

Prop 2: Prioritize Funding of Budget Stabilization Funds

Explanatory Statement:

If approved by voters, this proposition would add a section to the Snohomish County Charter to require the County to maintain a primary stabilization fund and a secondary catastrophic stabilization fund. Appropriations from these funds will require a supermajority of the County Council. Any appropriation from the secondary catastrophic stabilization fund shall include a replenishment plan.

The County shall maintain the primary stabilization fund for fiscal stabilization, revenue volatility, and general budget continuity and shall be administered by the County Finance Department consistent with applicable law and County policies.

The County shall maintain the secondary catastrophic stabilization fund for declared emergencies, catastrophic natural disasters, or severe fiscal disruption threatening the continuity of essential services. The secondary catastrophic stabilization fund shall be capitalized by transferring ten percent of the balance of the primary stabilization fund to the secondary catastrophic stabilization fund. The secondary catastrophic stabilization fund shall be administered by the County Treasurer consistent with County investment policies and State law. The County Treasurer shall provide an annual public report on the condition of the secondary catastrophic stabilization fund. The County Council shall adopt ordinances providing for contributions to the secondary catastrophic stabilization fund from investment earnings from the primary stabilization fund, one-time or extraordinary revenues, emergency reimbursements, dedicated revenue sources, and other sources as directed by ordinance.

PRO

Name	Statement
Brian Sullivan	Author of Prop 1 as the Snohomish County Treasurer

CON

Name	Statement
Christine Eck	Again, this Proposition No. 2 restricts County Council's authority. As they are the elected representatives of County residents, the County Council should retain the authority to make budgetary decisions. And in times of financial crisis, it is critical that County Council as a body be able to decide the allocation of funding after their lawful legislative deliberative process.
Hans Dunshee	I only oppose the requirement of a super majority as it violates the principle of one person one vote. I want my representatives to have equal power to all others and visa versa
Janice Green	I oppose Proposition 2 because county ordinance already protects the budget stabilization fund, with deposit triggers and a supermajority requirement for withdrawals. Locking those mechanics into the charter removes the flexibility to respond to emergencies and fixes a funding formula that commissioners flagged on the record as a possible source of a structural budget gap. The mechanism was reworked late in the process, bond counsel questions were left open before transmittal, and final language reached commissioners the same day they voted on it, after the public hearing had closed. Voters deserve to hear these facts before amending the charter. I reviewed the full 2026 Charter Review Commission record, including the treasurer and budget office testimony on this proposal, and can write a Con statement grounded in primary sources rather than speculation