

# Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

<b>Bill Number:</b> 1045 HB	<b>Title:</b> Uniformed personnel
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

## Estimated Operating Expenditures

Agency Name	2025-27				2027-29				2029-31			
	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total
Criminal Justice Training Commission	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
<b>Total \$</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Agency Name	2025-27			2027-29			2029-31		
	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	2025-27			2027-29			2029-31		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Criminal Justice Training Commission	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
<b>Total \$</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Agency Name	2025-27			2027-29			2029-31		
	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:** Danya Clevenger, OFM

**Phone:**  
(360) 688-6413

**Date Published:**  
Final 1/19/2025

# Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

<b>Bill Number:</b> 1045 HB	<b>Title:</b> Uniformed personnel	<b>Agency:</b> 227-Criminal Justice Training Commission
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

## 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: Benjamin McCarthy	Phone: 360-786-7100	Date: 01/10/2025
Agency Preparation: Francesca Heard	Phone: 206-610-8870	Date: 01/13/2025
Agency Approval: Francesca Heard	Phone: 206-610-8870	Date: 01/13/2025
OFM Review: Danya Clevenger	Phone: (360) 688-6413	Date: 01/19/2025

## 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.*

House Bill 1045 expands the definition of uniformed personnel to all law enforcement officers employed by a city, town, or county; and amends RCW 41.56.030.

This bill has no significant fiscal impact to the Criminal Justice Training Commission.

### 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:** 1045 HB

**Title:** Uniformed personnel

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

### Legislation Impacts:

- Cities: Indeterminate costs for 47 small cities with police departments
- Counties: Indeterminate costs for four counties.
- Special Districts:
- Specific jurisdictions only: Applies to cities with populations of less than 2,500 and counties with populations of less than 10,000
- Variance occurs due to:

## Part II: Estimates

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs:
- Legislation provides local option:
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: The outcome of potential labor provisions, including interest arbitration, on city and county budgets

### 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: Hailey Brown	Phone: 360-725-5035	Date: 01/17/2025
Leg. Committee Contact: Benjamin McCarthy	Phone: 360-786-7100	Date: 01/10/2025
Agency Approval: Alice Zillah	Phone: 360-725-5035	Date: 01/17/2025
OFM Review: Danya Clevenger	Phone: (360) 688-6413	Date: 01/19/2025

## **Part IV: Analysis**

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

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

Sec. 1 amends RCW 41.56.030. "Uniformed personnel" means: (a) Law enforcement officers as defined in RCW 41.26.030 employed by the governing body of any city or town and law enforcement officers employed by the governing body of any county.

### **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.*

The legislation would have an indeterminate impact on approximately 47 cities and four counties. Under current law, "uniformed personnel" refers to officers of cities with populations greater than 2,500 and counties with more than 10,000 residents. The legislation would remove those minimum thresholds.

By adding the officers of smaller cities and counties to the definition of "uniformed personnel," the bill grants qualifying officers:

- Requirements for meditation;
- Giving members of the bargaining unit access to interest arbitration; and
- Applying the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Agreement (PECBA) prohibition against labor strikes.

This could result in higher expenditure costs in the future under collective bargaining agreements, if an issue gets elevated to interest arbitration. If interest arbitration was to occur, there would be increased legal costs and a potential increase in wage and benefit costs for the local governments, depending on the outcome of the arbitration. Those potential future costs cannot be estimated.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The law enforcement agencies of 47 cities (with less than 2,500 residents, but having a police department) and four counties (with less than 10,000 residents) would be eligible for the provisions of the bill.

Those counties are:

Columbia, Ferry, Garfield, Wahkiakum

The cities are:

Adams County: Ritzville

Asotin County: Asotin

Cowlitz County: Castle Rock

Grant County: Grand Coulee, Royal City, Soap Lake

Grays Harbor County: Cosmopolis, McCleary, Oakville, Westport

Island County: Langley

King County: Beaux Arts Village, Carnation, Skykomish, Yarrow Point

Kittitas County: Cle Elum, Kittitas

Klickitat County: Bingen

Lewis County: Morton, Mossyrock, Napavine, Pe Ell, Toledo, Winlock

Lincoln County: Odessa, Reardan

Okanogan County: Brewster, Coulee Dam (part), Oroville, Winthrop

Pacific County: Ilwaco, Long Beach, South Bend

Pend Oreille Co: Newport

Pierce Co: Roy, Ruston

Snohomish Co: Gold Bar, Index, Woodway

Stevens Co: Kettle Falls

Thurston Co: Tenino  
Whatcom Co: Sumas  
Whitman Co: Garfield, Oakesdale, Palouse  
Yakima Co: Mabton, Tieton

Smaller jurisdictions generally have lower salaries for their city and county employees. As an example, the average cost for salary and benefits of a law enforcement officer in a small city is \$111,226. The average cost for the salary and benefits for a law enforcement officer in medium and large cities is \$135,535.

### **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 would not impact local government revenues.

#### **SOURCES:**

Association of Washington Cities  
Local Government Fiscal Note, HB 5808 (2024)  
Local Government Fiscal Note Program Criminal Justice Cost Model (2024)  
Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs  
Washington Council of Police & Sheriffs  
Washington State Association of Counties