Introduced by: <u>Bernice Stern</u>

æ

	76/969	
1	MOTION NO.	
2	A MOTION authorizing the Council Administrator	
3	to evaluate King County's compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and to	
4	recommend actions to eliminate unnecessary delay, uncertainty and expense caused by the SEPA process.	•*
5	WHEREAS, the Council has maintained a long-standing concern	
6	to ensure that environmental values become an integral part of the	
7	governmental decision-making process along with economic and	
8	technical considerations, and	•
9	WHEREAS, King County was the first local government in the	
10	state to adopt a comprehensive ordinance implementing the State	
11	Environmental Policy Act, and	
12	WHEREAS, the application of SEPA has in many cases substan-	
13	tially improved the quality of King County decisions, and	
14	WHEREAS, while SEPA was orginally designed to apply primarily	
15	to large scale public projects, it has subsequently, by administra-	
16	tive action and court decision been applied to small, private	
17	projects, and	÷.
18	WHEREAS, these interpretations of SEPA have increased the	
19	burden on both local government and private parties, making in	-
20	effect most actions of local government today subject to litigation	
21	and delay, and	÷
22	WHEREAS, there is a need to eliminate unnecessary delay,	
23	uncertainty and expense caused by the SEPA process while	
24	maintaining objectives set forth in the Act, and	
25	WHEREAS, RCW 43.21C.140 authorizes the County to review its	
26	steps for implementing SEPA and the SEPA guidelines and allows the	
27	County to submit a report on the cost of implementation to the	
28	State Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management so that	
29	these evaluations may be incorporated into a report to the	
30	45th Legislative Session.	
31		
32		
33		
	-1-	

11/3/76

2789

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County: 1. The Council Administrator, in conjunction with the County Executive and the County Prosecutor, is hereby authorized to evaluate King County's compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act and to recommend actions to eliminate unnecessary delay, uncertainty and expense caused by the SEPA process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 ,

28

29

30

31

32

33

7 2. In the course of this review, the Council Administrator
8 is directed to look at the following:

a. The effectiveness and efficiency of using the SEPA process for both public and private projects, Countywide programs, and legislative actions.

b. The progress made by County Departments, Divisions and agencies to integrate SEPA requirements into their ongoing decision-making process.

c. The scope of exemptions to the requirements of SEPA, including the size and type of projects and discretionary and duplicative nature of actions.

d. The cost to prepare impact statements, both to private parties and to the public, and the time delays involved in preparation of impact statements.

e. Alternatives to impact statements or modifications to the scope of impact statements that may streamline the process and improve its effectiveness.

f. Changes in the Act, guidelines, County procedures or County organization that may simplify the process and improve its effectiveness.

-2-

3. Prior to implementing this study, and throughout the study itself, the Council Administrator is requested to consult with both interested citizens, public agencies and groups to establish a specific work program for the Council's consideration as a part of the 1977 Legislative Branch Work Program. PASSED this 672 day of December ____, 1976. KING COUNTY COUNCIL KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON man ATTEST: Clerk of the Council 27, -3-

1 129