

BEST PRACTICES: BILL ANALYSIS



OPB BILL TRACKING AND ANALYSIS PROCESS

1. OPB reviews all daily bill introductions from members of the House and Senate.
2. OPB reaches out to stakeholders to determine whether to track a bill that is potentially relevant to the UW.
3. Per stakeholder suggestion, OPB adds bills that have an impact and their identified "reviewers" to the online tracking system, LobbyGov. Certain units have "liaisons" who assign bills added in their departments.
4. If added to a bill in LobbyGov, reviewers receive an analysis request email from LobbyGov. We ask that reviewers open the bill page to review the available documents and complete assessments within the timeline specified.

For more detailed directions on using LobbyGov and other legislative resources, please visit the State Operations tab at washington.edu/opb.

HOW TO READ A BILL

Bill analysis can seem time consuming and complicated. When you are asked to review a bill, please look for these easy indicators:

New sections provide all new language. Please review carefully!

Underlined Text is text that will be added to existing statute

Struck out text is text that will be removed from existing statute

2 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

3 NEW SECTION. Sec. 1. The legislature finds that Dubs, the UW
4 Mascot, has dutifully served as an effective representative of the
5 University of Washington. Seeing as the state as a whole could
6 similarly benefit from a morale boost, the legislature seeks to rename
7 Mt. Rainier to Mt. Dubs. To this end, the bill would update RCW
8 37.08.210 to change the name of Rainier National Park to Dubs National
9 Park.

10 Sec. 2. RCW 37.08.210, Rainier National Park, is hereby amended as
11 follows:
12 Exclusive jurisdiction shall be, and the same is hereby ceded to the
13 United States over and within all the territory that is now or may
14 hereafter be included in that tract of land in the state of Washington,
15 set aside for the purposes of a national park, and known as the ~~Rainier~~
16 Dubs National Park; saving, however, to the said state, the right to

BILL REVIEW GUIDELINES

As part of your review, you will be asked to briefly answer general assessment questions and to recommend a position and priority that UW should take for the bill. A helpful assessment is one that gives us a brief summary and helps us understand the scope of the bill's implications. Please consider the impact of the bill on **both your unit and the UW community at large**.

Bill Review Questions

Reviewers will be asked to answer the following questions/prompts:

1. Please assess the impact of this bill on the UW.
2. Do you have any suggested amendments for the bill? If so, please include them below in as much detail as possible.
3. What is the impact of this bill on BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) communities (students, staff, faculty, or community members)? What is the impact on vulnerable communities (i.e., those who are displaced, low-income, disabled, experiencing homelessness, etc.)?

Recommended Position

When considering a recommended position of a bill we ask that you consider its impact on 1) the mission of the UW, 2) UW students, staff, faculty, and other community members, or 3) equity initiatives within the UW community.

You will have four options for a position:

1. Support: The bill **positively impacts** the UW or supports research or initiatives by students, faculty, and staff (e.g., creates new revenue source for the University).
2. Oppose: The bill **negatively impacts** the UW or research or initiatives by students, faculty, and staff (e.g., limits the University's ability to set tuition rates).
3. Neutral: The bill will have **little to no impact** on the UW or research or initiatives by students, faculty, and staff (e.g., requires state agencies to implement a lightbulb purchasing policy already implemented five years ago).
4. Concerns: The bill **may negatively impact** the UW or research or initiatives by students, faculty, and staff. The bill's wording is **unclear or vague** and has the potential to negatively impact the UW or research or initiatives by students, faculty, and staff (e.g., section 2 of the bill exempts some state agencies, but does not specifically list higher education institutions, so it is unclear if the bill would impact the UW.).

Recommended Priority

When evaluating a bill's priority, please consider 1) impact to mission, 2) financial impact, 3) operational impact, 4) impacts to faculty and staff, and 5) impacts to academic and student life.

You will have four options for a priority:

1. High: This bill will have a **significant positive or negative impact on the University** and necessitates the highest level of attention by OPB and State Relations through the legislative process. The bill will fundamentally change a major policy or major business process, cost the university a significant amount of money, or increase or decrease revenue (e.g., the fiscal impact is greater than \$1 million).
2. Medium: The bill will have **some positive or negative impact on the University or will have significant impact on my unit** (e.g., the fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000). The bill necessitates a heightened level of attention.
3. Low: The bill will have **minimal impact on the University and my unit** (e.g., the cost of implementation would be absorbed within existing resources), but we need to track the bill for future amendments that could change the impact.
4. Monitoring: The bill will have **no impact on the University and my unit**, but we need to track the bill for future amendments that could change the impact.

HELPFUL REMINDERS

- Be clear and concise
- Note any areas of confusion
- Provide some education
- Give us a sense of importance
- Respond as soon as possible!