implementation of a schools safety model plan. In addition, local governments shall conduct an annual evaluation and review of each school's comprehensive safety school plan. Subsequently, local governments may also be requested to participate in the schools safety advisory committee, which shall develop a training program of best practices on schools safety issues. Furthermore, local governments are requested to assist in providing schools safety information to the schools safety center within OSPI.

The following assumptions are based on information provided by the Washington State Military Department Emergency Management Division (EMD), the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), and local fire and police departments:

General:

- There are several local government agencies currently participating in schools safety issues in their communities at varying degrees, however this analysis assumes that no school have adopted the comprehensive schools safety model plan.
- The distribution of expenditures incurred is assumed to be 40% by counties, 40% by cities, and 20% by special purpose districts.
- Expenditures associated with this bill are assumed to remain the same annually.
- According to OSPI, development of a comprehensive plan costs approximately \$2000, however there is not enough information to determine how long the development of a comprehensive plan will take. OSPI reported that the development of a model comprehensive plan

will be an ongoing process for schools.

Advisory Committee:

- OSPI anticipates that there would be 2 representatives from each stakeholder group to participate in the schools safety advisory group to develop a training program. Based on this information 6 out of the 18 members will be local government representatives. It is assumed that 2 firefighters, 2 law enforcement officers, and 2 local emergency management representatives will participate in this group.
- OSPI estimates that there will be 5 meetings for advisory committee purposes. The 5 meetings are estimated to last 2 days for the first meeting and 1 day for subsequent meetings. It is assumed that each meeting will take between 6 and 7 hours each, for an average total of 40 hours participating in the schools safety advisory committee meetings.
- This analysis assumes that the schools safety advisory committee shall have the same number of meetings in following years.
- OSPI will account for local government member's travel expenses/reimbursements to participate on the schools safety advisory committee.
- It is assumed that the additional time spent by local government members on the schools safety advisory committee will be time taken from regular duties. Therefore, local governments would incur costs for the additional time spent on annual reviews and the participation of members on the schools safety advisory group.

Evaluation of Comprehensive Plans:

- There are an estimated 2071 educational buildings that will require an annual review and evaluation. (High School=310, Junior High/Middle School=328, Elementary School=1118, Other Schools and Buildings=315)
- This analysis assumes that annual reviews will not be conducted until FY03 since model plans will are not required to be approved until September 1, 2002.
- It is assumed that 2 local law enforcement officers, 2 local firefighters, and 2 members of the local emergency management agency will assist in the coordination of conducting the annual reviews of developed model plans in all elementary, junior high/middle, and high schools.
- According to the City of Olympia, 3 hours is necessary to conduct a comprehensive review of an elementary school's comprehensive plan, which includes the following: utility inspections, fire safety hazards, intrusion plans, lockdown drills, the school's communication process, and all other hazards. Additionally, it would take an estimated 5 hours to conduct a review of a middle school, and 8 hours (1 day) to review a high school's comprehensive plan.
- It is assumed that Other Schools and Buildings will require a 3 hour comprehensive review.
- Based on information in the Association of Washington Cities 2000 Salary and Benefits Survey, as well as consultation with local fire departments, it is assumed that the average hourly wage, including benefits, for a firefighter or a law enforcement officer is approximately \$30.00 per hour.
- According to EMD and local emergency management agencies, an average hourly wage for a local emergency management agency representative is calculated at \$22.54 per hour.
- This analysis does not include the time for writing a final report, discussing the findings of the evaluation with the school's administrator and staff, as well as the training that is involved to ensure the safety plans success and compliance.

DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE SAFETY SCHOOL PLAN

According to OSPI, the development of a comprehensive safety school plan costs an estimated \$2000, however local governments would incur an indeterminate expenditure for involvement in the model plan developments. Due to a lack of relevant information regarding the time it takes to develop a comprehensive school safety plan, the costs cannot be determined with certainty.

SCHOOLS SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

According to OSPI an estimated 2 members per stakeholder group will participate in the schools safety advisory committee. The costs associated with participating in this group are estimated at:

$4(2 \text{ firefighters} + 2 \text{ law enforcement officers}) \times \$30.00 (\text{average hourly rate for firefighter and law enforcement officer}) \times 40 (\# \text{ of additional hours spent on the schools safety advisory committee for local governments}) = \4800

$2(\text{local emergency management representatives}) \times \$22.54 (\text{average hourly rate for a local emergency management representative}) \times 40 (\# \text{ of additional hours spent on the schools safety advisory committee for local governments}) = \$1803.20 \text{ rounded to } \1803

TOTAL SPENT ON SCHOOLS SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE = \$6603

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SAFETY SCHOOL PLANS

Under the provisions of this bill, local governments are to coordinate with school districts to conduct comprehensive safety school plans and evaluations. Based on the information provided above, local governments would incur additional costs for the time spent conducting these evaluations in elementary schools, junior high/middle schools, high schools, and other school buildings.

Elementary Schools:

$4(2\text{local firefighters} + 2\text{local law enforcement officers}) \times \30.00 (average hourly rate for a firefighter and law enforcement officer) $\times 3$ (total # of hours to conduct a comprehensive elementary school review) = \$360 for additional times spent for a local firefighter to conduct a review)

$\$360 \times 1118$ (# of buildings to be reviewed in elementary schools) = \$402,480

$2(\text{local emergency management representatives}) \times \22.54 (average hourly rate for a local emergency management representative) $\times 3$ (# of hours to conduct a comprehensive elementary school review) = \$135.24 rounded to \$135 for additional times spent for 2 local emergency management representatives to conduct a review.

$\$135 \times 1118$ (# of buildings to be reviewed in elementary schools) = \$150,930.

TOTAL EXPENDITURE TO REVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS = \$553,410

Junior High/Middle Schools:

$4(2\text{local firefighters} + 2\text{local law enforcement officers}) \times \30.00 (average hourly rate for a firefighter and law enforcement officer) $\times 5$ (# of hours to conduct a comprehensive junior high/middle school review) = \$600 for additional times spent for a local firefighter to conduct a review

$\$600 \times 328$ (# of buildings to be reviewed in junior high/middle school) = \$196,800

$2(\text{local emergency management representatives}) \times \22.54 (average hourly rate for a local emergency management representative) $\times 5$ (# of hours to conduct a comprehensive junior high/middle school review) = \$225.40 rounded to \$225 additional times spent for 2 local emergency management representatives to conduct a review.

$\$225 \times 328$ (# of buildings to be reviewed in junior high/middle schools) = \$73,800.

TOTAL EXPENDITURE TO REVIEW JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOL = \$270,600

High Schools:

$4(2\text{local firefighters} + 2\text{local law enforcement officers}) \times \30.00 (average hourly rate for a firefighter and law enforcement officer) $\times 8$ (# of hours to conduct a comprehensive high school review) = \$960 for additional times spent for a local firefighter to conduct a review

$\$960 \times 310$ (# of buildings to be reviewed in elementary schools) = \$297,600

$2(\text{local emergency management representatives}) \times \22.54 (average hourly rate for a local emergency management representative) $\times 8$ (# of hours to conduct an elementary school review) = \$360.64 rounded to \$361 for additional times spent for 2 local emergency management representatives to conduct a review.

$\$361 \times 310$ (# of buildings to be reviewed in high school) = \$111,910

TOTAL EXPENDITURE TO REVIEW HIGH SCHOOLS = \$409,510

Other School Buildings (eg. alternative schools and unclassified schools):

$4(2\text{local firefighters} + 2\text{law enforcement officers}) \times \30.00 (average hourly rate for a firefighter and law enforcement officer) $\times 3$ (# of hours to conduct a comprehensive school review) = \$360 for additional times spent for a local firefighter to conduct a review

$\$360 \times 315$ (# of buildings to be reviewed in elementary schools) = \$113,400

$2(\text{local emergency management representatives}) \times \22.54 (average hourly rate for a local emergency management representative) $\times 3$ (# of hours to conduct a comprehensive other school and building review) = \$135.24 rounded to \$135 for additional times spent for 2 local emergency management representatives to conduct a review.

$\$135 \times 315$ (# of buildings to be reviewed in other school buildings) = \$42,525

TOTALEXPENDITURESTOREVIEWOTHERSCHOOLBUILDINGS=\$155,925

ESTIMATEDTOTALFORALLSCHOOLSEXPENDITURES=\$1,389,445

TOTALLOCALGOVERNMENTEXPENDITURES=\$1,396,048

INFORMATIONSHARING

Itisassumedthatlocalgovernmentswouldnotincurcostsforsharingorprovidinginformationwiththeschoolsafetycenter.

C.SUMMARYOFREVENUEIMPACTS

Brieflydescribeandquantifytherevenueimpactsofthelegislationonlocalgovernments,identifyingtherevenueprovisionsbysection number,andwhenappropriate,thedetailofrevenuesources.Delineatebetweenecity,countyandspecialdistrictimpacts.

Therearenolocalgovernmentrevenueimpacts.