

## **KING COUNTY**

1200 King County Courthouse 516 Third Avenue Seattle, WA 98104

## **Signature Report**

July 23, 2002

## Ordinance 14426

**Proposed No.** 2002-0320.1

**Sponsors** Hague and Irons

| 1  | AN ORDINANCE relating to requests for interpretation of                   |
|----|---|
| 2  | the King County Code; and amending Ordinance 14033,                       |
| 3  | Section 9, and K.C.C. 2.100.900   |
| 4  |   |
| 5  |   |
| 6  | STATEMENT OF FACTS:   |
| 7  | 1. Ordinance 14033 was adopted in compliance with the findings and        |
| 8  | orders contained in a September 11, 2000, King County superior court      |
| 9  | decision. In the decision, the court determined that the county failed to |
| 10 | adopt procedures for rendering administrative interpretations of code as  |
| 11 | required by RCW 36.70B.030(3) and 36.70B.110(11). The county was          |
| 12 | ordered to adopt, by ordinance, procedures for administrative             |
| 13 | interpretations no later than one hundred fifty days from the date of the |
| 14 | decision.   |
| 15 | 2. In its adoption of Ordinance 14033, the council included a provision   |
| 16 | contained in Ordinance 14033, Section 9, and codified as K.C.C.           |
| 17 | 2.100.900, that called for the transmittal within twelve months of the    |

| 18 | effective date of the ordinance, a report to the chair of the growth          |
|----|---|
| 19 | management and unincorporated areas committee evaluating the                  |
| 20 | effectiveness of the ordinance and recommending any necessary revisions       |
| 21 | to better carry out the intent of the ordinance.                              |
| 22 | 3. Although the department of development and environmental services          |
| 23 | had several inquiries about the code interpretation process during the first  |
| 24 | year (February 2001-2002) it has been in effect, no formal request for a      |
| 25 | code interpretation was submitted to any county departments in that           |
| 26 | period. No evaluation of the effectiveness of the process was possible.       |
| 27 | 4. In April and May, two requests were received by the department of          |
| 28 | development and environmental services. Neither interpretation decision       |
| 29 | has been issued to date. Based on the limited number of requests              |
| 30 | submitted to date and the fact that no formal interpretation has been issued  |
| 31 | on those limited requests, the executive has no recommended changes to        |
| 32 | the ordinance or process at this time.  |
| 33 | 5. The need for the subsequent evaluation anticipated at the time of          |
| 34 | ordinance adoption, is not diminished by the lack of requests for             |
| 35 | interpretations. Therefore, the deadline for a report should be extended to   |
| 36 | allow the submittal of additional requests upon which to base an              |
| 37 | evaluation.   |
| 38 | 6. Of greater significance is the fact that, in the same section, the council |
| 39 | stipulated that the ordinance would be in effect for five hundred forty-      |

| 40 | eight days after the effective date of the ordinance, which is August 24,                |
|----|--|
| 41 | 2002.  |
| 42 | 7. Since Ordinance 14033 was adopted in response to a court order, there                 |
| 43 | is a risk that the county may be found out of compliance with the order if               |
| 44 | the code interpretation procedure is allowed to expire.                                  |
| 45 | BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:  |
| 46 | SECTION 1. Ordinance 14033, Section 9, and K.C.C. 2.100.900 are each hereby              |
| 47 | amended to read as follows:  |
| 48 | ((Effective period and e))Evaluation. ((Ordinance 14033 shall be in effect for a         |
| 49 | period of five hundred forty-eight days after February 22, 2001. Within twelve months of |
| 50 | February 22, 2001, t))The executive shall transmit a report to the chair of the growth   |
| 51 | management and unincorporated areas committee by June 1, 2003, evaluating the            |

- effectiveness of ((the o))Ordinance  $\underline{14033}$  and recommending any necessary revisions to
- better carry out the intent of ((the o))Ordinance 14033.

54

Ordinance 14426 was introduced on 7/15/2002 and passed by the Metropolitan King County Council on 7/22/2002, by the following vote:

Yes: 13 - Ms. Sullivan, Ms. Edmonds, Mr. von Reichbauer, Ms. Lambert, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Pelz, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Constantine, Mr. Pullen, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Hague, Mr. Irons and Ms. Patterson

No: 0

Excused: 0

KING COUNTY COUNCIL KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

nthia Sullivan, Chair

ATTEST:

Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

APPROVED this 1 day of lugus, 2002

Ron Sims County Executive

PH 2: 3

Attachments

None