

# Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

<b>Bill Number:</b> 2384 E S HB	<b>Title:</b> Traffic safety cameras
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

## 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
Department of Licensing	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.								
Department of Social and Health Services	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	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.					
Loc School dist-SPI						
Local Gov. Other	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.					
Local Gov. Total						

## 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
Administrative Office of the Courts	2.0	814,000	814,000	814,000	2.0	742,000	742,000	742,000	2.0	742,000	742,000	742,000
Consolidated Technology Services	Fiscal note not available											
Washington State Patrol	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
Traffic Safety Commission	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	350,000	.0	0	0	300,000
Department of Licensing	Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.											
Department of Social and Health Services	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
Department of Transportation	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
<b>Total \$</b>	2.0	814,000	814,000	814,000	2.0	742,000	742,000	1,092,000	2.0	742,000	742,000	1,042,000

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
Administrative Office of the Courts	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Consolidated Technology Services	Fiscal note not available								
Washington State Patrol	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Traffic Safety Commission	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Department of Licensing	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Department of Social and Health Services	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Department of Transportation	.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	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

<b>Prepared by:</b> Tiffany West, OFM	<b>Phone:</b> (360) 890-2653	<b>Date Published:</b> Preliminary 2/22/2024
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

# Judicial Impact Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 2384 E S HB	<b>Title:</b> Traffic safety cameras	<b>Agency:</b> 055-Administrative Office of the Courts
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

## Part I: Estimates

**No Fiscal Impact**

**Estimated Cash Receipts to:**

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

**Estimated Expenditures from:**

STATE	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
State FTE Staff Years		4.1	2.0	2.0	2.0
<b>Account</b>					
General Fund-State 001-1		814,000	814,000	742,000	742,000
State Subtotal \$		814,000	814,000	742,000	742,000
COUNTY	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
County FTE Staff Years					
<b>Account</b>					
Local - Counties					
Counties Subtotal \$					
CITY	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
City FTE Staff Years					
<b>Account</b>					
Local - Cities					
Cities Subtotal \$					

**Estimated Capital Budget Impact:**

NONE

*The revenue and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Responsibility for expenditures may be subject to the provisions of RCW 43.135.060.*

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 for 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.

Legislative Contact: Beth Redfield	Phone: 360-786-7140	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Preparation: Angie Wirkkala	Phone: 360-704-5528	Date: 02/20/2024
Agency Approval: Chris Stanley	Phone: 360-357-2406	Date: 02/20/2024
OFM Review: Gaius Horton	Phone: (360) 819-3112	Date: 02/21/2024

195,173.00

Request # 219-1

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

The bill would expand the use of traffic safety cameras to more jurisdictions, require reduced penalties for certain registered owners, and change the distribution of certain photo enforced traffic infractions.

Section 2(14) would authorize a county or city to adopt the use of an on-line ability to pay calculator to process and grant reductions in fines or civil penalties for photo enforced traffic violations.

Section 2(15) would require penalties be reduced 25 percent to registered owners who are recipients of state public assistance and request a reduced penalty. It would also require the registered owner be provided with information on their eligibility and opportunity to apply for the reduction via mail or internet.

Section 2(17) would require photo enforced traffic infractions authorized in this bill to include the traumatic brain injury fee specified in RCW 46.63.110(7)(c) to be deposited in the Traumatic Brain Injury Account created in RCW 74.31.060. This fee would be waived for registered owners granted the 25 percent reduction in Section 2(15).

Section 6(1) would lower the population requirement from 500,000 to 10,000 where automated traffic safety cameras may be used increasing the number of courts requiring vehicle-related violations onboardings.

Section 8 would grant authority for noncommissioned officers or any public employee designated by a city or county with authority to review infractions and issue notices of infraction. The officers or employees would need to be trained by cities, counties, or law enforcement in reviewing and issuing notices. This would expand the number of judicial information system users.

Section 10 would strike receipts from penalties collected under RCW 46.63.170 (currently local funding) and require funds dedicated by the Legislature to be deposited into the state Cooper Jones Active Transportation Safety Account.

Section 11 would allow for a waiver of the \$5 Traumatic Brain Injury assessment for registered owners who are recipients of state public assistance.

### II. B - Cash Receipts Impact

Indeterminate

Currently all parking ticket monies are kept 100 percent local. The impact of Section 10 would be a shift from the money remaining local to it being sent to the state.

The amount cannot be calculated. It would require the total the number of filings, the total amount of the ticket, and subtract \$5 per ticket from the total. The total amount due for each is not consistent jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Additionally, all not all courts file the tickets in JIS – some only receipt the amounts in the JIS.

### II. C - Expenditures

This bill would have fiscal impact to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the courts.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

AOC would incur costs related to one-time changes required in the Judicial Information Systems/Enterprise Justice (JIS System), one-time and ongoing law table updates, one-time forms changes, and on-going staffing required for onboarding and supporting new courts for vehicle-related violations (VRV).

Law Table, JIS System and Accounting Changes – \$402,000 one-time

The bill would require a number of changes related to parking violations.

The Traumatic Brain Injury fee is not currently included in parking violation amounts and is not currently waivable. The bill would change the funding distribution between state and local funds and allow penalties and assessments to be waived. All of these changes would require changes to the systems to recognize and accept new accounting codes (BARS codes), different funding distributions, and the ability to adjust when waivers are granted.

Additionally, the provisions of Section 8 would require AOC add noncommissioned officers or public employees for each city into the JIS system.

The mid-range estimate to complete this work is based on 3,885 staff hours at an average of approximately \$103 per hour across multiple

195,173.00

Form FN (Rev 1/00)

2

Request # 219-1

Bill # 2384 E S HB

job classifications needed to complete the interface (Business Analyst, System Integrator, Senior System Integrator, IT Supervisor, and Manager).

**Forms Updates – \$31,000 one-time**

This bill would likely require all jurisdictions to update their notice of infractions (NOI) and have them reapproved. It would require AOC staff 300 hours to support the forms update, review and approval.

Senior Legal Services Analyst. Beginning July 1, 2024 one-time, AOC would require salary, benefits, and associated standard costs for 300 hours of AOC staff time to support the forms update, review and approval (0.15 FTE).

**Ongoing Court Onboarding and Maintenance of Law Tables – \$371,000 ongoing, \$10,000 additional start up in FY 2025**

The bill would expand the cities that can have photo enforcement cameras. AOC would be onboarding these courts to the vehicle-related violation system to get the photo tickets into the JIS system. Additionally, there would be a large amount of law entries needed to support each city’s violations. This involves potentially 59 new cities and an ongoing work load as their laws change and they introduce new photo enforcement violations over time.

System Integrator (1.0 FTE) and Business Analyst (1.0 FTE). Beginning July 1, 2024 ongoing, AOC would require salary, benefits, and associated standard costs for staff to support court onboarding and law table updates.

**Explanation of standard costs by object:**

Salary estimates are current biennium actual rates at Step L.

Benefits are the agency average of 30.59% of salaries.

Goods and Services are the agency average of \$3,600 per direct program FTE.

Travel is the agency average of \$2,000 per direct program FTE.

Ongoing Equipment is the agency average of \$1,800 per direct program FTE.

One-time IT Equipment is \$4,800 for the first fiscal year per direct program FTE.

Agency Indirect is calculated at a rate of 25.86% of direct program salaries and benefits.

**IMPACT TO THE COURTS OF LIMITED JURISDICTION**

Judicial impact would be indeterminate. It is unclear whether the request for a penalty reduction requires an additional hearing be scheduled or if the request can be granted ex-parte. In certain jurisdictions, hearings are currently scheduled when someone indicates they have an inability to pay under current law.

**Part III: Expenditure Detail**

**Part III: Expenditure Detail**

**III. A - Expenditure By Object or Purpose (State)**

<i>State</i>	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
FTE Staff Years		4.1	2.0	2.0	2.0
Salaries and Wages		472,000	472,000	434,000	434,000
Employee Benefits		144,000	144,000	132,000	132,000
Professional Service Contracts					
Goods and Other Services		14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Travel		8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Capital Outlays		17,000	17,000	8,000	8,000
Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
Debt Service					
Interagency Reimbursements					
Intra-Agency Reimbursements		159,000	159,000	146,000	146,000
<b>Total \$</b>		<b>814,000</b>	<b>814,000</b>	<b>742,000</b>	<b>742,000</b>

**III. B - Expenditure By Object or Purpose (County)**

NONE

**III. C - Expenditure By Object or Purpose (City)**

NONE

**III. D - FTE Detail**

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
Bus. Analyst/Snr. System	127,000		1.9	1.0		
Integrator/Manager/Sup Business Analyst	108,300		1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0
Legal Svcs Snr Analyst	122,600		0.2	0.1		
System Integrator	108,300		1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0
<b>Total FTEs</b>			4.1	2.0	2.0	2.0

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

NONE

**Part IV: Capital Budget Impact**

**IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures**

NONE

**IV. B1 - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose (State)**

NONE

**IV. B2 - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose (County)**

NONE

**IV. B3 - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose (City)**

NONE

**IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout**

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

NONE

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 2384 E S HB	<b>Title:</b> Traffic safety cameras	<b>Agency:</b> 225-Washington State Patrol
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

## 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: Beth Redfield	Phone: 360-786-7140	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Preparation: Megan Given	Phone: 360-596-4049	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Approval: Mario Buono	Phone: (360) 596-4046	Date: 02/13/2024
OFM Review: Tiffany West	Phone: (360) 890-2653	Date: 02/22/2024

## 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.*

The changes in the engrossed version of this bill do not change our assessment that there is no fiscal impact to the Washington State Patrol (WSP) from this legislation.

This legislation addresses cities' and counties' use of automatic traffic safety cameras to enforce traffic safety ordinances, notably stoplight violations, rail crossing violations, speed violations, stopping when traffic obstructed violations, stopping at intersection or crosswalk violations, public transportation only lane violations, and stopping or traveling in restricted lane violations.

Per Subsection 2(1), this legislation does not prohibit a law enforcement officer from issuing a notice of traffic infraction to a person in control of a vehicle at the time a traffic violation occurs under RCW 46.63.030(1)(a), (b), or (c)

### 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.*

There are no cash receipts to the WSP from this legislation.

### 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.*

This legislation has no impact on the volume of current WSP workload, nor on how we conduct enforcement actions.

## 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> 2384 E S HB	<b>Title:</b> Traffic safety cameras	<b>Agency:</b> 228-Traffic Safety Commission
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

## 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
<b>Account</b>					
Highway Safety Account-State 106 -1	0	0	0	350,000	300,000
<b>Total \$</b>	0	0	0	350,000	300,000

### 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: Beth Redfield	Phone: 360-786-7140	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Preparation: Mark McKechnie	Phone: 3607259889	Date: 02/16/2024
Agency Approval: Mark McKechnie	Phone: 3607259889	Date: 02/16/2024
OFM Review: Tiffany West	Phone: (360) 890-2653	Date: 02/22/2024

## 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.*

AN ACT Relating to automated traffic safety cameras; amending RCW 46.16A.120, 46.63.030, 46.63.075, and 46.68.480; adding new sections to chapter 46.63 RCW; and repealing RCW 46.63.170

The engrossed substitute added annual reporting requirements for the WTSC "that includes aggregated information on the use of automated traffic safety cameras in the state that includes an assessment of the impact of their use, information required in city and county annual reports under (b)(i) of this subsection, and information on the number of automated traffic safety cameras in use by type and location, with an analysis of camera placement in the context of area demographics and household incomes. Cities and counties using automated traffic safety cameras must provide the commission with the data it requests for the report required under this subsection in a form and manner specified by the commission." The first time that cities and counties are required to provide the data is December 1, 2025. Thus, collection, analysis and reporting to the Legislature will occur annually starting in 2026. Because of the demographic analysis required, which differs from the data collection and analysis currently done by WTSC, this would require contracting with a consultant. Estimates from multiple sources indicate the contract costs would be between \$150,000 - \$300,000 per year. Based upon this, we have included a contract cost to support the analysis and reporting of \$200,000 in the first year (FY 2026) and \$150,000 per year thereafter. In addition, there are staffing costs for providing the information to the consultant, contract management, crash data analysis, and compiling the information into a report for the legislature annually. Agency staffing and related costs are indeterminate but are likely no more than \$50,000 per year.

This bill would also eliminate new revenues from traffic camera fines currently directed to the Cooper Jones Active Transportation Safety Account, under RCW 46.68.480 (Section 10 below). The full revenue impact would depend upon additional decisions by the legislature on how to handle funds that are currently in the account.

The available balance for Fund 106/24Q as of 1/1/24 is \$1,731,773

Appropriations for the current biennium include \$400,000 for local safety grants and \$236,000 for a lighting study contract. We would request that funds for the current biennium be maintained.

The Legislature has typically appropriated \$400,000 per biennium for pedestrian and bicycle safety grants. If no additional revenues are received, and the Legislature continues to authorize expenditures at this level, the funds currently in the account would be exhausted during the 2029-2031 biennium, with approximately \$295,773 available.

There are no other fiscal impacts anticipated from the bill, summarized below. The proposal does not require WTSC to add staff or incur other expenses.

Many of the provisions in the bill are taken from current law, but they have been re-organized for clarity. New or modified provisions are noted as such.

Section 1: Adds new section to chapter 46.63 RCW. Definitions of:

Automated traffic safety camera

Hospital speed zone

Public park speed zone

Public transportation vehicle

School speed zone

School walk zone (expanded definition from current law)

Section 2:

1. Use of automated cameras does not preclude law enforcement officers from issuing traffic citations

2. Use of traffic safety cameras (TSC) may be authorized by city or county ordinance
3. Requires local legislative authority to prepare analysis of proposed camera locations, including equity analysis
4. Prohibits use of TSC on interstate on-ramps
5. Cities may use TSC on state highways that function as city streets
6. Requires local ordinance to contain the restrictions and provisions for signage and public notice in this section with provisions for programs established prior to July 2005. Requires cities and counties to post an annual report on the number of crashes at camera locations, as well as the citations issued, and the revenues, costs, and expenditures related to traffic camera citation fines. Requires cities and counties to provide information to WTSC and for WTSC to provide an annual report to the legislature "with an analysis of camera placement in the context of area demographics and household incomes." [This change increases the fiscal impact of the bill for the agency.]
7. Requires locations of TSC to be clearly marked at least 30 days prior to activation. Signs placed after June 2012 must follow MUTCD guidelines
8. TSCs may only record images of the vehicle and license plate and may not reveal the face of the driver or passengers. Cities and counties must also consider placement that minimizes the impact of camera flashes on drivers
9. Requires mailing the notice of infraction to the registered owner of the vehicle within 14 days of the violation with provisions for events where the vehicle was rented. Outlines the requirements of the notice. Specifies that the citation recipient may respond via mail.
10. Presumption that registered owner of the vehicle is responsible for the infraction that is the subject of the notice unless owner overcomes the presumption in 46.63.075, or meets requirements related to rental car business
11. Recorded images are for exclusive use by authorized employees in their duties under this section; not admissible in other matters.
12. Payments to TSC vendors may not be based upon a portion of the fines/penalties generated by the equipment
13. Permits local government to use revenues from TSC fines in excess of costs for traffic safety purposes; expenditures must be spent in proportion to population in low-income communities. (ends the requirement that a portion of proceeds for some camera types be forwarded to the state Cooper Jones Account)
14. Allows county or city to reduce fines from TSC for low income individuals
15. Requires 25% reduction in fine for driver enrolled in specified public benefit programs based upon low-income status.
16. Infractions detected through TSC are not part of the vehicle owner's driving record; must be processed in same manner as parking infractions and amount may not exceed amount of parking infractions in the jurisdiction. Fines for specified camera types capped at two-thirds of specified fine amounts.
16. Adds \$5 contribution to TBI account.
17. Notice requirements when vehicle owner is a rental car business and requirements for business response to the notice
18. Provisions for vehicles owned by rental car business

Section 3: Subject to section 2, TSC may be used to detect stoplight violations at locations described.

Section 4: Subject to section 2, TSC may be used at rail crossings to detect vehicles that fail to stop for a signal

Section 5: Speed cameras

1. TSC may be used to detect speed violations subject to Sec. 2
2. TSC may be used to detect speed violations in hospital, park, school, school walk zones and (NEW) state highways that function as city streets
3. (Modified to include counties) One TSC may be used per 10,000 population by the local legislative authority in locations that experience higher crash risks due to excessive speeds.

Section 6: Cities with 10,000 or higher population may use TSC to detect violations related to travelling or stopping in transit lanes or restricted lanes or blocking intersections or crosswalks.

Bars transit authority from taking disciplinary action against driver who receives infraction under this section

Section 7: Updates references in 46.16A.120 to reflect sections 2 through 6 above

Section 8: Allows noncommissioned officers and employees of local DOT or public works department to review infractions detected by TSC and issue notices of infraction.

Section 9: Updates references in 46.63.075 to Sections 2 through 6 above

Section 10: Amends Cooper Jones active transportation safety account. No longer receives funds from designated traffic safety camera fines from local jurisdictions under 46.63.170. Legislature may designate funds to the account. (HAS REVENUE IMPACT)

Section 11: Amends RCW 46.63.110 to indicate that revenue from automated traffic camera fines may be waived as provided Section 2 of this act.+

Section 12: Repeals current Automated traffic safety camera section, RCW 46.63.170  
Existing TSC statute, 46.63.170 is repealed.

## 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.*

Indeterminate impact.

This bill would eliminate new revenues from traffic camera fines currently directed to the Cooper Jones Active Transportation Safety Account, under RCW 46.68.480 (Section 10 below). The full revenue impact would depend upon additional decisions by the legislature on how to handle funds that are currently in the account.

The available balance for Fund 106 as of 1/1/24 is \$1,731,773

Appropriations for the current biennium include \$400,000 for local safety grants and \$236,000 for a lighting study contract. We would request that funds for the current biennium be maintained.

The Legislature has typically appropriated \$400,000 per biennium for pedestrian and bicycle safety grants. If no additional revenues are received, and the Legislature continues to authorize expenditures at this level, the funds currently in the account would be exhausted during the 2029-2031 biennium, with approximately \$295,773 available.

## 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 Engrossed Substitute added an annual reporting requirement for WTSC "that includes aggregated information on the use of automated traffic safety cameras in the state that includes an assessment of the impact of their use, information required in city and county annual reports under (b)(i) of this subsection, and information on the number of automated traffic safety cameras in use by type and location, with an analysis of camera placement in the context of area demographics and household incomes. Cities and counties using automated traffic safety cameras must provide the commission with the data it requests for the report required under this subsection in a form and manner specified by the commission." Sec. 2 (6)(b)(ii)

The first time that cities and counties are required to provide the data is December 1, 2025. Thus, collection, analysis and reporting to the Legislature will occur annually starting in 2026. Because of the demographic analysis required, which differs from the data collection and analysis currently done by WTSC, this would require contracting with a consultant. Estimates from multiple sources indicate the contract costs would be between \$150,000 - \$300,000 per year. Based upon this, we have included a contract cost to support the analysis and reporting of \$200,000 in the first year (FY 2026) and \$150,000 per year thereafter.

In addition, there are staffing costs for providing the information to the consultant, contract management, crash data analysis, and compiling the information into a report for the legislature annually. Agency staffing and related costs are indeterminate but are likely no more than \$50,000 per year.

**Part III: Expenditure Detail**

**III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures**

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
106-1	Highway Safety Account	State	0	0	0	350,000	300,000
<b>Total \$</b>			0	0	0	350,000	300,000

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

	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
FTE Staff Years					
A-Salaries and Wages					
B-Employee Benefits					
C-Professional Service Contracts				350,000	300,000
E-Goods and Other Services					
G-Travel					
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
9-					
<b>Total \$</b>	0	0	0	350,000	300,000

**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

No impact.

## **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> 2384 E S HB	<b>Title:</b> Traffic safety cameras	<b>Agency:</b> 240-Department of Licensing
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

## 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:

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

### 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: Beth Redfield	Phone: 360-786-7140	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Preparation: Don Arlow	Phone: (360) 902-3736	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Approval: Collin Ashley	Phone: (564) 669-9190	Date: 02/13/2024
OFM Review: Kyle Siefering	Phone: (360) 995-3825	Date: 02/14/2024



## 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.*

Differences between SHB 2384 and ESHB 2384: ESHB 2384 makes additional changes that will impact local jurisdictions, the Department of Transportation, and the Washington Traffic Safety Commission.

None of the changes affect the department's fiscal note, that remains indeterminate for both cash receipts and expenditures.

The fiscal impact of this bill is indeterminate. Bill language is permissive regarding adoption of automated traffic safety cameras by local jurisdictions. The Department of Licensing (DOL) cannot determine how many jurisdictions will adopt the bill's provisions, or when such adoption would occur. DOL does not anticipate the need for information technology systems changes. Other operational components that could be impacted, such as additional driver records staff, hearings staff, and postage costs will get addressed in a future budget cycle as necessary.

### 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.*

Please see attached fiscal note.

### 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.*

Please see attached fiscal note.

## Part III: Expenditure Detail

### III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

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

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

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

**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

Agency 240 – Department of Licensing

Bill Number: ESHB 2384

Bill Title: Traffic safety cameras

## Part 1: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

### Estimated Cash Receipts:

INDETERMINATE; PLEASE SEE NARRATIVE

### Estimated Expenditures:

INDETERMINATE; PLEASE SEE NARRATIVE

*The revenue 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 the fiscal impact is **less than \$50,000** per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- 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.
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Beth Redfield	Phone: (360) 786-7140	Date: 2/13/2024
Agency Preparation: Don Arlow	Phone: (360) 902-3736	Date: 2/13/2024
Agency Approval: Collin Ashley	Phone: (360) 634-5384	Date: 2/13/2024

Request #	1
Bill #	2384 ESHB

## **Part 2 – Explanation**

This bill changes provisions related to automated traffic enforcement requirements. The bill authorizes cities and counties to use automated traffic safety cameras and clarifies provisions that apply to cities and counties, including how they may be used, analysis that must include equity implications, providing notices, and clarity around fines and revenue.

Differences between SHB 2384 and ESHB 2384: ESHB 2384 makes additional changes that will impact local jurisdictions, the Department of Transportation, and the Washington Traffic Safety Commission. None of the changes affect the department's fiscal note, that remains indeterminate for both cash receipts and expenditures.

The fiscal impact of this bill is indeterminate. Bill language is permissive regarding adoption of automated traffic safety cameras by local jurisdictions. The Department of Licensing (DOL) cannot determine how many jurisdictions will adopt the bill's provisions, or when such adoption would occur. DOL does not anticipate the need for information technology systems changes. Other operational components that could be impacted, such as additional driver records staff, hearings staff, and postage costs will get addressed in a future budget cycle as necessary.

## **Part 3 – Expenditure Detail**

None.

## **Part 4 – Capital Budget Impact**

None.

## **Part 5 – New Rule Making Required**

None.

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 2384 E S HB	<b>Title:</b> Traffic safety cameras	<b>Agency:</b> 300-Department of Social and Health Services
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---

## 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: Beth Redfield	Phone: 360-786-7140	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Preparation: Douglas Hoffer	Phone: 360-902-8187	Date: 02/17/2024
Agency Approval: Dan Winkley	Phone: 360-902-8236	Date: 02/17/2024
OFM Review: Breann Boggs	Phone: (360) 485-5716	Date: 02/19/2024

## 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.*

There is no fiscal impact on expenditures for the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS). The bill explicitly authorizes cities and counties to use automated traffic safety cameras through ordinance adoption. Currently, a fee of \$5 is deposited into the Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Account for each traffic infraction. Under this proposal, infractions issued as civil penalties associated with a speed safety camera systems will result in funds deposited into the TBI account, except for exemptions outlined in Section 2(15) for people receiving public assistance. This could result in an indeterminate impact to cash receipts to the TBI account.

### 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.*

This bill could result in an indeterminate impact to cash receipts. Under this proposal, infractions issued as civil penalties associated with a speed safety camera system could impact funds deposited into the TBI account.

### 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> 2384 E S HB	<b>Title:</b> Traffic safety cameras	<b>Agency:</b> 405-Department of Transportation
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---

## 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: Beth Redfield	Phone: 360-786-7140	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Preparation: Nicole Daane	Phone: 360-705-7340	Date: 02/20/2024
Agency Approval: Dina Swires	Phone: 360-705-7297	Date: 02/20/2024
OFM Review: Maria Thomas	Phone: (360) 229-4717	Date: 02/20/2024



## 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.*

See attached WSDOT fiscal note.

### 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.*

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

**Bill Number:** SHB 2384    **Title:** Automated Traffic Safety Cameras    **Agency:** 405-Department of Transportation

## Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact (Explain in section II. A)

*If a fiscal note is assigned to our agency, someone believes there might be, and we need to address that, showing why there is no impact to the department.*

Indeterminate Cash Receipts Impact (Explain in section II. B)

Partially Indeterminate Cash Receipts Impact (Explain in section II. B)

Indeterminate Expenditure Impact (Explain in section II. C)

Partially Indeterminate Expenditure Impact (Explain in section II. C)

If fiscal impact is less 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 greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, **complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V**

Capital budget impact, **complete Part IV**

Requires new rule making, **complete Part V**

Revised

## Agency Assumptions

N/A

## Agency Contacts:

Preparer: Nicole Daane	Phone: 564-669-4537	Date: 2/13/2024
Approval: Dina Swires	Phone: 206-276-5763	Date: 2/13/2024
Budget Manager: Robert Sirghie	Phone: 360-705-7546	Date: 2/15/2024

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

## Part II: Narrative Explanation

### II. A - Brief description of what the measure does that has fiscal impact.

The proposed legislation Substitute House Bill (SHB) 2384 would allow the use of automated traffic safety cameras in cities by ordinance over a population of 90,000. It also amends RCW 46.16A.120, 46.63.030, 46.63.075, and 46.68.480; adding new sections to chapter 46.63 RCW; and repealing RCW 46.63.170 to align with the proposed bill. The substitute changed the following sections:

Section 8 (1) (d), Authorized personnel: Trained civilian employees of law enforcement or public works can review and issue notices for automated traffic camera-detected infractions under sections 2 through 6 of this act. Training and certification by qualified peace officers or traffic engineers required, without affecting collective bargaining rights.

This proposed legislation does not have a fiscal impact to WSDOT. These cameras will likely lead to a reduction in crash severity in these cities and could have positive crash reductions on city streets as part of state highways. This may have indirect financial benefits to WSDOT related to reduced crash outcomes on state owned facilities at once before and after the speed camera installations.

### II. B – Cash Receipts Impact

N/A

### II. C - Expenditures

N/A

## Part III: Expenditure Detail

### III. A - Expenditures by Object or Purpose

N/A

## Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

N/A

## Part V: New Rule Making Required

N/A

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Commerce

Bill Number: 2384 E S HB

Title: Traffic safety cameras

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

### Legislation Impacts:

Cities: Indeterminate expenditure impact as a result of new reporting requirements, new penalty reduction process, new reporting requirements, updating ordinances; indeterminate revenue impact as a result of elimination of state remittance requirement, new penalty reduction process, new penalty maximum

Counties: Indeterminate expenditure impact as a result of new penalty reduction process

Special Districts:

Specific jurisdictions only:

Variance occurs due to:

## Part II: Estimates

No fiscal impacts.

Expenditures represent one-time costs: Indeterminate expenditures to update city ordinances authorizing the use of automated traffic safety camera systems

Legislation provides local option: Cities with more than 10,000 residents could use automated traffic safety cameras to detect certain other specified violations

Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: Amount of additional staff time required to comply with new reporting requirements, process additional requests for penalty reductions, update city ordinances; automated traffic safety camera revenues that would otherwise be remitted to the state; additional reductions in automated traffic safety camera penalties that may be granted; automated traffic safety camera system revenue that may be lost as result of new maximum penalty for violations other than traffic control signal violations

### Estimated revenue impacts to:

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

### Estimated expenditure impacts to:

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

## Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: James Vogl	Phone: 360-480-9429	Date: 02/20/2024
Leg. Committee Contact: Beth Redfield	Phone: 360-786-7140	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Approval: Alice Zillah	Phone: 360-725-5035	Date: 02/20/2024
OFM Review: Tiffany West	Phone: (360) 890-2653	Date: 02/20/2024

## **Part IV: Analysis**

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

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

This fiscal note analyzes the local government impact of ESHB 2384, comparing it to SHB 2384.

#### **CHANGES BETWEEN THIS VERSION AND PREVIOUS BILL VERSION:**

The proposed engrossed substitute bill would add a requirement in section 2 that, beginning December 1, 2025, the Washington Traffic Safety Commission must prepare an annual report on automated traffic safety camera systems that includes an assessment of the impact of their use, the information required in city and county annual reports, information on the number of cameras in use by location and type, and an analysis of camera placement in the context of area demographics and household incomes. Local jurisdictions operating automated traffic safety camera systems would be required to provide the commission data for these reports in a form and manner specified by the commission.

The revenue use requirements in section 2 would be modified, replacing language directing the use of citation revenue for specified purposes in overburdened communities, with language directing the use of such revenue for specified purposes in census tracts that have household incomes in the lowest quartile and areas that experience above average rates of injury crashes.

Finally, the changes in section 2 would specify that fines issued for infractions detected by automated traffic safety camera systems other than traffic control signal violations may not exceed two-thirds of the penalty for unscheduled infractions as prescribed by the Supreme Court in accordance with RCW 46.63.110 (3).

#### **SUMMARY OF CURRENT BILL:**

Sections 1 through 6 of the proposed legislation would each add new sections to chapter 46.63 RCW.

Section 1 would provide definitions for sections 2 through 6 of the bill.

Section 2 would specify that cities and counties may authorize the use of automated traffic safety cameras through an ordinance. Local legislative authorities would be required to prepare an analysis that includes specified equity considerations before installing new cameras or moving existing cameras. Cities and counties using automated traffic safety cameras would be required to post an annual report on their website, containing the number of crashes and citations for each camera location, the percentage of camera citation revenues used to cover the costs of the camera program and the uses of any citation revenue in excess of costs.

Beginning December 1, 2025, the Washington Traffic Safety Commission would be required to prepare an annual report on automated traffic safety camera systems that includes an assessment of the impact of their use, the information required in city and county annual reports, information on the number of cameras in use by location and type, and an analysis of camera placement in the context of area demographics and household incomes. Local jurisdictions operating automated traffic safety camera systems would be required to provide the commission data for these reports in a form and manner specified by the commission.

Automated traffic safety camera revenue used for traffic safety purposes would be required to include use of revenue in census tracts that have household incomes in the lowest quartile and areas that experience above average rates of injury crashes that is at least proportionate to the share of the population in a city or county who are residents of these areas. This share must be directed to investments that provide direct and meaningful traffic safety benefits to these communities.

Additionally, this section would also require that registered owners of vehicles that receive notices of infractions detected by automated traffic safety camera systems who are recipients of public assistance or participate in the Washington Women, Infants and Children program who request a reduction of the penalties for such infractions be granted a reduction of 25% of the penalty amount. Registered owners of vehicles who receive notices of infraction would be required to be provided with information on their eligibility and the opportunity to apply for a reduction in penalty amounts through the

mail or internet.

Fines issued for infractions detected by automated traffic safety camera systems other than traffic control signal violations would be required not to exceed two-thirds of the penalty for unscheduled infractions as prescribed by the Supreme Court in accordance with RCW 46.63.110 (3).

Finally, this section would also specify requirements concerning signage, citation procedures, permissible uses of citation revenue, and other administrative elements related to automated traffic safety cameras.

Section 3 would authorize the use of automated traffic safety cameras to detect stoplight violations.

Section 4 would authorize the use of automated traffic safety cameras to detect railroad grade crossing violations.

Section 5 would authorize the use of automated traffic safety cameras to detect speed violations, including in work zones on city streets, state highways also classified as city streets, and county roads.

Section 6 would authorize cities with more than 10,000 residents to use automated traffic safety cameras to detect certain other specified traffic violations.

Sections 7 through 9 would replace references to RCW 46.63.170 with references to sections 2 through 6 of the proposed legislation.

Section 8 would authorize trained and authorized civilian employees of general authority law enforcement agencies, and designated public employees with sufficient supervision and training, to review automated traffic safety camera infractions and issue citations.

Section 12 would repeal RCW 46.63.170 and various other session laws related to automated traffic safety cameras.

## **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.*

### **CHANGE IN EXPENDITURE IMPACT BETWEEN THIS VERSION AND PREVIOUS BILL VERSION:**

According to the Association of Washington Cities (AWC), the new requirement in section 2 that local jurisdictions that operate automated traffic safety camera systems provide data to the Washington Traffic Safety Commission for the commission's annual reports on automated traffic safety camera systems would create a need for additional staff time, and an associated increase in municipal expenditures.

It is unknown, however, how much additional staff time may be required to comply with the new reporting requirements in section 2, so the magnitude of the associated increase in municipal expenditures is indeterminate.

### **EXPENDITURE IMPACT OF CURRENT BILL:**

The proposed legislation would have an indeterminate impact on local government expenditures.

Cities and counties that currently operate automated traffic camera safety systems are already required to post an annual report of the number of traffic accidents that occurred at each location where an automated traffic safety camera is located as well as the number of notices of infraction issued for each camera. The proposed legislation would require such cities and counties to also post an annual report of the percentage of camera citation revenues used to cover the costs of the camera program and the uses of any citation revenue in excess of costs.

AWC reports that one large city surveyed indicated that complying with the new reporting requirements that the proposed legislation would create would not create additional expenditures. AWC indicates, however, that this may not be true for every city that operates an automated traffic camera safety system, especially small and medium sized cities. Additionally,

the new requirement in section 2 that local jurisdictions that operate automated traffic safety camera systems provide data to the Washington Traffic Safety Commission for the commission's annual reports on automated traffic safety camera systems would create a need for additional staff time, and an associated increase in municipal expenditures.

It is unknown, however, how much additional staff time may be required to comply with the new reporting requirements in section 2, so the magnitude of the associated increase in municipal expenditures is indeterminate.

Section 2 of the proposed legislation would require that people who receive public assistance or who are participants in the Washington Women, Infants and Children program who request a reduction in penalties for automated traffic safety camera infractions be granted a reduction of 25% of the penalty amount.

Currently, many jurisdictions that operate automated traffic safety cameras offer people who are issued citations the opportunity to request a reduction in their citation fees based on applicable mitigating circumstances, and the City of Seattle offers people who are low income a dedicated process to request reductions in citation fees. Some jurisdictions may be able to accommodate requests for penalty reductions under the process described in section 2 within existing resources dedicated to reviewing requests for penalty reductions, however some jurisdictions may incur additional costs to process requests for penalty reductions under section 2. Additionally, some jurisdictions process citations through municipal courts, while others collaborate with county district courts to issue automated traffic safety camera citations.

It is unknown, however, how many additional people may have request to have their citations reduced, or what the additional staff time required to process these requests might be, and accordingly, the magnitude of any resulting local government expenditure increase is indeterminate.

Section 6 of the proposed legislation would create a local option authorizing cities with more than 10,000 residents to use automated traffic safety cameras to detect certain other specified traffic violations. Currently, only cities with more than 500,000 residents are authorized to use automated traffic safety cameras to detect these specified traffic violations. Cities with between 10,000 and 500,000 residents that chose to exercise the local option to use automated traffic safety cameras to detect these traffic violations would incur associated construction and operating costs.

Finally, AWC indicates that some if not all cities currently operating automated traffic safety camera systems would need to update their local ordinances authorizing the use of such systems to reflect the new requirements of the proposed legislation, and the fact that RCW 46.63.170, which currently authorizes the use of these systems, would be repealed by the proposed legislation. The details of these ordinances vary by jurisdiction, however, and it is unknown what the scope of the required updates might be, or the associated staff time that might be required. Accordingly, the associated one-time costs for municipalities are indeterminate.

The 2024 Local Government Fiscal Note Program Unit Cost Model estimates that the costs to pass a city ordinance range from \$638 to \$6,280, depending on complexity. If hearings are required, these costs would increase.

## **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.*

### **CHANGE IN REVENUE IMPACT BETWEEN THIS VERSION AND PREVIOUS BILL VERSION:**

Section 2 of the proposed engrossed substitute bill would specify that fines issued for infractions detected by automated traffic safety camera systems other than traffic control signal violations may not exceed two-thirds of the penalty for unscheduled infractions as prescribed by the Supreme Court in accordance with RCW 46.63.110 (3). The maximum penalty for such infractions would accordingly be \$96. According to the Association of Washington Cities (AWC), some cities currently issue automated traffic safety camera citations up to \$250 for violations other than traffic control signal violations. Such jurisdictions would see an associated decrease in citation revenue as a result of the maximum penalty for such violations being set at \$96.

It is unknown, however, how many future infractions would have resulted in penalties in excess of this amount, or what



the value of those excess penalties might be. Accordingly, the associated decrease in local government revenues is indeterminate.

#### REVENUE IMPACT OF CURRENT BILL:

The proposed legislation would have an indeterminate impact on local government revenues.

Currently, cities and counties that operate automated traffic safety camera systems to detect speed violations, stopping when traffic obstructed violations, stopping at intersection or crosswalk violations, public transportation only lane violations, or stopping or traveling in a restricted lane violations, are required under RCW 46.63.170 to remit 50% of noninterest revenue from these systems in excess of costs to the state. Section 12 of the proposed legislation would repeal RCW 46.63.170, meaning cities and counties that operate automated traffic safety camera systems would keep all revenue collected from these systems.

It is unknown how much revenue cities remit annually to the state under RCW 46.63.170, or what future revenues generated by automated traffic safety camera systems may be, however, so the local government revenue increase that would result from the proposed legislation is indeterminate. Section 2 would require that any traffic safety camera system revenue collected in excess of administrative and operating costs must be spent only for traffic safety purposes, and that revenue used for traffic safety purposes must include use of revenue in census tracts that have household incomes in the lowest quartile and areas that experience above average rates of injury crashes that is at least proportionate to the share of the population in a city or county who are residents of these areas.

Section 2 of the proposed legislation would also require that people who receive public assistance or who are participants in the Washington Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program who request a reduction in penalties for automated traffic safety camera infractions be granted a reduction of 25% of the penalty amount.

Currently, many jurisdictions that operate automated traffic safety cameras offer people who are issued citations the opportunity to request a reduction in their citation fees based on applicable mitigating circumstances, and the City of Seattle offers people who are low income a dedicated process to request reductions in citation fees. The new citation reduction process specified in section 2 for people who receive public assistance or who are participants in the WIC program could lead to an indeterminate additional decrease in citation revenue from automated traffic safety camera systems. It is unknown, however, how many additional people may have citations reduced compared to the number of people who might have their citations reduced through existing processes, or what the total value of these reductions might be.

Finally, section 2 of the proposed legislation would specify that fines issued for infractions detected by automated traffic safety camera systems other than traffic control signal violations may not exceed two-thirds of the penalty for unscheduled infractions as prescribed by the Supreme Court in accordance with RCW 46.63.110 (3). The maximum penalty for such infractions would accordingly be \$96. According to AWC, some cities currently issue automated traffic safety camera citations up to \$250 for violations other than traffic control signal violations. Such jurisdictions would see an associated decrease in citation revenue as a result of the maximum penalty for such violations being set at \$96.

It is unknown, however, how many future infractions would have resulted in penalties in excess of this amount, or what the value of those excess penalties might be. Accordingly, the associated decrease in local government revenues is indeterminate.

For reference, the City of Seattle reported collecting \$9,662,727 in fines from school zone speed safety camera violations in 2022.

#### SOURCES:

Association of Washington Cities

Bill report for ESHB 2384, 2024

City of Seattle Automated Enforcement Report, 2022

Local Government Fiscal Note Program Unit Cost Model, 2024