



Public Records

Modernize the Public Records Act (PRA) so that cities can continue to provide open and transparent government services to our residents

Pro – Legislature passed **HB 1595** which amends the PRA to allow cities to charge a small fee for providing copies of electronic records, creates the ability to deny overwhelming computer generated “bot” requests, prohibits overly-broad requests for all records, and creates a way to apply a service charge to exceptionally complex requests.

Pro – Legislature passed **HB 1594** which updates training requirements for records officers, creates a grant program to improve their public record management systems, establishes a program to consult on public records best practices, and updates the process for asking a requestor to clarify a request. The bill also requires some new data collection processes.



Homelessness, Housing & Human Services

Enhance efforts to increase affordable housing, decrease homelessness, and improve a strained behavioral health system

Pro – The document recording fee was extended for four additional years, which is the single biggest source of state and local resources. New authority to use REET dollars for homeless housing was created for two years.

Pro – Funding was maintained for the Housing and Essential Needs (HEN) program, funding for implementation of the Sec. 1115 Medicaid waiver, and TANF funding.

Con – There was no increase in the document recording fee and only limited new tools.

Con – The Legislature’s failure to adopt a capital budget postpones planned critical investments in mental health facilities around the state.



City-State Partnership

Maintain critical funding of key services and programs

Pro – State operating budget fully funded traditional state shared revenues at \$210 million for 2017-19, including liquor and municipal criminal justice funds.

Pro – Passed **EHB 2163** implementing state Marketplace Fairness Act sales tax collection or customer reporting for use tax by out of state internet retailers, effective January 1, 2018, increasing city sales tax revenues by \$40.9 million for 2017-19.

Pro – The budget provided necessary funding to the Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC) to meet the immediate training needs for the Basic Law Enforcement Academy (BLEA). However, the budget only provided for 16 classes per year when the likely need is for 18 classes in order to meet the expected demand for training new officers.

Pro – The Legislature fully funded its commitment to the LEOFF 2 pension system. An earlier proposal would have shifted \$70 million of the state’s commitment to cities.

Pro – The final budget provided additional funding for cities from the Office of Public Defense competitive grant program.

Pro – Fully funded Municipal Research Services Center (MRSC).

Con – **EHB 2163** phases out Streamlined Sales Tax (SST) mitigation for cities and counties by October 1, 2019.

Con – The final budget for 2017-19 reneged on the agreement from 2015 by reducing the amount of marijuana mitigation revenue sharing from \$15 million per year to \$6 million per year. However, there is a caveat that the money may be restored if the February 2018 revenue forecast meets a certain threshold.

Con – Did not pass **SHB 1113/SB 5240** to restore growth in the local government share of liquor revenues.

more outcomes on back 

Contact:

Dave Williams

Director of Government Relations
davew@awcnet.org • 360.753.4137





Local Authority

Respect city local authority to respond to local needs

Pro – **EHB 2005** passed requiring all cities to join the state Business Licensing Service (BLS) by 2022 or FileLocal by 2020 to administer business licenses, but protected local authority to impose rates and enforce regulations. Established workgroups on a business license threshold and local B&O tax service income apportionment.

Pro – Successfully defended against proposals to limit cities' authority to regulate and zone marijuana businesses.

Con – Did not pass **HB 1764** replacing the one percent property tax revenue limit with a limit tied to population growth and inflation.



Local Infrastructure

Revitalize key infrastructure assistance programs that support job creation, community health and safety, and quality of life

Pro – If the Legislature can resolve other disputes and pass a capital budget, legislators are poised to fund a Public Works Trust Fund (P WTF) loan list for the first time since the 2011-13 budget. They did show their support for continuing the program with the passage of **HB 1677**, the P WTF reform bill.

Con – The diversion of tax revenues that would go into the Public Works Trust Fund was extended for another four years. The cash in the account was swept into the education budget, and partially replaced with bond funds (if they pass a capital budget) undermining the structure of this revolving loan fund.

Contact:

Dave Williams

Director of Government Relations
davew@awcnet.org • 360.753.4137

