

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 5473 SB	Title: Project permit timelines
-----------------------------	--

Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

Agency Name	2023-25		2025-27		2027-29	
	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	2023-25				2025-27				2027-29			
	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total
Department of Commerce	1.2	341,999	341,999	341,999	.6	171,486	171,486	171,486	.6	173,886	173,886	173,886
Total \$	1.2	341,999	341,999	341,999	0.6	171,486	171,486	171,486	0.6	173,886	173,886	173,886

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			7,678,293			1,087,914			1,087,914
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			7,678,293			1,087,914			1,087,914

Estimated Capital Budget Expenditures

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Department of Commerce	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total \$	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0

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

NONE

Prepared by: Gwen Stamey, OFM	Phone: (360) 790-1166	Date Published: Final
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 5473 SB	Title: Project permit timelines	Agency: 103-Department of Commerce
-----------------------------	--	---

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
FTE Staff Years	1.8	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.6
Account					
General Fund-State 001-1	256,256	85,743	341,999	171,486	173,886
Total \$	256,256	85,743	341,999	171,486	173,886

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: Maggie Douglas	Phone: 3607867279	Date: 01/26/2023
Agency Preparation: Buck Lucas	Phone: 360-725-3180	Date: 02/01/2023
Agency Approval: Jason Davidson	Phone: 360-725-5080	Date: 02/01/2023
OFM Review: Gwen Stamey	Phone: (360) 790-1166	Date: 02/01/2023

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.

Section 3(1)(d) requires counties and cities to issue final permit decisions for complete project permits based on the following timeline, unless modified by the jurisdiction.

- 45 days for permits which do not require public notice.
- 70 days for permits which require public notice.
- 120 days for permits which require public notice and a public hearing.

Section 3(3)(c) requires counties and cities under 20,000 population that are subject to Urban Growth Capacity Report requirements, Buildable Lands, to submit annual permit performance reports to the Department of Commerce (department) by March 1 of each year, beginning in 2025.

Section 3(3)(d) requires that the department publish a report of annual performance data, including the jurisdictions with timeframes shorter than those established under this section by July 1 of each year. This will aid identification of best practices in expediting permit review. The department must also develop a template to be utilized by municipalities for reporting data on permits, and to compile an annual report with key metrics and findings on performance data provided by counties and cities.

Section 3(3)(e) counties and cities required to report must begin submitting annual reports to the department beginning in 2025, while data collection must begin in 2024. Jurisdictions that do not submit performance reports by March 1 of each year would not be eligible to receive funding from the Public Works Board or the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, as outlined under 36.70A.130(7) .

Section 5 amends RCW 36.70B.160 requiring the department to provide technical assistance and develop guidance to local governments, reasonable and sufficient to recover true costs, including guidance on appropriate growth factors or other measures to reflect cost increases over time. Priority for technical assistance will be given to jurisdictions that have enacted at least three of the local review and code provisions provided in this section.

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.

Agency assumptions

- The department would receive annual reports from 50 municipalities (7 counties and 43 cities) detailing permit performance data.
- The department would develop a template to be utilized by municipalities for reporting data on permits before data collection is set to begin in 2024.

1.0 FTE Commerce Specialist 3 (2,088 hours) in FY24 and 0.5 FTE Commerce Specialist 3 (1,044 hours) in FY25-FY29, to develop processes to collect and report data and reports from cities and counties, provide administration and consult with local governments. This position will be responsible for ongoing operations of annual data collection and report production, tracking compliance, and providing guidance and assistance review services to reporting jurisdictions and the setting of

appropriate fee structures to recover true costs.

0.5 FTE Management Analyst 4 (1,044 hours) in FY24, to develop guidance and provide technical assistance to local governments, including development of policies and procedures to implement the reporting and compliance systems and provide ongoing management.

Salaries and Benefits:

FY24: \$169,044

FY25-FY29: \$ 57,423 each fiscal year

Goods and Services:

FY24: \$26,597

FY25-FY29: \$9,428 each fiscal year

Equipment:

Standard workstations for new team members and a replacement computer on the agency's five-year lifecycle replacement schedule.

FY24: \$5,000

FY28: \$2,400

Intra-agency Reimbursements:

FY24: \$55,615

FY25-FY29: \$18,892 each fiscal year

Note: Standard goods and services costs include supplies and materials, employee development and training, Attorney General costs, central services charges and agency administration.

=====
Total costs:

FY24: \$256,256

FY25-FY27: \$85,743 each fiscal year

FY28: \$88,143

FY29: \$85,743

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
001-1	General Fund	State	256,256	85,743	341,999	171,486	173,886
Total \$			256,256	85,743	341,999	171,486	173,886

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
FTE Staff Years	1.8	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.6
A-Salaries and Wages	125,162	42,259	167,421	84,518	84,518
B-Employee Benefits	43,882	15,164	59,046	30,328	30,328
C-Professional Service Contracts					
E-Goods and Other Services	26,597	9,428	36,025	18,856	18,856
G-Travel					
J-Capital Outlays	5,000		5,000		2,400
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements	55,615	18,892	74,507	37,784	37,784
9-					
Total \$	256,256	85,743	341,999	171,486	173,886

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 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
Administrative Services - Indirect	111,168	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Commerce Specialist 3	82,056	1.0	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.5
Management Analyst 4	86,212	0.5		0.3		
Total FTEs		1.8	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.6

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.

Section 5: Rulemaking to update technical assistance guidance under chapter 365-196 WAC.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Commerce

Bill Number: 5473 SB	Title: Project permit timelines
-----------------------------	--

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

Legislation Impacts:

- Cities:** Increased expenses related to new ordinances for permit processing and permitting timelines for project permit applications for all cities fully planning under the Growth Management Act; certain cities would have increased costs related to implementing new permit tracking and reporting requirements.
- Counties:** Same as above.
- Special Districts:**
- Specific jurisdictions only:** Only counties, and cities within those counties with populations greater than 20,000, that are required to conduct Urban Growth Capacity Reports under the buildable lands program would have new permit tracking and reporting requirements.
- Variance occurs due to:**

Part II: Estimates

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs: Ordinance adoption costs.
- Legislation provides local option: Adopting further project review and code provisions established by this act.
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: Number of jurisdictions that would not implement the permit processing and permitting timelines for project permit applications; if the permit tracking template could reduce costs for local governments required to submit reports to the Department of Commerce; number of jurisdictions that would implement additional project review and code provisions.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

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

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY 2024	FY 2025	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29
City	2,006,212	3,570,506	5,576,718	298,076	298,076
County	762,552	1,339,023	2,101,575	789,838	789,838
TOTAL \$	2,768,764	4,909,529	7,678,293	1,087,914	1,087,914
GRAND TOTAL \$					9,854,121

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: 02/03/2023
Leg. Committee Contact: Maggie Douglas	Phone: 3607867279	Date: 01/26/2023
Agency Approval: Allan Johnson	Phone: 360-725-5033	Date: 02/03/2023
OFM Review: Gwen Stamey	Phone: (360) 790-1166	Date: 02/03/2023

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

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

This legislation would amend local project review statute which outlines requirements for reviewing project permits, providing public notice, clarifying open record hearing, public meeting, and closed record appeal, determining application completeness, and issuing a notice of decision.

For jurisdictions fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA), project permit applications would be procedurally complete if the all of the information listed on a submission checklist is included with an application packet, however addition information or studies may still be requested by the local government.

Fully planning jurisdiction must revise final approval deadlines of project permit applications depending on the public notice and public hearing requirements. Unless provided for the consolidated review of more than one permit, a final decision on permit timelines may not exceed 120 days. These jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt policies into their local code that provide prompt and accountable project permit application review procedures.

Under this legislation, jurisdictions that are required to conduct Urban Growth Capacity Reports under the buildable lands program would have new permit tracking and annual reporting requirements for certain types of permits associated with housing. Annual reporting would begin March 1st, 2025. Cities and counties that do not submit these reports, would not be eligible to receive grants, loans, or financial guarantees provided by the state for public works projects and water pollution control facilities.

Sec. 1 would amend 36.70B.020 RCW

The definition of project permit or project permit application is amended such that site-specific rezones which do not require a comprehensive plan amendment are included in this definition. Building permits are removed from the definition of project permit or project permit application.

Sec. 2 would amend 36.70B.070 RCW

(2) A jurisdiction fully planning under the GMA must provide a written determination within 20 business days that a project permit application is complete or incomplete. For incomplete applications, the determination must include an outline of what is necessary to make the application procedurally complete. Project permits are complete when it meets the procedural submission requirements and additional information or studies may be required subsequent to the procedural review of the application by the local government. A completeness determination by the local government does not necessary need additional information if the application meets the requirements of the project permit application.

(4) An application must be deemed procedurally complete on the 29th day after a local government receives a project permit application if the jurisdiction does not prove a written determination indicating the application is procedurally incomplete. The notice of application must be provided within 14 days after a determination of completeness.

Sec. 3 would amend 36.70B.080 RCW

(1) Development regulations adopted by fully planning jurisdictions must establish and implement time periods for local government actions for project permit applications that do not exceed those specified in this section. However, local governments may exempt certain permit types and timelines applications as provided by RCW 36.70B.140.

(1)(d) These permitting timelines are: 45 days for permits which do not require public notice, 70 days for permits which require public notice, and 120 days for permits which require public notice and a public hearing.

(1)(e) Jurisdictions may add permit types, change the permit names, and address how consolidate review time frames may be different than permits submitted individually. Unless provided for the consolidated review of more than one permit, a final decision on permit timelines may not exceed 120 days.

(1)(f) If a local government does not adopt an ordinance or resolution modifying the provision of subsection (1)(d), this subsection would take effect.

(1)(g) The total number of days of the application in review must be calculated using the number of business days from the date of a determinate of completion to the date a final decision is issued on the application. Certain time periods do not count toward an applications review time.

(1)(i) Annual comprehensive plan amendments are not subject to the requirements of this section.

(1)(j) Only modified permit timelines that are adopted through ordinance or resolution that contain permit type provisions with final decisions exceeding 120 days may be appealed.

(2) When the final decision of a permit timeline is not met by the local government, up to 20 percent of the permit fee must be refunded to the applicant. Alternatively, 80 percent of the fee may be paid up front by the applicant and the remaining 20 percent may be paid if the permit time frames are met. These provisions do not apply to cities and counties that have implemented at least three of the encouraged actions related to project permit review in Sec. 5(1).

(3) Counties subject to the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215 and cities within those counties with greater than 20,000 in population must submit annual performance reports that include information outlining time periods for certain types of permit types associated with housing. Cities and counties must begin collecting this data in 2024, to be prepare for a report due to the Department of Commerce (Commerce) on March 1, 2025, and each year thereafter. Cities and counties that do not submit these reports, would not be eligible to receive grants, loans, or financial guarantees provided by the state for public works projects and water pollution control facilities.

Sec. 4 would amend 36.70B.140 RCW

A local government may exclude project permits for approvals relating to the use of public areas or facilities, or other project permits, if the local government provides by ordinance or resolution the authorization for timelines for approval that are different than those provided in RCW 36.70B.060 through 36.70B.090 and 36.70B.110 through 36.70B.130.

Sec. 5 would amend 36.70B.160 RCW

Each local government is encouraged to adopt further project review and code provisions to provide prompt, coordinated review for project permit applications.

Sec. 6 establishes that Sec. 3 of this act would take effect on January 1, 2025.

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 proposed legislation would have both determinate and indeterminate impacts on cities, towns, and counties planning under the provisions of the Growth Management Act (GMA).

For expenses that can be estimated at this time, costs would be approximately \$3.0 million (\$735,648 to adopt new procedurally complete project permit requirements + \$2,332,456 to adopt ordinances for the new permitting timelines) for all GMA fully planning cities, towns, and counties and the timing of these costs would occur in FY24 and FY25. The start-up costs to develop the permit tracking and reporting programs within the seven counties and 43 cities over 20,000 in population in the buildable lands program, would be approximately \$4 million in FY24 and FY25 to establish recording keeping in advance of the March 1, 2025 reporting deadline, with on-going operations and reporting requirements of approximately \$544,000 per fiscal year, starting in FY25.

There would be additional indeterminate aspects of this bill that include an unknown number of jurisdictions that do not implement the permit processing and permitting timelines for project permit applications ordinances by the effective date of this act, and the degree that the permit tracking template could reduce costs for local governments required to submit

reports to the Department of Commerce (Commerce).

Adopting additional project review and code provisions would be a local option for GMA fully planning cities, towns, and counties. If local governments take no action, there would be no impact.

ORDINANCE ADOPTION FOR PROCEDURALLY COMPLETE PROJECT PERMITS:

\$735,648 - It is a requirement of Sec. 2 of this act that all fully planning jurisdictions must amend development review policies such that a written determination for project permit applications are submitted to the applicant within 20 business days. For incomplete applications, the ordinance would detail that a determination must include an outline of what is necessary to make the application procedurally complete. The Local Government Fiscal Note Program Unit Cost Model estimates the cost of adopting a simple ordinance with hearing of the same complexity to amend existing local code would be \$3,000 for cities and \$2,916 for counties. For the purposes of analysis, these impacts are assumed to occur 90 days after the conclusion of the 2023 session, during FY 2024.

218 cities x \$3,000 = \$654,000

28 counties x \$2,916 = \$81,648

Total: \$654,000 + \$81,648 = \$735,648

For jurisdictions that do not outline the completeness requirements on the project permit application itself, there would be further costs to amend these documents so that the new requirements were specified in the application. Costs to modify documents may be de minimis to more substantive depending on the work to add local project permit processes to the permit. The number of jurisdictions that would be required to amend documents is not currently known.

ORDINANCE ADOPTION FOR PROJECT PERMIT TIMELINES:

\$2,332,456 - It is a requirement of Sec. 3 of this act that all fully planning jurisdictions must adopt an ordinance to amend project permit application review timelines. The Local Government Fiscal Note Program estimates the cost of adopting a complex ordinance with hearing of the same complexity at \$9,492 for cities and \$9,400 for counties. For the purposes of analysis, these impacts are assumed to occur during FY 2025 to comply with the implementation date of January 1, 2025, specified by Sec. 6.

218 cities x \$9,492 = \$2,069,256

28 counties x \$9,400 = \$263,200

Total: \$2,069,256 + \$263,200 = \$2,332,456

These costs include draft ordinances, advisory commission meeting and recommendation, finalized ordinance, publication of ordinance, and general public information. This cost estimates is for only one meetings and staff reports, more complex ordinances would likely require more advisory committee meetings and potentially more staff reports. There would be further costs associated with enforcing or executing the ordinance.

Other changes needed to implement this legislation could result in increases in staffing hours, retention of consulting services, providing training and altering permit software systems would need to occur separately and would result in additional expenditures. These impacts will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and cannot be predicted in advance.

If a local government does not adopt an ordinance or resolution modifying their local code with the provision of Sec. 3(1)(d), this subsection would take effect. Some jurisdictions may elect not to bring their codes into conformity with the requirements of this legislation prior to the applicable deadline. In these jurisdictions, the provision of Sec. 3(1)(d) would

automatically apply and take effect, per Sec. 3(1)(f) . It is unclear if these jurisdictions would incur any legal costs based upon codes that do not conform to the required code measures. Such costs cannot be anticipated in advance and are indeterminate.

If a jurisdiction were unable to update their code by the effective date and their code were superseded by state statute, there would be increased workload for local government staff to parse their code and differentiate which portions were still enforceable and which were superseded. This would increase the staff time needed to administer their code by an unknown amount, and impact cities and counties that did not implement the ordinance established by this act by the applicable deadline.

PERMIT TRACKING AND REPORTING FOR BUILDABLE LANDS CITIES AND COUNTIES:

\$4,066,231 in start-up, and \$543,957 in on-going reporting costs – Local governments compile permit records in a number of different ways. Some jurisdictions compile the information manually by pulling permit files and extracting the information. Some jurisdictions have developed very sophisticated permit processing systems that are online, integrated with neighboring jurisdictions, include GIS maps and track permits. These different methods of compiling permit records for the annual report specified by Sec. 3(3) would have varying costs depending on the system and processes developed by the local government, and how efficiently the new requirements could be incorporated into existing permit tracking systems. It is not currently known how the template created by Commerce would be integrated into the requirements of Sec. 3(3) and reduce costs for jurisdictions in the buildable lands program.

Start-up and On-going Costs:

A survey of buildable lands cities counties was conducted by Commerce in 2005 that estimated the start-up costs and on-going costs of the removed provisions of Sec 3(3)(b). When adjusted for inflation using the Bureau of Labor and Statistics CPI inflation calculator, these costs range from approximately \$56,000 for jurisdictions with more than 10,000 in population, and \$195,000 counties with greater than 200,000 in population, within the buildable lands program. These costs are assumed to be incurred from FY24 to FY25 to meet the annual reporting deadline starting March 1st, 2025.

7 buildable lands counties – $\$194,544 \times 7 = \$1,361,808$

43 buildable lands cities –

35 cities above 20,000 and 100,000 in population - $\$55,925 \times 35 = \$1,957,375$

8 cities above 100,000 in population - $\$93,381 \times 8 = \$747,048$

Total: $\$1,361,808 + \$2,704,423 = \$4,066,231$

Starting March 1st 2025, there would be on-going annual reporting costs associated with Sec. 3(3). Using on-going operations costs from the Commerce study on local government project permitting, the responding jurisdiction's average CPI inflation adjusted costs are \$3,466 for cities and \$56,417 for counties. These costs would be incurred during FY25 through FY29, and on-going into future years. However, the template created by Commerce would be integrated into the requirements of Sec. 3(3) and may potentially reduce costs for jurisdictions in the buildable lands program.

7 buildable lands counties – $\$56,417 \times 7 = \$394,919$

43 buildable lands cities – $\$3,466 \times 43 = \$149,038$

Total: $\$394,919 + \$149,038 = \$543,957$

Local governments that do not submit required information to Commerce are assumed to be doing so as a local option, and no fiscal impacts are associated with the ineligibility for grants, loans, or financial guarantees provided by the state for

public works projects and water pollution control facilities.

ADOPT FURTHER PROJECT REVIEW AND CODE PROVISIONS:

Local Option - Each local government is encouraged to adopt further project review and code provisions to provide prompt and coordinated review for project permit applications, as a local option. There would be no impact for local governments that take no action related to this section. The number of jurisdictions that would codify additional project review code revisions specified in Sec. 5(1) cannot be known in advance.

However, if permitting final decisions do not meet the required deadlines detailed by Sec. 3(1)(d) local governments would be required to reimburse up to 20 percent of application fees to applicants. There may be long-term cost savings for jurisdictions that do not habitually meet project permit application deadlines. The magnitude of these cost savings would depend on project permit volume and the number of applications that fail to meet the deadline, both of which would vary by jurisdiction and cannot be estimated at this time.

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 legislation may result in indeterminate revenue reductions for cities and counties planning under the Growth Management Act that are not able to process permit applications within the timeframes specified by Sec. 3(1)(d). The number of jurisdictions that would not meet these deadlines cannot be known in advance.

Revenue reductions for such jurisdictions would vary by the types of project permits, the fees associated with these permits, and the length of time before a final decision on an application was made by a local government as detailed and Sec. 3(2)(a)(i) and (ii). The maximum amount of refunded permit fee revenue would be 20 percent if the established time frame is exceeded by more than 20 percent.

For local governments that implement at least three provisions of Sec. 5(1)(a) through (i) these revenue reductions would not apply. However, the number of local governments that would adopt provisions of Sec. 5(1) into their local code cannot be known in advance.

SOURCES:

Association of Washington Cities

Bureau of Labor and Statistics, CPI Inflation Calculator

Department of Commerce, Local Government Project Permitting (2005)

Local Government Fiscal Note Program, FN SB 6461

Local Government Fiscal Note Program, Unit Cost Model (2023)

Municipal Research and Services Center, When is a Development Application Ready for Review

Senate Bill Analysis, SB 5473