

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 1443 2S HB	Title: Mobile dwellings
--------------------------------	--------------------------------

Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

Agency Name	2025-27		2027-29		2029-31	
	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total	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 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
Department of Commerce	.3	261,580	261,580	261,580	.3	104,730	104,730	104,730	.3	104,730	104,730	104,730
Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
Total \$	0.3	261,580	261,580	261,580	0.3	104,730	104,730	104,730	0.3	104,730	104,730	104,730

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			7,304,800						
Local Gov. Other	In addition to the estimate above, there are additional indeterminate costs and/or savings. Please see individual fiscal note.								
Local Gov. Total			7,304,800						

Estimated Capital Budget Expenditures

Agency Name	2025-27			2027-29			2029-31		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Department of Commerce	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total \$	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0

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: Marie Davis, OFM	Phone: (360) 890-1163	Date Published: Final 3/11/2025
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1443 2S HB	Title: Mobile dwellings	Agency: 103-Department of Commerce
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

Part I: Estimates

☐

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
FTE Staff Years	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Account					
General Fund-State 001-1	104,140	157,440	261,580	104,730	104,730
Total \$	104,140	157,440	261,580	104,730	104,730

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: Jackie Kauble	Phone: 360-786-7125	Date: 02/28/2025
Agency Preparation: Jodi Barnes	Phone: (564) 669-0071	Date: 03/06/2025
Agency Approval: Jodi Barnes	Phone: (564) 669-0071	Date: 03/06/2025
OFM Review: Marie Davis	Phone: (360) 890-1163	Date: 03/11/2025

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.

Differences between 2SHB 1443 and SHB 1443:

Section 1 is amended to allow up to two mobile dwelling units per lot rather than one and require a sanitary yard hydrant connection with an approved double check valve assembly.

Section 2 modifies the required adoption date to the next comprehensive plan update in 2027 or within two years of the effective date.

Sections 3, 4, and 5 are updated to prevent common interest communities from enacting any new rules that would prohibit up to two mobile dwellings per residential lot.

Section 6 adds a null and void clause.

2SHB 1443 would not change the fiscal impact to the Department of Commerce (Department).

Bill Summary:

The bill proposes to allow up to two mobile dwelling units, which includes travel trailers, fifth-wheel trailers, folding camping trailers, truck campers, tiny house with wheels, and motor homes, in urban growth areas (UGAs) on all lots zoned for residential use where an existing housing unit is located, and power is available. When the mobile dwelling unit has plumbing, a water connection (via a "yard hydrant or an antisiphon hose bib" with a potable water hose and a double check valve assembly) and sewer connection (through a permitted sewer lateral clean out) must be provided.

Section 1 adds a new section to Growth Management Act (GMA) codified as Chapter 36.70A RCW requiring cities and counties planning under the GMA to allow up to two mobile dwellings on each lot zoned for residential use.

Section 2 adds a new section to Chapter 64.32 RCW to limit the controls of an association of apartment owners, stating they may not prohibit two mobile dwellings on each residential lot.

Section 3 adds a new section to Chapter 64.34 RCW to limit the controls of an association of a condominium, stating they may not prohibit two mobile dwellings on each residential lot.

Section 4 adds a new section to Chapter 64.38 RCW to limit the controls of an association of homeowners, stating they may not prohibit two mobile dwellings on each residential lot.

Section 5 adds a new section to Chapter 64.90 RCW to limit the controls of an association of a common interest community, stating they may not prohibit two mobile dwellings on each residential lot.

Section 6 states that if funding is not provided for the purpose of this act by June 30, 2025, this act is null and void.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

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

II. C - Expenditures

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

The Department of Commerce (Department) assumes that technical assistance, guidance, rulemaking, and updates to existing publications will be necessary to implement the proposed legislation.

0.10 FTE Commerce Specialist 5 (208 hours) FY26-FY31 to provide day-to-day direction to staff upon hire. This includes assigning contracts and program planning elements to staff. Staff will present advanced technical business information to the housing section manager. This position will also provide support work to policy and rule development.

0.20 Commerce Specialist 3 (416 hours) FY26-FY31 to provide capacity around solicitation, origination, management, and the monitoring of project contracts. This staff will also assist senior management with representing the agency, developing policy positions, and coordinating the state’s role in the implementation of the GMA. This position will also provide direct technical assistance to local governments.

Salaries and Benefits:
FY26-FY31: \$35,640 each fiscal year

Professional Services Contract: The Department assumes a professional services contract to facilitate a workgroup and produce guidance on the new mobile dwelling unit requirements for all fully planning cities and counties.
FY26: \$50,000
FY27: \$100,000

Goods and Services: In addition to the standard Goods and Services associated with additional FTEs, the Department assumes Assistant Attorney General review of the guidance will be required. This includes assuming 20 hours at \$165/hour in FY27.
FY26: \$4,300
FY27: \$7,600
FY28-FY31: \$4,300 each fiscal year

Travel: The Department assumes updated guidance will necessitate community outreach and technical assistance presentations at in-person conferences FY26-FY27, and standard Department travel costs thereafter for ongoing technical assistance.
FY26-FY27: \$2,475 each fiscal year
FY28-FY31: \$700 each fiscal year

Intra-Agency Reimbursements:
FY26-FY31: \$11,725 each fiscal year

Total Costs:
FY26: \$104,140
FY27: \$157,440
FY28-FY31: \$52,365 each fiscal year

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
001-1	General Fund	State	104,140	157,440	261,580	104,730	104,730
Total \$			104,140	157,440	261,580	104,730	104,730

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
FTE Staff Years	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
A-Salaries and Wages	26,708	26,708	53,416	53,416	53,416
B-Employee Benefits	8,932	8,932	17,864	17,864	17,864
C-Professional Service Contracts	50,000	100,000	150,000		
E-Goods and Other Services	4,300	7,600	11,900	8,600	8,600
G-Travel	2,475	2,475	4,950	1,400	1,400
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements	11,725	11,725	23,450	23,450	23,450
9-					
Total \$	104,140	157,440	261,580	104,730	104,730

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

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
Commerce Specialist 3	84,518	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Commerce Specialist 5	98,040	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total FTEs		0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3

III. D - Expenditures By Program (optional)

Program	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
Local Government Division (600)	104,140	157,440	261,580	104,730	104,730
Total \$	104,140	157,440	261,580	104,730	104,730

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.

The Department assumes that Section 1 of SHB 1443 will require rulemaking and updates to WAC 365-196.

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1443 2S HB	Title: Mobile dwellings	Agency: 468-Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

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: Jackie Kauble	Phone: 360-786-7125	Date: 02/28/2025
Agency Preparation: Dominga Soliz	Phone: 3606649173	Date: 03/04/2025
Agency Approval: Dominga Soliz	Phone: 3606649173	Date: 03/04/2025
OFM Review: Lisa Borkowski	Phone: (360) 742-2239	Date: 03/04/2025

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.

No changes to impacts.

Sec. 1 adds a new section to chapter 36.70A RCW requiring cities and counties planning under RCW 35.70A.040 to allow up to two mobile dwellings on residential zones lots within the urban growth areas that have existing housing units, provided that the mobile dwelling is not located in the shorelines of the state, natural resource lands, or critical areas. Certain building and inspection standards are provided. "Mobile dwelling" is defined. Cities required to submit a comprehensive plan update in 2027 are required to include regulations to implement Sec. 1 in the next comprehensive plan update. All other cities required to plan under the Growth Management Act must adopt implementing regulations within two years of the effective date of Sec. 1.

Secs. 2–5 add new sections to chapters 64.32, 64.34, 64.38, and 64.90 prohibiting apartment owners’ associations, condominium associations, homeowners’ associations, and associations or declarants for common interest communities from creating bylaws, restrictions, covenants, and other similar instruments aimed at prohibiting the siting of mobile dwellings provided for in section 1.

Sec. 6 provides that if specific funding for the purposes of this act, referencing this act by bill or chapter number, is not provided by June 30, 2025, in the omnibus appropriations act, this act is null and void.

The Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office (ELUHO) anticipates that any impacts as a result of this bill could be absorbed by the Growth Management Hearings Board.

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: 1443 2S HB

Title: Mobile dwellings

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

Legislation Impacts:

- ☒ Cities: Estimated costs of \$5,930,700; or approximately \$23,150 per city, and costs of up to \$57,000 in larger cities, to adopt new development regulations of this act. Annual indeterminate costs for the enforcement requirements on homes on wheels, which would vary by city.
- ☒ Counties: Estimated costs of \$1,374,000; or approximately \$26,000 per county, and costs of up to \$60,000 in larger counties to adopt new development regulations of this act. Annual indeterminate costs for the enforcement requirements on homes on wheels, which would vary by county.
- ☐ Special Districts:
- ☐ Specific jurisdictions only: There are 246 jurisdictions that fully plan under the Growth Management Act.
- ☐ Variance occurs due to:

Part II: Estimates

- ☐ No fiscal impacts.
- ☒ Expenditures represent one-time costs: Costs to amend or implement new development regulation ordinances.
- ☐ Legislation provides local option:
- ☒ Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: Additional inspection and enforcement requirements that would vary by the number of mobile dwellings within the urban growth area; potential changes to training for new enforcement and compliance procedures, number of permits issued to bring existing mobile dwelling units into compliance with this act.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

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

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY 2026	FY 2027	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
City	2,965,400	2,965,400	5,930,800		
County	687,000	687,000	1,374,000		
TOTAL \$	3,652,400	3,652,400	7,304,800		
GRAND TOTAL \$	7,304,800				

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

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Jordan Laramie	Phone: 360-725-5044	Date: 03/10/2025
Leg. Committee Contact: Jackie Kauble	Phone: 360-786-7125	Date: 02/28/2025
Agency Approval: Allan Johnson	Phone: 360-725-5033	Date: 03/10/2025
OFM Review: Marie Davis	Phone: (360) 890-1163	Date: 03/11/2025

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

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

This fiscal note reflects language in the second substitute version of HB 1443, 2025 legislative session. The amendments to this bill are compared to the substitute version of HB 1443.

CHANGES FROM PRIOR BILL VERSION:

This second substitute bill would establish a cap on the number of mobile dwellings compared to the prior act and authorizes impacted jurisdictions to site up to two mobile dwellings per residential lot.

Amends the implementation timeline compared to prior act to align with the next comprehensive plan update for cities and counties required to submit plans in 2027, and within two years of the effective date of the bill for all other impacted cities and counties.

Adds a null and void clause, requiring funding to be appropriated by the legislature for the specific purposes of this act by June 30, 2025.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT BILL:

This proposed substitute legislation requires that cities and counties planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) allow mobile dwellings on residential lots if the lot already contains a primary home, the site is within an urban growth area, and does not lie within environmentally sensitive areas such as shorelines, natural resource, or critical areas. Mobile dwellings authorized by this act would require specific utility and infrastructure provisions and compliance with these requirements would be enforced by the city or county.

Sec.1 would be a new section added to chapter 36.70A RCW that would add conditions for each fully planning jurisdiction planning under the GMA to allow up to two mobile dwellings on lots zoned for residential use. As a condition of siting of mobile dwellings, the residential lot must have an existing house on the lot within an urban growth area, not be in environmentally sensitive areas, and have specific utility hookup requirements for electricity, water, and sewer.

Local governments would be responsible for permitting, inspection, and enforcement of the siting and utility hook requirements of this act. The requirements of this act must be implemented by the next comprehensive plan update for cities and counties required to submit plans in 2027, and within two years of the effective date of the bill for all other impacted cities and counties.

This act would take effect 90 days after the adjournment of the session in which the bill is passed.

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.

EXPENDITURE CHANGES FROM PRIOR BILL VERSION:

Amendments to this act would not change the determinate and indeterminate impact associated with the workload required by the prior act.

This second substitute has higher costs due to additional outreach about the cap on mobile dwellings, from at least one dwelling to a maximum of two. Some jurisdictions reported that there would be no additional work to establish this cap compared to the prior bill version, while others reported that there would be higher costs associated with this work. Additionally, expenses were amended to account for potentially considerable community interest in this act in some jurisdictions, which would require more community and stakeholder feedback sessions to develop code that is best suited at the local level. These additional considerations increase the expenses for 45 jurisdictions from the prior act by nearly \$1.5 million. Due to the implementation amendment in Sec. 1(6) costs from the prior bill version would be shifted so that

they occur during FY2026 and FY2027, over two state fiscal years.

Outreach indicates that there are a few unknown conditions associated with this act, such as whether the mobile dwellings could be regulated under rental registration and/or safety inspection programs, which would help defray costs associated with inspection and code enforcement. Additionally, there were unknown factors related to uncertainty for code enforcement, including: fire separation requirements from the principal unit, other structures, ADU(s), or the other permissible mobile dwelling; dwellings being used as short-term or long-term housing; whether many dwellings would be moved into and out of already established utility hook-up over time, and the lack of building safety code for certain types of mobile dwellings. One jurisdiction noted that establishing a limiting timeframe would alleviate potential dilapidation of the units with such an intense use.

Many jurisdictions indicated that it is difficult to determine how many people would put a first or second mobile dwelling on a property. However, if both mobile dwellings were being placed on the property at the same time, there may be minimal impact. Alternatively, if the property owner were to place them at different times, or allow these dwellings to come and go, then there would be a more significant implication on staff time.

The City of Portland implemented a similar model of occupied recreational vehicle/tiny home on wheel ordinance in the metro area in 2021. Outreach to the City's Permitting and Development Center indicated that RVs and tiny homes on wheels (THOWs) are essentially an extra unit with low permitting barriers. Often the only permit that these dwellings may need to get are plumbing permits for the campground style faucet connections, depending on whether the tiny homes have internal plumbing. As such, the city's plumbing permit records do not necessarily reflect that they are for the purpose of residential mobile dwelling use for either short- or long-term use on a residential property.

Lastly, this act would be null and void unless funding would be available for the purposes of this act depending on appropriation by the legislature by June 30, 2025.

EXPENDITURE IMPACT OF CURRENT BILL

This proposed substitute legislation would have determinate and indeterminate impacts on local government expenditures for each jurisdiction that fully plans under the Growth Management Act (GMA).

Determinate Costs:

Sec. 1 Adopting Development Regulations:

For each fully planning jurisdiction there would be costs of at least \$23,000 per city and \$26,000 per county to adopt the development regulations of Sec. 1 or amend similar development regulations in existing local code. These costs are assumed to be more extensive in cities and counties with populations greater than 50,000 residents (19 fully planning counties and 26 fully planning cities) where costs for this development regulation would start at \$57,000 per city, and \$60,000 per county. Full implementation of the prescribed development regulation would affect 246 jurisdictions that fully plan under the Growth Management Act and have costs of at least \$7,304,800. These costs would be incurred over two state fiscal years in FY2026 and FY2027.

The Local Government Fiscal Note Program Unit Cost Model (2025) assumes that a new development regulation would have starting costs of approximately \$26,000 for each county, and \$23,150 in costs for code cities, cities and towns. There would be additional costs in larger cities for greater interdepartmental coordination, stakeholder engagement, and public feedback sessions. Jurisdictions that were contacted for this fiscal note indicated that there would likely be a high degree of community and stakeholder interest in the mobile dwelling authorization established by this act, which would require more community input to arrive at a code update that works for local conditions. In some jurisdictions (such as larger cities and counties) costs may exceed \$60,000.

Baseline assessments:

There would be a review of existing development regulations in all impacted jurisdictions to identify where the new statutory language must be integrated. The legal staff may conduct an initial review of the new state requirements and identify needed changes in the development regulations. For jurisdictions with laws allowing the siting of mobile dwellings in residential areas within existing development and zoning code and/or tiny house ordinances, there would likely be more work.

Issue identification & concepts

The planning team would develop a framework which fine tunes the development regulation based on internal feedback from the permitting, enforcement, and other departments. The framework would then be presented in a planning commission workshop, and the final draft of code concepts would be finalized.

Outreach (as needed)

Development of a public engagement plan that would identify the best ways to engage the public throughout the planning process, which may include an in-person or virtual engagement collaboration as appropriate. Planning staff would conduct interviews and/or workshops to discuss how amendments could impact neighborhoods and different portions of the community with neighborhood organizations and citizen committees. There may also be a need to engage with the public through social media, questionnaires, and mailers. This may also involve direct outreach with public event(s) that require rental space, materials, and facilitation by city staff. These costs are assumed to be extensive in cities and counties with populations greater than 50,000 residents (19 fully planning counties and 26 fully planning cities).

Code preparation and adoption

Planning staff would then prepare a draft code amendment meeting at a council/planning commission workshop. The planning team would then prepare revisions to the existing draft mobile dwellings code to allow for siting given certain conditions are met. A city or county planner would draft the mobile dwellings code amendments, which would be reviewed by the planning team, managers, director, and attorney(s). Staff reports would be prepared prior to each meeting, which would require additional review by the planning team and legislative authority's administrator.

Council administrative staff would handle advertisements, meeting packets/agendas, and meeting minutes for at least two planning commission and two council meetings, which includes one public hearing. Meetings would be staffed by a planner, clerk, attorney, and the planning director, as well as the full council. This work would likely combine the mobile dwellings development regulations and any mechanisms necessary for compliance required with this act.

Included in this work is a non-project SEPA review checklist for determination of environmental impact. The draft final code amendments, and then presented through planning commission public hearing and legislative council public hearing. Final code assessment and adoption and final edits per city council or planning commission feedback.

Assumptions:

All 246 fully planning jurisdictions would be required to review and revise existing code for conformance with Sec. 1 of this act and these jurisdictions would be required to implement this act within two years of this act's effective date.

---All fully planning cities and counties would conduct the work to implement the prescribed ordinance over a period of 18-months starting in mid FY2026 (January 1, 2026) and end by FY2027 (June 30, 2027).

--There are 19 counties and at least 26 cities that would have higher costs to conduct more extensive interdepartmental coordination and public outreach, with costs starting at \$60,000 per county and \$57,000 per city.

--Eighteen counties and 214 cities would have starting costs of \$26,000 per county, and \$23,150 per city.

Estimated Costs:

Higher cost jurisdictions:

19 counties x \$60,000 = \$1,140,000

26 cities x \$57,000 = \$1,485,900

Lower cost jurisdictions:

9 counties x \$26,000 = \$234,000

192 code cities, cities, and towns x \$23,150 = \$4,444,800

Combined (rounded to the nearest 100)

FY2026: \$3,652,400

FY2027: \$3,652,400

FY2028: \$0

FY2029: \$0

FY2030: \$0

FY2031: \$0

Total: \$7,304,800

Fully planning cities, towns, and code cities (rounded to the nearest 100)

FY2026: \$2,965,400

FY2027: \$2,965,400

FY2028: \$0

FY2029: \$0

FY2030: \$0

FY2031: \$0

Total: \$5,930,800

Fully planning counties (rounded to the nearest 100)

FY2026: \$687,000

FY2027: \$687,000

FY2028: \$0

FY2029: \$0

FY2030: \$0

FY2031: \$0

Total: \$1,374,000

Outreach indicates that there are a few unknown conditions associated with this act, such as whether the mobile dwellings could be regulated under rental registration and/or safety inspection programs, which would help defray costs associated with inspection and code enforcement. Under E HB 1337 (2023) local governments are prohibited from requiring the owner of a property from being the sole occupant of an accessory dwelling unit constructed on the property. Under this act, there does not seem to be the same condition placed on local governments, however there would likely be stakeholder engagement and legal review to determine if cities and counties could pursue regulating mobile dwellings acting as rental properties. In the City of Portland RVs and tiny homes on wheels used as long-term rentals have additional property maintenance regulations (Portland City Code Title 29) if the occupied recreational vehicle is a rental dwelling unit and not occupied by the property owner. These dwellings cannot be used as short-term rentals.

Indeterminate Costs:

Additional inspection and enforcement requirements:

For all jurisdictions there would be indeterminate costs that range from minor (less than \$5,000) to significant (greater than \$100,000) depending on the staffing level and/or workload increases required by the enforcement provision of Sec. 1(4). These costs would be incurred on an annual basis, vary by year, as well as by the permitting, inspection, and enforcement workload that would be specific to each affected jurisdiction. It is possible that for some jurisdictions this act would require hiring a code enforcement officer or other similar inspection and enforcement staff with annual labor and benefits of approximately \$200,000 per year.

If a jurisdiction is only inspecting utility connections, then there would likely not be enough of a workload to necessitate an additional position, except in cities and counties with an extremely high uptake on mobile dwelling sitings. However, if the work included inspecting foundations, tie downs, additional decking, fire and life safety, rental registration and safety inspections, etc. then additional staff support would be necessary. Many jurisdictions indicated that it is difficult to determine how many people would put a second mobile dwelling on a property. However, if both mobile dwellings were being placed on the property at the same time, there may be minimal impact. Alternatively, if the property owner were to place them at different times, or allow these dwellings to come and go, then there would be a more significant implication on staff time.

Under this act there would be long-term enforcement responsibilities and compliance pathways policies established for authorizing mobile dwellings in residential lots, including staffing to handle code enforcement activities, compliance follow-ups, and any related additional inspections or fines for mobile dwellings that did not meet the requirements. The requirements of Sec.1(4) would increase the workload of existing code enforcement, administrative, and planning/permitting staff depending on the case load, which cannot be determined in advance.

King County indicates that the types of complaints would affect the code enforcement officer time per complaint. Complaints could be grouped into (at a minimum): Number of units on a lot, location of the lot (within urban growth areas), location of the mobile dwelling unit on the lot (outside of critical areas), and adequacy and regulatory compliance of electrical and water/sewer connections. The county also mentioned that Public Health should be consulted on water and septic/sewer requirements.

Illustrative example of mobile dwelling siting frequency:

If the frequency is at the same rate of Accessory Dwelling Units:

If mobile dwellings are sited at the same frequency as ADUs there could more than 1,500 mobile dwelling sited each year. The Office of Financial Management (OFM) statewide building permit data indicates that between 2020 and 2024, an average of 1,562 ADU building permits were issued each year. In 2024 there were 2,174 ADU building permits issued statewide with major cities in King, Pierce, Snohomish, Clark, and Spokane as the largest permitting entities.

If the frequency is approximately 1 out of every 1000 incorporated resident:

The American Planning Association – Washington Chapter estimate that the annual permitting rate could be as high as 1 per 1,000 in incorporated population. If this upper bound is achieved, it would be approximately 5,300 mobile dwelling units per year statewide based on OFM population data for 2024. A response from King County indicates that they project tens of thousands of mobile dwelling units could potentially be allowed within their jurisdiction under this second substitute act, which would require additional staff and place additional workload responsibilities on existing staff.

Potential changes to training for new enforcement and compliance procedures:

Under this act, cities and counties are required to enforce standard inspection procedures for utility hookups to mobile dwellings. There are also specific requirements for these hookups that are different than those for residential construction, such as connection to a potable water source through a sanitary yard hydrant or an anti-siphon hose bib in Sec. 1(3)(a)(ii).

New enforcement procedures and specialized training may need to be adopted as a condition of the changes to permitting

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.

CHANGES FROM PRIOR BILL VERSION:

The amendments to this proposed second substitute act would not change the revenue impact of the prior bill version.

REVENUE IMPACT OF CURRENT BILL:

This proposed legislation would have indeterminate revenue impacts for cities and counties that fully plan under the Growth Management Act. However, this act is not anticipated to increase overall local government revenue due to the cost-recovering nature of inspection and permit fees.

Increased Number of Inspections and Permits:

This act would increase the inspection requirements in all residential zones within an urban growth area for all cities and counties that fully plan under the Growth Management Act. The result of compliance requirements may increase the number of inspection fees collected and permits issued by local governments for owners to bring their mobile dwellings into compliance with the electrical, water, sewer, and stormwater requirements of this act.

Fees collected by local governments for compliance with local laws are cost-recovering and focused on covering the administrative expenses associated with permit processing, inspections, and enforcement. Therefore, any fees collected must be proportional to the actual administrative workload, and the revenue generated through increased permitting is assumed to be commensurate with costs.

SOURCES:

American Planning Association – Washington Chapter

Association of Washington Cities, Salary Survey (2024)

City of Bellingham

City of Portland, OR, Occupied Recreational Vehicles and Tiny Houses on Wheels

City of Portland, OR, Permit and Development Center

City of Spokane

House Bill Analysis, HB 1443 (2025)

House Bill Report, HB 1443 (2025)

Department of Commerce, Planning Cost Study (2023)

King County

Local Government Fiscal Note Program, Unit Cost Model (2025)

Municipal Research and Services Center, Building Codes and Building Permits

Municipal Research and Services Center, Tips for Timely and Predictable Local Government Permitting

Office of Financial Management, Reported Permits, Completions, and Demolitions by Structure Type (2024)

Washington State Association of Counties