CITY OF RITZVILLE
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
November 17, 2026

1. CALL COUNCIL TO ORDER 7:00pm
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONSENT AGENDA
4. PUBLIC REQUESTS AND COMMENTS

CONSENT AGENDA
- Acceptance of the Agenda
- Minutes:
  November 3, 2026
- Approval of Payables:
  $98,057.95

5. ACTION AGENDA
   A. Keeping Animals Chapter 5.12 Amendment Public Hearing – Ordinance No. 2210
   B. 2027 Property Tax Levy Public Hearing - Ordinance No. 2211
   C. 2027 Preliminary Budget Public Hearing
   D. High Priority Sewer Collection System Improvement Pay Estimate No. 2 – POW Contracting, Inc.
   E. CJTC ESHB 2015 Public Safety Funding Program Round 2 Award
6. DISCUSSION AGENDA
   A. 2027 Preliminary Budget
7. CORRESPONDENCE
   A. City Attorney Response to Council Member Scheel's Questions
   B. Multistate Coalition Case
8. REPORTS
   A. Mayor
   B. City Council Committees
   C. City Attorney
   D. Public Works
   E. Police
   F. Fire
   G. Clerk-Treasurer
   H. Community Development

COUNCIL COMMITTEES
- License, Rules and Permits
- Finance and Employee Benefits
- Health and Wellness
- Public Safety
- Public Works
- Parks and Recreation
- Personnel Committee

9. ADJOURNMENT

Call Information
1-253-215-8782 United States Toll
Meeting ID: 273 377 5980
Passcode: 1930
View Meeting Online:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/2733775980?pwd=SU14WTVqdGJpYnVMeEYzV1pJOEFOQT09&omn=84867384568

OPENING OF COUNCIL MEETING

Mayor Yaeger opened the remote/in-person council meeting at 7:00 p.m. The council members present were Jessica Quinn, Jen Verhey, Eric Ottmar, and Mike Schrag. Staff members in attendance were Clerk-Treasurer Julie Flyckt, Deputy Clerk Treasurer II Michelle Asmussen (remote), Public Works Director Dave Breazeale, Chief of Police Mike Suniga, City Attorney John Kragt, and Community Development Director Tom Reese (remote). City Fire Chief Joel Bell and Council Members Dennis Chamberlain, Brooke Scheel, and Ky Beck-Gmeiner were excused. Also present were Rod Larse, Brian Bothun, and Rick from the Cheney Free Press.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Yaeger asked if there were any corrections or additions to the consent agenda. Council Member Mike Schrag moved to accept the November 3, 2026,consent agenda including payables of $83,504.73 and payroll of $128,816.46. Council Member Jen Verhey seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

PUBLIC REQUESTS AND COMMENTS

Mayor Yaeger asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to comment. Brian Bothun (309 W. 5th Ave) invited everyone on behalf of the Community Heart & Soul to the dinner they are having on Thursday at 5:30 p.m. Five people will get $50 gift certificates from Akins.

ACTION AGENDA

A. **2027 SCP Scrub Seal Project Task Order Agreement- Ardurra** - The Council discussed a task order agreement with Ardurra Group Inc. for the 2027 SCP scrub seal project. The project will be funded 95% by the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) and will cover roadway work north of the railroad tracks. The anticipated schedule includes site visits, design, and construction to be completed before July 1st, with construction details to be determined at a later date. It was noted that an error in the task order number needed to be corrected by Ardurra Group Inc. before the agreement is signed. Council Member Eric Ottmar made a motion to approve the Task Order Agreement with Ardurra and have the mayor sign it. Council Member Jen Verhey seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

B. **Establishing an Official Public Commitment to Eliminate Roadway Fatalities and Serious Injuries by 2040- Resolution 2026-08** - Community Development Director Tom Reese spoke about the SS4A plan and the commitment to eliminate roadway fatalities and serious injuries by 2040. Council Member Jen Verhey moved to approve Resolution 2026-08 establishing a commitment to eliminate roadway fatalities and serious injuries by 2040 as part of the SS4A plan. Council Member Jessica Quinn seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

A. **2027 Preliminary Budget** - Clerk-Treasurer Julie Flyckt presented updates to the 2027 preliminary budget. The current expense fund shortfall was reduced to $58,555, assuming approval of the visitor impact grant. Flyckt reviewed several revenue and expenditure adjustments, including updated treasury bond estimates, a property tax levy estimate of $407,791, and adjustments to Police Department wages. The Council discussed the preliminary budget and identified additional items requiring review before final budget adoption. Flyckt will incorporate actual figures through November into the final budget for presentation at the December 15 meeting. Additional work will include reviewing the fee schedule, insurance rates, golf fees, and completing minor corrections.

CORRESPONDENCE – There was no correspondence.

REPORTS

A. **Mayor Updates** – No report.
B. **Council Committee Updates:**
   - **License, Rules, and Permits** – No report.
   - **Finance and Employee Benefits** – No report.
   - **Health and Wellness-** No report.
   - **Public Safety** – There will be a meeting on Thursday at 3:30 p.m. at the Police Department.
   - **Public Works** – There was a meeting last Friday.
   - **Parks and Recreation** – The next meeting will be scheduled.
   - **Personnel Committee** – Flyckt will follow up with Associated Industries regarding the handbook.
C. **City Attorney** – John Kragt reported he was reviewing some documents and questions submitted by Council Member Scheel.
D. **Public Works** – Public Works Director Dave Breazeale reported that the public bathrooms had been closed for the winter. The golf course roof project has a tentative start date of November 10. Breazeale will begin the water facilities inventory annual report this week or next, work on identifying a replacement for the sweeper within the next year and install the street name sign brackets.
E. **Police** – Police Chief Mike Suniga announced the hiring of a new entry-level officer with a tentative start date of December 1.
F. **Fire** – Chief Joel Bell was excused.
G. **Clerk-Treasurer** – Clerk-Treasurer Julie Flyckt stated Clerk Deputy Treasurer I Renee Arp is working on the chicken ordinance permitting process. Sections of the ordinance will be reviewed and clarified before the next public hearing.
H. **Community Development** – Community Development Director Tom Reese reported a successful kickoff for the Community Forestry and Parks Urban Forestry and Placemaking Program. He also noted an increase in building activity. Reese will review the fee schedule from the budget workshop and bring it back to the Finance Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further comments or business to come before the council, Mayor Yaeger adjourned the remote and in-person meeting at 7:27 p.m.

_____ _____

Michelle Asmussen, Deputy Clerk-Treasurer

Julie Flyckt, Clerk-Treasurer

ORDINANCE NO. 2210
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RITZVILLE, WASHINGTON AMENDING CHAPTER 5.12 KEEPING ANIMALS AND CHAPTER 5.16 DOMESTIC FOWL AT LARGE OF THE RITZVILLE CITY CODE.

WHEREAS, there is a need for amendment to Chapter 5.12 Keeping Animals and Chapter 5.16 Domestic Fowl at Large of the Ritzville City Code to allow rear yard chickens; and

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Ritzville does ordain as follows:

Section 1. Ritzville City Ordinance 906 Chapter 5.12 of the Ritzville City Code, together with all ordinances or parts thereof from which said code originated, are hereby amended as follows:

Chapter 5.12 Keeping Animals
Sections:
5.12.020 Keeping domestic animals or fowl – Permit required.
5.12.030 Permit – Application – Issue.
5.12.040 Permit – Rules and regulations governing – Council to promulgate.
5.12.050 Permit – Revocation – Procedure.
5.12.055 Rear yard chickens
5.12.060 Violations – Penalties.

5.12.020~~.~~ Keeping domestic animals or fowl – Permit required.

It is unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to keep, harbor, or maintain any horse or horses of any kind or description, cow, bull, steer, heifer, or calf, or cattle of any kind or description, mule or ass, goat or goats, sheep, pig or pigs, ~~or~~ or any other animal typical of a barnyard, ~~or any other domestic animals, chickens,~~ rabbits or hares, ducks, geese, peacocks, pigeons, birds of prey, or game birds, or any other domestic fowl within the City of Ritzville, except rear yard chickens kept in compliance with RCC 5.12.055, without first having procured a permit to do so from the city council in the manner provided in chapter 5.12.030. ~~hereinafter provided. Rabbits and hares will be allowed only under certain conditions. A permit will be issued, in the manner hereinafter provided, to participants of FFA or 4H projects who are under supervision by leaders and other conditions imposed by the council. With respect to sheep, it is unlawful for any person to keep the same without first having procured a permit to do so from the city council, according to rules and regulations prescribed by it; provided, further, that the same shall only be permitted in areas zoned agricultural or shown as being in an agricultural area, as set forth in the city of Ritzville Comprehensive Plan.~~
(Ord. 401 § 2, 1950; Ord. 718 § 2, 1983; Ord. 730 § 2, 1984; Ord. 906 § 2, 1995)

5.12.030. Permit – Application – Issue.

Any person, firm, or corporation desiring to keep any of the animals or fowls described in RCC § 5.12.020 shall make application for a permit to the city council, in writing, and upon a form to be provided by the city clerk/treasurer. Such permit may be granted by the city council by vote of a majority of the members present at any regular meeting of the city council.
(Ord. 401 § 3, 1950)

5.12.040. Permit – Rules and regulations governing – Council to promulgate.

The city council shall hereafter promulgate rules and regulations governing the conditions upon which permits for the maintenance of animals and fowls will be granted. (Ord. 401 § 4, 1950)

5.12.050. Permit – Revocation – Procedure.

The city council shall have the right to revoke any permit that may be granted in accordance with RCC § 5.12.030 by giving the holder of such permit one week's notice to appear before the city council at its next regular meeting, and to show cause, if any he has, why such permit should not be revoked. A majority vote of the members of the city council present shall be sufficient to revoke any permit granted in accordance with the terms of this chapter, and the revocation shall become effective at such time as shall be designated by the city council.
(Ord. 401 § 5, 1950)

5.12.055 Rear yard chickens

A. Purpose.
To allow residents to keep rear yard hens while protecting public health, safety, welfare, and neighborhood character.

B. Definitions.

1. "Hen": A female domestic chicken.
2. "Chicken coop": A covered structure used to shelter chickens.
3. "Chicken run": A fenced outdoor enclosure associated with a coop.
4. "Owner": Any person who owns, keeps, or controls chickens.
5. "Rear yard": The portion of a lot located behind the rear wall of the principal dwelling and extending to the rear property line.
6. "Cockerel": Male chicken under one year of age.
7. "Rooster": Male chicken one year of age or older.

C. Zoning and use authorization.

1. Rear yard hens are permitted as an accessory use on single family residential properties within the City.
2. Chickens, coops, and runs shall not be kept on vacant lots.
3. Commercial poultry operations are prohibited unless otherwise authorized by City code.

D. Administrative permit required.

1. A rear yard chicken permit is required.
2. The permit shall be perpetual in length.
3. Applications shall include applicant information, site plan, coop location, and number of hens.
4. The permit applies only to the approved individual and parcel and is not transferable between parcels or individuals.
5. The applicant shall pay the administrative permit fee required in accordance with the fee schedule adopted by the City Council.

E. Number of hens.

1. No more than eight (8) hens may be kept on one single family residential parcel.
2. Cockerels are allowed up to 12 weeks of age and then shall be immediately removed from the City. Roosters are explicitly prohibited.
3. Other poultry species are prohibited unless separately authorized.

F. Coop and run standards.

1. Chickens shall be housed in a secure coop and enclosed run.
2. Coops shall be located at least ten (10) feet from adjacent dwellings.
3. Coops shall be weather-resistant, ventilated, predator-resistant, rodent-resistant, and maintained in good repair.
4. Minimum space requirements: 4 square feet of coop space and 10 square feet of run space per hen.

G. Operational requirements.

1. Owners shall provide adequate food, water, shelter, and care. No owner shall cause or allow any of the chickens to be or become malnourished, or subject to abuse or neglect.
2. Feed shall be stored in rodent-proof containers.
3. Any rodent activity in the vicinity of any chicken structure or enclosure shall require the permitted owner of the chickens to eradicate the rodents in compliance with local, state, and federal laws.
4. Waste shall be regularly removed and disposed of properly so as not to create a nuisance.
5. Chickens shall not roam off the owner's property.
6. Slaughtering chickens within city limits is prohibited. Should a chicken be seriously injured or ill, humane euthanasia, performed in accordance with applicable law, is allowed.

H. Nuisance conditions.

No person shall keep chickens in a manner that violates subsections C through G of this chapter. Chickens shall be kept in a manner that does not create nuisances in accordance with Chapter 3.36 RCC.

I. Enforcement.
The City may investigate complaints and inspect properties as authorized by law. Violations are subject to RCC 5.12.060 and may result in the suspension or revocation of the rear yard chicken permit.

5.12.060. Violations – Penalties.

~~Any person, firm or corporation who violates any of the conditions of this chapter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $5.00 nor more than $25.00 for the first violation, and of not less than $25.00 nor more than $100.00 for the second violation or any subsequent violation, and each day that any pig, hog or swine of any kind or description, or goat or goats, or sheep are harbored, kept and maintained in the city of Ritzville, shall constitute a separate offense, and each day that any of the animals described in RCC § 5.12.020 shall be kept, harbored and maintained within the city limits of the city of Ritzville without having a valid permit in full force and effect shall constitute a separate offense. (Ord. 401 § 6, 1950)~~
Unless otherwise designated, a first violation of this chapter is a class 2 civil infraction, exclusive of any statutory assessments. Unless otherwise designated, the second violation of this chapter within one year is a class 1 civil infraction, exclusive of any statutory assessments. A third violation of this chapter within a one-year period shall be designated a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for a maximum term fixed by the court of not more than 90 days, or by a fine in an amount fixed by the court of not more than $1,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine. The court may suspend any, or all, of the monetary penalty and/or jail time of any violation of this chapter upon appropriate conditions to be established by the court in its discretion, including payment of restitution to any injured party as set forth.

Section 2. Ritzville City Ordinance 1092 Chapter 5.16 of the Ritzville City Code, together with all ordinances or parts thereof from which said code originated, are hereby amended as follows:

Chapter 5.16 Domestic Fowl aAt Large

Sections:

5.16.010 Domestic fowl – Running at large prohibited.

5.16.020 Domestic fowl – Must be enclosed on premises.

~~5.16.030 Violations – Penalties.~~5.16.030 Violations - Penalties

5.16.010. Domestic fowl – Running at large prohibited.

It shall be unlawful for any person or persons owning or having in his or their control any domestic fowl to permit such domestic fowl to run at large within the city limits. (Ord. 95 § 1, 1902)

§ 5.16.020. Domestic fowl – Must be enclosed on premises.

It is the duty of each person owning or having in charge domestic fowl to keep the same securely enclosed upon his own premises.
(Ord. 95 § 2, 1902)

§ 5.16.030. Violations – Penalties.

Any person violating any of the provisions of this chapter shall be deemed to have committed a civil infraction punishable in accordance with RCC § ~~15~~.~~02~~12.~~010~~060, General penalty.
(Ord. 95 § 3, 1902; Ord. 1092 § 103, 2005)

Section 3. If any section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is declared unconstitutional or invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance.

Section 4. Any other ordinance conflicting with this ordinance is hereby repealed.

Section 5. This ordinance shall take effect and be in full force 5 days after publication in the City's official newspaper of record.

READ in open meeting. PASSED by the City Council present, and, ORDERED PUBLISHED this ___ day of _____ 2026.

_____
Scott Yaeger, Mayor

Attest:

_____
Julie Flyckt, Clerk-Treasurer

Approved as to form:

_____
John Kragt, City Attorney

ORDINANCE NO. 2211

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RITZVILLE, ADAMS COUNTY, WASHINGTON, AUTHORIZING AN INCREASE IN THE REGULAR PROPERTY TAX LEVY FOR COLLECTION IN 2027

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Ritzville has met and considered its budget for the calendar year 2027; and

WHEREAS the city levy amount from the previous year was $403,481.01; and

WHEREAS, the population of this city is less than 10,000; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Ritzville held a public hearing concerning revenue for the 2027 budget including possible increases in property tax revenues on November 17, 2026; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Ritzville that:

Section 1. An increase in the regular property tax levy is hereby authorized for the levy to be collected in the 2027 tax year. The dollar amount of the increase over the actual levy amount from the previous year shall be $4,310 or the maximum amount allowed by law. This amount includes an increase of 1% from the previous year. The increase is exclusive of additional revenue resulting from new construction, improvements to property, newly constructed wind turbines, solar, biomass, and geothermal facilities, any increase in value of state assessed property, increment value, and any annexations that have occurred and refunds made.

Section 2. Any ordinance or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Section 3. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in full force five (5) days after publication.

READ in open meeting;

PASSED by the City Council of the City of Ritzville; and

ADOPTED AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this 17th day of November, 2026.

_____
Scott Yaeger, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Julie Flyckt, Clerk-Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
John Kragt, City Attorney

City of Ritzville
Values for 2027 Tax Collection

Previous levy: **$403,481.01**
New construction value: $**142,056**
Last year's levy rate: **$1.973792456893**
1% increase: **$4,310.00** *in order to receive this increase you will need to complete a resolution*
2026 highest lawful levy: **$407,791**

General Budget Procedures

- Each taxing district is required to hold a public hearing on revenue sources for the district's following year's budget prior to the time the taxing district makes the request to have the taxes levied.
- Each taxing district must file the certified budget or estimate with the clerk of the county's governing board on or before November 30th.
- Each taxing district must certify to the County Assessor the amount of taxes levied by November 30th (RCW 84.52.070).
- **All districts must certify their population.** You will need to certify your population in a letter or in your resolution.
- All regular levy requests resulting in a ***percentage increase*** must be accompanied by a resolution/ordinance per RCW 84.55.120.
- As the State Utility Values are usually received in late November or early December, your maximum regular levy amount has not yet been calculated. The attached preliminary figures include last year's State Utility Values. Once we have received the 2027 State Values and have all of the regular levy requests, calculations will be made to determine if the requested amount will be allowable under other limitation rules.

Excess / Special Levies

Voter approval provides you with the ability to request an excess/special levy. You must still forward a request for collection identifying the amount and the year in which the collection is to occur (it could be, and on occasion has been, less than what was approved by the voters).

You can find the current forms on the DOR website https://propertytax.dor.wa.gov//

- Look under Forms and Publications
- Forms
- Levy Forms – use the dropdown menu to use form: 64 0007- Highest lawful levy calculation

When you open the sheet, you will need to fill out part A. Use the highest lawful levy amount that I provided for you below. You will put the 100 or 101 and it will calculate the amount for you. That is what you will use as for your levy certification sheet.

VARELA
Engineering & Management

November 13, 2026

City of Ritzville
216 E. Main
Ritzville, WA 99169

ATTN: Mayor Yaeger and Council
RE: High Priority Sewer Collection System Improvements
Pay Estimate #2

Dear Mayor Yaeger and Council Members,

Please find attached Pay Estimate #2 from POW for the High Priority Sewer Collection System Project in the amount of $176,306.76

Pay Estimate #2 includes work performed through November 13, 2026. The work includes:

- Mobilization and Administration, construction staking
- Installation of approximately 340 LF of sewer main, manholes, 4 inch service pipe and service connections and asphalt removal

POW has provided invoices to substantiate their request for payment of materials on hand. Varela recommends approval of Pay Estimate #2 in the amount of $176,306.76.

Please sign the enclosed Pay Estimate, and return to us for forwarding to the Contractor and funding agency. If you have any questions, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

Ben Varela
Principal

cc: file
encl: As stated

Spokane
601 W Mallon Ave, Suite A
Spokane, WA 99201
509.328.6066

Wenatchee
10 First Street, Suite 116
Wenatchee, WA 98801
509.888.1116

varela-engr.com

CONTRACTORS APPLICATION FOR PAYMENT No. 2

Owner: City of Ritzville
Engineer: Ben Varela
Contractor: POW
Project: High Priority Sewer Collection System Improvements
Contract: 0

Owners Project No.: (n/a)
Engineer's Proj. No.: 127-52
Contractor's Proj. No.: (n/a)

Application Period:
From: 10/3/2026 To: 11/6/2026

Application Date:

1	Original Contract Price (inc. Sales Tax)	$598,810.32
2	Net change by Change Orders (inc. Sales Tax)	$0.00
3	Current Contract Price (Line 1 + Line 2).	$598,810.32
4	Total Work completed and materials stored to date	$242,035.56
5	Total Retainage (na)	
6	Amount eligible to date (Line 4 - Line 5)	$242,035.56
7	Less previous payments (Line 6 from prior application)	$65,728.80
8	Amount due this application (Line 6 - Line 7)	$176,306.76
9	Balance to finish, include retainage (Line 3 -Line 4)	$356,774.76

Contractor's Certification

The undersigned Contract certifies, to the best of its knowledge, the following:
(1) All previous progress payments received from Owner on account of Work done under the Contractor have been applied on account to discharge Contractor's legitimate obligations incurred in connection with the Work covered by prior Applications for Payment;
(2) Title to all Work, materials and equipment incorporated in said Work, or otherwise listed in or covered by this Application for Payment, will pass to Owner at time of payment free and clear of all liens, security interests, and encumbrances (except such as are covered by a bond acceptable to Owner indemnifying Owner against any such liens, security interest, or encumbrances); and
(3) All the Work covered by this Application for Payment is in accordance with the Contract Documents and is not defective.

Contractor: POW Scott Seguin Project Manager

Signature: Scott Seguin Date: 11/13/26

Recommended by Engineer		**Approved by Owner**	
By:		By:	
Title:	PRINCIPAL	Title:	
Date:	11/13/26	Date:	

Approved by Funding Agency

By:		By:	
Title:		Title:	
Date:		Date:	

VARELA Engineering & Management

PAYMENT APPLICATION LOG

VARELA Engineering & Management

Owner: *City of Ritzville*
Engineer: *Ben Varela*
Contractor: *POW*
Project: *High Priority Sewer Collection System Improvements*
Contract:

BID ITEMS

	DESCRIPTION (Bid Item)	BID SCHEDULE UNIT PRICE	EST. QTY		AMOUNT	PE #3 QTY	PE #3 Amount	PE #2 QTY	PE #2 Amount	PE #1 QTY	PE #1 Amount	TO DATE QTY	TO DATE Amount	%
01 01 00	**Special Requirements/Bid Items**													
101	Minor Changes	$ 1.00	15,000	EA	$ 15,000.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0.00	$ -	0.0%
102	Detail MH-A1	$ 33,000.00	1	LS	$ 33,000.00		$ -	1	$ 33,000.00		$ -	1.00	$ 33,000.00	100.0%
103	Temporary Tee/Saddle and Sewer Service Connection(s)	$ 15,000.00	1	EA	$ 15,000.00		$ -	1	$ 15,000.00		$ -	1.00	$ 15,000.00	100.0%
104	Pothole Existing Sewer Service Pipe	$ 1,500.00	3	EA	$ 4,500.00		$ -	3	$ 4,500.00		$ -	3.00	$ 4,500.00	100.0%
01 10 00	**General Requirements**													
105	Construction Staking	$ 15,000.00	1	LS	$ 15,000.00		$ -	10%	$ 1,500.00	75%	$ 11,250.00	85%	$ 12,750.00	85.0%
106	Existing Monuments and Survey Markers	$ 8,000.00	1	LS	$ 8,000.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0%	$ -	0.0%
107	Traffic Maintenance, Control and Safety	$ 9,000.00	1	LS	$ 9,000.00		$ -	25%	$ 2,250.00	25%	$ 2,250.00	50%	$ 4,500.00	50.0%
01 30 00	**Mobilization and Administration**													
108	Mobilization and Administration (Maximum 8% of Bid Subtotal)	$ 37,100.00	1	LS	$ 37,100.00		$ -	25%	$ 9,275.00	50%	$ 18,550.00	75%	$ 27,825.00	75.0%
03 40 00	**Manholes, Wet Wells and Dry Wells**													
109	Standard Manhole 48-inch dia.	$ 9,000.00	3	EA	$ 27,000.00		$ -	61%	$ 5,490.00	1	$ 12,510.00	200%	$ 18,000.00	66.7%
110	Shallow Manhole 48-inch dia.	$ 7,500.00	2	EA	$ 15,000.00		$ -	1	$ 7,500.00		$ -	1.00	$ 7,500.00	50.0%
111	Extra Manhole Depth	$ 1,200.00	1.1	VF	$ 1,320.00		$ -	1	$ 1,200.00		$ -	1	$ 1,200.00	90.9%
112	Manhole Testing	$ 2,500.00	2	EA	$ 5,000.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0.0%
31 23 00	**Trench Excavation, Backfill and Compaction**													
113	Furnish Imported Pipe Bedding (<6-inch pipe)	$ 6.00	320	LF	$ 1,920.00		$ -	165.5	$ 993.00		$ -	166	$ 993.00	52%
114	Furnish Imported Pipe Bedding (>6-inch pipe)	$ 14.00	667	LF	$ 9,338.00		$ -	504	$ 7,056.00		$ -	50400%	$ 7,056.00	75.6%
115	Trench Excavation Safety System	$ 7,500.00	1	LS	$ 7,500.00		$ -	50%	$ 3,750.00		$ -	50%	$ 3,750.00	50.0%
32 10 00	**Surface Improvements and Restoration**													
116	AC Pavement Removal	$ 12.50	1,250	SY	$ 15,625.00		$ -	650	$ 8,125.00		$ -	650	$ 8,125.00	52%
117	HMA Pavement Placement (3-inch HMA CL 1/2"PG-28 over 8-inch CSTC)	$ 78.00	650	SY	$ 50,700.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0%
118	HMA Pavement Placement (3-inch HMA CL 1/2"PG-28 over existing gravel base)	$ 63.00	600	SY	$ 37,800.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0%
119	Concrete Curb Removal	$ 25.00	60	LF	$ 1,500.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0%
120	Concrete Curb Placement	$ 105.00	60	LF	$ 6,300.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0%
121	Concrete Flatwork Removal and Placement	$ 60.00	45	SY	$ 2,700.00		$ -	8	$ 480.00		$ -	8	480.00	18%
122	Concrete Flatwork Placement	$ 190.00	45	SY	$ 8,550.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0%
123	Gravel Surface Placement (4-inch)	$ 30.00	300	SY	$ 9,000.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0%
32 90 00	**Landscape Restoration**													
124	Sod	$ 78.00	200	SY	$ 15,600.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0%
33 31 00	**Wastewater Pipelines**													
125	8-inch PVC Wastewater Pipeline	$ 100.00	667	LF	$ 66,700.00		$ -	341	$ 34,100.00	163	$ 16,300.00	504	$ 50,400.00	76%
126	4-inch PVC Wastewater Pipeline	$ 86.00	150	LF	$ 12,900.00		$ -	165.5	$ 14,233.00		$ -	166	$ 14,233.00	110%
127	Reconnect Existing Side Sewers 4-inch	$ 175.00	170	LF	$ 29,750.00		$ -	5	$ 875.00		$ -	5	$ 875.00	3%
128	8x4 Service Wye	$ 400.00	9	EA	$ 3,600.00		$ -	5	$ 2,000.00		$ -	5	$ 2,000.00	56%
129	4-inch PVC Cleanout	$ 2,250.00	7	EA	$ 15,750.00		$ -	4	$ 9,000.00		$ -	4	$ 9,000.00	57%
130	CCTV Video Inspection - Sewer Main	$ 5.00	667	LF	$ 3,335.00		$ -	504	$ 2,520.00		$ -	504	$ 2,520.00	76%
	BID SUBTOTAL - BASE BID				$ 483,488.00		$ -		$ 162,847.00		$ 60,860.00		$ 223,707.00	
	SALES TAX : 8.0%				$ 38,679.04		$ -		$ -		$ 4,868.80		$ 17,896.56	
	TOTAL AMOUNT BID - BASE BID				$ 522,167.04		$ -		$ 162,847.00		$ 65,728.80		$ 241,603.56	

SCHEDULE B

	DESCRIPTION (Bid Item)	BID SCHEDULE UNIT PRICE	EST. QTY		AMOUNT	PE #3 QTY	PE #3 Amount	PE #2 QTY	PE #2 Amount	PE #1 QTY	PE #1 Amount	TO DATE QTY	TO DATE Amount	%
03 40 00	**MANHOLES, WET WELLS AND DRY WELLS**													
201	Shallow Manhole 48-inch dia.	$ 9,500.00	1	EA	$ 9,500.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0.00	$ -	0.0%
31 23 00	**TRENCH EXCAVATION, BACKFILL AND COMPACTION**													
202	Furnish Imported Pipe Bedding (<6-inch pipe)	$ 6.00	36	LF	$ 216.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0%	$ -	0.0%
203	Furnish Imported Pipe Bedding (>6-inch pipe)	$ 14.00	235	LF	$ 3,290.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0%	$ -	0.0%
32 10 00	**SURFACE IMPROVEMENTS AND RESTORATION**													
108	Gravel Surface Placement (4-inch)	$ 30.00	350	SY	$ 10,500.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0%	$ -	0.0%
32 31 00	**WASTEWATER PIPELINES**													
205	8-inch PVC Wastewater Pipelines	$ 135.00	235	LF	$ 31,725.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0%	$ -	0.0%
206	6-inch PVC Wastewater Pipelines	$ 260.00	6	LF	$ 1,560.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0.00	$ -	0.0%
207	4-inch PVC Wastewater Pipelines	$ 150.00	30	LF	$ 4,500.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0.0%
208	8x6 Service Wye	$ 500.00	1	EA	$ 500.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0.0%
209	8x4 Service Wye	$ 400.00	5	EA	$ 2,000.00		$ -	1	$ 400.00		$ -	1	$ 400.00	20.0%
210	8-inch PVC Cleanout	$ 3,750.00	1	EA	$ 3,750.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0	$ -	0%
211	4-inch PVC Cleanout	$ 2,250.00	1	EA	$ 2,250.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0%	$ -	0.0%
212	CCTV Video Inspection-Sewer Main	$ 5.00	235	LF	$ 1,175.00		$ -		$ -		$ -	0%	$ -	0.0%
	BID SUBTOTAL - SCHEDULE B				$ 70,966.00		$ -		$ 400.00		$ -		$ 400.00	
	SALES TAX : 8.0%				$ 5,677.28		$ -		$ -		$ -		$ 32.00	
	TOTAL AMOUNT BID - SCHEDULE B				$ 76,643.28		$ -		$ 400.00		$ -		$ 432.00	
	CURRENT CONTRACT AMOUNT				$ 598,810.32		$ -		$ 163,247.00		$ 65,728.80		$ 242,035.56	
	TOTAL AMOUNT BID - BASE BID AND SCHEDULE B				$ 598,810.32		$ -		$ 163,247.00		$ 65,728.80		$ 242,467.56	

CHANGE ORDERS

NO.	DESCRIPTION (Change Order Item)	CHANGE ORDER ITEMS UNIT PRICE	EST. QTY	AMOUNT	CO #3 Quantity	CO #3 Amount	CO #2 Quantity	CO #2 Amount	CO #1 Quantity	CO #1 Amount	Quantity	Amount
	SUBTOTAL CHANGE ORDERS :			$ -		$ -		$ -		$ -		$ -
	Sales Tax 8.0%			$ -		$ -		$ -		$ -		$ -
	TOTAL CHANGE ORDERS			$ -	TOTAL	$ -	TOTAL	$ -	TOTAL	$ -	TOTAL	$ -
						$ -		$ -		$ -		$ -
	ORIGINAL CONTRACT AMOUNT			$ 598,810.32								
	CURRENT CONTRACT AMOUNT			$ 598,810.32		$ -		$ 163,247.00		$ 65,728.80		$ 242,467.56
	ORIGINAL CONTRACT AMOUNT w/ Sales Tax			$ 598,810.32								
	TOTAL CHANGE ORDERS TO DATE w/ Sales Tax			$ -		$ -		$ 163,247.00		$ 65,728.80		$ 242,467.56
	Original Contract Amount + Change Orders			$ 554,454.00		$ -		$ 163,247.00		$ 60,860.00		$ 224,107.00
	TAX : 8.0%			$ 44,356.32	PE #3	$ -	PE #2	$ 13,059.76	PE #1	$ 4,868.80	TO DATE	$ 17,928.56
	SUBTOTAL WITH TAX:			$ 598,810.32	TRUE	$ -	FALSE	$ 176,306.76	TRUE	$ 65,728.80	FALSE	$ 242,035.56
	Amount Owed:			$ 598,810.32		$ -		$ 176,306.76		$ 65,728.80		$ 242,035.56

Work Completed To-Date (with Sales Tax)

WASHINGTON STATE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE TRAINING COMMISSION
Jerrell C. Wills, Interim Executive Director
19010 1st Avenue South • Burien, WA 98148 • Phone: 206-835-7300 • www.cjtc.wa.gov

October 22, 2026

ELECTRONICALLY DELIVERED

Chief Mike Suniga
Ritzville Police Department
209 North Adams
Ritzville, WA 99169
mike.suniga@ritzville-wa.us

Dear Chief Suniga:

Congratulations! The Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission is pleased to notify you that we anticipate awarding Ritzville Police Department $214,127.40 in Round 2 grant funding through the ESHB 2015 Public Safety Funding Program, pending final verification that your agency's policies and practices meet the requirements to qualify for the grant.

Your agency will have the opportunity to identify which of your requests you would like the grant to fund, up to the anticipated amount awarded. Funding must be used for the public purpose of providing state funding to local and tribal law enforcement agencies to support officer hiring, retention, and training, as well as broader public safety efforts (RCW 43.101.540, ESHB 2015).

Attached to this letter is an overview of the Round 2 rubric decisions and eligible uses of grant funds.

We would like to schedule a meeting to discuss this anticipated award amount and the funding categories we are approving. Please email a few meeting options that work for you to cjtchb2015@cjtc.wa.gov, and we will respond with a meeting notice.

Once your agency meets the remaining eligibility requirements, we will follow up with an official award letter and documents.

Again, congratulations. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Jerrell C. Wills
Interim Executive Director

Attachment (1)
cc: Francesca Heard, Budget Manager, Budget Unit
Gail Stone, Project Manager, Budget Unit

ESHB 2015 Public Funding Safety Program
Overview of Round 2 Grant Rubric Decisions and Eligible Uses of Grant Funds
10/20/2026

Round 2 Rubric Decisions

The following is an overview of award decisions and criteria as outlined below.

1. All applicant agencies that meet the policy and practice requirements will receive an award through either Round 1 or Round 2.

2. Fund salaries, benefits, and Basic Law Enforcement Academy (BLEA) local match costs for all new officer requests.

3. Grant funds remaining after funding officer salaries, benefits, and BLEA will be distributed equitably based on agency size (small, medium, or large) as identified in the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission's (WSCJTC) BLEA Job Task Analysis.

- Small: 1-19 officers
- Medium: 20-99 officers
- Large: 100 officers and above

Agency size categories based on application materials

- Small (1-19 officers): Minimum award is $100,000 or 30% of the request, whichever is higher.
- Medium (20-99 officers): Minimum award is $300,000 or 20% of the request, whichever is higher.
- Large (10 officers and above): Minimum award is $700,000 or 10% of the request, whichever is higher.

4. Agencies whose awards for officer salaries, benefits, and BLEA local match costs exceed the amounts in item 3 will receive funding for those costs only.

5. For all awards beyond officer salaries, benefits, and BLEA local match costs:

- When an agency's award amount is less than requested, WSCJTC will ask the agency to identify which eligible uses it wishes to fund with the grant.

Eligible Uses of Funds for Round 2 Grant Awards

Eligible uses of funds were determined based on the allowable uses specified in RCW 43.101.540, Section 7(a-c) as outlined below.

1. Hire new entry-level law enforcement officers
   - Salaries, benefits, and BLEA local match for newly commissioned law enforcement officers
   - Recruiting efforts for new law enforcement officers
   - Salaries and benefits for new limited-commissioned law enforcement officers (e.g. parking enforcement)

2. Support co-response, including peer counselors and behavioral health professionals
   - Funding for new and existing co-response models
   - Salaries and benefits for non-commissioned staff and emergency management center staff

3. Cover required training, including crisis intervention and trauma-informed practices
   - Advanced and applied skills training for law enforcement including course requirements under ESHB 2015, as well as any associated costs.
   - Overtime backfill for advanced training for both the attending officer and the officer providing coverage.
   - Equipment for training

4. Broader law enforcement and public safety response efforts
   - Officer wellness programs, including fitness
   - Body-worn cameras and associated installation and ongoing costs
   - Less-lethal equipment, including impact weapons, oleoresin capsicum spray, projectile impact weapons, and electronic control weapons
   - Other equipment, including firearms
   - Radios and radio accessories
   - Vehicles, vehicle outfitting, and vehicle upgrades
   - Technology, IT, and software licensing
   - Drones and related training
   - K-9 Programs
   - Retention bonuses

	Proposed Expedenitures		Updated Expenditures		
Items	Total				
Portable Radios	$	320,000.00	0		
Training costs & policies	$	131,554.00	42,728		
Training Equipment	$	56,000.00	55,600		
Wellness Costs	$	30,000.00	20,000		
Less Lethal Tools	$	84,000.00	78,163		
Safety Tools	$	18,500.00	18,500		
Evidence collection	$	10,544.00		**Allowed by Grant**	
		Currently	$ 214,991.00	**$ 214,127.40**	864
	$	650,598.00			

WASHINGTON STATE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE TRAINING COMMISSION
Jerrell C. Wills, Interim Executive Director

19010 1st Avenue South • Burien, WA 98148 • Phone: 206-835-7300 • www.cjtc.wa.gov

October 26, 2026

Chief Mike Suniga
Ritzville Police Department
209 North Adams
Ritzville, WA 99169
mike.suniga@ritzville-wa.us

Dear Chief Suniga,

Thank you for your grant application and providing materials to establish compliance with the eligibility requirements of ESHB House Bill 2015, codified in RCW 82.14.345 and RCW 43.101.540. In consultation with the Attorney General's Office, the Criminal Justice Training Commission (WSCJTC) is charged with certifying compliance and awarding grants.

We have carefully considered your materials and, as described below, find they are currently insufficient to establish compliance with ESHB 2015's requirements. We hope this letter provides a useful framework for how the Citty may supplement its application and successfully reapply.

We look forward to working with you to enable the City to benefit from ESHB 2015's public safety initiatives.

Summary of Requirements:
Below, we describe our review and findings for each requirement in ESHB 2015. Please submit your supplemental documentation via the online ESHB 2015 Grant Application Form.

1. Keep Washington Working - Please provide updates to these criteria.
10.3, Personal Information. Please add "Definition includes but is not limited to" before the list.

10.4, Court Order of Judicial Warrant. Please change "Court order and judicial warrant" to "Court order or judicial warrant."

10.20.1, Consular Notification. Your policy is good. However, the Consular Notification form must include mention of the detainee's right to request communication with their consul and it must document their decision in writing. Please see the attached KWW template to revise your form.

10.23 & 10.23.1, Recording Personal Information Disclosures. There is no need to draft a memo stating there have been no disclosures. Instead, please create a Disclosure log (spreadsheet) showing no disclosures of personal information or release dates. Having this tracking log on hand will help ensure that any future disclosures are recorded. Attached is a template, which you can use to create the log.

10.25 & 10.27, In-Custody Consent. Your policies are good. However, your English and Spanish consent forms need to be available for use now. There is no need to use your limited funding to create a Spanish language form. Please use our KWW templates (English/Spanish), attached here. You may customize the forms by incorporating your logo and formatting.

10.36.3, Data-sharing Agreements. Although you do not currently have data sharing agreements, we ask that you adopt our data sharing template for use in any future agreements. See attachment.

10.43.1, KWW Audit. We understand that you have limited resources and intend to conduct the first audit in December 2026. However, we do not have authority to award public safety funding under this program until the first KWW audit is completed. To make this audit requirement less cumbersome, we suggest that you email your officers and supervisors, asking if they are aware of any federal requests for immigration and citizenship info, assistance with immigration enforcement, access to detainees, or requests for and contacts with foreign consuls. Their feedback will be sufficient for the purposes of this audit and can be summarized in a memo.

10.44, KWW Policies. Given that Ritzville PD does not currently have a website, we ask that your 412 policy (Immigration Considerations Policy) be added to the City of Ritzville's website so that the public can find it there until the PD's website goes live in January 2027. The link on the city website should include your name and contact information or another police employee who can answer questions.

2. Use of Force Policies and Practices – Meets the criteria.

3. Use of Force Data Collection – Meets the criteria.

4. Civil Protection Orders and Firearms Relinquishment Policies – Please make updates to the following criteria.

13.5, Petitioning for Civil Protection Orders. Please update Training 342.13 to include what you are planning to train on for this criteria.

13.17, Lethality Assessment Protocols. Please share your LAP. Also, please change "should" to "shall" in training section 342.13.

5. Use of Volunteers – Meets the criteria.

6. Training Requirements

The following trainings need to be updated or completed.

- LETCSA
- Sexual Assault and Gender-Based Violence
- Roster Identifying Officer Status

Your agency can come into compliance with the missing criteria above by working with WSCJTC to establish a detailed training plan.

Thank you again for your submittal of this ESHB 2015 Sales and Use Tax Verification. We are here to answer questions and assist you in meeting the requirements of the legislation. Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Gail Stone
Program Manager, Public Safety Funding Program (ESHB 2015)
Gail.Stone@cjtc.wa.gov

Cc: Austin Mello, WSCJTC

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ritzville City Council

FROM: MDKJ Law

RE: Criminal Justice Sales and Use Tax

At the end of September, Councilwoman Scheel sent our office a list of questions regarding the proposed RCW 82.14.345 sales and use tax. Below, in Q&A format, are the answers we have found.

Q1: Can a law enforcement agency either adopt the Attorney General's model policies or adopt its own policies, with certain stipulations?

A1: RCW 43.10.315 states that law enforcement agencies must either adopt policies that are consistent with the AGO guidance or notify the AGO that the guidance and model policies (or policies consistent with the model policies) are not being adopted and with that, provide the reasoning for declining to adopt and a copy of the agencies policies to ensure compliance the Keep Washington Working Act. It does not state that the law enforcement agency need adopt the AGO's model policies themselves.

Q2: Does HB 2015 and the certification process associated with RCW 82.14.345 make adoption of the AGO model policies mandatory as a condition of utilizing this taxing authority?

A2: No, the house bill does not; however, the KWWA checklist provided by the Criminal Justice Training Commission does make it a requirement. The CJTC has provided a checklist ("Assessment Tool") on its website that matches the AGO model policies. The Assessment Tool states that although agency policies need not be identical to the AGO model policy, they do need to "be substantially similar and free from significant deviation." This makes it less cumbersome for an agency to simply adopt the AGO model policies rather than construct its own from scratch. The CJTC can provide templates and forms to be included as well.

Q3: What is being certified, who is responsible for making the certifications, and are any of those certifications made under penalty of perjury?

A3: The agency implementing the tax has certain requirements it must fulfill in order to qualify for the HB 2015 grant. Those requirements include, but are not limited to:

- Training and policies consistent with the AGO;
- Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC) trainings;
- Use of force policies;
- Crisis intervention training;
- Gender-based violence training;
- Certain leadership requirements;
- Certain volunteer requirements.

The Council must submit documentation of the City's sales tax eligibility to the Washington State CJTC via the WSCJTC website. The city and the county can both pass and use the tax independently or in addition to the other.

Q4: Are Ritzville's current policies sufficient to meet the certification requirements?

A4: Chief Suniga spoke with Gail Stone, one of the key players in the new tax. Ms. Stone told the Chief that Ritzville's policies are sufficient, and any deficiencies that need to be addressed can be done using the funds received from implementing the program. From review of the policies, there is a fair amount of verbiage that references the KWWA and reiterates that immigration status is in the federal government's realm and the Ritzville PD remains in compliance with RCW 43.17.425 and RCW 10.93.160 and with the AGO's model policy. For example, there is language in the policies that prevents RPD personnel from releasing information to federal immigration authorities except when required by court order, judicial warrant, or the Public Records Act.

Q5: Is compliance with the state requirements necessary to receive the tax revenue in conflict with federal law, federal immigration-enforcement requirements, or conditions attached to current or future federal grants received by the City or Police Department?

Q6: If the City certifies compliance with the state requirements, could that certification potentially conflict with representations or certifications the City is required to make when accepting federal funding?

Q7: If state required policy or practice restricts conduct that a current or future federal grant requires or conditions funding upon, where does that leave the City?

Q8: If a requirement of the Keep Washington Working Act conflicts with a federal requirement that is a condition of receiving federal funds, which requirement controls and to what extent?

Q9: Does that statutory protection allow the City to comply with a conflicting federal grant condition without jeopardizing its compliance with HB 2015 or its eligibility to continue receiving the sales tax revenue?

Q10: Is federal preemption implicated, and if so, what practical risks would that create for the City?

A5-A10: The previous 6 questions have the same answer: The language of the Keep Washington Working Act and associated statutes repeatedly state that the policies must be implemented "to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law[;]" "implementation of any policy ... must be in accordance with state and federal law[;]" and that nothing in the KWWA prohibits the collection, disclosure, etc., of information "required to comply with policies, grants, waivers, or other requirements necessary to maintain funding...." The Act does not attempt to prevent or conflict with federal law.

Q11: Does the current Adams County litigation against the State regarding the KWWA provide any relevant guidance for Ritzville?

A11: No, not particularly. The most recent filing is from June 25, 2025. However, the Court does clarify that compliance with federal law is an affirmative defense under KWWA. Additionally, the Court states that "Washington's courts are required to interpret state statutes in a manner that comports with federalism and federal supremacy" and that "[i]t would be inappropriate at this juncture to assume KWW[A] 'will be construed in a way that creates a conflict with federal law.'" Order on Mot. to Remand and Dismiss, 10:13-17, June 25, 2025, Dkt. No. 12.

Q12: Does compliance create specific continuing operational requirements for the Police Department, including requirements related to:

- Immigration detainers or requests from federal agencies;
    - HB 2015 defined "immigration detainer request" in a manner that could create operational requirements, but does not explicitly appear to do so.
- Civil immigration detention agreements;
    - HB 2015 adds a definitions section to RCW 43.17, which could impact the way the agreements are currently being treated, particularly because some of the language creates very strict mechanisms and manners for communicating with federal agencies.
- U-visa/T-visa certification procedures or required training;
    - The HB essentially strengthens the existing framework, creating narrower timelines and expanded trainings.

- Response-time requirements associated with certification requests; and
    - Have not come across as of yet.
- Any reporting, training, policy-update, or notification requirements that continue after the City begins collecting the tax.
    - The City must provide an annual accounting that describes how the tax money was spent.

Q13: What is the duration of the tax itself? Is the taxing authority permanent once imposed, does is have a statutory expiration date, or can the City establish a sunset/review period?

A13: The grant expires in 2028, but the tax is permanent once imposed.

Q14: If the City later determines that the requirements or risks associated with the tax outweigh the benefit, what process would be required to discontinue it?

A14: Because the tax is a local option, the City could likely have voters pass a repeal resolution.

Conclusion- I believe that the questions above have been answered to the best of my firm's ability. Councilwoman Scheel, I appreciate your thoughts, concerns and questions and I am not sure if this memo will help fully answer those concerns. I think the biggest issue is the concern with the perceived conflict with Federal Law. However the House Bill and all corresponding legislation and requirements clearly state that it is not in conflict and cannot be in conflict with Federal Law. That is something that is obviously not necessary because State Law cannot be in conflict with Federal Law, that would be in violation of the Supremcy Clause. I think the fact that the Legislature put that language in, was either to make it very clear to people who had concerns or they wanted to put this exact issue on the front for local Cities and Counties to debate which you have done a good job at doing. At the end of the day, when I look at the mass amount of Cities and Counties, many of them being in Republican leaning areas that have signed up for this, it makes me believe the former. So, I have been and continue to be comfortable with the Council moving this project forward. However, that is not for myself or my firm to determine. The questions you have asked have been answered with the current information and facts at our disposal and that is all that we can do in this moment in time.

AG Brown, multistate coalition win case protecting $7.5 million in law enforcement funding for Washington

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Nov 5 2026

Attorney General Nick Brown and a multistate coalition of 23 states secured a victory in court Wednesday that blocks the federal government from withholding congressionally-authorized grants for law enforcement from Washington, including grants that fund ongoing criminal justice and public safety operations, such as crisis intervention programs, support for survivors of domestic violence, and efforts to reduce youth recidivism.

The federal government had attempted to withhold the funds unless states agreed to unlawfully imposed conditions requiring cooperation with the federal government's immigration enforcement efforts. District of Rhode Island Chief Judge John J. McConnell, Jr., declared the federal government's actions unlawful and permanently blocked any implementation or enforcement of these conditions.

"The federal government's attempt to play politics with public safety was dangerous and illegal," said AG Brown. "Our communities will be safer because of this ruling."

This lawsuit resolves two different attempts by the federal government to unlawfully impose funding conditions on states. In the first attempt, the federal government declared that states would be unable to access grants that provide critical resources to victims and survivors of crime through the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) unless they agreed to the administration's extreme immigration demands. The multistate coalition filed suit (https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/ag-brown-sues-trump-administration-imposing-illegal-conditions-funds-used) and succeeded in getting the federal government to remove those conditions on over $1.3 billion of VOCA funds.

This year, the U.S. Department of Justice tried again to apply these illegal conditions to essential grant programs, including funds dedicated to law enforcement and juvenile justice. For example, the federal government attempted to withhold funds distributed through the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Formula Grants. For decades, regardless of which political party held power, the Byrne Programs have been the leading federal source of criminal justice funding to state and local governments.

With Wednesday's ruling, Washington will once again be eligible to receive these grants. In total, the ruling will restore $7.5 million in grants for Washington that the federal government attempted to withhold.

Brown joined this suit, which was co-led by the attorneys general of New Jersey, California, Delaware, Illinois, and Rhode Island, with the attorneys general of Colorado, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin, and the Governor of Pennsylvania.

-30-

Washington's Attorney General serves the people and the state of Washington. As the state's largest law firm, the Attorney General's Office provides legal representation to every state agency, board, and commission in Washington. Additionally, the Office serves the people directly by enforcing consumer protection, civil rights, and environmental protection laws. The Office also prosecutes elder abuse, Medicaid fraud, and handles sexually violent predator cases in 38 of Washington's 39 counties. Visit www.atg.wa.gov (https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.atg.wa.gov%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cbrionna.aho%40atg.wa.gov%7Cca1de901495e4dbe44e808d938325a7e%7C2cc5baaf3b9742c9bcb8392cad34af3f%7C to learn more.

Media Contact:

Email: press@atg.wa.gov (mailto:press@atg.wa.gov)

Phone: (360) 753-2727

General contacts: Click here (https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.atg.wa.gov%2Fcontact-us&data=02%7C01%7Cask4isd%40atg.wa.gov%7C0bf096ab891d45ee964608d812417366%7C2cc5baaf3b9742c9bcb8392cad34af3f%7C0%7C0%7C637279419610422508&sdata=Pz

Media Resource Guide & Attorney General's Office FAQ (https://agportal-s3bucket.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/uploadedfiles/AGOMediaResourceGuide.pdf)

News Release Search

Advanced Search (/news/news-releases/news-release-search)

Topic:

- AGO (/news/news-releases/AGO)
- Campaign Finance (/news/news-releases/Campaign%20Finance)
- Civil Rights (/news/news-releases/Civil%20Rights)
- Consumer Protection (/news/news-releases/Consumer%20Protection)
- Courts (/news/news-releases/Courts)
- Crime (/news/news-releases/Crime)
- Environment (/news/news-releases/Environment)
- Firearms (/news/news-releases/Firearms)
- Health (/news/news-releases/Health)
- Housing (/news/news-releases/Housing)