

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 6164 SB	Title: County emergency management
-----------------------------	---

Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

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
Military Department	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
Total \$	0.0	0	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 Expenditures

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Military Department	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total \$	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

NONE

Prepared by: Val Terre, OFM	Phone: (360) 280-3973	Date Published: Final 2/ 5/2024
------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 6164 SB	Title: County emergency management	Agency: 245-Military Department
-----------------------------	---	--

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: 01/26/2024
Agency Preparation: Serina Roberts	Phone: 2535127388	Date: 01/31/2024
Agency Approval: Regan Hesse	Phone: 253-512-7698	Date: 01/31/2024
OFM Review: Val Terre	Phone: (360) 280-3973	Date: 01/31/2024

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 amends RCW 38.52.070, which relates to emergency management programs in local subdivisions. It amends the communication plan requirements for local jurisdictions to require that their plans include expeditious notifications during a hazardous material spill or release.

This has no fiscal impact on the Military Department, as the agency already provides all necessary support to ensure expeditious notifications occur.

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

Bill Number: 6164 SB

Title: County emergency management

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

Legislation Impacts:

- Cities:** Indeterminate but potentially substantial impacts totaling approximately \$6,650,000 for 95 cities to update their Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans, plus an additional indeterminate amount for any jurisdictions that have to purchase a new notification system as a result of the proposed legislation.
- Counties:** Same as above but all 39 counties' Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan updates could total approximately \$2,730,000.
- Special Districts:**
- Specific jurisdictions only:**
- Variance occurs due to:** Staff and funding available to conduct Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan updates; which jurisdictions will be required to purchase and maintain a new notification system.

Part II: Estimates

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs:
- Legislation provides local option:
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time:** Each jurisdiction's average cost to amend a comprehensive emergency management plan; how "the most appropriate [notification] technology" is defined and by whom or what agency; which jurisdictions would need to purchase it, and how much the notification system would cost.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

None

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

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

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Kate Fernald	Phone: 564-200-3519	Date: 02/05/2024
Leg. Committee Contact: Maggie Douglas	Phone: 3607867279	Date: 01/26/2024
Agency Approval: Allan Johnson	Phone: 360-725-5033	Date: 02/05/2024
OFM Review: Val Terre	Phone: (360) 280-3973	Date: 02/05/2024

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

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

Sec. 1. (3) would amend RCW 38.52.070. A local organization that produces a local comprehensive emergency management plan must include in its communication plan an expeditious notification of citizens at risk during a hazardous materials spill or release. Notification must be via the most appropriate technology available to determine citizen risk levels.

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.

Cities and counties would experience indeterminate but substantial impacts (approximately \$6,650,000 cities + \$2,730,000 counties) as a result of the legislation requiring 39 counties and 95 cities to update their Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans. Additionally, any jurisdiction deemed as lacking “the most appropriate technology available” for their notification software may be required to purchase and maintain a notification system that uses “appropriate technology” to notify residents of a hazardous materials spill or release any time that the Incident Command System is initiated.

Notification must be via the most appropriate technology available to determine citizen risk levels. Under the provisions of this legislation, it is unclear who will make this determination and what types of notification will be allowed. The method of notification could vary by jurisdiction and may range from contact through land-line phones to cell phone notification service. Following the selection of appropriate technology options, each jurisdiction may be able to choose the method of notification, although this opportunity remains unclear. Due to these variables, the impacts of this legislation are indeterminate.

COMPREHENSIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN (CEMP) UPDATES:

According to the Municipal Research Services Program’s January 16, 2024 article titled, “Local Government Emergency Planning,” any local jurisdiction that chooses to have emergency management is required to have a Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP). According to the Emergency Management Division, as of February 2024, 95 cities and all 39 counties have a CEMP.

The legislation would require all jurisdictions with a CEMP to modify it. Each CEMP would be required to add a communication plan during a hazardous materials spill or release. While actual costs to update a CEMP cannot be predicted in advance, the Emergency Management Division approximates that the average CEMP update costs roughly \$70,000 per jurisdiction based on EMD’s experience working with cities and counties to update their CEMPs. Using EMD’s average cost estimate, city and county expenditure impacts are approximated below.

- Cities could incur CEMP update costs totaling roughly \$6,650,000 (95 cities x \$70,000).
 - Counties could incur CEMP update costs totaling roughly \$2,730,000 (39 counties x \$70,000).
- However, actual costs will vary by jurisdiction and cannot be predicted in advance.

ILLUSTRATIVE CEMP UPDATE COSTS:

A sampling of jurisdictions’ actual CEMP update costs are offered below to demonstrate what it could cost each jurisdiction to update their CEMP per the requirements of the proposed legislation:

- Asotin County: \$84,000 (actual cost from a different plan update with a similar process in complexity)
- Chelan County: \$10,000
- City of North Bend: \$50,000
- Franklin County: \$100,000
- Grant County: \$80,000
- Skagit County: \$150,000 to \$200,000
- Snohomish County: \$406,000

-- Whatcom County: \$141,925

NOTIFICATION SYSTEM:

The bill would require local jurisdictions to use “the most appropriate technology available” to notify residents of a hazardous materials spill or release any time that the Incident Command System is initiated. While all jurisdictions have access to a notification system, the types of notification systems jurisdictions use vary across the state. Any jurisdiction that was determined not to have “the most appropriate technology available” would incur indeterminate costs to purchase and maintain the notification system(s) deemed appropriate. Skagit County noted that they would also require one new FTE in their Department of Emergency Management to manage the notification system project. Because no notification systems have been deemed “appropriate,” the cost of such a system, and the number of staff that may be required to manage it, is unknown until additional information becomes available.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTIFICATION SYSTEM UPDATE COSTS:

According to the Emergency Management Division, notification systems vary by jurisdiction, but the two most common systems are Everbridge and CodeRED, which bill on a per capita bases. However, it is not known at this time which system each jurisdiction uses. As such, the number of jurisdictions that will need to purchase “the most appropriate technology available” is unknown. Those jurisdictions would be required to purchase and maintain a new notification system, so a sampling of various jurisdictions’ notification systems and their 2023 costs are offered below to demonstrate the potential cost impacts to jurisdictions required to purchase a new system:

- Benton County: \$25,700: CodeRED
- Chelan County: \$32,500: not reported
- Clark County: \$104,213: Everbridge
- Franklin County: \$18,500: CodeRED
- Grant County: \$41,100: Everbridge
- Klickitat: \$8,454: Rave
- Snohomish County: \$100,000: Rave
- Walla Walla: \$19,550: Everbridge
- Whatcom: \$60,000: Genays
- Yakima: \$63,550: Everbridge

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

The Emergency Management Division also reported that under current law, the first person to arrive on the scene of a reported hazardous materials spill or release becomes the incident command officer responsible for assessing and determining which residents could potentially be impacted by the spill or release. Because the bill would not change who or how residents at risk are determined, there is no cost impact to assessing and determining who is potentially impacted by a hazardous materials spill or release.

SHERIFFS AND COUNTY EMERGENCY MANAGERS:

In counties where sheriffs are also the county’s Emergency Manager, staff resources may be slim. These jurisdictions may require more time than well-resourced jurisdictions to complete CEMP updates due to limited funding and staff availability to complete the extra work, as reported by EMD.

COUNTY TREASURERS:

County treasurers’ workload to administer the Emergency Management Fund is not anticipated to increase significantly as a result of the legislation. According to current law, when two or more political subdivisions join in the establishment and operation of a joint local organization for emergency management, each shall pay its share of the cost into a special pooled fund to be administered by the treasurer of the most populous subdivision. According to Washington Association of County Officials and Thurston County, county treasurers’ workload to administer the Emergency Management Fund is not anticipated to increase significantly as a result of the legislation.

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.

The legislation would not impact local governments' revenue.

SOURCES:

Asotin County
Association of Washington Cities
Benton County
Chelan County
City of North Bend
Clark County
Franklin County
Grant County
Department of Ecology
Department of Fish and Wildlife
Emergency Management Division
Klickitat County
Municipal Research Services Program's "Local Government Emergency Planning" Jan. 2024
Skagit County
Snohomish County
State Emergency Response Commission
Walla Walla County
Washington State Association of Counties
Yakima County