

REGULATORY NOTE
CHECKLIST OF CRITERIA

Proposed No.: 2019-XXXX Prepared By: Christine Jensen, Permitting Division
Date: March 17, 2019

Yes No N/A
[X] [] []

NEED: Does the proposed regulation respond to a specific, identifiable need? If yes then explain.

Yes, the 2019 Periodic Update to the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) is required by the State Shoreline Management Act. These policy and code amendments are necessary in order to be consistent with changes in state law and to address environmental impacts from certain aquaculture uses.

[X] [] []

If so, is county government the most appropriate organization to address this need? If yes then explain.

Yes, these amendments will apply to the shoreline areas in unincorporated King County, where the County has jurisdiction over shoreline regulations.

[] [] [X]

ECONOMY & JOB GROWTH: Has the economic impact of the proposed regulation been reviewed to ensure it will not have a long-term adverse impact on the economy and job growth in King County? If yes then explain.

[X] [] []

PURPOSE: Is the purpose of the proposed ordinance clear? Describe the purpose of the ordinance.

Yes, the purpose of the ordinance is to update King County’s shoreline regulations, as required by state law to periodically review and update shoreline regulations.

[X] [] []

Are the steps for implementation clear? Describe the steps for implementation.

Yes, implementation will occur through County agencies applying the updated policies and development regulations on land uses in unincorporated King County.

[] [] [X]

EVALUATION: Does the proposed ordinance identify specific measurable outcomes that the proposed regulation should achieve? Describe the measurable outcomes.

[] [] [X]

Is an evaluation process identified? Describe the evaluation process.

[X] [] []

INTERESTED PARTIES: Has adequate collaboration occurred with all those affected by the proposed regulation (including the public, the regulated and the regulators)? Describe the level of collaboration that has been performed.

Yes, a draft of the ordinance was provided to the public for review and comment prior to transmittal, which included the following outreach activities:

- A 30-day public comment period from November 1 to November 30, 2018.
- Development of a project website, which included information about the proposals and various methods for public comment.
- Postcards were mailed to all properties in unincorporated King County that are within the County's shoreline jurisdiction (unincorporated parcels along lakes, streams, rivers, marine shorelines, and within floodplains).
- An open house was held on Vashon on November 17, 2018.
- An online town hall.
- Individual outreach to the tribes, stakeholder groups, adjacent jurisdictions, and federal and state agencies.
- King County social media messaging.
- Outreach to the Vashon media outlets.

COSTS & BENEFITS: Will the proposed regulation achieve the goal with the minimum cost and burden?

Has the cost of not adopting the proposed regulation been considered? Describe and quantify the cost of not adopting the proposed regulation.

Not adopting the policy and code amendments could impact the County's ability to comply with state law. Further, not adopting the proposed aquaculture regulations could result in detrimental impacts to water quality, habitat, and endangered species.

Do the benefits of the proposed regulations outweigh the costs? Describe and the cost and benefits of proposed regulation.

VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE: Does the proposed ordinance inspire voluntary compliance? Describe how voluntary compliance is anticipated to take place.

The proposed code amendments includes provisions for some regulatory relief for property owners that undertake shoreline restoration projects.

CLARITY: Is the proposed ordinance written clearly and concisely, without ambiguities?

Yes.

CONSISTENCY: Is the proposed regulation consistent with existing federal, state and local statutes?

Yes.