

REGULATORY NOTE  
CHECKLIST OF CRITERIA **2004-114**

Proposed No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared By: Paul Reitenbach, DDES

Date: March 1, 2004

Yes No N/A

**NEED: Does the proposed regulation respond to a specific, identifiable need?**

The proposed regulations implement the policies of the King County Comprehensive Plan. For example, proposed amendments to Title 21A Allow increased economic activity in Rural and Resource lands without the need for higher levels of public services. This addresses a need identified by farmers and rural residents.

**If so, is county government the most appropriate organization to address this need?**

King County Government has regulatory authority for land use in unincorporated areas

**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?**

No adverse impacts to the economy or job growth have been identified. The proposed comprehensive plan update accommodates the job and household growth targets assigned to King County in the Countywide Planning Policies.

**PURPOSE: Is the purpose of the proposed ordinance clear?**

The ordinances would adopt the Executive Recommended Comprehensive Plan 2004 and related amendments to the King County Code in accordance RCW 36.70A.130 and K.C.C. 20.18 .

**Are the steps for implementation clear?**

The comprehensive plan guides land use in unincorporated King County. The comprehensive plan will be primarily implemented by DDES, through the development review process. The amendments in the plan will be implemented by amendments to K.C.C. Titles 13, 14, 19A, and 21A.

Yes No N/A

**EVALUATION: Does the proposed ordinance identify specific measurable outcomes that the proposed regulation should achieve?**  
The comprehensive plan includes growth targets for the unincorporated Urban Area.

**Is an evaluation process identified?**  
A monitoring system is in place to determine whether or not King County is achieving its growth targets.

**INTERESTED PARTIES: Has adequate collaboration occurred with all those affected by the proposed regulation (including the public, the regulated and the regulators)?**

A detailed account of the extensive public outreach associated with the development of the Executive Recommended Comprehensive Plan 2004 is included in the transmittal package.

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

No fiscal impacts have been identified to King County government. The proposal does not place undue financial burdens on affected property owners.

**Has the cost of not adopting the proposed regulation been considered?**  
Failure to adopt the proposed Update by December 1, 2004 would violate the requirements of the Growth Management Act (36.70A.130).

**Do the benefits of the proposed regulations outweigh the costs?**

**VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE: Does the proposed ordinance inspire voluntary compliance?**

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

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

Refer to the analysis matrix included with the transmittal package.