

# Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

<b>Bill Number:</b> 1203 HB	<b>Title:</b> Community oversight boards
-----------------------------	--

## Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

## Estimated Operating Expenditures

Agency Name	2021-23				2023-25				2025-27			
	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total
Criminal Justice Training Commission	.0	213,000	213,000	213,000	.0	219,000	219,000	219,000	.0	0	0	0
<b>Total \$</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>213,000</b>	<b>213,000</b>	<b>213,000</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>219,000</b>	<b>219,000</b>	<b>219,000</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Agency Name	2021-23			2023-25			2025-27		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Local Gov. Courts									
Loc School dist-SPI									
Local Gov. Other			49,558,076			87,239,425			216,802,828
Local Gov. Other	In addition to the estimate above, there are additional indeterminate costs and/or savings. Please see individual fiscal note.								
Local Gov. Total			49,558,076			87,239,425			216,802,828

## Estimated Capital Budget Expenditures

Agency Name	2021-23			2023-25			2025-27		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Criminal Justice Training Commission	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
<b>Total \$</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Agency Name	2021-23			2023-25			2025-27		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Local Gov. Total									
Local Gov. Courts									
Loc School dist-SPI									
Local Gov. Other	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.								

## Estimated Capital Budget Breakout

<b>Prepared by:</b> Cynthia Hollimon, OFM	<b>Phone:</b> (360) 810-1979	<b>Date Published:</b> Final 1/26/2021
---	---------------------------------	---

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 1203 HB	<b>Title:</b> Community oversight boards	<b>Agency:</b> 227-Criminal Justice Training Commission
-----------------------------	--	---

## Part I: Estimates

☐ No Fiscal Impact

### Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

### Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

	FY 2022	FY 2023	2021-23	2023-25	2025-27
<b>Account</b>					
General Fund-State 001-1	108,000	105,000	213,000	219,000	0
<b>Total \$</b>	108,000	105,000	213,000	219,000	0

### Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

*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: Omeara Harrington	Phone: 360-786-7136	Date: 01/21/2021
Agency Preparation: Brian Elliott	Phone: 206-835-7337	Date: 01/26/2021
Agency Approval: Brian Elliott	Phone: 206-835-7337	Date: 01/26/2021
OFM Review: Cynthia Hollimon	Phone: (360) 810-1979	Date: 01/26/2021

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

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

Section 7 (1) requires each local jurisdiction to report its compliance in establishing a community oversight board that aligns with the requirements in this chapter to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs by January 1, 2025. The Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs must compile the submitted information into a report, which must be delivered to the legislature by March 1, 2025.

### 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.*

This bill has no cash receipt impact on the Criminal Justice Training Commission.

### 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.*

Expenses to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs are as follows:

Program coordinator:

Fiscal year 2022 = \$91,000.

Fiscal year 2023 = \$93,000.

Fiscal year 2024 = \$96,000.

Fiscal year 2025 = \$98,000.

Equipment in fiscal year 2022 = \$5,000.

Supplies = \$1,000 annually.

Communications = \$3,500 annually.

Travel = \$2,500 annually.

Administrative expense at 5%:

Fiscal year 2022 = \$5,141.

Fiscal year 2023 = \$5,011.

Fiscal year 2024 = \$5,135.

Fiscal year 2025 = \$5,262.

Annual totals rounded to nearest thousand:

Fiscal year 2022 = \$108,000.

Fiscal year 2023 = \$105,000.

Fiscal year 2024 = \$108,000.

Fiscal year 2025 = \$111,000.

## Part III: Expenditure Detail

### III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2022	FY 2023	2021-23	2023-25	2025-27
001-1	General Fund	State	108,000	105,000	213,000	219,000	0
Total \$			108,000	105,000	213,000	219,000	0

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

	FY 2022	FY 2023	2021-23	2023-25	2025-27
FTE Staff Years					
A-Salaries and Wages					
B-Employee Benefits					
C-Professional Service Contracts					
E-Goods and Other Services					
G-Travel					
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services	108,000	105,000	213,000	219,000	
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
9-					
Total \$	108,000	105,000	213,000	219,000	0

**III. C - Operating FTE Detail:** List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA

NONE

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

NONE

## Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

### IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures

NONE

### IV. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

### IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout

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

NONE

**IV. D - Capital FTE Detail:** List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part IVB

NONE

This bill has no capital budget impact on the Criminal Justice Training Commission.

**Part V: New Rule Making Required**

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Commerce

<b>Bill Number:</b> 1203 HB	<b>Title:</b> Community oversight boards
-----------------------------	--

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

### Legislation Impacts:

- ☒ Cities: Costs for the establishment and operation of a community oversight board
- ☒ Counties: Same as above
- ☐ Special Districts:
- ☒ Specific jurisdictions only: As of October 31 2019, there are 111 police departments and 35 sheriff's departments for a total of 146 local jurisdictions that have 10 or more law enforcement officers in addition to the police chief or sheriff
- ☐ 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: Exact policies and procedures established for each community oversight board

### Estimated revenue impacts to:

None

### Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY 2022	FY 2023	2021-23	2023-25	2025-27
City	11,584,982	23,169,964	34,754,946	61,101,899	151,727,738
County	4,934,377	9,868,753	14,803,130	26,137,526	65,075,090
<b>TOTAL \$</b>	16,519,359	33,038,717	49,558,076	87,239,425	216,802,828
<b>GRAND TOTAL \$</b>	<b>353,600,329</b>				

In addition to the estimates above, there are additional indeterminate costs and/or savings. Please see discussion.

## Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: David Rosen	Phone: 360-790-3274	Date: 01/22/2021
Leg. Committee Contact: Omeara Harrington	Phone: 360-786-7136	Date: 01/21/2021
Agency Approval: Alice Zillah	Phone: 360-725-5035	Date: 01/22/2021
OFM Review: Cynthia Hollimon	Phone: (360) 810-1979	Date: 01/25/2021

## Part IV: Analysis

### A. SUMMARY OF BILL

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

Section 2 gives several definitions:

- “Law enforcement agency” includes any general authority Washington law enforcement agency as defined in RCW 10.933.030 that employs 10 or more law enforcement officers in addition to the chief of police or sheriff, not including state law enforcement agencies
- “Law enforcement office” includes any person who is employed or commissioned by a law enforcement agency to enforce the criminal laws of the state of Washington.
- “Local jurisdiction” includes counties and any city or town with a law enforcement agency serving directly under its authority, rather than by contract or agreement with another local jurisdiction, and does not include special purpose district.
- “Similar oversight body” includes any law enforcement oversight or advisory body that is external to the law enforcement agency the body oversees, and may include, but is not limited to, police ombudsman offices and citizen advisory, review, and oversight boards

Section 3 (1) requires all local jurisdictions as defined by this legislation to establish a community oversight board by January 1, 2025. Said board must conform with the requirements of Section 3 except as provided by Section 6 of this legislation.

Section 3 (2) requires community oversight boards to have the following powers and duties:

- To receive community member complaints regarding conduct of law enforcement officers or civilian employees
- To investigate incidents that occur between members of the public and law enforcement officers or civilian employees when a complaint is filed or on its own initiative
- The board is given the power and duty to issue its findings on any incidents investigated. If the incident was initially reported by a community member complaint, the board must investigate whenever possible and issue its findings within 120 days of receipt of the complaint. If an investigation is not possible the board must notify the complainant and provide a reason said investigation was not pursued
- To recommend discipline of law enforcement officers or civilian employees following any investigations conducted that involve serious breaches of departmental or professional standards. Whenever said recommendation is made it and a report of supporting information must be submitted to the concerned law enforcement agency and if said recommendation concerns an officer, to the Washington Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC)
- To hold hearings and issue subpoenas to compel any person to appear, give sworn testimony, or produce documentary or other evidence reasonable in scope and relevant to a matter under inquiry pursuant to Section 3. The board may petition the superior court for enforcement of the subpoena if a person fails to obey its initial issuance
- To review and make recommendations for changes to police, practice, and procedures of the law enforcement agency. If the agency declines to implement one or more of the recommended changes, it must create a written public record of its rationale for doing so
- To review all internal investigations conducted by the law enforcement agency and to issue finds regarding its accuracy, completeness, impartiality, and sufficiency of any resulting discipline
- To request reports of the annual expenditures of the law enforcement agency and make budgetary recommendations to the local jurisdiction’s legislative body concerning future appropriations
- To be given access to crime scenes and related administrative investigations provided that access is in a manner that protects the crime scene or investigation’s integrity. Board access to crime scenes and investigations cannot be more restricted than access granted to members of the press
- To make public reports on its activities
- To select qualified candidates to fill any vacancy in the position of chief of police in applicable local jurisdictions
- To undertake other duties authorized by the local jurisdiction that are reasonably necessary for the board to effectuate its lawful purpose of effective law enforcement agency, officer, and employee oversight

Section 3 (3) requires local jurisdictions to establish policies and procedures for its community oversight board including but not limited to the number of members, composition and appointment of membership, meetings and hearings, and access to files, records, and other information.

Sections 3 (4), (5), and (6) dictate guidelines and requirements for board membership to local jurisdictions.

Section 3 (8) allows community oversight boards to retain legal counsel. Said counsel must be paid from the funds of the local jurisdiction.

Section 3 (9) requires that the annual budget for a community oversight board to be equal to or greater than 5 % of the total funds allocated in the local jurisdiction for law enforcement purposes.

Section 4 (1) dictates that, subject to Section 4 (2), when the vacancy of chief of police opens in a local jurisdiction that has a community



oversight board the board must as soon as possible, but no later than 60 days from the start of vacancy, produce a list of four qualified candidates for the position. Furthermore, the appointing party of the local jurisdiction must select the replacement chief of police from this aforementioned list provided by the board.

Section 4 (2) dictates Section 4 (1)'s requirements begin January 1, 2022 for jurisdictions with a community oversight board or similar oversight body that existed prior to the effective date of Section 4.

Section 5 strikes Section 4 (2)'s language with an effective date of January 1, 2025, the date by which all local jurisdictions are required to have established a community oversight board per Section 3 (1) of this legislation.

Section 6 dictates that the requirements of this legislation apply to any community oversight board created by a local jurisdiction on or after the effective date of this section. Any community oversight board or similar oversight body that is in place prior to this legislation's effective date must comply with its requirements by January 1, 2022 except when said full compliance would violate a federal consent decree or mandate.

Section 7 requires local jurisdictions to report their compliance in establishing or bringing an existing community oversight board into compliance pursuant to this legislation to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) by January 1, 2025. If compliance is not met at this time, said jurisdiction must provide a written explanation to WASPC at this time.

Section 8 states that any time an appointment is made for the position of chief of police in a city that has a community oversight board the appointment must be made from a list of qualified candidates provided by the board as provided in Section 4 of this legislation.

Sections 9 through 12 amends the related RCW sections for the powers and duties of city managers, strong mayors, town governments, and second-class city governments to be in compliance with the powers vested in community oversight boards by Section 4 of this legislation.

## **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.*

This legislation would have indeterminate expenditure impacts on local governments. Please note, expense figures in the grid above for FY22 through FY24 only refer to the Cities of Seattle and Spokane, and King County. The reason for this is explained in the Indeterminate Impacts section below.

### **BUDGET REQUIREMENTS:**

Section 3 (1) requires all local jurisdictions to have established a community oversight board by January 1, 2025. Per Section 2 (2), local jurisdictions are defined as counties and any city or town having a law enforcement agency serving directly under its authority and does not include special purpose districts. Per Section 2 (1), law enforcement agencies are defined as general authority Washington law enforcement agencies as defined in RCW 10.93.020 that employ 10 or more law enforcement officers in addition to their chief of police or sheriff.

Given these definitions, per the 2019 Crime in Washington Report there were 109 cities and 35 counties with 11 or more commissioned officers as of October 31, 2019 for a total of 144 jurisdictions affected by this legislation. This analysis assumes among these counts are the chief of police and/or sheriff. Therefore, agencies with 11 officers (10 officers + 1 chief or sheriff) meet the definition of law enforcement agency per Section 2 (1). Please note, it is possible jurisdictions have lost or gained officers since the publishing of the referenced report so jurisdictions affected may have changed since.

Section 3 (9) requires all local jurisdictions' annual budgets for their community oversight board to be equal to or greater than 5 % of the total funds allocated in said jurisdiction for law enforcement purposes. This analysis used the Law Enforcement Activities expenditures from the Washington State Auditor Office's (SAO) Financial Intelligence Tool (FIT) reported by these jurisdictions for 2019, the most recent data available. In 2019 between these 144 jurisdictions Law Enforcement Activities spending totaled about \$2.168 billion. Therefore, under Section 3 (9)'s requirement for community oversight boards to have budgets equal to or greater than 5 % of that figure, and assuming local governments were to not lessen budgets and/or services in other programs or operations, local governments will have to spend \$108,401,414 by FY26. This number is halved for FY25 as Section 3 (1)'s establishment requirement is at the midpoint of the fiscal year.

FY25 - Counties

\$650,750,902 Spending in 2019 X .05 X .5 = \$16,268,773

#### FY25 - Cities

\$1,517,277,378 Spending in 2019 X .05 X .5 = \$37,931,935

#### FY26 and Forward - Counties

\$650,750,902 Spending in 2019 X .05 = \$32,537,545

#### FY26 and Forward - Cities

\$1,517,277,378 Spending in 2019 X .05 = \$75,863,869

To view all data used in these calculations and a data summary please reference the attached documents . Jurisdictions are presented in alphabetical order. Please also note due to the age of this data and the increases in spending local jurisdictions may incur by FY25 , these numbers are likely to understate the minimum required funding local jurisdictions must provide their community oversight boards .

#### INDETERMINATE IMPACTS:

##### Jurisdictions With Oversight Entities In Place

At this time, this analysis knows of three jurisdictions that have oversight entities that may meet the qualifications of this legislation . However, it is assumed their spending may need to be increased to meet the requirements of Section 3 (9). The three jurisdictions are the City of Seattle, City of Spokane, and King County. Section 6 requires these boards to comply with requirements of this legislation, such as Section 3 (9), by January 1, 2022. For the purposes of spending figures for FY22, 23, and 24, the 2019 spending of the three aforementioned jurisdictions were used and then multiplied by the 5% factor required by Section 3 (9).

Section 3 (9)'s language dictates the 5% budgeted spending compared to law enforcement purposes spending is the minimum requirement . It is possible that jurisdictions choose to spend above this requirement . It is also possible jurisdictions are already spending some monies for their commissions, and the figures given in FY22-FY24 are meant to show the minimum said jurisdictions must spend to meet Section 3(9)'s and Section 6's requirements. For FY22 half the yearly figure is used as January 1, 2022 splits the fiscal year.

##### FY22 (Seattle and Spokane)

\$463,399,289 Spending in 2019 X .05 X .5 = \$11,584,982

##### FY22 (King County)

\$197,375,066 Spending in 2019 X .05 X .5 = \$4,934,377

##### FY23 and FY24 (Seattle and Spokane)

\$463,399,289 Spending in 2019 X .05 = \$23,169,964

##### FY23 and FY24 (King County)

\$197,375,066 Spending in 2019 X .05 = \$9,868,753

##### Further Spending For Board Setup and Establishment

It is reasonable to assume spending to begin establishing community oversight boards will occur before FY25 for jurisdictions that are required to have a community oversight board per this legislation. These costs incurred will vary by jurisdiction and cannot be reliably estimated at this time. The figures in the expense grid above are used to show the minimum funding oversight boards must be given by jurisdictions per Section 3 (9) of this legislation only.

##### Other Cost Drivers

This analysis focuses on the primary cost driver presented in Section 3 (9). However , it is reasonable to assume jurisdictions may incur other costs due to the requirements of this legislation. Per example, duties and powers given to community oversight boards may require law enforcement agencies to commit to and/or hire more staffing, resources, training, and person-hours to meet their cooperative responsibilities with the community oversight board, or recruiting processes for chiefs of police may be elongated due to the requirements of Section (8). In sum, the effects of this legislation will vary by jurisdiction as Section 3 (3) grants jurisdictions the power to establish their community oversight board's policies, procedures, and thus, their ultimate cost drivers. This analysis can therefore only be sure of the budgeted spending required by Section 3 (9).

## 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.*

This legislation would have no revenue impacts on local governments.

### SOURCES:

2019 Crime in Washington Report

National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement

Office of the Washington State Auditor Financial Intelligence Tool

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs

Jurisdiction	2019 Total Commissioned Officers	2019 Law Enforcement Spending (\$)	Yearly Community Oversight Board Minimum Spending by 1/1/25 per 2019 LE Spending (\$)
Adams County	15	2,283,803	114,190
Asotin County	13	1,675,460	83,773
Benton County	73	13,638,550	681,928
Chelan County	58	12,009,024	600,451
City of Aberdeen	36	5,676,198	283,810
City of Airway Heights	20	2,807,840	140,392
City of Anacortes	24	5,005,096	250,255
City of Arlington	28	7,351,717	367,586
City of Auburn	113	28,550,535	1,427,527
City of Bainbridge Island	23	4,944,433	247,222
City of Battle Ground	24	4,266,075	213,304
City of Bellevue	185	46,943,722	2,347,186
City of Bellingham	117	24,104,934	1,205,247
City of Blaine	14	2,318,610	115,931
City of Bonney Lake	30	6,145,642	307,282
City of Bothell	67	14,941,789	747,089
City of Bremerton	59	12,382,405	619,120
City of Burien	52	12,423,805	621,190
City of Burlington	25	4,126,617	206,331
City of Camas	28	5,378,786	268,939
City of Centralia	29	5,484,936	274,247
City of Chehalis	17	2,752,601	137,630
City of Cheney	17	2,632,406	131,620
City of Clarkston	14	1,813,498	90,675
City of College Place	14	1,941,284	97,064
City of Covington	19	4,537,729	226,886
City of Des Moines	38	11,352,265	567,613
City of Duvall	13	2,239,475	111,974
City of East Wenatchee	21	3,367,867	168,393
City of Edgewood	11	2,827,914	141,396
City of Edmonds	51	11,616,820	580,841
City of Ellensburg	26	4,356,007	217,800
City of Enumclaw	19	3,679,484	183,974
City of Ephrata	15	2,696,881	134,844
City of Everett	199	34,999,204	1,749,960
City of Federal Way	128	24,978,389	1,248,919
City of Ferndale	20	3,953,090	197,655
City of Fife	30	7,361,359	368,068
City of Gig Harbor	19	3,705,858	185,293
City of Grandview	18	2,747,406	137,370
City of Hoquiam	24	2,820,383	141,019
City of Issaquah	36	7,454,592	372,730
City of Kelso	26	4,356,231	217,812
City of Kenmore	15	3,588,058	179,403
City of Kennewick	102	21,555,601	1,077,780
City of Kent	152	37,982,688	1,899,134
City of Kirkland	108	24,905,590	1,245,280
City of Lacey	55	10,833,437	541,672
City of Lake Forest Park	20	4,622,583	231,129
City of Lake Stevens	32	6,587,308	329,365
City of Lakewood	97	25,717,316	1,285,866
City of Liberty Lake	13	1,642,551	82,128
City of Longview	59	13,526,506	676,325
City of Lynden	15	3,178,085	158,904
City of Lynnwood	67	17,398,211	869,911
City of Maple Valley	20	4,937,987	246,899
City of Marysville	65	14,712,911	735,646
City of Mercer Island	31	7,068,683	353,434
City of Mill Creek	24	4,385,836	219,292
City of Milton	14	2,382,168	119,108
City of Monroe	32	7,398,361	369,918
City of Moses Lake**	38	6,049,838	302,492
City of Mount Vernon	45	8,504,604	425,230
City of Mountlake Terrace	28	5,782,614	289,131
City of Mukilteo	29	5,338,274	266,914
City of Newcastle	11	2,304,323	115,216
City of Oak Harbor	26	4,753,493	237,675

City of Olympia	72	16,856,140	842,807
City of Omak	11	1,568,155	78,408
City of Othello	17	2,200,253	110,013
City of Pacific	11	2,187,197	109,360
City of Pasco	82	16,835,200	841,760
City of Port Angeles	32	5,837,813	291,891
City of Port Orchard	22	5,140,573	257,029
City of Port Townsend	15	3,496,819	174,841
City of Poulsbo	18	3,318,784	165,939
City of Prosser	14	1,946,712	97,336
City of Pullman*	28	6,515,056	325,753
City of Puyallup	68	18,961,087	948,054
City of Quincy	22	3,341,069	167,053
City of Redmond	84	16,547,566	827,378
City of Renton	125	35,191,356	1,759,568
City of Richland	62	13,376,044	668,802
City of Ridgefield	11	1,808,898	90,445
City of Sammamish	29	6,786,009	339,300
City of SeaTac	49	11,523,449	576,172
City of Seattle	1,416	401,201,396	20,060,070
City of Sedro-Woolley	16	2,856,551	142,828
City of Selah	15	2,298,876	114,944
City of Sequim	20	3,003,018	150,151
City of Shelton	18	3,010,891	150,545
City of Shoreline	49	12,402,320	620,116
City of Snohomish	17	3,171,135	158,557
City of Snoqualmie	25	6,553,708	327,685
City of Spokane	332	62,197,893	3,109,895
City of Spokane Valley	109	20,398,426	1,019,921
City of Stanwood	11	2,120,695	106,035
City of Sumner	19	4,267,555	213,378
City of Sunnyside	26	4,295,009	214,750
City of Tacoma	359	94,318,947	4,715,947
City of Toppenish	11	1,443,489	72,174
City of Tukwila	74	17,149,297	857,465
City of Tumwater	28	6,997,319	349,866
City of Union Gap	17	2,707,906	135,395
City of University Place	17	4,287,422	214,371
City of Vancouver*	213	47,113,859	2,355,693
City of Walla Walla	43	9,629,273	481,464
City of Washougal	20	3,218,567	160,928
City of Wenatchee	39	7,401,302	370,065
City of West Richland	20	3,631,156	181,558
City of Woodinville	16	3,762,740	188,137
City of Yakima	131	25,709,706	1,285,485
City of Yelm	15	2,489,833	124,492
Clallam County	37	7,316,545	365,827
Clark County	141	34,565,236	1,728,262
Cowlitz County	42	10,472,854	523,643
Douglas County	31	5,070,050	253,503
Franklin County	27	4,834,085	241,704
Grant County	56	11,085,519	554,276
Grays Harbor County	62	7,204,771	360,239
Island County	39	7,044,492	352,225
Jefferson County	22	4,177,343	208,867
King County	214	197,375,066	9,868,753
Kitsap County	122	25,968,014	1,298,401
Kittitas County	33	5,987,259	299,363
Klickitat County	21	3,120,804	156,040
Lewis County	42	8,185,571	409,279
Lincoln County	15	2,110,447	105,522
Mason County	48	8,473,087	423,654
Okanogan County	30	4,059,498	202,975
Pacific County	15	2,229,389	111,469
Pend Oreille County	15	2,073,868	103,693
Pierce County	290	80,266,380	4,013,319
San Juan County	20	3,428,415	171,421
Skagit County	56	9,700,136	485,007
Skamania County	33	2,883,625	144,181

Snohomish County	297	68,316,513	3,415,826
Spokane County	125	42,705,560	2,135,278
Stevens County	28	4,226,110	211,306
Thurston County	93	20,434,308	1,021,715
Walla Walla County	28	4,703,023	235,151
Whatcom County	89	17,759,275	887,964
Whitman County	17	2,652,327	132,616
Yakima County	57	12,714,495	635,725

***\*2018 Data Used***

***\*\*2017 Data Used***

HB 1203 Minimum Local Jurisdiction Spending Summary per Section 3 (9)			
Jurisdiction Type	# of Jurisdictions Effected	2019 Law Enforcement Spending	Yearly Community Oversight Board Minimum Spending by 1/1/25 per 2019 LE Spending
Cities	109	\$1,517,277,378	\$75,863,869
Counties	35	\$650,750,902	\$32,537,545
Totals	144	\$2,168,028,280	\$108,401,414