

JUDICIAL IMPACT FISCAL NOTE

Bill Number: 1116 SHB	Title: Family and Medical Leave Insurance	Agency: 055 – Admin Office of the Courts (AOC)
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

Account	FY 2018	FY 2019	2017-19	2019-21	2021-23
General Fund State	690	690	1,380	1,380	1,380
Counties	5,310	5,310	10,620	10,620	10,620
Total:	6,000	6,000	12,000	12,000	12,000

Estimated Expenditures from:

STATE	FY 2018	FY 2019	2017-19	2019-21	2021-23
FTE – Staff Years					
Account					
General Fund – State (001-1)					
State Subtotal					
COUNTY					
County FTE Staff Years					
Account					
Local - Counties					
Counties Subtotal					
CITY					
City FTE Staff Years					
Account					
Local – Cities					
Cities Subtotal					
Local Subtotal					
Total Estimated Expenditures:					

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:	Phone:	Date:
Agency Preparation: Sam Knutson	Phone: 360-704-5528	Date: 3/1/2017
Agency Approval: Ramsey Radwan	Phone: 360-357-2406	Date:
OFM Review:	Phone:	Date:

Part II: Narrative Explanation

Part II.A – Brief Description of what the Measure does that has fiscal impact on the Courts

Section 9 would amend RCW 49.86.080 to allow the department of employment security to file with the superior court clerk of any county within the state a warrant in the amount of the overpayment assessment plus a filing fee.

Section 17 would amend RCW 49.86.130 to allow an individual who believes that he or she was discharged or otherwise discriminated against by an employer in violation of this section may file a complaint with the commissioner . If the commissioner determines that this section has been violated, the commissioner shall bring an action in the superior court of the county in which the violation is alleged to have occurred. If the commissioner determines that this section has not been violated, the individual may institute the action on his or her own behalf.

NOTE: This bill differs from HB 1116 by adding two subsections to Section 20:

Section 20(2) would amend RCW 49.86.170 directing the Office of the State Treasurer to transfer \$42 million from the State General Fund to the Family and Medical Leave Insurance Account, effective July 1, 2017.

Section 20(3) would amend RCW 49.86.170 to define the transfer of funding in Section 20(2) as a loan for start-up costs of the program that must be repaid with interest in the rate that the State General Fund would have earned without the transfer (as determined by the State Treasurer). By June 30, 2019 the State Treasurer is directed to transfer the amount of the loan, together with interest, from the Family and Medical Leave Insurance Account to the State General Fund.

The changes in the substitute version of this bill do not change judicial impact.

II.B - Cash Receipt Impact

Based on input from the lead agency, employment security department, it is estimated that 25 claims per month would be filed with the superior court. The filing fee is \$20 and the split is 88.5% to county and 11.5% to state. If there are 25 claims per month, that would equal about 300 cases per year. The estimated increased revenue would be \$6,000 (300 x \$20) with \$5,310 remaining with the county and \$690 to the state.

II.C – Expenditures

There is minimal cost to the clerks for the collection of the fee and no cost to the courts for the filing of the warrant . There is no data to determine how many of the cases would require a hearing. It would require 165 hearings to reach \$50,000 in judicial costs.