S1

09/08/2025 Definition Amendment

Sponsor: Mosqueda
[O.Brey]

Proposed No.: BOH25-02

1 STRIKING AMENDMENT TO PROPOSED RULE AND REGULATION BOH25-

2 **02, VERSION 1**

3 On page 1, beginning on line 11, strike everything through page 10, line 198, and insert:

4 "PREAMBLE:

5 1. According to the seminal 2009 study, Broken Laws, Unprotected 6 Workers: Violations of Employment and Labor Laws in America's Cities, 7 conducted by sociologists at UCLA, University of Illinois, and Rutgers, in 8 any given week as many as twenty-five percent of workers in low wage 9 jobs are paid less than minimum wage. These results were replicated in 10 2018 by David Cooper & Teresa Kroeger who together published 11 Employers Steal Billions from Workers' Paychecks Each Year, which 12 found if low wage workers were paid in compliance with minimum wage 13 laws, 159,000 families in the top ten most populous states would be lifted 14 out of poverty. Likewise, according to a 2022 wage theft study conducted 15 by Neil Damron, Martin Garfinkel, Danielle Alvarado, and Daniel Galvin, 16 those trends are the same in King County where an estimated three in ten 17 low wage workers suffered minimum wage violations depriving them of 18 almost 20 percent of their earned wages.

2. The most vulnerable workers are most in need of protection from wage theft. In Deterring Wage Theft: Alt Labor, State Politics, and the Policy Determinants of Minimum Wage Compliance, Daniel Galvin, Associate Professor of Political Science and Faculty Fellow at the Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University, concluded that the more vulnerable the worker, the more likely an employer will engage in wage theft. This is because, as further described by Professor Nicole Hallett in The Problem of Wage Theft, employers stand to gain more from violating the law the greater the difference between the market wage and the minimum wage. 3. It is difficult and risky for vulnerable, low wage workers to bring claims of wage theft, therefore policy solutions should focus on deterrence, attempting to create a cultural expectation of timely payment. Again, according to Daniel Galvin in Deterring Wage Theft, it is possible to achieve wage theft deterrence in two ways. First, if the consequence of each violation is relatively low, deterrence can be achieved if the enforcement happens reliably and consistently. Second, where consistent enforcement is not possible, then the deterrence can still be achieved but the individual consequences are more significant. 4. As has been recognized for many years, deterring wage theft among vulnerable workers helps to preserve and protect public health. RCW 49.12.010, first enacted in 1917, makes this connection clear by declaring "the welfare of the state of Washington demands that all employees be protected from conditions of labor which have a pernicious effect on their

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

health. The state of Washington, therefore, exercising herein its police 43 and sovereign power declares that inadequate wages and unsanitary 44 conditions of labor exert such pernicious effect." 45 5. Upholding Washington's minimum wage law in West Coast Hotel Co. 46 v. Parrish, 300 U.S. 379 (1937), the United States Supreme Court agreed, 47 finding "the exploitation of a class of workers who are in an unequal 48 position with respect to bargaining power [...] is not only detrimental to 49 their health and wellbeing but casts a direct burden for their support upon 50 the community." In 1961, the legislature again affirmed this purpose 51 again in Washington's minimum wage law by "declar[ing] that in its 52 considered judgment the health, safety and the general welfare of the 53 citizens of this state require the enactment of [the minimum wage law]." 54 BE IT ADOPTED BY THE KING COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH: 55 SECTION 1. Findings: 56 A. The Washington state Department of Labor and Industries conducts 57 employment-related investigations and enforcement actions under Title 49 RCW, which 58 includes laws governing: protected leave, under title 49 RCW; the Industrial Welfare Act, 59 chapter 49.12 RCW; youth employment, under chapter 49.12 RCW and chapter 296-125 60 WAC; family care, under RCW 49.12.265 through RCW 49.12.295; emergency first 61 responders, under RCW 49.12.460; healthcare overtime, under RCW 49.28.130; 62 agriculture, under chapter 49.30 RCW, chapter 19.30 RCW, and chapter 296-131 WAC; 63 minimum wage and paid sick leave, under chapter 49.46 RCW and chapter 296-128 64 WAC; retaliation, under chapter 49.46 RCW and chapter 296-128 WAC; wage payment,

under chapter 49.48 RCW; the Washington Equal Pay and Opportunities Act, chapter 49.58 RCW; isolated workers, under RCW 49.60.515; domestic violence protected leave, under chapter 49.76 RCW; military spousal leave, under chapter 49.77 RCW; warehouse protections, under chapter 49.84 RCW.

- B. The city of Seattle Office of Labor Standards conducts investigations and enforcement actions of city employment-related laws including: app-based worker minimum pay, chapter 8.37 Seattle Municipal Code ("SMC"); cannabis employee job retention, chapter 8.38 SMC; app-based worker paid sick and safe time, chapter 8.39 SMC; paid sick time, chapter 14.16 SMC; fair chance employment, chapter 14.17 SMC; hotel employees job retention, chapter 14.19 SMC; minimum wage, chapter 14.19 SMC; wages, hours, and conditions of employment, chapter 14.20 SMC; secure scheduling, chapter 14.22 SMC; domestic workers, chapter 14.23 SMC; protecting hotel employees from violent or harassing conduct, chapter 14.26 SMC; protecting hotel workers from injury, chapter 14.27 SMC; improving access to medical care for hotel employees, chapter 14.28 SMC; commuter benefit, chapter 14.30 SMC; and independent contractor protections, chapter 14.34 SMC.
- C. The King County department of local services has the authority to conduct investigations and enforcement of county minimum wage laws in unincorporated areas under K.C.C. chapter 12.18B.
- D. The Washington state Office of the Attorney General has independent authority to bring enforcement actions in the public interest to ensure compliance with Washington laws under RCW 43.10.030, including antidiscrimination, wage-and-hour, and other laws regulating the conditions of employment of Washington workers.

- E. Financial obligations including fines and payments to affected workers may be ordered by a court or imposed on employers by the state, city, or county as a result of the employment-related enforcement actions.
 - F. On July 17, 2025, the King County Board of Health received a briefing that enforcement of minimum standards of wage and labor laws in the food service context protects the health of customers.

- G. WAC 246-215-08405 identifies the conditions that would prompt prioritized and more frequent inspections based on the Board of Health's assessment of a food establishment's history of compliance with the food code and the establishment's potential as a vector of foodborne illness.
- H. Required by the federal Fair Labor Standards Act, employers are required to post the federal minimum wage poster in a conspicuous place in their workplaces. Under RCW 50A.20.020, employers are required to post the Paid Family and Medical Leave Poster. Under RCW 49.17.220, employers are required to post the Job Safety and Health Law poster.
- I. Required by local jurisdictions, employers are required to post their local jurisdictions' employer labor standards poster in their workplaces.
- <u>NEW SECTION. SECTION 2.</u> There is hereby added to BOH 5.04 a new section to read as follows:
- "Noncompliant with employment-related financial obligations" means a failure to comply with payment obligations imposed through a final government agency-initiated order, determination, settlement, or court order, enforcing state and local labor standards laws from which no appeal is pending.

SECTION 3. R&R 17-01, Section 5, as amended, and BOH 5.15.010 are each hereby amended to read as follows:

- A. The requirements of this section apply to general food service establishments, bakeries, mobile food units, meat/fish establishments, and catering operations, and not to any other category of food establishment.
- B. The owner or operator of a general food service establishment, bakery, mobile food unit, meat/fish establishment, or catering operation shall post, at the establishment, a food safety rating placard or placards provided by the health officer. Each placard must be posted:
- 1. Within five feet of the main public entrance or entrances of the general food service establishment, bakery, mobile food unit, meat/fish establishment, or catering operation, positioned conspicuously in a window or display case to ensure the placard is clearly visible to passersby and to patrons entering or visiting the establishment; or
- 2. In a conspicuous location at the general food service establishment, bakery, mobile food unit, meat/fish establishment, or catering operation as determined and directed in the discretion of the health officer to ensure the placard is clearly visible to passerby and to patrons entering or visiting the establishment.
- C. After the conclusion of each routine food safety inspection, the health officer shall recalculate the food safety rating of the general food service establishment, bakery, mobile food unit, meat/fish establishment, or catering operation and provide the establishment owner or operator one or more updated food safety rating placards for display at the establishment.

D.1. If the health officer has been notified under Section 4(9) that the general
food service establishment, bakery, mobile food unit, meat/fish establishment, or catering
operation is noncompliant with employment-related financial obligations, the health
officer shall place an additional placard with information regarding the noncompliance
with employment-related financial obligations in a conspicuous location directly adjacent
to the food safety placard while completing the health safety inspection under Section
<u>4(9).</u>
2. The additional placard shall remain in place until the food service
establishment, bakery, mobile food unit, meat/fish establishment, or catering operation
notifies the department that they are no longer noncompliant with employment-related
financial obligations due to initiation of payment or subsequent appeal. Upon notifying
the department, the food service establishment bakery, mobile food unit, meat/fish
establishment, or catering operation may remove the additional placard.
NEW SECTION. SECTION 4. There is hereby added to BOH 5.60 a new
section to read as follows:
Frequency – Performance- and risk-based. WAC 246-215-08405 is
supplemented with the following:
(9) Whether the health officer has been notified by the city of Seattle Office of
Labor Standards, the Washington state Department of Labor and Industries, or the
Washington state Attorney General that the establishment is noncompliant with
employment-related financial obligations under BOH chapter 5.04.
NEW SECTION. SECTION 5. There is hereby added to BOH 5.60 a new
section to read as follows:

157	obligations shall be completed by the health officer within thirty business days of
158	receiving notification from the city of Seattle Office of Labor Standards, the Washington
159	state Department of Labor and Industries, or the Washington state Attorney General that
160	an establishment is noncompliant with employment-related financial obligations.
161	NEW SECTION. SECTION 6. There is hereby added to BOH 5.60 a new
162	section to read as follows:
163	Public Health - Seattle & King County shall design an additional placard
164	indicating a food service establishment's noncompliance with employment-related
165	financial obligations. The additional placard should:
166	A. Indicate that the food establishment is subject to increased inspections due to
167	the noncompliance with employment-related financial obligations; and
168	B. Be designed to complement the existing food safety rating placard design and
169	not obscure information on the food safety rating placard.
170	NEW SECTION. SECTION 7. There is hereby added to BOH 5.60 a new
171	section to read as follows:
172	The health officer shall distribute written materials or provide a link to web-based
173	information on the food inspection report explaining sections 2 through 6 of this rule and
174	regulation to the person in charge of a food establishment as part of all food safety
175	inspections.
176	SECTION 8. The King County executive shall confer with the city of Seattle
177	Office of Labor Standards, the Washington state Department of Labor and Industries, and
178	the Washington state Attorney General and endeavor to agree with each entity by August

An inspection prompted by noncompliance with employment-related financial

1, 2026, on terms for an agreement that shall contain, but not be limited to, the following elements:

- A. The process for notifying the Seattle-King County Department of Public Health of owners or permit holders who are located within King County or have zip codes within King County who are noncompliant with employment-related financial obligations.
- B. Identification of the data that will be transmitted between agencies including, for example, name of owner or permit holders who are noncompliant with employment-related financial obligations, contact information, unique business identifier, the name and case number of the final judgment, frequency of transmission of data, no less than once per quarter, and mechanism for transmission.
- C. The process and authority for other Washington state and city of Seattle departments to communicate with Seattle-King County Department of Public Health that the establishment has resolved the employment-related financial obligation notified under subsection A. of this section or if the establishment is under protest.
- D. Language to be included in the placard and communications from the Public

 Health Seattle & King County, the city of Seattle Office of Labor Standards, the

 Washington state Department of Labor and Industries, and the Washington state Attorney

 General to the owners or permit holders regarding this rule and regulation.
- SECTION 9. Sections 1 through 7 of this R&R take effect August 15, 2026.

 SECTION 10. Severability. If any provision of this rule or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the rule or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected."

EFFECT prepared by O. Brey: The amendment would make clarifying edits to the definition of "noncompliant with employment-related financial obligations" and make edits to the use of the term throughout the R&R. The amendment would add to the findings the Washington State Attorney General's role in enforcing labor-related laws and add additional employment and labor-related laws to the list of laws that the City of Seattle's Office of Labor Standards enforces. The amendment would also add the Washington State Attorney General as a party that could share data on businesses that are noncompliant with employment-related financial obligations.