BRUCE LAING LOUISE MILLER MAGGI FILIIA LABRY GOSSETT

CHRISTOPHER VANCE BRIAN DERDOWSKI --- LARRY PHILLIPS PETE VON REICHBAUER

GREG NICKFI S RON SIMS CYNTHIA SULLIVAN JANE HAGUE

June 2, 1994

Introduced By:

KENT PULLEM

regsmo6.doc

Proposed No.:

мотіом по. 9319

A MOTION establishing criteria to guide the development, review and adoption of regulatory ordinances and requesting the county executive to transmit a regulatory note with proposed regulatory ordinances.

WHEREAS, the county exercises its responsibilities to provide for public safety and to promote public welfare by enacting regulatory ordinances, and

WHEREAS, at its recent special hearings on economic development and job growth, the council heard testimony that many federal, state and local laws and regulations overlap, are ambiguous and are costly to administer and comply with, and

WHEREAS, the council heard further testimony that these laws and regulations inadvertently hinder economic development and job growth, and

WHEREAS, King County government should operate efficiently, without unnecessarily burdening citizens either directly with taxes to support unnecessary governmental regulatory operations or indirectly by unnecessarily increasing costs to businesses which are then passed on to consumers, and

WHEREAS, many speakers at the hearing urged the council to support the work of the Governor's Task Force on Regulatory Reform, which includes criteria for "good regulations" that should be considered when enacting regulatory legislation at the state level, and

1

2

3

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

1	5. INTERESTED PARTIES: Has adequate collaboration
2	occurred with all those affected by the proposed regulation
3	(including the public, the regulated and the regulators)?
4	
5	6. COSTS AND BENEFITS: Will the proposed regulation
6	achieve the goal with the minimum cost and burden? Has the
7	cost of not adopting the proposed regulation been considered?
8	Do the benefits of the proposed regulations outweigh the
9	costs?
٥٠.	
11	7. VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE: Does the proposed ordinance
12	inspire voluntary compliance?
13	
14	8. CLARITY: Is the proposed ordinance written
15	clearly and concisely, without ambiguities?
16	
17	9. CONSISTENCY: Is the proposed regulation
18	consistent with existing federal, state and local statutes?
19	
20	C. The council intends to apply these criteria not only when
21	reviewing proposed regulatory ordinances requested by the
22	executive, but also when reviewing proposed regulatory
23	ordinances initiated by the council.
24	
25	PASSED this 2015 day of Que , 1994.
26 27	KING COUNTY COUNCIL Passed by a vote of $12-0$. KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON
28	Kent Pullen
29	Chair
30	ATTEST:
٠	
31 32	Clerk of the Council