

Judicial Impact Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 5197 S SB	Title: Agency decision making	Agency: 055-Admin Office of the Courts
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---

Part I: Estimates

☐ No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

Account	FY 2016	FY 2017	2015-17	2017-19	2019-21
Counties					
Cities					
Total \$					

Estimated Expenditures from:

STATE	FY 2016	FY 2017	2015-17	2017-19	2019-21
State FTE Staff Years					
Account					
General Fund-State 001-1	7,867	15,734	23,601	31,468	31,468
State Subtotal \$	7,867	15,734	23,601	31,468	31,468
COUNTY	FY 2016	FY 2017	2015-17	2017-19	2019-21
County FTE Staff Years					
Account					
Local - Counties	34,404	68,808	103,212	137,616	137,616
Counties Subtotal \$	34,404	68,808	103,212	137,616	137,616
CITY	FY 2016	FY 2017	2015-17	2017-19	2019-21
City FTE Staff Years					
Account					
Local - Cities					
Cities Subtotal \$					
Local Subtotal \$	34,404	68,808	103,212	137,616	137,616
Total Estimated Expenditures \$	42,271	84,542	126,813	169,084	169,084

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 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.

Legislative Contact: Sherry McNamara	Phone: (360) 786-7402	Date: 02/27/2015
Agency Preparation: Renee Lewis	Phone: 360-704-4142	Date: 03/02/2015
Agency Approval: Ramsey Radwan	Phone: 360-357-2406	Date: 03/02/2015
OFM Review:	Phone:	Date:

Request # SSB 5197-1

Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

The change to the original bill is that a new section would be added to say that if specific funding for the purposes of this act, referencing this act by bill or chapter number, is not provided by June 30, 2015, in the omnibus appropriations act, this act is null and void. There is no change to the judicial impact.

This bill would establish a 90 day review timeline for the following:

RCW 70.94.181, RCW 76.09.060, RCW 77.55.021, RCW 78.44.081, RCW 86.16.025, RCW 70.95.205, RCW 15.54.820, RCW 43.21C.033, RCW 77.115.040, RCW 16.65.030, RCW 70.119A.110, RCW 90.03.350, RCW 90.03.370, RCW 90.58.140, RCW 70.118B.030, RCW 70.94, RCW 90.48, RCW 90.76, RCW 18.104, RCW 69.30, RCW 90.64, RCW 15.58, RCW 17.21, RCW 70.95J and RCW 90.66.

If the 90 day deadline is not met, the applicant may file a motion in the appropriate superior court requesting court approval of the application. This bill would also allow an applicant to appeal a denial or lack of a decision directly to the appropriate superior court. The appeal process would be an alternative to any other provision of law establishing appeal procedures.

II. B - Cash Receipts Impact

II. C - Expenditures

Section 1 of this bill would establish a 90 day review timeline for certain agency applications, permits and transfers. If the 90 day deadline is not met, the applicant would be allowed to file a motion in the appropriate superior court requesting court approval of the application. It would also allow an applicant to appeal a denial or lack of a decision directly to the appropriate superior court. The appeal process would be an alternative to any other provision of law establishing appeal procedures.

It is not known how many applicants would choose to file a motion or appeal with the superior courts instead of using the current appeal procedures. Due to the large amount of permits issued by agencies, it is assumed that there is a potential for enough motions and appeals to the superior courts to cause costs to exceed \$50,000 on a statewide basis. These estimates are based on standard assumptions for superior courts. For illustrative purposes, a range of costs is shown below with the middle range of 50 motions used for the judicial impact note. In addition, it is assumed there would not be any hearings for the first half of FY16 because the process is new.

If 30 motions or appeals were filed per year, an additional 0.08 judicial officer, 0.20 superior court staff and 0.26 clerk staff would be needed. The cost to the state would be \$9,441 and the cost to the county would be \$41,285.

If 50 motions or appeals were filed per year, an additional 0.13 judicial officer, 0.33 superior court staff and 0.43 clerk staff would be needed. The cost to the state would be \$15,734 and the cost to the county would be \$68,808.

If 70 motions or appeals were filed per year, an additional 0.19 judicial officer, 0.46 superior court staff and 0.60 clerk staff would be needed. The cost to the state would be \$22,028 and the cost to the county would be \$96,332.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

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

<i>State</i>	FY 2016	FY 2017	2015-17	2017-19	2019-21
FTE Staff Years					
Salaries and Wages	5,216	10,431	15,647	20,862	20,862
Employee Benefits	2,651	5,303	7,954	10,606	10,606
Professional Service Contracts					
Goods and Other Services					
Travel					
Capital Outlays					
Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
Debt Service					
Interagency Reimbursements					
Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
Total \$	7,867	15,734	23,601	31,468	31,468

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

<i>County</i>	FY 2016	FY 2017	2015-17	2017-19	2019-21
FTE Staff Years					
Salaries and Benefits	25,697	51,393	77,090	102,786	102,786
Capital	8,707	17,415	26,122	34,830	21,405
Other					
Total \$	34,404	68,808	103,212	137,616	124,191

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

<i>City</i>	FY 2016	FY 2017	2015-17	2017-19	2019-21
FTE Staff Years					
Salaries and Benefits					
Capital					
Other					
Total \$					

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact