

2026 Budget Suggestions



To view all of MRSC's budgeting resources,
visit [mrsc.org/budgeting](https://www.mrsc.org/budgeting)

2026 BUDGET SUGGESTIONS

Copyright © 2025 by the Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington (MRSC). All rights reserved. Except as permitted under the Copyright Act of 1976, no part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means or stored in a database or retrieval system without the prior written permission of the publisher; however, governmental entities in the state of Washington are granted permission to reproduce and distribute this publication for official use.

DISCLAIMER

The content of this publication is for informational purposes only and is not intended as legal advice, nor as a substitute for the legal advice of an attorney. You should contact your own legal counsel if you have a question regarding your legal rights or any other legal issue.

MRSC MISSION

Trusted guidance and services supporting local government success.

MRSC

OFFICE: 225 Tacoma Ave S., Tacoma, WA 98405

MAILING: 1712 6th Ave, Suite 100, PMB 1330, Tacoma, WA 98405

(206) 625-1300 | (800) 933-6772

www.MRSC.org

Contents

Introduction	1
Core Revenues	2
Property Taxes	2
Sales Taxes	2
B&O and Utility Taxes	3
Ballot Measure Planning	3
Economic Factors	4
National Economy	4
State Economy	4
Consumer Price Index	4
Implicit Price Deflator	5
Population Estimates	6
Legislation That May Affect Your Budget	7
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) Flexibility – HB 1791	7
Local Law Enforcement Programs Sales & Use Tax – HB 2015	7
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (MVFT) Revenues – SB 5801	7
New Services Subject to Retail Sales and Use Tax – SB 5814	7
Initiatives on the Ballot	7
City and Town Budgets	8
2026 Budget Calendar – Cities and Towns	8
Budget Hearings – Cities and Towns	9
State Shared Revenues – Cities and Towns	10
County Budgets	20
2026 Budget Calendar – Counties	20
Budget Hearings – Counties	21
State Shared Revenues – Counties	22
Per Capita Shared Revenue Tables and Distribution Calendar	29
Budget Amendments	31

Introduction

MRSC's *Budget Suggestions* publication provides cities, towns, and counties with timely and relevant information to assist in budget development. The data and forecasts in this publication are obtained from various state and federal agencies.

Budget Suggestions has been published annually since 1943 – first by our predecessor organization, the Bureau of Government Research, and since 1970 under the MRSC name as one of our signature publications.

Budget Suggestions focuses primarily on state shared revenue forecasts, economic indicators, state legislative impacts, and proposed initiatives that may impact your budget forecast and development for the forthcoming year and beyond.

The MRSC website is another great resource for budget-related information. Throughout *Budget Suggestions*, there are links to our budget webpages for further information, as well as specific budgeting tools that are only available on our website. One example is the [State Shared Revenue Estimator](#) which allows users to click on their entity's name and automatically populate their state shared revenue projections for the upcoming year.

As part of the pre-budget process, we recommend that agencies review and update their financial policies to ensure they are still relevant and meet their needs and objectives. MRSC's [Financial Policies Tool Kit](#) is a great resource with areas such as fund balance, reserves, debt management, and cost allocation, as well as sample policies.

MRSC also publishes the [City Revenue Guide](#) and [County Revenue Guide](#). These publications provide in-depth discussions of property taxes, sales taxes, excise taxes, and much more and can help jurisdictions better understand existing and potential revenue sources.

The MRSC website contains many additional budgeting resources including checklists, templates, and sample budget documents. All of MRSC's budgeting resources can be found at mrsc.org/budgeting.

Budget Suggestions is a team effort. Eric Lowell, Finance Consultant, is the primary author of this publication. Steve Hawley, Research and Communications Analyst, is the editor of the publication. Angela Mack, Brand and User Experience Designer, makes the publication look awesome. If you have any comments about this year's *Budget Suggestions* publication or our online budget resources, we would love to hear them. Please send your comments to Eric Lowell at elowell@mrsc.org.

Core Revenues

Property taxes and sales taxes are, for most cities and counties, the two largest revenue streams. Some cities also generate a significant amount of business & occupation (B&O) and utility tax revenues. While MRSC cannot forecast those revenues for you, we can point you toward resources to help you forecast these revenues within a reasonable margin of error.

Whatever your forecasting methodology, it is important to document the methodology and discuss it with your budget team.

For a detailed understanding of Washington's property tax, sales tax, B&O taxes, and other local revenue sources, download MRSC's [City Revenue Guide](#) and [County Revenue Guide](#).

PROPERTY TAXES

The Department of Revenue (DOR) has created a [property tax calendar for 2025](#) which explains the process, the various state and local entities responsible for its development, and when you may expect to receive important property tax forecasting information.

Your local county assessor plays a vital role in certifying the assessed valuations that will be used to set your levies for the upcoming year. Typically, the assessor will distribute property tax information during the second half of September each year. This information consists of assessed valuations, new construction valuations, and state utility valuations, as well as each jurisdiction's current levy amounts, levy rates, and maximum statutory levy rate. The county assessor will provide you with a [levy limit worksheet](#) (see "Miscellaneous Administrative" section) specific to your jurisdiction that will form the basis of your property tax projection, and the assessor's office can also help you determine whether you have banked capacity available.

To see property tax and assessed valuation trends for all city and county general fund levies going back 10 years, as well as county road fund levies, see MRSC's [Tax and Population Data](#) webpage. For older data or other levies such as EMS or conservation futures levies, refer to the [DOR Local Taxing District Levy Detail](#) webpage.

Cities and counties of 10,000 population or greater will also have to pay attention to the implicit price deflator, which will officially be calculated on September 25. For a sneak peak, see our [Implicit Price Deflator](#) section later in this publication.

SALES TAXES

Sales tax revenues fluctuate depending upon local economic activity. To assist with your sales tax projections, it will be important to monitor actual sales tax revenues being reported and remitted to your entity. Cities and counties can access sales tax reports via the [My DOR Partner Portal](#).

To see the last 10 years of annual sales tax distribution data for the "first half" and "second half" (general fund) sales taxes, see MRSC's [Tax and Population Data](#) webpage. Many jurisdictions have also imposed additional sales taxes that are restricted to certain purposes. Our webpage also includes a spreadsheet listing local sales tax rates and components, to help explain what portion of the local sales tax rate goes to which entity and what the money can be used for.

B&O AND UTILITY TAXES

When forecasting B&O and utility taxes, it is important to know whether utilities are increasing their rates or whether local businesses are expanding or contracting.

BALLOT MEASURE PLANNING

If your jurisdiction is considering a voted revenue increase in the next year or two, such as a levy lid lift, bond measure, or voted sales tax, you must plan ahead and keep the various statutory requirements and deadlines in mind (see [RCW 29A.04.321](#) for counties and [RCW 29A.04.330](#) for cities and towns). Below are the key statutory deadlines for upcoming elections; you may also refer to the Secretary of State's [Elections Calendar](#).

Key Dates for Voted Revenue Increases				
Election	Filing deadline	Election date	Approved sales tax changes take effect (RCW 82.14.055)	Approved property tax changes take effect (RCW 84.52.070)
2025 Primary	Already passed	August 5, 2025	January 1, 2026	2026
2025 General	August 5, 2025	November 4, 2025	April 1, 2026	2026
2026 Feb. Special	December 12, 2025	February 10, 2026	July 1, 2026	2027
2026 Apr. Special	February 27, 2026	April 28, 2026	January 1, 2027	2027
2026 Primary	May 1, 2026	August 4, 2026	January 1, 2027	2027
2026 General	August 4, 2026	November 3, 2026	April 1, 2027	2027

For more information on the ballot measure process – including election timing considerations, ballot titles, pro/con committees, validation (turnout) requirements, and more – see our webpage [Local Government Ballot Measures](#).

Economic Factors

There are several economic factors that, for many, are instinctively incorporated into the budget forecasting process, especially if using judgmental forecasting and/or historical trend analyses. In particular, economic conditions may have an impact on revenue projections, especially in jurisdictions that are heavily dependent upon retail sales tax.

Major components of economic modeling in the budget process include inflation, employment, population growth, and the prevalence or concentration of particular industries within the local jurisdiction.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The rate of growth of the U.S economy is expected to grow from 1.4% in real gross domestic product (GDP) in 2025 to 1.6% in 2026. Unemployment is expected to rise from 4.3% through the end of 2025 and continue to rise to 4.9% before decreasing in 2027 to 4.7%. There appears to be disagreement within the Federal Reserve over whether to lower its rates in 2025. Some policymakers feel inflation has cooled enough while others are concerned about tariffs driving up prices for consumers. Mortgage rates jumped to just above 7% in January 2025 but have since decreased to 6.77% by the end of June 2025. They are expected to stay somewhere within the 6% range through 2026.

STATE ECONOMY

MRSC recommends a couple of resources for economic data and forecasting for Washington State, including the [Washington State Economic and Revenue Forecast Council](#) (ERFC) and the [King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis](#). Both agencies produce several reports which include national data, but their focus is local.

ERFC in its [Economic Review](#) from July 9, 2025, states that Washington's unemployment rate is expected to be around 4.3% in 2025 and to increase up to 4.7% in 2027. Seattle-area home prices have grown 3% over the year, but the housing market outlook is predicted to remain weak with higher mortgage rates. The Seattle-area consumer price inflation is currently lower than the national average and is expected to decrease to around 2.0% in 2027.

Since most economic data and forecasts are focused on more populous areas of the state, more rural local governments will need to analyze their own housing, employment, and tax revenue sources in order to develop a more realistic economic forecast for their area.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

The Consumer Price Index (CPI) is generally the most widely used measure of inflation. The CPI can impact local budgets in multiple ways, including:

- Statewide minimum wage and overtime salary thresholds for the coming year (announced September 30 and taking effect January 1);
- Cost-of-living adjustments and collective bargaining agreements;
- Pension adjustments; and
- Automatic increases for certain fees or revenue sources such as certain multi-year levy lid lifts or, for some jurisdictions, impact fees.

For more information on the CPI – including differences between the CPI-U and CPI-W indexes and the various geographic regions – see our [Consumer Price Index](#) webpage. For current data, see the Bureau of Labor Statistics [Consumer Price Index Pacific Cities and U.S. City Average Data Tables](#).

We will release information on the new minimum wage rates and overtime salary thresholds in our e-newsletters after they are released on September 30.

IMPLICIT PRICE DEFLATOR

The IPD is published quarterly by the federal Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), with monthly revisions. Its primary importance to local governments in Washington is in setting property tax levies for the coming year.

Taxing districts with a population of 10,000 or more may increase their total annual levy amount by 1% or the percentage increase of the IPD, whichever is less ([RCW 84.55.005](#)). If the 12-month change in the IPD is less than 1% as of September 25, these taxing districts cannot take the full 1% levy increase unless they adopt an ordinance or resolution of “substantial need.” (Taxing districts with a population under 10,000 are not impacted.)

Current IPD data can be found in the BEA National Income and Product Accounts (NIPA), [Table 1.1.9](#) (see Line 2, Personal Consumption Expenditures).

It appears the IPD increase will be above 1% for 2025, which means cities and counties with a population of 10,000 or more should be able to increase next year’s levy amounts the full 1% without declaring a substantial need.

On July 30, BEA released the first estimate of the Q2 2025 data, showing a preliminary 2.41% increase over Q2 2024. The Q2 2025 numbers will be revised again on August 28 and September 25, but the revisions should be inconsequential.

When the official IPD figure is available on September 25, we will publish it on our [Implicit Price Deflator](#) webpage as well as in our e-newsletters.

Population Estimates

Population estimates are of particular importance to cities, towns, and counties, as they not only indicate whether the population is growing and how quickly, but they also form the basis for the distribution of many state shared revenues.

The Office of Financial Management (OFM) is responsible for determining populations of all cities, towns, and counties every year as of April 1. Those estimates are certified to the secretary of state on or before July 1 and distributed to the state agencies responsible for making allocations or payments to local governments. The updated distribution rates then take effect on January 1 of the following year.

According to OFM’s [April 1 population estimates](#), here is the state’s recent population change:

Year	Total Population	% Change	Incorporated Population	% Change	Unincorporated Population	% Change
2022	7,864,400	1.3%	5,156,008	1.6%	2,708,392	0.7%
2023	7,951,150	1.1%	5,222,265	1.3%	2,728,885	0.8%
2024	8,035,700	1.1%	5,288,492	1.3%	2,747,208	0.7%
2025	8,115,100	1.0%	5,350,840	1.2%	2,764,260	0.6%

You can view your jurisdiction’s current population and recent changes at the OFM website linked above. For a summary of where population growth has been occurring, including natural increase vs. migration and maps showing population growth by county, see the [OFM press release](#).

In addition, OFM makes quarterly adjustments for any new annexations (see OFM’s [Central Annexation Tracking System](#)). Cities that annex qualify for state shared revenue distributions on their new population base starting the first day of the quarter after the effective date of the OFM-approved annexation. Distributions for other cities, towns, and counties may be adjusted slightly each quarter as a result, but the overall impact on per capita distribution rates should be minimal.

Legislation That May Affect Your Budget

REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX (REET) FLEXIBILITY – HB 1791

Effective July 27, 2025, [HB 1791](#) gives cities and counties greater flexibility in use of REET revenues. Local governments are now allowed to use REET 1 revenues for REET 2-eligible projects and vice versa. Additionally, cities and counties are no longer required to have a population under 5,000 in order to use REET for the purposes listed in [RCW 35.43.040](#). Also, cities and counties no longer must prepare and adopt the annual report for REET required under [chapter 82.46 RCW](#).

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS SALES & USE TAX – HB 2015

Effective July 27, 2025, [HB 2015](#) authorizes qualified cities and counties to impose by resolution or ordinance a 0.1% sales and use tax for various local law enforcement programs.

A city or county must meet certain requirements which include adopting specific law enforcement policies and practices. If a city or county does not impose the local law enforcement programs sales and use tax by June 30, 2028, the city or county must get approval by a majority of voters at the ballot. Revenues must be used on activities that “substantially assist the criminal justice system.” Unlike other sales and use taxes, this sales and use tax is stackable, meaning both the city and the county can impose the tax with no sharing requirements.

A city or county where the voters have repealed the criminal justice sales tax under [RCW 82.14.340](#) or rejected a ballot proposition to impose the public safety sales tax under [RCW 82.14.450](#) within the previous twelve months may not impose the local law enforcement programs sales tax.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX (MVFT) REVENUES – SB 5801

Effective July 1, 2025, [SB 5801](#) increased fuel taxes by \$0.06 per gallon and special fuel taxes by \$0.03 per gallon. Beginning July 1, 2026, fuel taxes are increased by 2%. July 1, 2027, the special fuel tax is increased by an additional \$0.03 per gallon and beginning July 1, 2028, the increase will be 2% annually. Of these increases, 2.5% will be distributed to incorporated cities and towns, and 2.5% will be distributed to counties on a per capita basis. ERFC was able to update its MFVT forecast for 2025, 2026, and 2027 and include these new revenues to cities, towns, and counties.

NEW SERVICES SUBJECT TO RETAIL SALES AND USE TAX – SB 5814

Effective October 1, 2025, [SB 5814](#) will extend the retail sales and use tax to several types of services that were not subject to the tax previously. Notable services include those related to IT, web design, security, temporary staffing, advertising, and live presentations. While this change might not have a big impact on many local government budgets, local governments should be aware of this change.

INITIATIVES ON THE BALLOT

There will be no initiatives on the ballot this year.

City and Town Budgets

2026 BUDGET CALENDAR – CITIES AND TOWNS

The annual budget preparation procedures and deadlines for cities are found in [chapter 35A.33 RCW](#) (code cities) and [chapter 35.33 RCW](#) (all other cities and towns except Seattle) and outlined below. For cities that budget on a biennial basis, the current biennium is 2025-2026.

Most of the pre-budget items listed below are recommendations only and are not required by statute. The rest of the items are based on statutory deadlines; cities and towns can take these steps earlier than listed or adopt different deadlines for some of these steps by ordinance or charter. Budgeting frequently requires more time than anticipated, so we encourage cities and towns to start the budget process early to allow sufficient time for budget retreats, strategic planning sessions, internal meetings, and public hearings.

For examples of budget preparation calendars adopted by cities and towns, see our webpage [City and Town Budget Calendars](#). For a detailed explanation of the budget requirements, as well as some helpful practice tips, see our webpage [City and Town Budget Procedures](#).

March— August	<p>Pre-Budget Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council retreat. Update and/or adopt financial policies. Public hearings for capital facility plan updates. Public forums or community outreach (ex: community priorities). Mayor/Manager communicates budget objectives to staff.
September	<p>Sept 8 Budget request to all department heads.</p> <p>Sept 8–22 Department heads prepare estimates of revenues and expenditures. Clerk prepares estimates for debt service and all other estimates.</p> <p>Sept 22 Budget estimates from department heads filed with clerk.</p> <p>Sept 25 Implicit price deflator calculated (cities of 10,000+ population only)</p>
October	<p>Oct 1 Clerk provides estimates filed by department heads to Mayor/Manager showing complete financial program.</p> <p>Oct 6 Mayor/Manager provides Council with estimates of revenues from all sources including estimates prepared by clerk for consideration of setting property tax levy.</p> <p>Mid-October to Mid-November (suggested) Required public hearing on revenue sources including possible increases in property tax.</p>
November	<p>Nov 2 Mayor/Manager prepares preliminary budget and budget message. Files with clerk and council.</p> <p>Nov 1–18 Publication notice of preliminary budget and final hearing.</p> <p>Nov 1–25 Public hearing(s) on preliminary budget. Public hearing on revenue sources for levy setting.</p> <p>Nov 21 Copies of budget available to public</p> <p>Nov 30 Property tax levies set by ordinance and filed with the county</p>
December	<p>Dec 1 Final budget hearing.</p> <p>Dec 31 Budget adoption deadline.</p>

BUDGET HEARINGS – CITIES AND TOWNS

By MRSC’s analysis, each city or town must hold at least three public hearings during the budget preparation process. The minimum statutory requirements are addressed below, but please note that some cities may have adopted additional public hearing requirements by policy.

Public Hearing #1: Property Taxes/Revenue Sources. See [RCW 84.55.120](#). The legislative body must hold a public hearing on revenue sources for the coming year’s budget, including consideration of possible increases in property tax revenues, prior to the property tax certification deadline, which is November 30. After the hearing, a city/town may choose to pass an ordinance at the same meeting establishing the property tax levy in terms of total dollars and percent increase from the previous year. This ordinance may cover a period up to two years, but in practice most jurisdictions – even biennial budget jurisdictions – hold a revenue hearing every year.

Because of the importance of revenue forecasting as a precursor to presenting a structurally balanced budget, we suggest that the property tax hearing precede the preliminary budget hearing (see below). This would place the property tax hearing sometime between mid-October and mid-November.

Notices must be placed in the official newspaper of the city/town prior to the public hearing. While the statute does not specifically address the length of time prior to the hearing that notice must be given, it is our recommendation that notice be provided no later than one week prior to the public hearing to ensure that the statutory intent and underlying purpose of notice is reasonably fulfilled.

Public Hearing #2: Preliminary Budget Hearing. See [RCW 35.33.057/RCW 35A.33.055](#) (annual budgets) and [RCW 35.34.090/RCW 35A.34.090](#) (biennial budgets).

The legislative body, or a committee thereof, must schedule preliminary “hearings on the budget or parts thereof” *prior* to the final budget hearing, which must be on or before the first Monday in December, and may require the presence of department heads to give information regarding estimates and programs. Public notice is required, but beyond the requirement to publish in the official newspaper of the city/town there are no additional publication requirements stated in statute. However, as with the property tax hearing, we recommend a minimum of one week’s publication notice.

Since the statutory language references “hearings” as plural, it has long been MRSC’s opinion that more than one preliminary budget hearing is required. However, since the statute also states that the hearings may be “on the budget or parts thereof,” we also conclude that cities and towns may count the property tax/revenue hearing outlined above as one of the required preliminary hearings. This means cities and towns must hold at least one preliminary budget hearing in addition to the property tax/revenue hearing.

Public Hearing #3: Final Budget Hearing. See [RCW 35.33.071/RCW 35A.33.070](#) (annual budgets) and [RCW 35.34.110/RCW 35A.34.110](#) (biennial budgets). The final budget hearing must begin on or before the first Monday in December (December 1 this year) and may continue from day-to-day beyond the first Monday but it must conclude no later than December 7 (the 25th day prior to the next fiscal year).

Notice of the final budget hearing must be published once a week for two consecutive weeks in the official newspaper. See [RCW 35.33.061/RCW 35A.33.060](#) (annual budgets) and [RCW 35.34.100/RCW 35A.34.100](#) (biennial budgets). The timing of this notice can be challenging for those cities and towns that have an official newspaper with less than a daily release schedule, so careful planning is required.

STATE SHARED REVENUES – CITIES AND TOWNS

The State of Washington distributes a number of “state shared revenues” to cities and towns. Some of these revenues are distributed to all cities and towns on a population (per capita) basis, while others are based on different factors and/or are only distributed to jurisdictions that meet certain criteria.

Forecasting state shared revenues can be somewhat tricky. First of all, the state fiscal year begins July 1 and ends June 30, while all cities and towns in Washington use a calendar year budget (January 1 to December 31).

Secondly, the state legislature can change distributions during any legislative session. When creating long-range forecasts, remember that these resources are potentially vulnerable, and carefully monitor legislative session updates provided by the Association of Washington Cities (AWC). Legislation can and often does impact shared revenue distributions halfway through the local government budget year.

And finally, some of the revenue distributions can vary significantly from year to year based on certain formulas, economic activity, and other factors.

We have provided our best estimates of the state shared revenue distributions for 2026 and 2027 based on the 2025-2027 state biennial budget (July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2027) and state economic and revenue forecasts. For those distributions that are done on a strictly per capita basis, we have provided per capita estimates (see the [Per Capita Shared Revenue Tables and Distribution Calendar](#) near the end of this publication). You can also view the total estimated per capita distributions, tailored to your specific jurisdiction, in our online [State Shared Revenue Estimator](#).

Cannabis (Marijuana) Excise Tax

The state’s cannabis taxation collections and distribution are codified in [RCW 69.50.530-.540](#). A portion of the revenues are shared with cities and counties under [RCW 69.30.540](#).

The state distributes a portion of the cannabis excise taxes to the Liquor and Cannabis Board (LCB) and various state agencies and programs on a quarterly basis. Local governments then receive 5% of the remaining revenues after deductions. The local government revenues are divided as follows:

- **Retail share:** 30% (1.5% of the total distribution after deductions) goes to cities and counties where retailers are physically located. This amount is prorated based on the share of total revenues generated and taxes collected.
- **Per capita share:** 70% (3.5% of the total distribution after deductions) goes to cities and counties that do not prohibit cannabis siting. This amount is distributed on a per capita basis. Cities receive 40% of this revenue while counties receive the remaining 60%.

Payments are distributed four times per year on the last day of each fiscal quarter (September 30, December 31, March 31, and June 30). The State Treasurer’s Office distributes both the “per capita” and “retail” shares together using the same BARS code.

The forecast information on the next page is based on the June 2025 ERFC economic and revenue forecast (see [Table 3.18](#)) and can help project future receipts after that point.

Due to the various factors that can impact the allocation of the shares of the cannabis excise tax (changes in cities and counties that prohibit cannabis businesses, number and location of retailers, etc.) MRSC cannot forecast what individual jurisdictions can expect to receive. We recommend factoring these percentage increases into the calculations you make for your jurisdiction using your historical data and accounting for any changes in cannabis retail sales within your jurisdiction’s boundaries.

Estimated Cannabis Excise Tax Distributions to CITIES AND COUNTIES COMBINED*		
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 21,865,271	-2.4%
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 21,039,500	-3.8%
2026 Estimate	\$ 20,521,000	-2.5%
2027 Estimate	\$ 21,060,500	2.6%

*Includes both “retail” and “per capita” shares.

City Assistance Distributions

The State of Washington imposes a real estate excise tax (REET) on each sale of real property ([RCW 82.45.060](#)), in addition to any local taxes.

1.4% of the state REET is deposited into the city-county assistance account ([RCW 43.08.290](#)) to provide assistance for certain cities and counties that meet the statutory qualifications (see the formulas in the table below). Half of these funds are distributed to cities and the other half to counties.

These funds were originally intended to mitigate the loss of the motor vehicle excise tax (MVET) that was distributed to local governments as a means of equalization of sales tax. The formula used to allocate city funding is based on a sales and property tax equalization formula and the 2005 MVET backfill levels. The maximum distribution for any eligible city was originally capped at \$100,000, to be increased each year by the increase in the July implicit price deflator (IPD) for personal consumption expenditures. The 2025 cap for cities is \$146,857.

The Department of Revenue (DOR) must “certify” the amounts to be distributed – that is, how much money each county and each eligible city *should* receive according to the formula – each year.

When the real estate market is very active, there are frequently enough state REET revenues for cities to receive most or all of their certified amounts according to the formulas on the next page. Any excess city assistance revenues are then distributed proportionately on the basis of population among those cities and towns that have qualified for city-county assistance and impose the full “second half-cent” of the sales and use tax under [RCW 82.14.030\(2\)](#).

However, when the market is less active there will not be enough REET revenues for cities to receive their full certified amounts, in which case the distributions will be reduced proportionately.

City Assistance Distributions

City/Town Population	Distribution Formula
<p>5,000 or less</p> <p><i>Only eligible if per capita assessed value is less than 2x the statewide average for all cities</i></p>	<p>Greater of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55% sales tax equalization on “first half” local sales tax; • 55% property tax equalization based on per capita assessed values (per \$1,000 AV); or • 2005 MVET backfill. <p><i>Not to exceed \$146,857 (in 2025)</i></p>
<p>Greater than 5,000</p> <p><i>Only eligible if per capita assessed value is less than the statewide average for all cities</i></p>	<p>Greater of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% sales tax equalization on “first half” local sales tax; or • 55% property tax equalization based on per capita assessed values (per \$1,000 AV) <p><i>Not to exceed \$146,857 (in 2025)</i></p>

Any city that incorporates after August 1, 2005 is not eligible for funding.

Information on the City-County Assistance distributions can be found on the Department of Revenue (DOR) [City-County Assistance webpage](#). To see your city’s 2025 certified amounts, click on “2025 City and County Distributions.” These spreadsheets show the amounts for which each city and county was certified in 2024. For budgeting purposes, it is important to note that “January 1” distributions are actually made in December of the preceding year.

The preliminary estimates for City-County Assistance distributions in 2026 will be available in September. They will be posted on the DOR City-County Assistance webpage under [“2026 City and County Distribution Estimates.”](#)

City-County Assistance Distribution Certification and Payment Dates

		Statutory Date for Distribution	Actual Payment Date <i>last business day of month</i>	Certification Date
2025 Budget	1st Quarter	April 1, 2025	March 2025	October 1, 2024
	2nd Quarter	July 1, 2025	June 2025	October 1, 2024
	3rd Quarter	October 1, 2025	September 2025	October 1, 2024
	4th Quarter	January 1, 2026	December 2025	October 1, 2025
2026 Budget	1st Quarter	April 1, 2026	March 2026	October 1, 2025
	2nd Quarter	July 1, 2026	June 2026	October 1, 2025
	3rd Quarter	October 1, 2026	September 2026	October 1, 2025
	4th Quarter	January 1, 2027	December 2026	October 1, 2026

Estimated City-County Assistance Fund Distributions to CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution	Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 9,673,312	19.3%
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 10,750,848	11.1%
2026 Estimate	\$ 10,099,418	-6.1%
2027 Estimate	\$ 12,131,768	20.1%

Editor’s Note: The real estate excise tax revenues and forecasts are the work of Eric Swenson of the Washington State Economic and Revenue Forecast Council (ERFC).

Criminal Justice Revenues

There are two separate criminal justice distributions for cities, created by [RCW 82.14.320](#) and [82.14.330](#). Each program originally (in state fiscal year 2000) appropriated a total of \$4.6 million, to be increased each July by the “[fiscal growth factor](#).”

The distribution in [RCW 82.14.320](#) is reserved for cities with high crime rates, while the distribution in [RCW 82.14.330](#) is subdivided into four different programs:

- Population (16%)
- Special Programs (54%)
- Contracted Services (10%)
- Violent Crime (20%)

Below is a summary of all these distribution programs, after state budgetary deductions for the state patrol.

High Crime

Criminal justice revenues created by [RCW 82.14.320](#) – the “Criminal Justice – High Crime” distributions – are distributed to cities and towns with a crime rate over 125% of the annual statewide average that also meet certain other statutory criteria. The cities that may qualify for these funds know who they are and are aware of the challenges they have in forecasting these revenues.

Estimated Criminal Justice High Crime Distributions – CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 12,926,377	6.0%
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 13,724,205	6.2%
2026 Estimate	\$ 14,632,946	6.6%
2027 Estimate	\$ 15,599,845	6.6%

Population

“Criminal Justice – Population” revenues are distributed to all cities and towns on a per capita basis, with each city receiving a minimum of \$1,000 per calendar year no matter how small its population.

Estimated Criminal Justice Population Distributions – CITIES			
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 2,068,220	6.0%	\$ 0.38*
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 2,195,873	6.2%	\$ 0.40*
2026 Estimate	\$ 2,341,271	6.6%	\$ 0.42*
2027 Estimate	\$ 2,495,975	6.6%	\$ 0.45*

*Minimum distribution of \$1,000 per calendar year regardless of population.

Special Programs

“Criminal Justice – Special Programs” revenues are distributed to all cities and towns on a strictly per capita basis to be used for innovative law enforcement strategies, programs to help at-risk children or child abuse victims, and programs to reduce the level of domestic violence or to provide counseling for domestic violence victims. While these funds must be spent in these specific areas, there is no requirement for how much must be spent in each area. The city’s entire distribution could be spent in only one of these areas if the city wishes.

Estimated Criminal Justice Special Programs Distributions – CITIES			
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 6,980,244	6.0%	\$ 1.34
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 7,411,071	6.2%	\$ 1.40
2026 Estimate	\$ 7,901,791	6.6%	\$ 1.48
2027 Estimate	\$ 8,423,916	6.6%	\$ 1.57

Contracted Services

“Criminal Justice – Contracted Services” revenues are distributed to cities that contract with another governmental agency for the majority of their law enforcement services. Cities that qualify for this distribution must notify the Department of Commerce November 30, 2025, to receive 2026 distributions. Cities are responsible for notifying Commerce of any changes regarding these contractual relationships. However, any cities that are added to or removed from this list will only impact distributions for the next calendar year, and no adjustments will be made retroactively.

Estimated Criminal Justice Contracted Services Distributions – CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 1,292,638	6.0%
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 1,372,420	6.2%
2026 Estimate	\$ 1,463,295	6.6%
2027 Estimate	\$ 1,559,985	6.6%

Violent Crime

“Criminal Justice – Violent Crime” revenues are distributed to cities with a three-year average violent crime rate (per 1,000 population) above 150% of the three-year statewide average. No city may receive more than \$1.00 per capita.

Estimated Criminal Justice Violent Crimes Distributions – CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 2,585,275	6.0%
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 2,744,841	6.2%
2026 Estimate	\$ 2,926,589	6.6%
2027 Estimate	\$ 3,119,969	6.6%

Fire Insurance Premium Tax

[RCW 41.16.050](#) requires each municipality having a regularly organized full-time fire department with paid firefighters to establish a firefighters’ pension fund. This fund is to consist of all bequests, gifts, or donations given or paid to the municipality for the firefighters’ pension fund; a proportional share of the state tax on fire insurance premiums; property taxes collected under the provisions of [RCW 41.16.060](#); interest on the investments of the fund; and any contributions made by firefighters themselves.

The state collects a 2% tax on the premiums of all insurance policies written. Of the tax collected on fire policies and the fire component of homeowner’s and commercial multi-peril policies, 25% is distributed to cities and fire districts that have firefighters’ pension funds.

The moneys received from the tax on fire insurance premiums under [RCW 41.16.050](#) are distributed to those cities and fire districts with a pre-LEOFF firefighters’ pension fund based on their proportionate number of paid firefighters – a calculation known as the “ratio value.” Each year, on or before January 15, cities and fire districts must certify to the State Treasurer their number of paid firefighters. The Office of Insurance Commissioner (OIC) must certify the fire insurance premiums collected between April 1 and March 31 and remit the funds to the State Treasurer’s office by May 15th. These moneys are then distributed to the reporting jurisdictions by the end of May each year based upon the calculated ratio value of insurance premiums/firefighters.

Below are our estimates for fire insurance premium distributions based on projections from the Washington State Office of the Insurance Commissioner. The actual figures for 2026 will be calculated next year based on the number of paid firefighters reported, fire insurance loss experience, and premiums paid.

Estimated Fire Insurance Premium Tax Distributions – CITIES				
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	Number of Paid Firefighters	Ratio Value per Paid Firefighter	% Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 7,303,421	5,072	\$ 1,440	9.2%
2025 Actual	\$ 8,467,309	5,174	\$ 1,637	15.9%
2026 Estimate	\$ 8,975,348	5,174	\$ 1,735	6.0%
2027 Estimate	\$ 9,513,869	5,174	\$ 1,839	6.0%

Liquor Revenues

Liquor revenues have two separate distributions that are received at different times. There is a state shared distribution from the liquor revolving account for licensing fees (this is referred to by the state and others as “liquor profits”), and there is a distribution from the liquor excise tax account that represents a portion of the excise tax collected on liquor sales. The total distribution from liquor profits is the same each year, while the total distribution for liquor excise taxes varies depending on actual liquor sales.

Liquor Excise Taxes

The formula works as follows:

1. 35% of liquor excise tax collected is deposited in the “liquor excise tax fund” for distribution to cities, towns, and counties ([RCW 82.08.160\(1\)](#)).
2. \$2.5 million each quarter (\$10 million a year) is deducted from the liquor excise tax fund and remitted to the state general fund ([RCW 82.08.170\(3\)](#)).
3. Of the remaining amount, 80% is distributed to cities (based on population) and 20% is distributed to counties (based on unincorporated population).

Below are projections based on the June 2025 ERFC report. It’s important to note that the distributions to cities and counties occur with a lag of one quarter after the collections are made by the state. This difference in timing makes state estimates and our estimates hard to compare. When comparing distributions by the state treasurer’s office to the ERFC forecasts there is usually a variation of plus or minus 2%.

Editor’s Note: The liquor excise tax forecasts are the work of Lance Carey of the Washington State Economic and Revenue Forecast Council (ERFC).

Estimated Liquor Excise Tax Distributions – CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 36,060,479	-3.1%	\$ 6.91
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 36,398,987	0.9%	\$ 6.88
2026 Estimate	\$ 37,405,928	2.8%	\$ 6.99
2027 Estimate	\$ 38,194,593	2.1%	\$ 7.10

Liquor Profits

Initiative 1183 in 2011 privatized liquor sales in Washington and changed the types of liquor revenues collected by the state. The state now collects revenue in the form of license fees from distributors and retailers, rather than profits from the state-run liquor stores. However, the Liquor and Cannabis Board (LCB) continues to call these funds “liquor profits.” A portion of these collections go to cities, counties, and border jurisdictions. Codified as [RCW 66.24.065](#), it reads:

The distribution of spirits license fees under [RCW 66.24.630](#) and [66.24.055](#) through the liquor revolving fund to border areas, counties, cities, towns, and [MRSC] must be made in a manner that provides that each category of recipients receive, in the aggregate, no less than it received from the liquor revolving fund during comparable periods prior to December 8, 2011. An additional distribution of ten million dollars per year from the spirits license fees must be provided to border areas, counties, cities, and towns through the liquor revolving fund for the purpose of enhancing public safety programs.

The “comparable periods prior to December 8, 2011” were determined by the Office of Financial Management (OFM) to be December 2010, March 2011, July 2011, and September 2011. The liquor profit revenue for cities, counties, and border areas for those four quarters was \$39,438,000. To this amount, LCB adds the \$10 million to enhance public safety programs for a total liquor profits distribution of \$49,438,000 each year. Of that amount, 0.3%, which equals \$148,314, is distributed to border cities and counties based on traffic totals, crime statistics, and per capita law enforcement spending. The remaining \$49,289,686 is distributed as follows:

- Cities receive 80%, or \$39,431,749 annually, distributed proportionately by population.
- Counties receive 20%, or \$9,857,937 annually, distributed proportionately by unincorporated population.

As noted in the statute, \$10 million of the \$49,438,000 – just under 20.23% – must be spent on “enhancing public safety programs.” We recommend that each city or town split its distribution so that it can account separately for the portion that must be spent on public safety. In addition, at least 2% of your distribution must be used for a licensed or certified alcohol or drug addiction program under [RCW 71.24.555](#).

When forecasting liquor profits beyond next year’s budget it’s important to note that the total city and town distributions will remain the same from year to year unless the legislature amends the statute. The initiative did not include any measures to account for inflation. The per capita ratio values will vary slightly each year due to population changes.

Estimated Liquor Profits Distributions – CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution*	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 39,431,749	—	\$ 7.46
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 39,431,749	—	\$ 7.37
2026 Estimate	\$ 39,431,749	—	\$ 7.33
2027 Estimate	\$ 39,431,749	—	\$ 7.30

*Plus additional distribution for border areas.

Transportation Distributions

All cities and towns receive three separate transportation distributions. The first is the motor vehicle fuel tax (MVFT), which is distributed as a percentage of the total fuel taxes collected statewide. The other two, the “increased motor vehicle fuel tax” and “multi-modal” distributions, were created in 2015 and consist of direct transfers from the state transportation fund, so those allocations are not impacted by actual fuel tax collections.

MVFT and increased MVFT distributions must be used for highway purposes, while the multi-modal funds may be used for any transportation purpose.

Reminder: [RCW 47.30.050](#) requires cities and towns to spend at least 0.42% of their MVFT funds each year on pedestrian, equestrian, or bicycle trails, unless 0.42% would amount to \$500 or less. In other words, this requirement applies to any city that receives approximately \$119,047 or more in MVFT revenue per year. Cities and towns also have the option to place these dedicated funds in a capital reserve or special revenue fund to accumulate the resources, so long as the funds are used for paths or trails within a 10-year time frame.

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax

Cities and towns receive MVFT distributions on a per capita basis under [RCW 46.68.090](#)(2)(g), (4)(a), and (5)(a), less state adjustments found in [RCW 46.68.110](#)(1) and (2) and the Small City Pavement and Sidewalk account.

Fuel taxes in Washington are assessed as cents per gallon, so motor vehicle fuel tax (MVFT) revenues – and therefore the MVFT distributions to cities and counties – depend on the number of gallons sold, not the dollar value of the sales.

The revised estimate for 2025 and the estimates for 2026 and 2027 all include the new 2.5% distribution of the fuel tax increase related to SB 5801. It is important to note that unexpected events that disrupt the transportation system can significantly reduce gas tax collections, as they have in the past with major snowstorms and the COVID-19 pandemic.

Estimated Gas Tax (MVFT) Distributions – CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 86,561,221	-3.4%	\$16.58
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 85,802,338	-0.9%	\$16.22
2026 Estimate	\$ 92,171,943	7.4%	\$17.23
2027 Estimate	\$ 92,850,826	0.7%	\$17.27

Increased Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax and Multi-Modal Funds

In addition to the monthly gas tax distributions, cities and towns receive a share of the multi-modal funds and the 2015 increase in fuel tax ([RCW 46.68.126](#)). This legislation provides a flat amount of over \$25 million annually to counties, cities, and towns, allocated as follows:

- Increased MVFT: \$11,719,000 per year
- Multi-modal funds: \$13,393,000 per year

These revenues are split equally between cities and counties and are not impacted by actual fuel sales. The total distribution amounts remain the same every year unless the legislature were to change them. City distributions are based on population; the per capita ratios will vary slightly each year due to population changes.

Estimated Increased MVFT Distributions – CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 5,859,500	—	\$1.12
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 5,859,500	—	\$1.11
2026 Estimate	\$ 5,859,500	—	\$1.10
2027 Estimate	\$ 5,859,500	—	\$1.09

Estimated Multi-Modal Distributions – CITIES

Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 6,696,599	—	\$1.28
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 6,696,599	—	\$1.27
2026 Estimate	\$ 6,696,599	—	\$1.25
2027 Estimate	\$ 6,696,599	—	\$1.25

County Budgets

2026 BUDGET CALENDAR – COUNTIES

The budget preparation procedures and deadlines for counties are found in [chapter 36.40 RCW](#) and outlined below. The initial procedures and requirements are the same for both annual and biennial budgets, with biennial jurisdictions required to conduct a mid-biennium review and adjustment the following year. (For more information, see our page on [Biennial Budgeting](#).)

Most of the pre-budget items listed below are recommendations only and are not required by statute. The rest of the items are statutory deadlines; the board of commissioners may alter the dates for some of these budget processes to conform to the optional alternative preliminary budget hearing date in December ([RCW 36.40.071](#)). Many counties have adopted alternative dates. Budgeting frequently requires more time than anticipated, so we encourage counties to start the budget process early to allow sufficient time for budget retreats, strategic planning sessions, internal meetings, and public hearings.

For examples of budget preparation calendars adopted by counties, see our webpage [County Budget Calendars](#). For a detailed explanation of the budget requirements, as well as some helpful practice tips, see our webpage [County Budget Procedures](#).

March— June	<p>Pre-Budget Items</p> <p>Strategic planning sessions to develop goals and priorities.</p> <p>Update and/or adopt financial policies.</p> <p>Public hearings for capital facility plan updates for GMA planning counties.</p> <p>Capital improvement plan updates for partially planning GMA counties.</p> <p>Communicate budget objectives to county departments and elected offices.</p>
July	<p>July 7* County auditor or chief financial officer (CFO) notifies all officials of the request for budget.</p>
August	<p>Before Aug 11* Auditor or CFO prepares estimates for debt service and all other estimates not called for in the notification to officials.</p> <p>Aug 11* Budget estimates from all officials filed with auditor or CFO.</p>
September	<p>Sept 2* Preliminary county budget prepared by auditor or CFO is submitted to the commissioners.</p> <p>Sept 22* Notice of public hearing on budget and tax levies. Copies of budget available to the public.</p> <p>Sept 25 Implicit price deflator calculated (counties of 10,000+ population only).</p>
October	<p>Oct 6* Final budget hearing by board of commissioners.</p>
December	<p>Dec 1 Alternate final budget hearing on preliminary budget; deadline to certify to assessor next year’s property taxes levied on behalf of other taxing districts (such as fire districts).</p> <p>Dec 15 Deadline to certify to assessor next year’s property tax levies for county purposes.</p> <p>Dec 31 Budget adoption deadline.</p>

* Dates may be altered if county is using alternate budget calendar

BUDGET HEARINGS – COUNTIES

By MRSC’s analysis, each county must hold at least two public hearings during the budget process. The minimum statutory requirements are addressed below, but please note that some counties may have adopted additional public hearing requirements by policy.

Public Hearing #1: Property Taxes/Revenue Sources. See [RCW 84.55.120](#). The legislative body must hold a public hearing on revenue sources for the coming year’s budget, including consideration of possible increases in property tax revenues, prior to the property tax certification deadline, which is now December 15, and prior to the final budget hearing.

Notice is required in the county’s official newspaper. While the statute does not specifically address the length of time prior to the hearing that notice must be given, it is our recommendation that notice be provided no later than one week prior to the public hearing to ensure that the statutory intent and underlying purpose of the notice is reasonably fulfilled.

After the hearing, a county may choose to pass an ordinance at the same meeting establishing the property tax levy in terms of total dollars and percent increase from the previous year. This ordinance may cover a period up to two years, but in practice most jurisdictions – even biennial budget jurisdictions – hold a revenue hearing every year.

Public Hearing #2: Final Budget Hearing. See [RCW 36.40.070/RCW 36.40.071](#). The legislative body must meet on the first Monday in October, or alternatively the first Monday in December if using the alternate budget dates, for the budget hearing. Officials in charge of county offices, departments, services, and institutions must appear at the hearing and may, at the appropriate time, be questioned concerning their budget estimates by the commissioners or any taxpayer.

The hearing may be continued from day-to-day but may not exceed a total of five days. Upon conclusion of the hearing, the legislative body must fix and determine each budget item separately and must adopt the budget by resolution.

Notice of the final budget hearing must be published once a week for two consecutive weeks, immediately following adoption of the preliminary budget, in the county’s official newspaper ([RCW 36.40.060](#)). The timing of this notice can be challenging for those counties that have an official newspaper with less than a daily release schedule, so careful planning is required.

Mid-Biennium Adjustments

[RCW 36.40.250](#) provides counties with the authority to adopt a biennial budget and states that there must be a “mid-biennium review and modification for the second year of the biennium.” However, the statute goes on to state that “[t]he state auditor shall establish requirements for preparing and adopting the mid-biennium review and modification for the second year of the biennium.”

The State Auditor’s Office provides limited guidance through its BARS manuals for the budget process and there are no additional requirements or guidance for the mid-biennium review. MRSC recommends that those counties with a biennial budget follow the same requirements as outlined earlier for cities.

STATE SHARED REVENUES – COUNTIES

The State of Washington distributes a number of “state shared revenues” to counties. Some of these revenues are distributed to all counties on a population (per capita) basis, while others are based on different factors and/or are only distributed to jurisdictions that meet certain criteria.

Forecasting state shared revenues can be somewhat tricky. First of all, the state fiscal year begins July 1 and ends June 30, while all counties in Washington use a calendar year budget (January 1 to December 31).

Secondly, the state legislature can change distributions during any legislative session. When creating long-range forecasts, remember that these resources are potentially vulnerable, and carefully monitor legislative session updates provided by the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC). Legislation can and often does impact shared revenue distributions halfway through the local government budget year.

And finally, some of the revenue distributions can vary significantly from year to year based on certain formulas, economic activity, and other factors.

We have provided our best estimates of the state shared revenue distributions for 2026 and 2027 based on the 2025-2027 state biennial budget (July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2027) and state economic and revenue forecasts. For those distributions that are done on a strictly per capita basis, we have provided per capita estimates (see the [Per Capita Shared Revenue Tables and Distribution Calendar](#) near the end of this publication). You can also view the total estimated per capita distributions, tailored to your specific jurisdiction, in our online [State Shared Revenue Estimator](#).

Cannabis (Marijuana) Excise Tax

The state’s cannabis taxation collections and distribution are codified in [RCW 69.50.530-.540](#). A portion of the revenues are shared with cities and counties under [RCW 69.30.540](#).

The state distributes a portion of the cannabis excise taxes to the Liquor and Cannabis Board (LCB) and various state agencies and programs on a quarterly basis. Local governments then receive 5% of the remaining revenues after deductions. The local government revenues are divided as follows:

- **Retail share:** 30% (1.5% of the total distribution after deductions) goes to cities and counties where retailers are physically located. This amount is prorated based on the share of total revenues generated and taxes collected.
- **Per capita share:** 70% (3.5% of the total distribution after deductions) goes to cities and counties that do not prohibit cannabis siting. This amount is distributed on a per capita basis. Cities receive 40% of this revenue while counties receive the remaining 60%.

Payments are distributed four times per year on the last day of each fiscal quarter (September 30, December 31, March 31, and June 30). The State Treasurer’s Office distributes both the “per capita” and “retail” shares together using the same BARS code.

The forecast information on the next page is based on the June 2025 ERFC economic and revenue forecast (see [Table 3.18](#)) and can help project future receipts after that point.

Due to the various factors that can impact the allocation of the shares of the cannabis excise tax (changes in cities and counties that prohibit cannabis businesses, number and location of retailers, etc.) MRSC cannot forecast

what individual jurisdictions can expect to receive. We recommend factoring these percentage increases into the calculations you make for your jurisdiction using your historical data and accounting for any changes in cannabis retail sales within your jurisdiction’s boundaries.

Estimated Cannabis Excise Tax Distributions to CITIES AND COUNTIES COMBINED*		
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 21,865,271	-2.4%
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 21,039,500	-3.8%
2026 Estimate	\$ 20,521,000	-2.5%
2027 Estimate	\$ 21,060,500	2.6%

*Includes both “retail” and “per capita” shares..

County Assistance Distributions

The State of Washington imposes a real estate excise tax (REET) on each sale of real property ([RCW 82.45.060](#)), in addition to any local taxes.

1.4% of the state REET is deposited into the city-county assistance account ([RCW 43.08.290](#)) to provide assistance for counties and certain cities. Half of these funds are distributed to cities and the other half to counties.

These funds were originally intended to mitigate the loss of the motor vehicle excise tax (MVET) that was distributed to local governments as a means of equalization of sales tax. All counties receive these funds, but the formulas are complicated and depend upon population, assessed value, sales tax receipts, and the 2005 MVET backfill. The sales tax equalization threshold for counties was originally set at \$250,000, to be increased each year by the increase in the July implicit price deflator (IPD) for personal consumption expenditures. The 2025 sales tax equalization threshold for counties is \$354,000.

The Department of Revenue (DOR) must “certify” the amounts to be distributed – that is, how much money each county *should* receive according to the formula – each year.

There are frequently enough state REET revenues for counties to receive their full certified amounts according to the formulas on the next page. Any excess county assistance revenues are then distributed proportionately on the basis of unincorporated population among those counties that impose the full “second half-cent” of the sales and use tax under [RCW 82.14.030\(2\)](#).

However, during a market downturn there may be years when there are not enough REET revenues for counties to receive their full certified amounts, in which case the distributions will be reduced proportionately.

County Assistance Distributions

Unincorporated Population	Distribution Formula
Greater than 100,000	Sales tax equalization up to the greater of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$354,000 (in 2025); or • 65% of the statewide per capita average collected for “first half-cent” sales tax in unincorporated areas in the previous fiscal year
15,001 to 100,000	Sales tax equalization up to the greater of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$354,000 (in 2025); or • 70% of the statewide per capita average for “first half-cent” sales tax in unincorporated areas in the previous fiscal year
15,000 or less	Greater of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sales tax equalization to \$354,000 (in 2025); • Sales tax equalization to 70% of the statewide per capita average for “first half-cent” sales tax in unincorporated areas in the previous fiscal year; or • The amount the county received in “backfill” for FY 2005 under section 716, Ch. 276, Laws of 2004 (amended state budget).

City-County Assistance Distribution Certification and Payment Dates

		Statutory Date for Distribution	Actual Payment Date <i>last business day of month</i>	Certification Date
2024 Budget	1st Quarter	April 1, 2025	March 2025	October 1, 2024
	2nd Quarter	July 1, 2025	June 2025	October 1, 2024
	3rd Quarter	October 1, 2025	September 2025	October 1, 2024
	4th Quarter	January 1, 2026	December 2025	October 1, 2025
2025 Budget	1st Quarter	April 1, 2026	March 2026	October 1, 2025
	2nd Quarter	July 1, 2026	June 2026	October 1, 2025
	3rd Quarter	October 1, 2026	September 2026	October 1, 2025
	4th Quarter	January 1, 2027	December 2026	October 1, 2026

Information on the City-County Assistance distributions can be found on the Department of Revenue (DOR) [City-County Assistance webpage](#). To see your county’s 2025 certified amounts, click on “2025 City and County Distributions.” These spreadsheets show the amounts for which each city and county were certified in 2025. For budgeting purposes, it is important to note that the “January 1” distributions are actually made in December of the preceding year.

The preliminary estimates for City-County Assistance distributions in 2026 will be available in September. They will be posted on the DOR City-County Assistance webpage under [“2026 City and County Distribution Estimates.”](#)

Estimated City-County Assistance Fund Distributions to COUNTIES		
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 9,673,312	19.3%
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 10,750,848	11.1%
2026 Estimate	\$ 10,099,418	-6.1%
2027 Estimate	\$ 12,131,768	20.1%

Editor’s Note: The real estate excise tax revenues and forecasts are the work of Eric Swenson of the Washington State Economic and Revenue Forecast Council (ERFC).

Criminal Justice Revenues

Counties receive state shared criminal justice funds from the state general fund under the provisions of [RCW 82.14.310](#). The initial appropriation, made by the state in fiscal year 2000, was \$23.2 million and is increased each July by the “[fiscal growth factor](#).” The county funding formula includes population, crime rate, and the annual number of criminal cases filed in superior court.

Below are the estimated distributions, after state budgetary deductions for the state patrol. Because revenues are not distributed on a strictly per capita basis, we cannot provide a per capita forecast.

Estimated Criminal Justice Distributions – COUNTIES		
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year
2024 Actual	\$ 64,991,864	6.1%
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 69,041,969	6.2%
2026 Estimate	\$ 73,626,370	6.6%
2027 Estimate	\$ 78,518,595	6.6%

Liquor Revenues

Liquor revenues have two separate distributions that are received at different times. There is a state shared distribution from the liquor revolving account for licensing fees (this is referred to by the state and others as “liquor profits”), and there is a distribution from the liquor excise tax account that represents a portion of the excise tax collected on liquor sales. The total distribution from liquor profits is the same each year, while the total distribution for liquor excise taxes varies depending on actual liquor sales.

Liquor Excise Taxes

The formula works as follows:

- 35% of liquor excise tax collected is deposited in the “liquor excise tax fund” for distribution to cities, towns, and counties ([RCW 82.08.160\(1\)](#)).
- \$2.5 million each quarter (\$10 million a year) is deducted from the liquor excise tax fund and remitted to the state general fund ([RCW 82.08.170\(3\)](#)).
- Of the remaining amount, 20% is distributed to counties (based on unincorporated population) and 80% is distributed to cities (based on population).

Below are projections based on the June 2025 ERFC report. It’s important to note that the distributions to cities and counties occur with a lag of one quarter after the collections are made by the state. This difference in timing makes state estimates and our estimates hard to compare. When comparing distributions by the state treasurer’s office to the ERFC forecasts there is usually a variation of plus or minus 2%.

Editor’s Note: The liquor excise tax forecasts are the work of Lance Carey of the Washington State Economic and Revenue Forecast Council (ERFC).

Estimated Liquor Excise Tax Distributions – COUNTIES			
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 7,931,870	-8.3%	\$ 2.91
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 8,016,497	1.1%	\$ 2.92
2026 Estimate	\$ 8,268,232	3.1%	\$ 2.99
2027 Estimate	\$ 8,465,398	2.4%	\$ 3.05

Liquor Profits

Initiative 1183 in 2011 privatized liquor sales in Washington and changed the types of liquor revenues collected by the state. The state now collects revenue in the form of license fees from distributors and retailers, rather than profits from the state-run liquor stores. However, the Liquor and Cannabis Board (LCB) continues to call these funds “liquor profits.” A portion of these collections go to cities, counties, and border jurisdictions. Codified as [RCW 66.24.065](#), it reads:

The distribution of spirits license fees under [RCW 66.24.630](#) and [66.24.055](#) through the liquor revolving fund to border areas, counties, cities, towns, and [MRSC] must be made in a manner that provides that each category of recipients receive, in the aggregate, no less than it received from the liquor revolving fund during comparable periods prior to December 8, 2011. An additional distribution of ten million dollars per year from the spirits license fees must be provided to border areas, counties, cities, and towns through the liquor revolving fund for the purpose of enhancing public safety programs.

The “comparable periods prior to December 8, 2011” were determined by the Office of Financial Management (OFM) to be December 2010, March 2011, July 2011, and September 2011. The liquor profit revenue for cities, counties, and border areas for those four quarters was \$39,438,000. To this amount, LCB adds the \$10 million to enhance public safety programs for a total liquor profits distribution of \$49,438,000 each year. Of that amount, 0.3%, which equals \$148,314, is distributed to border cities and counties based on traffic totals, crime statistics, and per capita law enforcement spending. The remaining \$49,289,686 is distributed as follows:

- Counties receive 20%, or \$9,857,937 annually, distributed proportionately by unincorporated population.
- Cities receive 80%, or \$39,431,749 annually, distributed proportionately by population.

As noted in the statute, \$10 million of the \$49,438,000 – just under 20.23% – must be spent on “enhancing public safety programs.” We recommend that each county split its distribution so that it can account separately for the portion that must be spent on public safety. In addition, at least 2% of your distribution must be used for a licensed or certified alcohol or drug addiction program under [RCW 71.24.555](#).

When forecasting liquor profits beyond next year’s budget it’s important to note that the total county distributions will remain the same from year to year unless the legislature amends the statute. The initiative did not include any measures to account for inflation. The per capita ratio values will vary slightly each year due to population changes.

Estimated Liquor Profit Distributions – COUNTIES			
Calendar Year	Total Distribution	% Change from Previous Year	Per Capita
2024 Actual	\$ 9,857,937	—	\$ 3.59
2025 Revised Estimate	\$ 9,857,937	—	\$ 3.57
2026 Estimate	\$ 9,857,937	—	\$ 3.55
2027 Estimate	\$ 9,857,937	—	\$ 3.53

*Plus additional distribution for border areas.

Transportation Distributions

All counties receive three separate transportation distributions. The first is the motor vehicle fuel tax (MVFT), which is distributed as a percentage of the total fuel taxes collected statewide. The other two, the “increased motor vehicle fuel tax” and “multi-modal” distributions, were created in 2015 and consist of direct transfers from the state transportation fund, so those allocations are not impacted by actual fuel tax collections.

MVFT and increased MVFT distributions must be used for highway purposes, while the multi-modal funds may be used for any transportation purpose.

Reminder: [RCW 47.30.050](#) requires counties to spend at least 0.42% of their MVFT funds each year on pedestrian, equestrian, or bicycle trails, unless 0.42% would amount to \$3,000 or less. In other words, this requirement applies to any county that receives approximately \$714,286 or more in MVFT revenue per year. Counties also have the option to place these dedicated funds in a capital reserve or special revenue fund to accumulate the resources, so long as the funds are used for paths or trails within a 10-year time frame.

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax

County MVFT revenues are distributed under [RCW 46.68.090](#)(2)(h) and (4)(b)and (5)(b), less state adjustments found in [RCW 46.68.120](#)(1) and (3) and withholding for the County Road Administration Board (CRAB) as required by [RCW 46.68.090](#)(2)(h). The distribution formula includes annual road costs and “need” in addition to population

([RCW 46.68.120\(4\)](#)). CRAB calculates the allocation percentages and distributions for each county and certifies them at its [July board meeting](#) each year; CRAB will notify counties directly of the allocations for the next fiscal period. CRAB also posts [Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Reports](#) on its website for current and past distributions.

Fuel taxes in Washington are assessed as cents per gallon, so motor vehicle fuel tax (MVFT) revenues – and therefore the MVFT distributions to cities and counties – depend on the number of gallons sold, not the dollar value of the sales.

The revised estimate for 2025 and the estimates for 2026 and 2027 all include the new 2.5% distribution of the fuel tax increase related to SB 5801. It is important to note that unexpected events that disrupt the transportation system can significantly reduce gas tax collections, as they have in the past with major snowstorms and the COVID-19 pandemic.

Increased Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax and Multi-Modal Funds

In addition to the monthly gas tax distributions, counties receive a share of the multi-modal funds and the 2015 increase in fuel tax ([RCW 46.68.126](#)). This legislation provides a flat amount of over \$25 million annually to counties, cities, and towns, allocated as follows:

- Increased MVFT: \$11,719,000 per year
- Multi-modal funds: \$13,393,000 per year

These revenues are split equally between cities and counties and are not impacted by actual fuel sales; the total distribution amounts remain the same every year unless the legislature were to change them. County distributions are established by the same CRAB formula as the MVFT described earlier and set at the July CRAB board meeting.

Estimated Transportation Distributions – COUNTIES				
Calendar Year	Gas Tax (MVFT)	% Change in Gas Tax from Previous Year	Multi-Modal	Increased MVFT
2024 Actual	\$ 136,664,976	-2.9%	\$ 6,696,599	\$ 5,859,500
2025 Actual	\$ 140,254,610	2.6%	\$ 6,696,599	\$ 5,859,500
2026 Estimate	\$ 149,507,615	6.6%	\$ 6,696,599	\$ 5,859,500
2027 Estimate	\$ 151,707,690	1.5%	\$ 6,696,599	\$ 5,859,500

Per Capita Shared Revenue Tables and Distribution Calendar

The tables below briefly summarize our per capita (population-based) state shared revenue projections; for details, as well as information on other shared revenues that are not distributed on a per capita basis, refer to earlier sections of this publication.

To estimate your jurisdiction’s revenues, multiply the numbers below by your population (unincorporated population for counties), or see our online [State Shared Revenue Estimator](#) (for 2026 estimates only). Please note that these are point-in-time estimates as of July 2025. In particular, MVFT and liquor excise revenues may fluctuate; consider monitoring [ERFC’s quarterly revenue forecasts](#) for updates to overall liquor/cannabis revenues and projected MVFT distributions.

Estimated Per Capita Distributions for Each CITY AND TOWN				
Distribution Type	2024 Actual	2025 Revised	2026 Estimate	2027 Estimate
Criminal Justice - Population*	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.42	\$ 0.45
Criminal Justice - Special Programs	\$ 1.34	\$ 1.40	\$ 1.48	\$ 1.57
Liquor Profits	\$ 7.46	\$ 7.37	\$ 7.33	\$ 7.30
Liquor Excise	\$ 6.91	\$ 6.88	\$ 6.99	\$ 7.10
Gas Tax (MVFT)	\$ 16.58	\$ 16.22	\$ 17.23	\$ 17.27
Multi-Modal	\$ 1.28	\$ 1.27	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.25
Increased MVFT	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.11	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.09

* Minimum distribution of \$1,000 per city/town, regardless of population

Estimated Per Capita Distributions for Each COUNTY				
Distribution Type	2024 Actual	2025 Revised	2026 Estimate	2027 Estimate
Liquor Profits	\$ 3.59	\$ 3.57	\$ 3.55	\$ 3.53
Liquor Excise	\$ 2.91	\$ 2.92	\$ 2.99	\$ 3.05

Shared revenues are distributed on the last business day of the month according to the schedule below.


Shared Revenue Distribution Calendar												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Gas Tax (MVFT)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Increased Gas Tax (MVFT)			●			●			●			●
Multimodal Distribution			●			●			●			●
Liquor Excise Tax	●			●			●			●		
Liquor Profits			●			●			●			●
Cannabis Excise Tax			●			●			●			●
Criminal Justice	●			●			●			●		
Fire Insurance Premium Tax					●							
City/County Assistance			●			●			●			●

Budget Amendments

After the budget is adopted, cities, towns, and counties may amend the budget at any time. It is especially important to monitor budget appropriation levels as you reach the end of your budget cycle. Cities, towns, and counties must have sufficient budget appropriations available for all expenditures including open period expenditures. Budget amendments, if any, must be adopted on or before December 31. Most budget amendments do not require public hearings under state law, although some jurisdictions may have adopted public hearing requirements by policy.

Cities, towns, and counties are not required to hold public hearings on budget amendments related to “nondebtable” emergencies – see [RCW 35.33.081/RCW 35A.33.080](#) (city/town annual budgets), [RCW 35.34.140/RCW 35A.34.140](#) (city/town biennial budgets), and [RCW 36.40.180](#) (counties). Public hearings are also not required for expenditures of unanticipated revenues, transfers within a single fund, or budget reductions. These types of amendments must be made by ordinance but do not require a public hearing.

However, public hearings are required for increasing expenditures for other “public emergencies” that are not considered “nondebtable” – see [RCW 35.33.091/RCW 35A.33.090](#) (city/town annual budgets), [RCW 35.34.150/RCW 35A.34.150](#) (city/town biennial budgets), and [RCW 36.40.140](#) (counties). For cities and towns, the public notice requirements are not specifically outlined in statute. MRSC recommends following the same notice requirements of the preliminary budget hearing. Counties must publish notice of the hearing, as well as a resolution stating the facts of the emergency and the estimated amount of money required to meet it, once in the official county newspaper at least one week before the hearing.

 1.800.933.6772

 MRSC@MRSC.org

 MRSC.org

 facebook.com/MRSCWA

 linkedin.com/company/mrsc

 @MRSC_WA

 OFFICE **225 Tacoma Ave S., Tacoma, WA 98402**
MAILING **1712 6th Ave, Suite 100, PMB 1330, Tacoma, WA 98405**