

# Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5955 SB	<b>Title:</b> Large port districts
-----------------------------	------------------------------------

## Estimated Cash Receipts

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total
Office of State Treasurer	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.								
<b>Total \$</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Agency Name	2023-25		2025-27		2027-29	
	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total
Local Gov. Courts						
Loc School dist-SPI						
Local Gov. Other		(867,000)		(4,528,529)		(8,502,894)
Local Gov. Total		(867,000)		(4,528,529)		(8,502,894)

## Estimated Operating Expenditures

Agency Name	2023-25				2025-27				2027-29			
	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total
Office of State Treasurer	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
Department of Commerce	.1	74,304	74,304	74,304	.1	16,574	16,574	16,574	.1	16,574	16,574	16,574
Department of Commerce	In addition to the estimate above, there are additional indeterminate costs and/or savings. Please see individual fiscal note.											
Department of Ecology	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
<b>Total \$</b>	0.1	74,304	74,304	74,304	0.1	16,574	16,574	16,574	0.1	16,574	16,574	16,574

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Local Gov. Courts									
Loc School dist-SPI									
Local Gov. Other			100,000,000			100,000,000			100,000,000
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			100,000,000			100,000,000			100,000,000

## Estimated Capital Budget Expenditures

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Office of State Treasurer	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Department of Commerce	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.								
Department of Ecology	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
<b>Total \$</b>	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Local Gov. Courts									
Loc School dist-SPI									
Local Gov. Other	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.								
Local Gov. Total									

## Estimated Capital Budget Breakout

Department of Commerce	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.
------------------------	--

<b>Prepared by:</b> Myra Baldini, OFM	<b>Phone:</b> (360) 688-8208	<b>Date Published:</b> Final 1/18/2024
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5955 SB	<b>Title:</b> Large port districts	<b>Agency:</b> 090-Office of State Treasurer
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	--

## Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

**Estimated Cash Receipts to:**

**Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.**

**Estimated Operating Expenditures from:**

NONE

**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: Maggie Douglas	Phone: 3607867279	Date: 01/12/2024
Agency Preparation: Mandy Kaplan	Phone: (360) 902-8977	Date: 01/15/2024
Agency Approval: Dan Mason	Phone: (360) 902-8990	Date: 01/15/2024
OFM Review: Amy Hatfield	Phone: (360) 280-7584	Date: 01/15/2024

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

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

SB 5955 creates the port district environmental equity fund, coupled with the general fund as the recipient of the earnings from investments under RCW 43.84.092(4).

### II. B - Cash receipts Impact

*Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.*

Projected cash flows are currently unavailable; therefore, estimated earnings from investments are indeterminable.

There may be an impact on the debt service limitation calculation. Changes to the earnings credited to the general fund impacts, by an equal amount, general state revenues.

### II. C - Expenditures

*Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.*

## Part III: Expenditure Detail

### III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

NONE

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

NONE

**III. C - Operating FTE Detail:** *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals 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

*Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.*

NONE

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

NONE

## **Part V: New Rule Making Required**

*Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.*

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5955 SB	<b>Title:</b> Large port districts	<b>Agency:</b> 103-Department of Commerce
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	---

## Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

### Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

### Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
FTE Staff Years	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
<b>Account</b>					
General Fund-State 001-1	0	74,304	74,304	16,574	16,574
<b>Total \$</b>	0	74,304	74,304	16,574	16,574

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

### Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.

*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: Maggie Douglas	Phone: 3607867279	Date: 01/12/2024
Agency Preparation: Buck Lucas	Phone: 360-725-3180	Date: 01/18/2024
Agency Approval: Pouth Ing	Phone: 360-725-2715	Date: 01/18/2024
OFM Review: Myra Baldini	Phone: (360) 688-8208	Date: 01/18/2024

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

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

Section 2 amends RCW 53.36.020 to modify port property tax authority, and require a portion of levy revenue to fund port mitigation programs.

Section 3 adds a new section to RCW 53.54 for an aircraft noise abatement and mitigation program. Qualifying ports (means more than 900 scheduled jet flights per day, which is only Port of Seattle for Seatac international airport) must (1) repair or replace failed mitigation equipment installed under this chapter; (2) provide sound mitigation equipment to residential, recreational, or educational facilities to reduce the impacts of aircraft noise; (3) provide air quality mitigation equipment to residential, recreational, or educational facilities to improve air quality; and within impacted areas, (4) provide urban forests or green space; (5) provide support of indoor recreation facilities; and (6) provide indoor community greenhouses. Ports must give priority consideration in the following order for failed mitigation equipment, sound and air quality mitigation equipment, and other qualifying properties.

Section 3(5) ports must enter into an interlocal agreement with the county where the port is located to receive building inspector services. If an interlocal agreement is not feasible, the port must contract out for building inspector services.

Section 6 amends RCW 53.54.040 to clarify that proceeds from the Department of Commerce (department) grants and loans detailed in Section 10 may be used by ports to fund mitigation, including the additional property tax revenue detailed in Section 2.

Section 7 adds a new section to RCW 53.36 that requires qualifying ports to conduct an environmental justice assessment and consult with overburdened and vulnerable populations for significant port actions, which are defined as any actions involving a capital project of at least \$12 million.

Section 8 adds a new section to RCW 43.330 and, subject to appropriation, requires the department to form and administer a grant program for qualifying ports (Port of Seattle) to hire or contract with building inspectors, or to enter into interlocal agreements with the county where the port is located (King County) to provide building inspectors for qualifying ports to meet their responsibilities under Section 3.

Section 8(2) the department must publish an annual report detailing grants made for building inspectors for sound and noise mitigation equipment, which must include (a) the number of inspectors hired or contracted, (b) number of inspections conducted, (c) number of remedial mitigation projects provided in Section 3.

Section 9 amends RCW 70A.65.260 to provide authority for Climate Commitment Act funds to be deposited into the Port District Environmental Equity Fund established in Section 10, and for port mitigation projects under Section 3 and to provide environmental justice assessment, consultation and engagement for these mitigation projects under Section 7.

Section 10 adds a new section to RCW 53.20 to establish the Port District Environmental Equity Fund, which may be spent only after appropriation. Resources in the fund must be issued as either grants or loans to (a) supplement port mitigation projects required under Section 3, and (b) to provide environmental justice assessment of significant port actions under Section 7. The department must develop fund management procedures, including grant and loan selection criteria, and provide project monitoring. To qualify for a grant or loan, a port district must demonstrate that proposed actions will improve the effectiveness of mitigation measures for the project area.

Section 10(3) the department must publish an annual report detailing all grants or loans made, including their uses and project benefits.

## II. B - Cash receipts Impact

*Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.*

## II. C - Expenditures

*Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.*

The department would require approximately \$30,000 in FY25 for outreach and to form the three loan or grant activities in Sections 8 and 10, with outreach declining each fiscal year thereafter. The number of awards made and at what levels are unknown and subject to appropriation.

Agency assumptions:

- The department assumes outreach and engagement with communities as part of the required environmental justice assessments for the new programs created in Sections 8 and 10. Outreach would include coordination with the Port of Seattle and King County to identify potential mitigation projects at the port and the feasibility of county personnel to provide building inspection services.
- The department assumes one annual report that would combine the requirements under Section 8 and Section 10 for awards made for mitigation, building inspection services, and consultation of significant port actions. The publication date would vary dependent on an appropriation and completion of qualifying projects.
- The department assumes annual coordination with the Port of Seattle to collect data on awards and project outcomes under the proposed legislation and to meet the requirements of the annual reports in Section 8 and Section 10.
- The number and size of grants or loans for mitigation, building inspector services, and environmental justice assessment and consultation for significant port actions are unknown and subject to appropriation. The department does not know how large a project area may be, which would define the scope and inform the cost of community consultation of significant port actions, or the share of costs that would be requested. The department also does not know the size and scope of a mitigation project and the resultant staff hours for a building inspector to review mitigation projects.

Sections 8 and 10 - program formation, outreach, and reporting

0.12 FTE Commerce Specialist 3 (518 hours) in FY25 and 0.05 FTE (105 hours) in FY26-29 to provide program management, project technical assistance, collect data, produce annual reports, and conduct the requisite environmental justice assessments prior to program formation.

0.02 FTE WMS Band 2 (65 hours) in FY25 to provide leadership, oversight, coordination over all element of program formation and operation. Staff will also support community outreach and engagement, and review of annual reports published to the department webpage.

Salaries and benefits:

FY25: \$17,180

FY26-FY29: \$5,778 per fiscal year

Professional Services Contracts:

Translated materials would cost approximately \$1,725 per document per language (between \$0.16 and \$0.21 cents per word) with an assumption that up to 27 translations (two program documents into the nine most common English language alternatives) would be required in FY26 as part of the requisite environmental justice assessments, including program



communications during the first year of program operations (\$1,725 x 27 = \$46,575).

FY25: \$46,575 per fiscal year

Goods and services:

The department assumes \$3,360 (16 hours at \$210 per hour) in FY25 for Assistant Attorney General (AAG) consultation each year with the assumption there will be grant contracts each fiscal year.

FY25: \$4,705

FY26-FY29: \$480 per fiscal year

Travel:

The department assumes approximately 10 trips in the first year of the program to support community outreach and engagement, and declining thereafter.

FY25: \$192

FY26-FY29: \$128 per fiscal year

Intra-agency reimbursements

FY25: \$5,652

FY26-FY29: \$1,901 per fiscal year

Note: Standard goods and services costs include supplies and materials, employee development and training, Attorney General costs, central services charges and agency administration. Agency administration costs (e.g., payroll, HR, IT) are funded under a federally approved cost allocation plan.

=====  
Total Costs

FY25: \$74,304

FY26-FY29: \$8,287 per fiscal year

**Part III: Expenditure Detail**

**III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures**

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
001-1	General Fund	State	0	74,304	74,304	16,574	16,574
<b>Total \$</b>			0	74,304	74,304	16,574	16,574

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

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

	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
FTE Staff Years		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
A-Salaries and Wages		12,673	12,673	8,452	8,452
B-Employee Benefits		4,507	4,507	3,104	3,104
C-Professional Service Contracts		46,575	46,575		
E-Goods and Other Services		4,705	4,705	960	960
G-Travel		192	192	256	256
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements		5,652	5,652	3,802	3,802
9-					
<b>Total \$</b>	0	74,304	74,304	16,574	16,574

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

**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

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
Administrative Services - Indirect	111,168		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Commerce Specialist 3	91,068		0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
WMS Band 2	84,518		0.0	0.0		
<b>Total FTEs</b>			0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1

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

NONE

**Part IV: Capital Budget Impact**

**IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures**

Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.

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

Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.

**IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout**

Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.

Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.

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

NONE

The proposed legislation has an indeterminate capital budget impact. Subject to appropriation, capital funds may be made available as grants or loans to finance the mitigation projects. It is unknown when projects for community consultation (Section 8), or mitigation and community consultation (Section 10) would begin or end. The department would require approximately \$140,000 in FY25 to operate the three loan or grant activities in Sections 8 and 10. The number of awards made and at what levels are unknown and subject to appropriation.

FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY:

Agency assumptions:

- The number and size of grants or loans for mitigation, building inspector services, and environmental justice assessment and consultation for signification port actions are unknown and subject to appropriation. The department does not know how large a project area may be, which would define the scope and inform the cost of community consultation of significant port actions, or the share of costs that would be requested. The department also does not know the size and scope of a mitigation project and the resultant staff hours for a building inspector to review mitigation projects.

Section 8 - building inspector grant program

0.15 FTE Commerce Specialist (313 hours) in FY25 and 0.08 FTE (167 hours) in FY26-29 to provide program management, project technical assistance, management of grant funding availability, application review, compiling project detail. Staff will manage awarded contracts, validate invoices, monitor contract implementation, develop project communications, collect data, produce annual reports, and conduct the requisite environmental justice assessments prior to program formation.

0.01 FTE WMS Band 2 (20 hours) in FY25-FY29 to provide leadership, oversight, coordination over all element of the established programs. Staff will also support community outreach and engagement, application development, technical assistance, application scoring and prioritization, and review of annual reports published to the department webpage.

0.01 FTE Budget Analyst 4 (30 hours) in FY25-FY29 to provide fund management, project accounting and project financial data management for the grant and loan fund established in Section 10.

Salaries and benefits:

FY25: \$20,224

FY26-FY29: \$12,134 per fiscal year

Goods and services:

The department assumes \$2,520 (12 hours at \$210 per hour) in FY25 and \$4,200 (20 hours at \$210 per hour) in FY26-FY29 for Assistant Attorney General (AAG) consultation each year with the assumption there will be grant contracts each fiscal year.

FY25: \$4,150

FY26-FY29: \$5,160 per fiscal year

Travel:

The department assumes approximately 10 trips in the first year of the program to support community outreach and engagement, and declining thereafter.

FY25-FY29: \$128 per fiscal year

Intra-agency reimbursements

FY25: \$6,654

FY26-FY29: \$3,992 per fiscal year

Note: Standard goods and services costs include supplies and materials, employee development and training, Attorney General costs, central services charges and agency administration. Agency administration costs (e.g., payroll, HR, IT) are funded under a federally approved cost allocation plan.

=====

Total Costs Section 8:

FY25: \$31,156

FY26-FY29: \$21,414 per fiscal year

Section 10 -mitigation and environmental consultation of significant port actions

0.23 FTE Commerce Specialist 3 (480 hours) in FY25 and 0.12 FTE (250 hours) in FY26-29 to provide program management, project technical assistance, management of grant funding availability, application review, compiling project detail. Staff will manage awarded contracts, validate invoices, monitor contract implementation, develop project communications.

0.07 FTE WMS Band 2 (146 hours) in FY25 and 0.02 FTE (45 hours) in FY26-FY29 to provide leadership, oversight, coordination over all element of the established programs. Staff will also support community outreach and engagement, application development, technical assistance, and application scoring and prioritization.

0.03 FTE Budget Analyst 4 (50 hours) in FY25-FY29 to provide fund management, project accounting and project financial data management for the grant and loan fund established in Section 10.

Salaries and benefits:

FY25: \$41,874

FY26-FY29: \$20,881 per fiscal year

Professional Services Contracts:

Translated materials would cost approximately \$1,725 per document per language (between \$0.16 and \$0.21 cents per word) with an assumption that up to 18 translations (two program documents into the nine most common English language alternatives) would be required in FY26-FY29 as a regular part of community engagement during program operations (\$1,725 x 18 = \$31,050). Translation costs may increase as the number of grants issued increases.

FY26-FY29: \$31,050 per fiscal year

Goods and services:

The department assumes \$2,520 (12 hours at \$210 per hour) in FY25 and \$4,200 (20 hours at \$210 per hour) in FY26-FY29 for Assistant Attorney General (AAG) consultation each year with the assumption there will be grant contracts each fiscal year.

FY25: \$5,692

FY26-FY29: \$5,832 per fiscal year

Travel:

The department assumes approximately 10 trips in the first year of the program to support community outreach and engagement, and declining thereafter.

FY25: \$640

FY26-FY29: \$308 per fiscal year

Intra-agency reimbursements

FY25: \$13,777

FY26-FY29: \$6,870 per fiscal year

Note: Standard goods and services costs include supplies and materials, employee development and training, Attorney General costs, central services charges and agency administration. Agency administration costs (e.g., payroll, HR, IT) are funded under a federally approved cost allocation plan.

=====  
Total Costs Section 10:

FY25: \$61,983

FY26-FY29: \$64,941 per fiscal year

Total of all costs for Sections 8 and 10

FY25: \$93,139

FY26-FY29: \$86,355 per fiscal year

## **Part V: New Rule Making Required**

*Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.*

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5955 SB	<b>Title:</b> Large port districts	<b>Agency:</b> 461-Department of Ecology
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	--

## Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

**Estimated Cash Receipts to:**

NONE

**Estimated Operating Expenditures from:**

NONE

**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: Maggie Douglas	Phone: 3607867279	Date: 01/12/2024
Agency Preparation: Andrew Contreras	Phone: 360-485-7648	Date: 01/12/2024
Agency Approval: Erik Fairchild	Phone: 360-407-7005	Date: 01/12/2024
OFM Review: Lisa Borkowski	Phone: (360) 742-2239	Date: 01/14/2024

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

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

This bill would require that port districts operating large airports dedicate a portion of their property tax levy towards a program to mitigate the impacts of noise and air pollution on surrounding communities and assess adverse impacts of significant port actions. Section 9 would authorize the Climate Commitment Account to be used for the grant or loan program authorized for Department of Commerce in section 10.

Ecology is not specified in the bill and assumes no new requirements under this bill. Therefore, Ecology assumes no fiscal impact.

### II. B - Cash receipts Impact

*Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.*

### II. C - Expenditures

*Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.*

## Part III: Expenditure Detail

### III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

NONE

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

NONE

**III. C - Operating FTE Detail:** *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals 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

*Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.*

NONE

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

NONE

## **Part V: New Rule Making Required**

*Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.*



# LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Commerce

<b>Bill Number:</b> 5955 SB	<b>Title:</b> Large port districts
-----------------------------	------------------------------------

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

**Legislation Impacts:**

- Cities:
- Counties: King County: indeterminate expenditure increase for managing inspections for new program
- Special Districts: loss of property tax revenue (through specific allocation), major increases in expenditures to manage new program
- Specific jurisdictions only: Port of Seattle, King County
- 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: costs of each inspection, area of eligibility, number of eligible residences/buildings, costs to perform community assessments, unit costs of additional services provided through new mitigation program

**Estimated revenue impacts to:**

Jurisdiction	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
Special District		(867,000)	(867,000)	(4,528,529)	(8,502,894)
<b>TOTAL \$</b>		(867,000)	(867,000)	(4,528,529)	(8,502,894)
<b>GRAND TOTAL \$</b>					(13,898,423)

**Estimated expenditure impacts to:**

Jurisdiction	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
Special District	50,000,000	50,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
<b>TOTAL \$</b>	50,000,000	50,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
<b>GRAND TOTAL \$</b>					<b>300,000,000</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: Angie Hong	Phone: 360-725-5041	Date: 01/16/2024
Leg. Committee Contact: Maggie Douglas	Phone: 3607867279	Date: 01/12/2024
Agency Approval: Allan Johnson	Phone: 360-725-5033	Date: 01/16/2024
OFM Review: Myra Baldini	Phone: (360) 688-8208	Date: 01/16/2024

## **Part IV: Analysis**

### **A. SUMMARY OF BILL**

*Description of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.*

This bill creates a new mitigation program.

Section 1 explains intent.

Section 2 amends RCW 53.36.020 [Finances – tax levy limitation] to dedicate a portion of the Port of Seattle’s property tax revenue toward a new mitigation program. Beginning in FY 2025, half of the district's levy increase must be utilized for mitigation programs. In FY 2026 and for every year thereafter, an increase of 1% of the total levy must be utilized, in addition to half of the increase, for mitigation programs.

Section 3 creates a new section in RCW 53.54 [Aircraft noise abatement] to create a new mitigation program to be run by the Port of Seattle, King County, and the State Dept. of Commerce.

Section 6 amends RCW 53.54.040 [Fund authorized—Sources] to specify that grants and loans issued by the Dept. of Commerce to the Port may be used to implement the new mitigation program and that property tax levy amounts will be used as well.

Section 7 creates a new section in RCW 53.36 [Port District Finances] to require the Port of Seattle to perform the following before considering a significant port action (any action involving a capital improvement project, purchase, or construction of \$12,000,000 or more in value):

- a) conduct an overburdened communities and vulnerable populations assessment
- b) explain mitigation measures
- c) engage overburdened communities and vulnerable populations

Section 8 creates a new section in RCW 43.330 [Dept. of Commerce] that states, subject to the availability of amounts appropriated, the Dept. of Commerce will provide grants for the hiring of subcontractors to perform inspections or for entering into an interlocal agreement with the county for the provision of a building inspector or inspectors to implement the new mitigation program.

Section 9 amends RCW 70A.65.260 [Climate commitment account] to specify funds from the climate commitment account may be allocated toward “supplementing the port district environmental equity fund” “for the purpose of making grants or loans to port districts to undertake remedial mitigation programs “ “or to comply with requirements related to consultation with overburdened communities and vulnerable populations prior to undertaking significant port actions.”

Section 10 creates a new section in RCW 53.20 [Port Districts – Harbor Improvements] to create a separate account for all purposes of this new mitigation program and places the Dept. of Commerce as a general administrator of the account; managing it and reporting regularly.

### **B. SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE IMPACTS**

*Expenditure impacts of the legislation on local governments with the expenditure provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Delineated between city, county and special district impacts.*

This bill majorly increases Port of Seattle expenditures by creating a new mitigation program that is expected to cost 1 billion dollars (determinately) - over 20 years - with additional indeterminate costs, according to the Port of Seattle. Additional, increased expenditures are expected for King County and are indeterminate.

SECTION 3 describes a new mitigation program that is expected to cost \$1,000,000,000 dollars in total starting in FY2024 according to the Port of Seattle. For the purposes of this fiscal note, this \$1B cost is illustratively compared to the implementation of another program that was implemented over a span of 20 years. To assume an amount per fiscal year,

the LGFN Program divided \$1B/20 years because similar comparisons are made below (\$50M/FY). Additional, indeterminate costs are expected to add to the \$50M per fiscal year.

For an illustration of the scale of these expenditures, the Local Government Fiscal Note Program compares a current Port of Seattle mitigation program and its costs with this new, proposed mitigation program. The Port of Seattle currently operates a noise mitigation program that works to mitigate the noise for residences within an area around the airport referred to as 65DnL. There are about 10,000 residences within the 65DnL area that are eligible for the program due to their location. It costs the port approximately \$100,000 for each residence that receives noise mitigation assistance through the program. As of 2023, about 9,500 residences have received noise mitigation assistance. This has cost approximately \$950 million dollars to implement in the 20+ years of operating the program. Approximately, 20% of this cost was covered by the Port of Seattle, which amounts to \$190 million dollars. The other 80% was covered with federal funds.

Section 3, describes a new mitigation program that has been expanded beyond the current program in the following ways:

It expands:

1. the area of eligibility from the 65DnL (exposed to 65 decibels or more) area, which currently includes about 10,000 residences to an area within a larger range 55DnL (exposed to 55 decibels or more) that includes an indeterminate number of additional eligible residences. To know the increased number of residences/buildings within a 55 decibel range sound testing will need to be performed.
  - a) According to an Illinois Dept. of Transportation pamphlet on traffic noise, decibels, and range, "generally, every time the distance doubles, the noise level will decline 3 dB(A) when it travels over hard surfaces. Over soft surfaces, the noise level will decline 4.5 dB(A) for every doubling of distance." Given this explanation of how sound travels, it can be assumed that the distance from the Port to eligible residences/building with a 10 decibel difference will double twice (quadruple) when soft surfaces are between the port and the eligible residence/building.
2. the type of building eligible; from residences to residential, recreational, or educational facilities.
3. eligibility for assistance by allowing residences that have received assistance from the current program to receive additional assistance from the new program, which is currently restricted by federal law under the current program.
4. It expands the type of mitigation assistance from just noise mitigation to also include:
  - a) failed mitigation equipment
  - b) provision of air quality mitigation equipment including, but not limited to, the provision of high particulate air purifiers designed to mitigate or eliminate ultrafine particles or other aviation-related air pollution;
  - c) provide urban forests or green space within an impacted area;
  - d) provision or support of indoor recreation facilities available to the community within an impacted area; and
  - e) provision of indoor community greenhouses within an impacted area

The section 3 mitigation program described in this bill will not be eligible for federal funds like the current mitigation program, which received approximately 80% of its operating expenses from the federal government. This is because current FAA regulations only contemplate noise mitigation for the 65 DnL. Current federal law also prohibits the use of federal funds or airport revenues for properties that have already received noise mitigation funding under the current program. Comparatively, the Port of Seattle covered 20% of the cost to provide mitigation assistance for their current noise mitigation program. However, the Port of Seattle will need to cover 100% (minus any state resources allocated) of the cost of this expanded program.

SECTIONS 3 and 8 mention the Port working with King County to administer a new inspection program. The inspections will be conducted at no cost to the potentially eligible person/building. Although the grant program managed by the State Dept. of Commerce (in section 6) will provide funds to complete inspections, dependent upon allocation, there will be costs to the County to procure contractors for these purposes. It is unknown what the costs to procure inspections for mitigation program eligibility purposes will be. These costs are indeterminate.

SECTION 6 requires the port to perform outreach in the form of pamphlets. Pamphlets will require increase printing and mailing costs. These costs are indeterminate.

SECTION 7 requires the port to engage communities and perform assessments prior to any significant port action (any action involving a capital improvement project, purchase, or construction of \$12,000,000 or more in value). These expenses are new and are indeterminate.

**C. SUMMARY OF REVENUE IMPACTS**

*Revenue impacts of the legislation on local governments, with the revenue provisions identified by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of revenue sources. Delineated between city, county and special district impacts.*

This bill substantially decreases local government revenue by dedicating property tax revenue toward a new mitigation program.

SECTION 2 dedicates a portion of the Port of Seattle’s property tax revenue toward a new mitigation program. In FY 2025, half of the district’s levy increase must be utilized for mitigation programs. In FY 2026 and for every year thereafter, an increase of 1% of the total levy must be utilized, in addition to half of the increase, for mitigation programs.

FY	Half of increase	Additive 1%	Additional 1% amount	Half increase plus additive 1%
25	867,000	N/A	N/A	867,000
26	884,340	1%	902,027	1,786,367
27	902,027	2%	1,840,135	2,742,162
28	920,469	3%	2,815,406	3,735,473
29	938,469	4%	3,828,952	4,767,421

These amounts of revenues (the half increase plus additive 1%) dedicated for this new mitigation program are counted by the Local Government Fiscal Note Program as a decrease in revenue as these revenues would be used for other purposes if not for this bill/new program.

SECTION 6 refers to grant programs made available through appropriation that are administered by the State Dept. of Commerce. It is unknown what appropriation will be made to offset the expenses associated with managing this new mitigation program. These revenue sources for local governments are indeterminate and are not accounted for in the fiscal year tables.

**SOURCES**

Port of Seattle  
King County

Illinois Dept. of Transportation pamphlet, (<https://idot.illinois.gov/content/dam/soi/en/web/idot/documents/doing-business/manuals-guides-and-handbooks/highways/design-and-environment/environment/highway-traffic-noise---noise-fundamentals-111215.pdf>)