Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 1201 S HB	**Title:** Emergency shelters/pets

Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

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
Military Department	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
Total $	**0.0**	**0**	**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 Expenditures

Agency Name	2025-27			2027-29			2029-31		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Military Department	.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: Gwen Stamey, OFM	Phone: (360) 790-1166	Date Published: Final 2/ 4/2025

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1201 S HB	Title: Emergency shelters/pets	Agency: 245-Military Department

Part I: Estimates

[X] **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:	Martha Wehling	Phone: 360-786-7067	Date: 01/29/2025
Agency Preparation:	Serina Roberts	Phone: 2535127388	Date: 02/04/2025
Agency Approval:	Seth Nickerson	Phone: 253-512-7340	Date: 02/04/2025
OFM Review:	Gwen Stamey	Phone: (360) 790-1166	Date: 02/04/2025

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.

Substitute House Bill 1201 has no substantive changes to the Military Department.

This bill updates state Emergency Management requirements obligating counties and cities to identify shelters that can accommodate pets and post the information on their website.

Each local or joint local organization for emergency management is required to submit a local comprehensive emergency management plan to the Washington Military Department Emergency Management Division. The local plans are coordinated with the state's comprehensive emergency management plan, and are required to be reviewed pursuant to the schedule created by the Adjutant General. Receiving and reviewing the local plans is part of Emergency Management's regular duties. The bill has no fiscal impact to Military Department.

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: 1201 S HB	**Title:** Emergency shelters/pets

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

Legislation Impacts:

[X] Cities: Approximately $53,000 in costs for cities to assess shelter conditions and designate shelters as pet-accommodating and update local comprehensive emergency management plans. Additional, indeterminate costs for assessing coshelter sites depending on existing policies.

[X] Counties: Approximately $38,000 in costs for counties to assess shelter conditions and designate shelters as pet-accommodating. and update local comprehensive emergency management plans. Additional, indeterminate costs for assessing coshelter sites depending on existing policies.

[ ] Special Districts:

[X] Specific jurisdictions only: Only impacts political subdivisions with that conduct local comprehensive emergency management planning. There are 39 county plans, 54 individual city plans, and two coalition plans, which comprise 1 cities in east and west Pierce County.

[ ] Variance occurs due to:

Part II: Estimates

[ ] No fiscal impacts.

[ ] Expenditures represent one-time costs:

[ ] Legislation provides local option:

[X] Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: Specific timing of when the updates occur, all comprehensive emergency management plans are to be reviewed and revised within four years; the number of comprehensive emergency management plans that already provide information on coshelters, emergency shelters, cooling centers, and warming centers sites with pet accommodations.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

None

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

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

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Jordan Laramie	Phone: 360-725-5044	Date: 01/30/2025
Leg. Committee Contact: Martha Wehling	Phone: 360-786-7067	Date: 01/29/2025
Agency Approval: Alice Zillah	Phone: 360-725-5035	Date: 01/30/2025
OFM Review: Gwen Stamey	Phone: (360) 790-1166	Date: 01/31/2025

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 substitute version of HB 1201, 2025 legislative session. The amendments to this bill are compared to the original version of HB 1201.

CHANGES FROM PRIOR BILL VERSION:
Sec. 2 changes the requirements of the prior bill of "counties or cities" to "political subdivision." Amends the types of pet accommodating sites that must be identified to the extent practical in local emergency management plans to include coshelters.

Sec. 3 would amend 38.52.070 RCW to include a requirement, to the extent practical, to find a suitable location for cosheltering during an emergency in each update of political subdivisions local comprehensive emergency management plan.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT BILL:
This proposed legislation would require that, to the extent practical based on resources and site-specific circumstances, political subdivisions must consider the accommodation of persons with pets in coshelters, emergency shelters, cooling centers, and warming centers in their local comprehensive emergency management plans.

Sec. 2 is a new section added to 38.52 RCW that would include new provisions of for a local comprehensive emergency management plan. The requirements include identifying at least one coshelter, emergency shelter, cooling center, and warming center that can accommodate persons with pets. Political subdivisions must also make pet emergency preparedness information available on their websites.

The bill would take effect 90 days after the bill were signed into law.

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:
The amends made to this act would result in minor but indeterminate increases in the planning time required to identify and integrate coshelter sites into local comprehensive emergency management plans (CEMPs).

Some cities and counties may already have provisions to allow companion animals in all shelters, such as Spokane County, where the county's existing CEMP indicates that all companion and service animals are allowed in shelters. While other jurisdictions only conform to the requirements of the PETS Act (2006) to have specific collocation of animal shelter services for coordinated care of animals at specifically designated sites that may or may not allow cosheltering.

There could be additional costs for more than 40 hours of work for emergency management department staff to find a suitable site that meets Federal Emergency Management Agency standards for shelter space for people and for companion animals. The number of local CEMPs that detail the location of cosheltering sites is not currently known. Costs for emergency management staff to conduct this work would be minor and add costs of approximately $2,100 (see calculations below) per affected jurisdiction to existing costs of the prior bill. These costs would include holding internal policy meetings, conducting on-site assessments, deciding if and where there are suitable location(s), and include this information in the next iteration of the local CEMP.

EXPENDITURE IMPACT OF CURRENT BILL VERSION:
Cities and counties would have minimal costs of approximately $1,000 to $2,000 for up to 40 hours of work by departments of emergency management and supporting staff (sheriff's/police offices, public safety, and human services

personnel) to assess shelter conditions and designate shelters as pet-accommodating and update local comprehensive emergency management plans (CEMPs). Additional indeterminate costs would be incurred by some local emergency management departments to determine site suitability for coshelter locations. For these jurisdictions there may be additional costs up to $2,200. These costs would include updates to the CEMP when the updates are scheduled to occur, updates to publicly available documents, and work with other local offices to implement this legislation.

According to WAC 118-30, local CEMPs must be reviewed and updated at least every two years, although two-, three-, and four-year updates are commonly performed by local governments. The Local Government Fiscal Note Program assumes that the requirements of this act would be incorporated during the next routine update.

NARRATIVE:
Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans are required of all counties, cities, and towns, however the planning and coordination of these documents can occur at the county-, city-, or joint-level between local governments. As of 2024, there are a total of 95 CEMPs submitted to the Washington State Department of Emergency Management: 39 county plans, 54 individual city plans, and two coalition plans, which comprise 10 cities in east and west Pierce County.

Outreach conducted for this assessment to local departments of emergency management indicate that if there was a simple update with existing shelter information that already had suitable sites for colocation of persons with animals, the workload may take between 8-10 hours of staff time, with minimal time to update the list of local resources available online (city/county website or social media). If additional approvals or policy changes are required, there could be as much as 10-20 hours of staff time, which includes coordination meeting with relevant departments. Variation in cost would be determined by existing work to have a comprehensive list of emergency shelters with potential for animal colocation, or if staff would need to do site visits to make these assessments.

Basic Assessment:
County staff to assess shelters and update CEMP:
Records Clerk, Sheriff's Office: (8.35 hours x $28/hr x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $350
Deputy Sheriff: (2 hours x $42/hr x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $125
Emergency Management Program Manager: (8.35 hours x $40 x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $500
County Costs: $350 + $125 + $500 = $975 x 39 local CEMPs = $38,025

City staff to assess shelters and update CEMP:
Records Clerk, Police Office: (8.35 hours x $28/hr x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $350
Assistant Police Chief: (2 hours x $39/hr x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $100
Emergency Management Program Manager: (8.35 hours x $40 x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $500
City Costs: $350 + $100 + $500 = $950 x 56 local CEMPs = $53,200

Relaying information online about pet accommodating centers/shelters and other pet emergency response best practices was reported to be a de minimis expense that could be incorporated into the workload of local communications staff.

Additional Assessment for Cosheltering Locations:
The number of local CEMPs that detail the location of cosheltering sites is not currently known. Costs for emergency management staff to conduct this work may be approximately $2,200 per effected jurisdiction to hold meetings, conduct site assessments, decide if there is a suitable location, and include this information in the next iteration of the local CEMP. These costs would only be incurred if the existing policy does not provide for cosheltering accommodations, or whether there is a comprehensive list of shelters that have already been identified by the local department of emergency management about accommodation of companion animals.

County staff to assess cosheltering locations:
Records Clerk, Sheriff's Office: (8 hours x $28/hr x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $350
Deputy Sheriff: (2 hours x $42/hr x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $125
Emergency Management Program Manager: (30 hours x $40 x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $1700
County Costs: $350 + $125 + $1700 = $2200

City staff to assess cosheltering locations:
Records Clerk, Police Office: (8 hours x $28/hr x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $350
Assistant Police Chief: (2 hours x $39/hr x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $100
Emergency Management Program Manager: (30 hours x $40 x 1.43 Benefits Multiplier) = $1700
City Costs: $350 + $100 + $1700 = $2150

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 act would not impact local government revenue.

SOURCES:
American Veterinary Medical Association, Pets Evacuation and Transportation Standards Act FAQ
City of Seattle Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (2021)
Federal Emergency Management Agency, "Can I bring my pets to the shelter?" (2023)
Municipal Research and Services Center, Emergency Planning
Spokane County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (2021)
Thurston County
Washington Administrative Code 118-30
Washington State Military Department, Emergency Management Division

Ten-Year Analysis

Bill Number	Title	Agency
1201 S HB	Emergency shelters/pets	245 Military Department

This ten-year analysis is limited to agency estimated cash receipts associated with the proposed tax or fee increases. The Office of Financial Management ten-year projection can be found at http://www.ofm.wa.gov/tax/default.asp .

Estimates

☐ **No Cash Receipts** ☐ **Partially Indeterminate Cash Receipts** ☐ **Indeterminate Cash Receipts**

Estimated Cash Receipts

Name of Tax or Fee	Acct Code											
Total												

Biennial Totals

Agency Preparation:	Serina Roberts	Phone:	2535127388	Date:	2/4/2025 7:30:35 am
Agency Approval:	Seth Nickerson	Phone:	253-512-7340	Date:	2/4/2025 7:30:35 am
OFM Review:		Phone:		Date:	